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H. B.
FOREWORD

The present *Dada Berlin* is the fifth volume of the series *Crisis and the Arts: The History of Dada*. It presents the history of that movement in the German capital and also its philosophical concepts and political conflicts. Despite the seeming disappearance of Dada as a historical phenomenon, the questions that the movement once raised continue to provoke to this day, and the answers are still lacking. Regarding modernism as long as we talk of a crisis in the arts and in culture, we will have to reconsider the options and positions of Dada, since it was Dada that opened up a perspective of its own on modernism. Dada perceived modernism neither from an optimistic-utopian nor from a pessimistic-cultural angle, but rather as a field of tension that continually produces polarizing movements of extremes and ambivalences between chaos and order, life and the sciences, playing and the “Bloody Earnest”, artistry and political involvement, art as revolution and art at the service of revolution — between “Everything” and “Nothing.”

Since the 1970s, histories of literature and art have systematically analyzed Dada Berlin (1917–23), perceiving it as a specific contribution within the international Dada movement. While the first monographs on Dada by Motherwell (1951) and Verkauf, Bolliger, and Janco (1957) and also the Dada exhibitions in New York (1936, 1953, 1968), in Dusseldorf (1958), and in Zurich and Paris (1966–67) failed to adequately appreciate Dada Berlin, it received its first comprehensive representation in the context of the exhibition organized by the Council of Europe *Tendenzen der zwanziger Jahre: Dada in Europa* (Tendencies of the Twenties: Dada in Europe) in 1977. This event was followed by exhibitions: *Dada and Surrealism Reviewed* (1978), *Paris-Berlin* (1978), *The Twenties in Berlin* (London, 1978), *Dada: Berlin, Cologne, Hanover* (Boston, 1981). In 1994, it was integrated once more into the extensive synopsis of the international Dada movement in Zurich.

These publications and exhibitions contributed to the fact that since the 1970s research interests have focused also on the individual artistic members of Dada Berlin or at least have assessed the Dada movement within the context of their works as a whole. The last comprehensive retrospectives of Hannah Höch (Berlin, 1989; Minneapolis, New York, Los Angeles, 1997), Hausmann (Berlin and Valencia, 1994), Heartfield (Berlin, Bonn, Tübingen, Hannover, 1991–92), Grosz (Berlin and Dusseldorf, 1995), Dix (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1991), Schlichter (Tübingen, Wuppertal, Munich, 1997–98), and the monographs on Huelsenbeck (1996) and documentations on Baader (1991) now confirm the unshakeable importance of Dada Berlin in “Classic Modernism.”

Moreover, since the 1950s, the participating artists in Dada Berlin had been writing about Dada Berlin from their own points of view: Grosz (1942), Huelsenbeck (1957), Hausmann (1958), Mehring (1959), and Jung (1961). Huelsenbeck published a literary documentation on Dada in 1964, when the interest in Dada was rising in the context of Pop Art, Fluxus, and an increased political awareness of art. Richter made an extensive presentation of international Dadaism available. Hannah Höch commented comprehensively on Dada Berlin by the end of 1968, and in 1972, a wide-ranging publication by Hausmann was printed, drawing attention to Hausmann’s own participation in the movement.

The driving forces of the first research publications on Dada Berlin in the seventies were Karl Riha and Richard Sheppard, both of whom were motivated primarily by their literary research interests. In Italy, Arturo Schwarz, as a gallery owner and as a publisher, was focusing his attention on Dada. From an art-historical point of view, Dada Berlin has received a solid grounding owing to Eberhard Roters’ Berlinische Galerie with exhibitions and publications of
the unpublished works by Höch and Hausmann. Since the eighties, Rudolf Kuenzli and Stephen Foster (University of Iowa) have directed the attention of American scholarship to the history of Dada. Stephen Foster has made a particular contribution with a series of publications begun in 1996 that takes stock of the scholarly research on this subject. In these respects, American scholarship has freed itself from the perspective chiefly initiated by William S. Rubin of seeing Dada mainly in connection to Surrealism.

Since the 1960s in the course of publications on collage and montage, works of Dada Berlin received the attention of art historians. The high point of collage exhibitions and publications came with the works of Alain Jouffroy and Robert Label, Harriet Janis and Rudi Blesh, Jürgen Wissmann, Ewald Rathke, Herta Wescher, Erika Billeter, Helen Hutton, Franz Mon, and Heinz Niedel, followed in 1969 by the first comprehensive exhibition on photomontage organized by Richard Hiepe. Annegret Jürgens-Kirchhoff in 1976 took on a research publication of the Berlin montages to mark out their difference from the collage works by Schwitters and to consider them within the context of Peter Bürger’s theory of Avant-garde (1974), thereby differentiating them through concrete analyses. In 1987, Werner Hofmann linked the montage principle with the wider context of mannerism, connecting montage to the distinctive mannerist mix of forms: freedom of choice for the degree of realism, polyvalence, transitory interweaving and distortion of shapes, forms of potentiality and variability, as well as multi-materiality. Finally, as an attitude, Dada Berlin entered the philosophical realm in 1983 with Peter Sloterdijk, forming an important part of his Kritik der zynischen Vernunft (Critique of Cynical Reason) as “chaotology” and “neokynism.” In my own research on Dada Berlin, I have identified these movements since the seventies as a focal point reflecting the inner conflicts and irreconcilabilities, the breaks, polarities, and simultaneities of “Classic Modernism.” This present book is based on my extensive research on Dada, documented already in 1977 in the exhibition and catalogue Dada in Europa: Werke und Dokumente (Dada in Europe: Works and Documents). While my publication Das Lachen Dadas (Dada’s Laughter, 1989) concentrated on the open concept of Club Dada, in 2000 I focused primarily on the analysis of the “products” in my book Montage und Metamechanik (Montage and Metamechanics).

Dada answered the culture shock of modernity that had been generated particularly by World War I, alerting to the fact that there were no homogenous phenomena in modernity, as was claimed for example by “International Style.” It developed an attitude of “both-and” in place of an “either-or,” simultaneously including and excluding the contradictions, for example, of euphoria and criticism of technology, internationalism and regionalism, utopian holistic visions and heterogeneity, relativity and nonsense or contradictions between, for example, the lack of tradition and the penchant toward another cultural tradition in which art, life, and the sciences still are unified. These polarizations do not imply mechanistic divisions or static basic conflicts. They are comparable to the poles of a magnet that only Dada was able to bring into a state of tension and between which the Dadaists performed a “balance in contradictions” (Hausmann) provoking their diverging but complementary fields of force.

With its “artistry of polarities,” Dada Berlin was aiming at the production of a creative form of life, transforming Nietzsche’s philosophy of life and art into contemporary terms, since for the Dadaists art did not stop at the work of art. What concerned them was art as the art of living, its design, ideas, and experiments of a new existence, through which alone the artist becomes what he is — epitomizing a constant self-experiment, far from all ambitions of perfectibility. Only in this process of acquisition, choice, revision, remodeling, and balancing did those artistic procedures develop that allowed for a net of relationships and the complexity of
life. Here it was the substance, the material, and the object alone that opened up “life,” which could be experienced only through the crossing of the hierarchical cultural borders. Only by going beyond traditional aesthetics, values, and ideals, did art approach the concept of truth that itself became an artistic act. Therefore, the work of art was not to ossify into a finished object, but to become a “product” in the course of the montage procedure.

In this manner, as “artists of life,” the Dadaists admitted the very forms of production and the movements of life as polar processes, driving them with a “balance of contradictions” into a state of formlessness that, however, did not end in chaos but evoked an original work on form. For the dissolution, even the destruction of form was aiming at a new self-formation in the interfaces of cultural revolt, epochal political disturbances, gender crisis, the beginning revolution in the media, turbo-developments in technology, and scientific upheavals.

Dada’s artistic worldview, however, was not only concerned with the recognition of life; it also was making sure to include both the cognitive elements of art and the artistic components of the sciences, seeing itself as “Gay Science” (Nietzsche), as it were. It is therefore noticeable that between 1917 and 1922 contradictory creative procedures of Dada Berlin were emerging, which not only became evident in the various activities and manifestations but also in both the “products” of the montages and in the “metamechanical constructions.” Their polar driving forces interpenetrated and were mutually conditional, resulting both in a simultaneously eccentric and cool effect. While the montage principle was concerned with the excessive search for the fulfilled moment in keeping with the times, and while, as political allegory, it was transforming the tension between disintegration and dynamics, this ecstatic method also produced its contrary. Simultaneity generated its stagnating present, and the turbulent media-event created its own dullness of the ever same conditions of a powerful interconnection of capital, politics, industry, and culture. This other side was exposed after 1919 by the “metamechanical constructions” with the help of the universalistic means of technical drawings and diagrams, transforming these into heuristic drafts of a new connection between art and technology, art and the sciences, at the same time playful and rational, filled with irritating brightness and clarity.

For the first time, in the present analysis, Dada’s polar procedure is genuinely related to the complex interplay of the Dionysian-Apollinian antagonisms as they were developed in Nietzsche’s philosophy of life and art. Moreover, Dada is seen in the context of his demand to view art in the perspective of life and science in the perspective of art. The representation of the First International Dada-Fair (1920), the reconstruction of the exhibition, and the illustrations of the catalog show how Dada’s artistry conceptually condensed into a genre-dissolving and product-blasting total work of destruction. At the same time, it magnified into a grotesque apocalypse, in which both progress-orientation and ideological addiction (especially the German nationalistic pathos of “last judgment”) were burned at the stakes of Dada, igniting a saturnalia of art.

Hanne Bergius
INTRODUCTION

World War I was the catastrophe initiating Dada, the tabula rasa of all traditions, beliefs, and ideals, leaving only one imperative: to have none. The movement created its insurgent ironic spirit out of the paradox of a negating affirmation of the “bankruptcy of occidental culture” (Grosz). The disintegration of the present world, obviously in a state of dissolution and metamorphosis, was to be propelled forward in order to topple the last hierarchical residues of thought and perception. Ready for risk and craving complexity the Dadaists set out to reassess art, daring chaos, recharging their creative endeavors with the anarchical “experience of all relationships” (Hausmann). What was at stake, despite and because of their renunciation of “pyramidal notions,” was totality as a “cross-section,” no matter how torn and fragmentary it might be. The focusing of powers was just as essential for Dada as was their disruption.

To be at the center of society, simultaneously against it and for it, to be free of and for things opened active communication that changed art into a multimedia operation that transgressed the borders between high and low culture. Dada Berlin was working at the intersection of artistic revolt, an emerging revolution in media, and social upheavals. The traditional concept of the work of art dissolved, and new coordinates of evaluation and reception were activated for the creative act. Imponderability and precariousness, decentralization and unfathomableness were the conceded and necessary factors of this radical aesthetic experiment; they were to guarantee that art would be propelled from the “areas of trends and schools” back into “concrete life” (Herzfelde). Not to deny contradictions or to cancel them, but to let them occur and collide in a creative act of balance, this was the new true-to-life quality of Dada’s artistry revealing the complex relationship of this revolt to the real chaos of the times. The forms of production and movements of life itself — its principle of polarity — characterized the new artistic methods of Dada as processual contradictoriness.

The tensions of polarities, like destruction and creation, ironic play and “bloody seriousness,” chaos and monotony, incomprehensibility and clarity, reality and possibility, mutually permeated and augmented each other between the absolute extremes of “everything” and “nothing.” The Dadaist was torn by the irreconcilable opposition of the genders, and he also faced the clashing of nature and artifact, of man and machine, the singular and the reproducible colliding and bringing forth of new tensions between life and death, movement and rigidity, partly irreconcilably opposed, partly relativizing one another. The change of strategies and positions was culminating in a “both-and” of autonomy and social engagement, of utopia and nonsense, abstraction and symbiosis of art and life, integrating the highs and lows of eccentricity and melancholy, emotion and intellectuality. Was Dada “a point zero of all world polarities” and at the same time “creator of all difference” (Friedlaender)?

Past and present were merging in an all-embracing simultaneity of the Dadaist products, seizing the decline of the era with enormous dynamics. Of all European metropolises, Berlin (fig. 2.1–2.8) was an outstanding place of political chaos that created this conflicting “Ort . . . da . . . da,” this “place . . . there . . . there” (Baader), where artists saw themselves confronted with the “entire brutal reality” (Huelsenbeck): with undigested consequences of the war, the breakdown of the empire, the policy disputes and social contradictions (like the November Revolution, the prosecution of Spartacus supporters, or the Kapp putsch), with diverging cultural interests and revolts, the powerful beginning of joint activities of media and politics, the exploding dimensions of technical-industrial dynamics, but also with criminal activities in the background. All this, and even the “double draft” blowing in the city simultaneously from America and
Russia made the Dadaists charge through their ateliers. They began their turbulent interplay of polar forces in the here and now of these tension-filled realities, attempting to keep the conflicting potential of these extremes open in a “Balance in Widersprüchen” (balance in contradictions, Hausmann). Constantly threatened to lose this balance, they exposed themselves to the attractions and repulsions of these polarities in order to create an authentic art in which dichotomies, breaks, and irreconcilables still would be visible in the works themselves.


Their procedures invalidated all previous concepts of a homogeneous artistic personality. Subjectivity was dissolved into multispectral and multivalid plurality by a process of “creative indifference” (Friedlaender): analytical and sensitive, critical and fictitious. With this concept of openness, the Dadaists distanced themselves from the pathos of a closed community, which still had been invoked by the Expressionists as a warming and elevating sanctuary. It was not the feeling of community that marked the Dadaists’ creations as real-montages but the gap between society and the anonymity of the public, in which “life” in all its facets of “self” and “other” (Otto Gross) was fluctuating. On the one hand, the new materiality of machines and media characterized their vitalistic view of this second nature of “life”; on the other, they resisted the increasing medialized and mechanized construction of the real, dissecting abruptly the coherence in the world of language and image. The montage principle became dominant among the different realizations of collage, photomontage Klebebild (“mucilage”), assemblage (the Plastik), and installation, dynamizing literary expression as well as the relationship between picture and text by employing new typography, sound-poetry, and simultaneous poetry, culminating in events and manifestations as early forms of happenings. Montage as a method can thus be attributed to different art forms, to literature, music, film, and theater, as well as to advertisement.

This centrifugal opening up of boundaries set off by the Dadaist montage method also provoked its aesthetic contrary: the centripetal, concentrated limitation. Dada Berlin was concerned both with the breaking up of contents and forms and with creating a new relationship between art and rationality. In the metamechanical constructions, the Dadaist changed himself into an abstractly working, de-individualized, collectivized “engineer,” simulating in his representations the rational functionalism of technology and its mechanized laws of precision. The works showed purified processes of reduction and abstraction, aesthetically oriented on blueprints, diagrams, constructions, and maps. Any false sentiment was to make way in order to assert “control over line and form” (Grosz). The unifying, typifying concept, contrary to the open form and to the abundance of material of the montages, was aiming at a hermetic design of the picture. While the montages activated and provoked the viewer, the metamechanical
constructions demanded instead a contemplative perception. Not least of all it was here that the tension between the group dynamic processes and the pensive loner, the Dandy, made itself felt.

True to the Dadaist attempt at balancing “everything” and “nothing,” the creative methods were ambivalent and transformed negatively both critique of civilization and culture and transformed positively visions of creative freedom. Antithetical as these methods seemed to be, their concepts nevertheless were not rigid; they related to each other and, especially in 1919 and 1920, they even intersected: the chaos of the montages, representing at the same time a constructive discipline and the purity of the metamechanics, included also a labyrinthine puzzle.

These polarized creative impulses, these creative tensions between eccentric dissolution and abstracting concentration, made for the “attitude” of Dada as a balancing totality of contradictions. By way of Friedlaender’s conceptual influence, they can be credited to Nietzsche’s philosophy of art and life. Within his philosophy, this contradiction can be understood as the antagonism between the Dionysian and Apollinian, his projection of the contradictoriness of modernity onto antiquity, first formulated in 1872 in Die Geburt der Tragödie aus dem Geiste der Musik (The Birth of Tragedy from the Spirit of Music). They are basically related to his demand to see art “in the perspective” of life and science “in the perspective” of art. The creative forces of the Dionysian and the Apollinian as reciprocal impacts penetrated both the montages, shaped more by the Dionysian, and the metamechanical constructions, predominantly molded by the Apollinian. But only the merging and antagonistic impulses of these two creative forces determined both procedures and elucidated their reciprocally polar fields of tension.

Even if the artistic revolt of Dada Berlin was syncretistic, concerning itself with anarchism (Bakunin, Kropotkin), individual anarchism (Stirner), communism (Marx, Engels), psychoanalysis (Freud, Adler, Gross), philosophy (Bergson, Schopenhauer), the natural sciences (Newton, Einstein), and the literary, architectural, musical, and artistic avant-garde movements of the times, and even if it was moreover characterized by the individual interests of the involved artists, Nietzsche’s influence on the concept was more fundamental and formative than all these important facets. Huelsenbeck claimed in Dada siegt! (Dada Triumphs!, 1920) that “all” Dadaists had read Nietzsche. The impact of his philosophy on culture at the time was of enormous importance at any rate; the principle of polarity, for example, is reflected in Worringer’s essay on Abstraktion und Einfühlung (Abstraction and Empathy, 1908), which became so decisive for the Expressionists; Kandinsky opened up the possibility of artistic choices between “Pure Realism” and “Pure Abstraction” (1910). Dada, however, was to “desecrate” the expressionist polarization by pushing “Pure Realism” without mercy beyond the edge of the painting into “impure” matter and by leading abstraction not into the “spiritual” but into technical-rational realms, thereby consistently integrating modern developments of the image appearing outside artistic works and magazines proper: photographic publications, various sorts of text and typography, drawings of engineers, anatomical cuts, x-rays, maps, diagrams, and cartograms, and beyond that, pauperist artifacts. Dada vehemently contradicted the tendencies in which Nietzsche’s influence was triggering harmonizing desires of retreat or salvation from the turmoil of modernity and where art was conjured up as a surrogate for religion. Dada also manifested an extreme contrast to the monumental designs of the “Grand Style” — concepts of a nationalist “Übermensch” (“Overman”) during the Wilhelmian era. The Dadaists were inspired by the perceptive, “light” Nietzsche, who confronted the dissonances of modernity, who rebelled against the fathers, against traditions and all ideological, cultural, and religious claims to power, demanding an “alternative art”: “a mocking, light, fleeting, divinely
undisturbed, divinely artificial art” (*Die fröhliche Wissenschaft*, Gay Science, 1882). In 1920 it inspired Hausmann to mention ironically in his satire *Adolf Kutschenbauch* (Adolf Coachbelly) that the Germans, instead of making the same old mistake of “comical self-delusion as over-everything-humans,” could have had the opportunity through Nietzsche to become “more Roman, more healthy, more Dadaist.”

Nietzsche was able to have such an impact on Dada because his aesthetic theory was embedded in an encompassing philosophical concept, upgrading art vis-à-vis religion, philosophy, and science as the leading force of a counter-movement, basically renewing cultural self-interpretation. Since, according to Nietzsche, the entire cultural tradition — metaphysics, morals, ideals, and rationality — were only different forms of “lies,” only “life” could reveal truths, showing a Dionysian reality behind the facades of culture where both the cruelty and the misery as well as the overflowing, the fertile, the unbounding, and the revolt of vital profusion were revealed. Art, “the great enabler of life, the great seductress to life, the great life stimulant” (*Nachgelassene Fragmente*, 1888), had to perform the duty of stimulating a process of cultural revaluation. For Dada, the Apollinian was awarded a new aesthetic function as the creative force of Dionysian truths that removed the taboos from the classicist reading of antiquity and freed it for new media concepts of the avant-garde. There were no more absolute aesthetic laws. They only came into being from the interplay of forces, the Dionysian and the Apollinian. The transfiguring power of the Apollinian, its measure, was created according to the Dionysian challenges — “the overflow of innumerable forms of being, pushing and shoving into life” (Nietzsche) — and it revealed its creativity to make the invisible visible and the immediate mediated. Culture, which for Nietzsche was alive, thus showed itself as a constant process of “reciprocal proportions” of the Dionysian and the Apollinian, experimentally driving the creative forces to the limits of possibility, since the “evolution of culture” depended on their “duplicity” (*Die Geburt der Tragödie*, 1872).

What was at stake, then, was not an “indecisive mixture” (Hausmann). The more rigid the cultural facade was, the more dynamic and destructive Dada’s attack would have to become. It is therefore not astonishing that still in 1920 the “masterwork” of an antique Apollo became a target for Schlichter. The aura that the sculpture had acquired through the reception of antiquity in the course of European cultural history was radically destroyed by the procedure of photomontage. Perfect form was irritated by the multiplicity of meanings and the possibilities of mechanical reproduction, bringing it back into “the capacities of our senses” (Herzfelde). Cultural production was seized from the outside by a process of deregulation, creating montages of images from pictures, materials, and media. The boundaries between inside and outside opened up, became passable; a new mechanism of inspiration, selection, and combination emerged and changed both cultural self-image and the role of the recipient.

The Dionysian was present in all Dadaist forms of protest. The insurgenacies and contradictions of Dada were vital catalysts vis-à-vis suppressed life, pulling “all” into their dynamics, which “attempted to deny the actual” (Herzfelde). “Dada is more than Dada” (Hausmann). Dada was to represent a surplus of strength, erupting in protest against any kind of authority, as well as against Nietzsche, against friends, against itself. There still was much heterochrony in simultaneity, demanding explosion. *Dada Triumphs!* — this sticker (fig. 1.3) invoked the mastery of the Dionysian, time and again and everywhere. But the Dadaists were not only a “wild bunch,” not only dancing satyrs above the abyss; determined not to have this triumph fall flat they were also Apollinian Dandies, modern fools, aware of the immense importance of methods and strategies for triumphing over one’s opponent. Therefore, a subtle
taming of the Dionysian through the moderating counterforce of the Apollinian was necessary. The Dadaists invented subversive and calculated procedures of irony, sarcasm, satire, and grotesque; used well aimed tactics of opposition to strike the adversary; employed games of mendacity and deception, of provocation and revolt; exercised ways of self-assertion and distancing to the point of controlling the emotions, immunizing against any authority of power, and at the same time launching provoking attacks against any form of control, especially in everyday life. The Dadaist slogan was not least a parodistic and subversive hint at Ernst Lissauer’s patriotic war song “We want to win.”

The montages made the pendulum swing widely between the anarchy of the Dionysian and its sublimation by the Apollinian. In the metamechanical constructions the fight initially seemed to be decided by the taming force of the Apollinian. But even there the resistance of the Dionysian was perceptible. Time and again the dismembering of the human was visible from within the metamechanical constructions. This group of works shows very clearly that the Dadaists did not want to give up reason but wanted to x-ray it skeptically by its own means, with the methods originating in culture, and to overcome its separation from life produced by the mechanical culture of mere intellect. Nietzsche opened up a new concept of rationality: the Dadaists’ abstractions were not bloodless; they bound and concentrated the vital forces of the Dionysian for a leap into a new quality of expression, whose equanimity was agitated to the utmost, whose objectivity was intoxicated to the maximum. Thus the Apollinian Dadaist rationalization turned out to be a coincidentia oppositorum (coincidence of opposites) of rationality and vitality, of moderation and unleashing, of passion and coldness, of suffering and mask — a “clarity that hurts” (Grosz).

The Erste Internationale Dada-Messe (First International Dada-Fair, July 1–August 25, 1920) condensed the contradictory and fighting forces into a grotesque Dadaist Judgment Day in which the “lies” of the old culture and their effigies were made fools of and the subversive and disruptive forces of the street entered the art-salons and demanded direct intervention in matters of culture, politics, science, and media.

Dada Berlin was a movement of crisis and transition — between a declining world and an uncertain “new” one. Irony as a fundamental attitude alone seemed to mediate between these worlds and to be able to oscillate between the poles. Creating its own “Anti-Dada” in the tensions of its “own contradictions,” from the beginning Dada Berlin included in its revolt self-doubts to the point of paradoxical self-annihilation and also strategic self-assertion, and thus found its own balance above the abyss in the ironical identity of the non-identical. “Vive dada! It is the only philosophy of life fit for Western Europeans, because it realizes the identity of the entire being with all its contradictions and still lets us sense, behind a veil of laughter and irony, the magic of the unfathomable, which we cannot master” (Hausmann).

The first part of this book deals with the political saturnalia, the performances and activities of Club Dada, delineating the movements that prepared Dada Berlin’s radical denial of the traditional image of mankind and culture and that also addressed early Expressionism, Futurism, and Dada Zurich. The tense games of the Da-Dandy with society showed where and how the Berlin Dadaists laid their fuses that led to the scandalous explosions of the Dada-events. According to them the destructive and activist gestures along with the symbolic aggressions were necessary in order to blow up the encrusted consciousness of the bourgeois public and to sharpen its perception of reality with unusual means. The ruptures and shocks, the incompatibilities and contradictions of the “entire brutal reality” (Huelsenbeck) were thus to be felt.
The second part of this book analyzes the *Erzeugnisse* of the Berlin Dadaists, determined by polar methods of a radical revaluation of art. The artists were not concerned with masterworks, but with products, with the attempt to vitalize art and to aestheticize life. The “products” of experimental hylomorphism, simultaneous montages, and metamechanical constructions in the end culminated in the *Erste Internationale Dada-Messe* (First International Dada-Fair) as a total Dada-event.
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“We want to radically demolish the sophistries of kindness, beauty, value, we want to destroy everything, we want to tear it to shreds — we want to hurl that new world from within ourselves, which is not security and repose, but upheaval and renewal. We don’t want to hide behind philosophies and religions any more. We want to be what we are: self-destroyers! . . . We are beyond the good, just society. And we ridicule the extinction of its world — we are free of fear of experiences and free of the dread that grips the citizen!”

Thus, Raoul Hausmann spouted off in 1919. Furthermore, Richard Huelsenbeck was aggressively demanding the destruction of all “slogans of ethics, culture, and contemplation into pieces.” The idea of destruction as an act of creation connected this revolt with the unconditional “severity” of Nietzsche’s “Umwertung aller Werte” (revaluation of all values): “And if your severity does not want to spark, and cut, and cut up: how would you some day — create with me?” Nietzsche philosophized “with a hammer” in Götzen-Dämmerung (Twilight of the Idols, 1889). Such processes of cutting would concretely characterize the montage-procedures of the Dadaists: with murderous passion their war was fought on the battlefields of culture. Grosz, in Dada-merika (1920), glued his photo-portrait onto the blade of a knife (fig. 162); Hannah Höch used a “kitchen knife” to dissect the beer-belly of Weimar (fig. 130).

Dada cut free the “motor of things”: traditional aesthetics was unveiled to bring the artless, the repressed, and the excluded to the light of day; Dada x-rayed consciousness for its subconscious impulses and society for its terrible crimes and their perpetrators. Thus Dada, both impulsive and distanced, was vivisecting the spirit of the times, its encrusted ideologies and conventions, its mechanisms of mediation and their strategies of assertion, its routines of life and thought, its habits of perception and its norms, in order to vehemently question all structures of order and authority. Both mind and body were declared centers of Dada’s revolt.

Nietzsche’s directions for those “who make their own laws, who create themselves,” maintaining “we want to become those who we are” were expanded by Baader to his oberdadaist (superaesthetic) invocation: “Become then who you are: a Dadaist.” The social-erotic revolt of the psychoanalyst Otto Gross (1877–1920) and the writer Franz Jung (1888–1963) contributed to this self-detoxification of Dada. Nietzsche’s “realization of the pathogenic influence of society on the individual” prompted Gross to attribute the cultural crisis of the Occident to the “conflict of self and other.” Causes of violence and suppression were seen in the patriarchal power-constellations of the Christian family nucleus and its morals. Authority and command were to be broken by the “will to relationship.” Gross motivated the Berlin Dadaists not only to create liberating relationships between the genders, but to construct these equivalently and fictitiously between all of humanity and its objects, thereby winning new creative possibilities by destroying the hierarchies of traditional values and orders.

Freie Strasse (Open Road), which Jung and Gross, together with Georg Schrimpf, Richard and Cläre Oehring, and Oskar Maria Graf, had published in six issues from 1915 to 1917, concentrated pre-Dadaist ideas of cultural revolution. These concepts had converged already before World War I in avant-garde circles and were just as much connected to new models for art and literature as to actionist gestures. Franz Jung, for example, released a new ecstatic form of tales with his collection of tales Das Trottelbuch (The Dope’s Book, 1912) and tried to stir up a new awareness for the activity of the writer with his campaign of solidarity with Otto Gross. This campaign was mainly meant as a signal against the generation of the fathers of
Wilhelmian culture: the professor of criminology Hans Gross from Graz wanted to put his son into prison, just as much for his “debaucheries” as for his nonconformist views of psychoanalysis. Otto Gross, namely, applied “das Eigene” (the “self” as personal identity) as a revolutionary power of the subconscious against the established barriers of culture and society. Since 1912, Jung and Gross had already been planning a first project for a magazine as “preparations for the revolution,” which would be continued in 1915 with *Freie Strasse*. With this title they simultaneously wanted to connect metaphorically to the American cultural revolution, since it alluded to the German translation of “Song of the Open Road” in *Leaves of Grass* by Walt Whitman. The magazine *Revolution*, which had been edited since 1913 by Hans Leybold at the publishing house F. S. Bachmair, also shows how early America’s culture was used as counterpart against Europe by the young avant-garde. Its anarchic tendency made it possible for Franz Jung to publish a “Special edition for Otto Gross” as no. 5 (1913), with which Huelsenbeck and Hugo Ball instantly declared their solidarity, next to Jacob van Hoddis, Ernst Blass, Else Lasker-Schüler, and Erich Mühsam.

Undoubtedly also the two avant-garde magazines *Der Sturm* (The Storm) (1910–32) by the circle of Herwarth Walden and *Die Aktion* (The Activity) (1911–32) by Franz Pfemfert provided the first platforms of the artistic and literary avant-garde in Berlin in which the Dadaists as young artists already participated. *Der Sturm* confronted them with international new artistic concepts, with Expressionist and Cubist ones of Russian and Italian variations, and especially with the Futurist strategy of “élan vital” of which they profited a great deal. But they were also influenced by outstanding personalities like Paul Scheerbart (1863–1915) on the one hand and Ludwig Meidner (1884–1966) on the other. Both were excessive in their poetical positions, the one more fantastic-utopian, inventive with his designs for *Perpeh*, a perpetuum mobile (1912) and *Glass Architecture* (1914), the other more “neopathetical,” bound to a new ecstatic urban painting. In this pre-Dadaist context Carl Einstein (1885–1940) took up a special position with the publication of *Bebuquin oder die Dilettanten des Wunders* (Bebuquin or the Dilettantes of Wonder, 1906–12). In his odyssey of fantastic places and grotesque characters, Bebuquin sought to create the “wonder” unconditionally out of himself. The complex view of the world and its origin was to be found by conceiving of “absolute” form, in the autonomous act of creation between exhilaration and metaphysical void. Here, in the literary realm, the two diametrically opposed poles of Dada Berlin already were manifest; later the Dadaists went beyond this by opening up the frontiers of art into a new materiality. Carl Einstein himself was to politicize his aesthetics, taking part in Dada Berlin with the magazine *Der blutige Ernst* (The Bloody Earnest, 1919–20). My book, *Das Lachen Dadas: Die Berliner Dadaisten und ihre Aktionen* (Dada’s Laughter: The Berlin Dadaists and their Activities, 1989), presents these preliminary forms of Dadaism more in depth.

**The Dionysian Momentum of the Montage Procedure**

The Dadaists carried out their revaluation of art with loud drum beats (Huelsenbeck), with enormous flexibility and topicality, with presence of mind and reflexivity, constantly watching out not to become “sedentary” — as before Nietzsche had already spoken from their heart, “The sedentary life . . . the true sin against the holy spirit.” To sit was connected with the “origin of the German spirit — sadly disordered guts” and beer-belly German lifestyle, which in turn was an expression of German mentality. Clearly inspired by Nietzsche’s critical remarks in *Ecce Homo* on the revealing connections between the culture of sitting, eating, and thinking,
Hausmann formulated his satirical manifesto “Return to Representational Art” (1920). Only Mediterranean cooking would guarantee a clear, functional spirit. Nietzsche for Hausmann was the man with “the gay intestines,” while the German bourgeois was suffering from constipation. This view fundamentally influenced the actionist revaluation of art directly affecting the grotesque and satirical body language of the Dadaist caricature of the German bourgeois.

The Dadaist was a dancer and a wanderer — like Zarathustra; his art was not stylistically rigid, but it became a method: it originated in free motion, was constantly on the move. The forays of his art left the narrowness of the academies and opened up “life” for him: life was meant to realize the world according to its concrete potentials, especially from the material culture of the everyday, in close contact with the facts and artifacts, from the surface as much as from the underground of the cities, and the unvanquished depths of the bottomless epoch. The behavioral attitudes of the city-nomad and ragtime-dancer also were taken on by the forms of expression and presentation of his artistry: the erratic, the broken-up and broken-off, the departure, the migratory, the associative, the sudden affinity, the observing distance, the coincidental, the multiperspective, the cosmopolitan. Only an art that originated in the dynamics of “life” was adequate to the Dadaist. Not to work on something, but to become this something by creating, that was the intention of Dada.

The Dadaist self-image absorbed a lot of those elements, which Nietzsche attributed to the Greek satyr chorus in his *Geburt der Tragödie aus dem Geiste der Musik* (Birth of Tragedy from the Spirit of Music, 1872). The satyrs embodied the belief in the force of life, which “in the ground of all things, despite of all shifting appearances, was indestructibly powerful and joyous.” The Dadaists, like the satyrs, meant to seize “existence in a truer, more real, more complete way” than could be achieved by the “man of culture who generally supposes himself to be the one true reality,” dwindling into a “lying caricature,” deformed by the doctrines of bourgeois culture.

The Dadaist unease with traditional academic art and culture had its roots in the fact that the bourgeois ideal of art excluded the Dionysian, the violent, reckless, and vital energy of life, and thus fell prey to a paralysis of traditions, norms, and terms, that could not grasp actual experiences any more. It showed the great alienation between culture and life, mind and body. Thus the bourgeois educated classes, and especially the German-nationalist one, became the bogeyman, having put the values of culture at the disposal of power politics and war propaganda. Beyond that, the Expressionists with their spiritual aristocracy and their “cathedral style” (Hausmann) had lost the perspective of life by roaming in “cloud-cuckoo-land” (Grosz). Dada-Dionysus demanded artless concepts and works: his projects opened up to unexpected, shocking, and provoking mixtures so that art could become raw material again and win back life. The aim was to close the gap between culture and life. The lack of life could be brought back aesthetically and poetically only if mind and body were mutually present in each other, vouching for this. The sensual experience of the “whole brutal reality,” the wild, raw, ugly, and primitive, the trivial and everyday matters, became evidence for the authenticity of Dada’s departure into a new relationship of art and life. This Dionysian and vitalist outline of art already in 1909 and 1910 gave Hugo Ball his identity as the “artist-philosopher” since he had begun to plan his pamphlet *Nietzsche in Basel* as a dissertation with the title *Nietzsche, ein Beitrag zur Erneuerung Deutschlands* (Nietzsche, a Contribution for a Renewal of Germany). As Ball combined his concepts of art with a life-philosophical approach, his artistic identity was created: as artist-philosopher he was at the same time theologian, poet, writer, script editor, choreographer, pianist, cabaret artist, sound poet, and impresario of Dada Zurich. For Ball, Nietzsche’s merits
lay in his presentation of a “rigorously aesthetic interpretation of the world” and of a “rigorously aesthetic perspective for the present in light of the Greeks.” According to Nietzsche, the crisis of European culture lay in a wrong type of control, in getting caught up in the “nets of the Alexandrine culture,” “a culture of reason, which moved only within the limits of abstraction and produced only abstraction, thus was merely intellectualistic” and whose “ancestor” was Socrates. The prospective founder of the Cabaret Voltaire (1916) mostly appreciated Nietzsche for being the first to chastise Germany with the “Voltairian whip.” An analogy to Ball’s criticism of November 1914 published in his diary Flucht aus der Zeit (Flight Out of Time, 1927) that cultural ideals had declined into nothing more than stuck-on labels can already be found in Zarathustra in form of a caricature of a cultural philistine, comparable in content and form to an outline for a Dada-montage: “Verily, you could wear no better masks, you contemporaries, than your own faces! Who could possibly — find you out! With these signs of the past written all over you, and these signs daubed over with new signs: thus have you concealed yourselves perfectly from all interpreters of signs. And even if one is a kidney-diviner, who would be fool enough to believe that you have kidneys? You seem baked out of colors and scraps of glued paper.”

The predecessor of the montage artist seems to have been Nietzsche, the precise anatomist of the physiognomy of his time. He was the one who so sensitively elucidated the shock waves of the beginning of modernism with its conflicts and contradictions that they still illuminated the Dadaists. Nietzsche did not produce ready-made truths; for the Dadaists he was a prophet of modernism: the cultural criticism of his philosophy, his renunciation of the “sick” culture of idealism, of the unnatural morals, the lies of Christianity, the theory of the two worlds (Zwei-Weltentheorie); the presentation of his critique, his blend of irony and satire, of rhetoric and provocation, parody and prophecy, his strategy of critical openness, his lack of dogmatism, and his polarized method, all influenced the ways in which the Dadaists argued, thought, and worked. For Huelsenbeck in his Dada Almanach (1920), quoting from Jenseits von Gut und Böse (Beyond Good and Evil), they were “parodists of world-history and God’s buffoons,” whose laughter was the only promise left. The culture of Nietzsche’s time presented itself as “carnival in grand style,” parading in the fancy dress of moralities, in articles of faith, artistic tastes and religions, in media, propaganda and cultural opinions, laying itself open to the “most mental carnivalesque laughter and high spirits,” to the “transcendental heights of highest idiocy and of Aristophanic world-mockery” that was Dada.

Already the Futurists and early Expressionists had paved the way for a reception of Nietzsche; Dada modified both influences, especially with regard to their pathos and their methods. Dada welcomed, however, the rooting of these movements in the experimentalism of Nietzsche’s philosophy, its Dionysian, vitalistic cult of “life” as a creative force that broke all cultural chains, as much as it welcomed the stress on the problems of immorality and the attempts to combine philosophy and art.

The Futurists, known since 1912 for the gallery Der Sturm (The Storm) in Berlin, had done Dada a favor by making a start on the destruction of traditional culture and the revaluation of art in the new, contemporary second nature, in the realms of dynamic urban media and machine life, encompassing the break-up of norms of thought and style, even to the destruction of the conventional notion of the subject or the dissolution of the atom. The Dadaists were particularly inspired in their procedures by the demonstration of an equivalency: according to Hausmann in his programmatic statement at the founding of Dada Berlin in April 1918, it was the “disparagement of the term ‘art’ in favor of the simultaneous perception and experience of
The environment." In 1913, in the futurist images at the salon of Hans Richter in Dresden, Hugo Ball had already experienced the city as a Dionysian world of chaotic super-impositions, full of tensions. Where the Futurists, however, idealized a “superman” hard as steel, always enthusiastic, patriotically inclined, and elated about technology, the Dadaists embarked on a skeptical play with the “tragic-Dionysian” strain of the world’s nonsense.

From the early Expressionists, the Dadaists inherited a self-critical attitude toward their own creations and the principle that the artist must transcend and transform himself from within. Already the circles around the neo-pathetic painter Ludwig Meidner and the “Neue Klub” of Kurt Hiller and Erwin Loewensohn before the war had propagated a radical life-philosophical criticism of the times and culture, drawing on Nietzsche’s and Schopenhauer’s work for their central statements. “Life-intensity” was posited against a dying world of decadence and of the philistine education of the Wilhelminian era; it was seen as the power of artists and writers for their revolutionary actions. But the Dadaists swore too much by urban modernism to take over the expressionist, Nietzschean metaphors of nature, like “solitude of the mountains,” “ocean,” “storm,” “thawing wind,” or “flame.” The Dadaists rejected the tendency of the Expressionists to transfigure the artist into a leader through an antimaterialist revolution of the spirit — both in a religious-transcendental and in an activist-politicizing manner. Hausmann already in 1916 felt provoked to make a statement against the activist Ludwig Rubiner, who had demanded a paradigmatic change for literature and art in his essay “The Poet Interferes with Politics.” The essay was written in a style that prompted Hausmann to distance himself from the “ethical aims” of such politics and to demand a revolution of the “own self” first.

The Dadaists developed irony as a poetical basis. Therefore, characteristic for them became the polarizing method of the theory of the creative balance of the world by Salomo Friedlaender (1871–1946), whom Hausmann and Baader had known since 1915. Friedlaender, in his study Friedrich Nietzsche: Eine intellektuale Biographie (Friedrich Nietzsche: An Intellectual Biography, 1911) developed his own philosophy of the indifferent balance of the polarizing world differences: “It is very important to see how Nietzsche already at the beginning of his philosophy is striving towards this powerful balance of the seemingly irreconcilable: he is aiming at a bond between Dionysus and Apollo, between forces, therefore, which seem to rather disrupt than to unite life. There can be no indifference that is more exciting.” In his work Schöpferische Indifferenz (Creative Indifference), which was completed in 1915 but published in 1918, Friedlaender refined his basic concept of polarity and of the dynamic center balancing all extremes. These works motivated the Dadaists to place themselves dissonantly not above but into “life,” passionate and distanced at the same time: radical thinking in extremes, the recognition of contradictions, the dialectic acceptance of contingencies, and relativities bordering on the grotesque. It was, therefore, above all, the active, “creatively indifferent” coming to terms with the shattering and dissolving effects of the time, of its differences and polarities that made the Dadaists more acutely aware of the realities of “life” than the revolt of the early Expressionists. Behind the facts of the world and of consciousness, these revolts of thought, language, and art unveiled a contradictory context, not accessible for traditional forms of perception. Dada’s artistry thus directed its creativity towards “artifices of elasticity” in the true sense of Friedlaender.

Even though the Dadaists before and during the war advanced into the processes of cultural revaluation influenced by Nietzsche, only Hugo Ball’s assessment of World War I as a cultural catastrophe of tragic, Dionysian dimensions made evident how much previous
fundamental work had been done by Nietzsche to overcome the maelstrom of the cultural vacuum and simultaneously to classify it as the new immediacy of “life”:

God is dead. . . . An epoch disintegrates. . . . There are no columns and pillars, no foundations any more — they have all been blown up. Churches have become castles in the clouds. Convictions have become prejudices. There are no more perspectives in the moral world. Above is below, below is above. The transvaluation of values has come to pass . . . But not only the walls have been broken: even the fragments have been granulated, dissolved, and trampled underfoot. Not a single stone . . . not a grain of sand, not an atom, remained in any sort of relationship. . . . As minds were freed from illusion in the philosophical domain, so were bodies in the physical domain.28

The breakdown of a “millennial culture” can be understood in the rapid succession of architectural and spatial metaphors: the blasting of pillars and columns, of fundamentals, forces crossing and intersecting, the loss of perspective, of a center and of standards, the turning upside down of hierarchies, the dismantling and decomposition of stones into fields of rubble, the increase beyond all measure; machines as new centers of power, churches as pies in the sky, titanic destruction of castles in the air.

In the metropolis of Berlin the Dadaists concretely experienced this breakdown as a political and cultural challenge. The capital of the former empire began to vacillate in all directions. Through its fissures it became evident that the tragic Dionysian sediments were the trouble spots of an immediately experienced modernity in which the breakdown had left its traces: the political Berlin with its tensions and contradictions of the fallen empire and the new republic, and of the bloody crush of the Spartacus Revolt; its tumults, street fights, and mass demonstrations; the loudly spouting Berlin of propaganda slogans, of world prophets, and do-gooders; the Berlin of the media industry and mechanical reproduction of photography constructing a new physiognomy of the time; the Berlin made of paper, covered with leaflets, advertisements, paper balls destroyed by shots, and inflationary paper currency; the hectic Berlin of racketeers and carpetbaggers; the endless bustle of city life, of dynamic traffic; and that destroyed, impoverished Berlin of the cripples, the unemployed, the hungry, and the prostitutes; the abysmal labyrinth of crime and sex murders; Berlin as an intersection of Western and Eastern influences, marked by the American cultural industry and the disputes about the Russian Revolution (fig. 2.1–2.8).

The breakdown of the traditional world of culture was consciously seen by Ball in architectural metaphors analogous to Nietzsche’s destructive dismantling of culture, showing that “since Plato all philosophical architects of Europe have built in vain,” because they did not resist the “enticement of morality,” building “bridges of lies to old ideals,” to “God, virtue, truth, justice, charity.”29 World War I for Ball destroyed the building of Christendom, that of European Enlightenment. The God of Christianity had died as certainly as had the God of philosophy, which was metaphysically based on the unity of being with the good, of theory with morals. The artists, according to Ball, “are forerunners, prophets of a new era. Only they can understand the tonality of their language. . . . Their works are simultaneously philosophical, political, and prophetic. They are forerunners of an entire epoch, a new total culture. . . . You will not
understand them, if you believe in God and not in Chaos. The artists of this age turn against themselves and against art.”

The collapse of construction was followed by the disintegration of perceiving the object. There was no longer a First Cause. Life asserted itself in a continuous process of effects: chaos was experienced with Nietzsche as the “unfathomable X” of a tragic-Dionysian occurrence, as “the utter transitoriness of all that is real — everything constantly acting and becoming, and not being.”

Suffering to the point of self-dissolution (Ball), the Dadaists began to accept this tottering deliriously and to transfer it with the “strength of their pessimism” into its opposite — into the creative freedom of Everything and Nothing.

Not only Nietzsche proved to be their conceptual teacher. He himself pointed back to the polarized thought and perception of the Greek philosopher Heraclitus (ca. 550–480 B.C.). According to Nietzsche’s observations, polarity was “the drifting apart of a force into two qualitatively different, polarized activities striving for unification.”

Provoking dialectics of meanings, the Dadaists began to refill the void in the energy field of the electrically charged nervousness and the noise of everyday urban existence with new “life”: “Life appears as a tumult of simultaneous noises, colors, mental rhythms, which — with all the sensational cries and fevers of its brazen, workaday psyche, and all its brutal reality — is absorbed into Dadaist art without wavering.”

“From the things of everyday life that surround me simultaneously, the city, the circus Dada, the rumbling, screaming, the steam sirens, rows of houses, smell of roasted veal, I get the impulse that points and pushes me on to direct activity, to Becoming, to the unfathomable X.”

The Dadaists thus grew obsessed with discovering “life” for art beneath the debris of philosophical misinterpretations and wrong cultural tracks. The scream of the Dadaists Hausmann and Heartfield gave the signal to set off beyond all boundaries: it was both the scream of the surplus energy of repressed life and that of thought, located before ideas and language — a resounding invocation of the lost unity of body and mind.

This Dionysian aesthetics of constant change and inconsistency showed itself in new forms and constructive principles in art:

— in actionist dissolution of the traditional concept of the work of art by “introducing the New Material”: “the painting has taken a . . . giant stride from the horizon beyond this side of the picture plane,” “taking part in life itself”;  

— in manifestations and performances that “convey the chaotic motion of life into our immediate consciousness”;  

— in dance both as an “art of the closest, most direct material” — that is, the body, purified of all its cultural dross;  

— in sound poetry, in the phonetic poem, which drives as a “transcendent-immanent soul-vehicle” out of the “chaotic oral cavity,” creating itself out of sounds from the larynx and the vocal chords, that knows no syntax, only continuation and stoppage;  

— in simultaneous poetry as “most direct symbol of action”: “In the last resort a simultaneous poem means nothing more or less than ‘Long Live Life’”,  
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— in bruitism, described as “life itself,” “which cannot be judged like a book, which rather represents a part of our personality, which attacks us, pursues us, and tears us to pieces”;

— in cut-ups, violently operating on the mass media construction of the world, destroying the semblance of unity between phenomena, cutting free life.

The Apollinian giving form stayed close to the endlessly shifting force field of freed, disconnected quantities and phenomena, creating montage as a processual procedure, becoming the energetic instrument of life, and developing its own creative laws. It was neither the undifferentiated fusion of art and life, nor was it a leveling downward of the difference between art and life, but a revitalizing of art, and an aesthetization of life with materials and media of the urban daily reality. Art, as a delimiting experiment, as an Apollinian-Dionysian playground-workshop was created from the polarity of destruction and construction of the materials, from the depths of the abysses and light-footed artistic metaphysics, from halcyon freedom, but was also — contrary to the Futurists — full of criticism and skepticism of civilization. Giving form meant to Dada always first smashing up form, and each smashing up of form created new forms. In the various configurations of montage: typography, sound poetry, and optophonetic poetry, collages (the Klebebild), the book- and photo-montages, the assemblages (the Plastik), installations, and manifestations, Nietzsche’s heraclitic bent became vividly apparent: “The world itself is a mixing bowl, which continuously has to be stirred. All that is becoming emerges from the war of oppositions.”

The world did not need any supporting evidence; it was subject to a dynamic force. According to Nietzsche it was “a self-propelled wheel,” comparable to the play activity of an artist or a child. The ball bearings and tires of the montages, coming from nowhere and going nowhere, expressed this world-game. The Dionysian characteristics of this process of rotation were transferred to the intuition of the montage method: “Dada is a vortex, born from its own periphery, risen from the general way of life, pulling mankind into it, hurling us about, shaking us up, either bringing us back to our own four legs — or leaving us behind.” The “explosions of an immense loosening of forces” (Hausmann) brought forth the multiplicities, the grotesques of the actions and montages, the multi-perspectivities and relativities, destroying them again, putting them back together, dissolving identities, changing them around, breaking them up, and making them stagger into abysses of contradictions. The Dadaist as “Dr. Maschin George Ventil (= valve), derived from boiler-explosion” ignited his “rattling soul-motor,” equipped with a machine-heart. Revolt, provocation, resistance were part of these processes of montage, drawing consciously from the store of materials and media traditionally alien to art. Art was to let the signs, brought to flux, speak for themselves and to be “active and inactive, devoted and disapproving.”

The Apollinian Abstraction in the Metamechanics

A second creative principle in polar interplay with the dominantly Dionysian principle of the montage emerged from the end of 1919 onward, displaced as to time, but certainly overlapping it: the Apollinian metamechanics. The Dadaists as Monteure (montage-makers) became engineers and constructors as well. They classified their works no longer as “mont.,” but as “mech.,” “meta-mech.,” “constr.,” “Prof. Met.mech.” or “Meta-Mech.constr. in accordance with
Prof. Hausmann.” Grosz and Heartfield advertised their works in 1921 as “great quality guaranteed in every type of art: expr., futur., dada, meta-mech.” The abbreviations ironically referred to the traditional “pinxit” and at the same time “meta-mech.” signalled the new role of the artist as constructor. The term stressed the technological character of the Dadaist “machine-art”: “plan,” “blueprint,” “mech. Construction,” “electro-mech. Tatlin sculpture,” “Mechanical Head,” “Tatlinist Blueprint.” This metamechanics demanded a new iconography, freed of the tradition, generating itself less from the “new material” of the media than from the repertoire of the technical sciences. The Apollinian syntax of the image made the language of form elementary, abstract, and spatialized, bringing back an architectural principle to painting.

With their metamechanical constructions, the Dadaists designed an Apollinian, tectonic beauty of coolness, of vacuum, seeming quietness and orderliness, pointing to the legitimacy of the Apollinian will over the Dionysian, without displacing it however. On the contrary, it restrained the latter into a concentration of forces. It seemed that chaos was supposed to be bound with the “veil” of a new classicism in the sense of a new “style” (Nietzsche). Metamechanics meant the breaking out of the dead end of a one-sided culture of rationality and intellectual achievement with the methods brought about by civilization itself. At stake was an aesthetic revision of the role and function of rationality, abolishing the opposition to life. Rationality was related to art and thus was brought back to the realms of artistry, of humanity. Art in this way was the necessary skeptical-ironical corrective to rationality, making it more productive, since life, according to Nietzsche, was also founded on the requirement of believing in something lasting, something regulating; logic, reason, system were to be regarded as the means of life. How these faculties underscored the “will to life,” Dada tried to capture with its metamechanical constructions — passionate on the inside, factual on the outside.

At the same time and with the same means, however, Dada criticized the one-sided, top-heavy demand for legitimacy of a technological, science oriented, and mechanistic civilization — the separation of the Apollinian and the Dionysian — presenting its deadly petrifications, the callused life extradited to a culture of rationality. It seemed to the Dadaists that only with a change of social conditions — in a classless society and culture freed of patriarchal nationalistic authority — the utopian dimensions of the metamechanics would become possible: the creation of “a new human being,” master of rationality, and not its object!

“Meta” points beyond reality and might have been inspired by the Italian “Metaphysical painting” of De Chirico and Carrà. It reaches beyond, transgressing limits in the sense of an intensification of life, engendering an immanent transcendence. Already Nietzsche had provocatively detached metaphysics from religious and philosophical positions, linking it to art in the sense of his antimetaphysical “artist-metaphysics” and critically getting involved with reality as appearance, error, contradiction; he influenced the Dadaists, particularly inspiring Hausmann to proclaim Dada as “the only practical religion of our time” in his manifesto “Dada in Europe” (1920). But while De Chirico’s “metaphysics” by destabilizing the perspectives of rationality emphatically revived the memories of a declining culture in the glowing light of “sunset” (Nietzsche), the Dadaist connected art to the rationality of technology and science in a new “metamechanical” awareness. As the montages related art exclusively to “life,” metamechanics related science and technology to art.

The Artistic Concept of Polarities: “Anthropogenesis of Dissonance”
The Dadaists recreated Nietzsche’s concept of artistry as an anti-moral, anti-metaphysical, and anti-Christian countermovement to established culture. They transformed his active conception of artistry as a process of disclosures of hidden truths into the artistic realm of experimental play and actions demanding the risk of inverted values.

The two pillars of the polar concept of Dada Berlin are montage and metamechanics with their respective Dionysian and Apollinian antagonisms. The catastrophic paradox, the negating “Yes to the whole of being” activated “the receptiveness to the opposite.” With Friedlaender’s attitude of “creative indifference”, this thinking in polarities and the belief in the polar constellation of all being was furthered, so that Hausmann already demanded in 1918, at the beginning of Dada, the “subjective ability to balance the contradictoriness of non-collapsing disintegrations.”

Friedlaender saw the possibility to steady both the contingency of materialities and the chaos of relations in a creative “center” as the indifferent point of balance of polarities and to mutually relate these in contradictoriness in order to “let life live.” The philosopher ordered and differentiated the world into polarities, as if on a scale of minus- and plus-values, colliding in a point zero, the point of indifference of the creative subject. Specific to this collision, however, was not a harmonious reconciliation, but a withstandling and balancing of opposites in the simultaneity of tension and relaxation.

The cultural tabula rasa, this “nothing, i.e. everything” was the uncremented “beginning” of Dada. If Everything was Nothing and Nothing the beginning of Everything, Dada intended an artistic-philosophical creation of an endlessly relational abundance and emptiness, instrumentalized ambivalently in the montages and metamechanical constructions — both into negative and positive spheres. The absolute “Nothing” thus became the Dadaist “indifferent precondition of all being” (Friedlaender), became the concentrate of all possibilities and was at the same time seen as the contradictory experience of a “stormy void” (Serner), loss of world-orientation and identity. “Instead of an a priori ego or individuality, of Nihil neutrale or norms, doesn’t there have to be the identity of the whole being, in short: of number, time, space, silence, movement,” Hausmann wondered, “doesn’t there have to be contained in this Nothing of all difference an Everything?”

The loss of values was transformed into the equivalence of an “insane simultaneous concert of murder, cultural fraud, erotics, and roast veal,” intensifying into a Dionysian frenzy of “dissonances” — into the “sanctity of senselessness.” The Dadaist turned the burden of disorientation into relief. Loss of sense was converted into renunciation of sense, insulting the idealist tradition, the Faustian profundity of the Expressionists as much as the spiritual aristocracy and ideology of the political activists. Sense came out of the simultaneous “experience of all relationships” and its creative transformation. Dada did not search for insight to be confirmed; its truth lay in the creative process itself.

This is how the “introduction of the New Material” has to be looked at. According to Huelsenbeck it has “a certain metaphysical value, it is, so to speak, a transcendent repulsion of the void, the result of fear . . . to be compared to a sort of horror vacui.” Initially, with fear, a basic mythical experience of Nihilism was entering, which Dada tried to overcome in a “metaphysical” heightening not into the hereafter but into this life, the here and now of the world, by “remaining open to the opposite,” i.e. by repulsing the void. The relation to metaphysics in this context was derived from a new definition of art as “metaphysical activity” (Nietzsche). Truth lay in the process of production (poiesis) itself and not in the invention of metaphysical truths. To see metaphysics in relation to the introduction of the new material
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provoked just as much a revaluation of art as did the “meta” of mechanics; it led artistry into the realm of open production deriving alone from the artistic activity.

My analysis of Dadaist works shows that it was the shock of the void that mostly became the triggering factor for the Dadaist pursuit of the “New Material”: “Catch the racing time, before the devil catches you! and before the rotary press is singing your funeral song,” these words of Grosz expressed his Dadaist hunger for reality, for life’s plenty. But the montages produced an ambivalent affluence. They adjusted to the media industry’s machinery of speed, flooding the artistic realm with reproductions, blowing it up, and pushing beyond it. On the one hand, the multitude of all kinds of references produced a new artistic mentality of experimentation of never-ending possibilities. On the other, the montages, packed with scraps of information, disclosed the void hiding behind the surface dynamics of the actual chaos, exposing it as vain profusion or as a boosted up void. The search for the relieving moment of creation in production and the fear of the void of the unbearable instant were mutually conditional and enhancing for Dada’s procedures.

This polar tension of abundance and emptiness brought forth the grotesque as an element of cultural and social critique, balancing the poles and juggling them, driving them to dissolve or to radically confront each other. According to Wieland Herzfelde in the catalog of the First International Dada-Fair (1920) the Dadaists undertook “to impel the present world forward, which obviously was in a state of dissolution and metamorphosis, by undermining it,” by destroying the given context of the world, by breaking rules and norms of traditional aesthetics, by distorting proportions and dimensions, colliding various levels of significance, introducing surprising and contradictory combinations of meaning and form, producing with images of metamorphosis and fusion the simultaneity of difference, of the disparate or incompatible. These processes of disintegration were accompanied by an active “anthropogenesis of dissonance” as Nietzsche had demanded from a cultural process of sublimation.

Of this foundation of all existence — the Dionysian basic ground of the world — not one whit more may enter the consciousness of the human individual than can be overcome again by this Apollinian power of transfiguration. Thus these two artistic impulses must unfold their powers in strict reciprocal proportion, according to the law of eternal justice.

Dada’s balancing artistry made the pendulum of these artistic drives swing far and wide by producing the montages and metamechanical constructions and thus radically challenging the “reciprocal proportions.”

Not only the “de-deification of the world brought about by critical philosophy” played a role in this process. Hugo Ball in 1917 also pointed out the “dissolution of the atom in science, and the massive expansion of population in present-day Europe,” including in this latter phenomenon also the culture of the masses, mass media, and cultural industry in the process of democratization. All three phenomena demanded new processes of presentation, based on new concepts.
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When the inscrutable ground of the epochal upheavals had opened up an experimental stage for Dada’s artistic self-creation, the “giant nonsense” (Grosz) of the world was juggled by the artistry of Dadaist performances and provocations. It was not an illusory *theatrum mundi* mirroring its order but became a disillusioning *circus mundi* — a dance above the abyss.

The Dadaist events, therefore, simultaneously seemed “endgames” and “crusades to reconquer the state of creativity” (Hugo Ball). This Dada theater was distinguished by anarchic laughter. According to Huelsenbeck everything pertaining to spirit, culture, and introspection was to be “slaughtered” during the performances “at an appropriate price.” It seemed as if the Berlin Dadaists were orienting themselves to the antithetical plebeian spirit of the Saturnalia and medieval carnivals, during which the world and its hierarchies were turned topsy-turvy. During these festivities the people ridiculed the authority of the official worldview and especially the power and morals of the church.¹

However, the differences are just as suggestive: The laughter in these festivities was limited by place and time; it was related to cleansing, revealing, and regenerating functions, whereas Dada’s laughter permanently questioned the new Weimar Republic as a whole and therefore was difficult to cope with. Many Dada works and periodicals were confiscated; exhibitions were closed or legal proceedings were brought against them. The proletarian revolt was crushed violently, and Dada remained a “neokynical” movement of outsiders, staging before an anonymous mass public its “clowns game from nothing” (Ball).² The Dadaist came on stage as the last impresario/artist/actor/director/poet of a bankrupt European culture. In the form of an aggressively grotesque play, he presented the tragic problem of the artist as an outsider of the masses.

Many Dadaists invented poetical jesters in an attempt to save their dignity in a society that had become degrading. In the last of his *Sieben schizophrene Sonette* (Seven Schizophrenic Sonnets), for example, Hugo Ball introduced himself as the “Great Clown Vauvert.” “Wearing the costume of a circus clown,” he presented himself as the “abysmally false prophet,” celebrated himself as a “king of letters and destructive jabberer,” praised the “hysteria clemens (the wise hysteria),” and played his clown’s games as a “mocker, a poet, a man of letters.”³

The fundamental ideas and attitudes of the Dada movement were theatrical and performative; they were purposeful, playful productions that engineered effects. Relating negatively to stage and audience, the artist nevertheless needed spectators whom he despised, in order to present the Dadaist spirit of negation and revolt, of shock and scandals. He transformed his stagings into poetical activity, detonating the traditional dramatic unities of place, time, and action. Provokingly hybrid forms emerged, presenting themselves as chaotic as “life” itself.

The influence of Nietzsche’s poetics of drama was prevalent in these Dada performances. While traditional action and dialogue were not dominant, music, gestures, activities, and dance were. The theater became the place of metamorphosis; actors and viewers alike were involved in the activities on stage. By breaking the *principium individuationis* (the principle of individualization), the subjective element disappeared and the “generally human” emerged. The “Dionysian enthusiast,” inoculated with the experience of chaos, could see “a new vision beyond himself” like a satyr.⁴ Clearly Nietzsche never envisioned a return to antiquity, but a liberation, an expropriation of the aesthetic from bourgeois art consumption in order to return art as much as possible to ritual: he wanted to take into account the reality of an extra-cultural world, the
memory of which had been repressed in the process of occidental enlightenment. “We must invent a completely new religion of energy, talent, and activity,” Huelsenbeck wrote on March 30, 1919 to Tristan Tzara about Dada Berlin. Tzara had demanded of Dada a “movement of grand style.” Hugo Ball as well had expected that Cabaret Voltaire should “enrapture” all of Zurich; otherwise, it would miss its intention.

From the beginning, winning and activating a large following was an important gauge by which Dada could justify its existence. After all, Dada was not a movement that had slowly developed through the years, but a signal, a strategic and subversive sign that the cultural, the visual, and verbal spheres were in an alarming way pulled into the rapid process of the world’s transformation into merchandise. For their negating-affirmative strategy, the Dadaists welcomed all media, while simultaneously calling them into question. They used “advertisement” and “propaganda” as if these were sensational brand names. Dada, by means of mass culture, stirred up curiosity, a craving for novelty and sensation, in order to outrageously disillusion its audience with its poetic activities. Scandal was Dada’s main aesthetic strategy of appeal. “To scandalize society” was Tzara’s declared poetical intention for Dada. Only scandal would disinhibit “all sensational screams and the fever of a reckless everyday psychology.” It was intended as an exciting and confusing overstatement of philistine fury, as an agitation of an encrusted consciousness (Hugo Ball), and as transfer into a “trance-like state” (Ribemont-Dessaignes). For Huelsenbeck it was meant to bring the “chaotic movement of life to unmediated perception” and to open the view for “all of brutal reality” as a shock and provocation.

The scandalous effects of the Dadaist forms of staging and performing were influenced in Berlin by the Futurists, the Swiss Dadaists, and the self-presentation of the world-prophets. The provoking tendencies of the literary cabarets and variety theaters of pre-war Berlin were also relevant for Dada, like the Neopathetisches Cabaret and the Cabaret Gnu. “We have to bring surprise and the necessity to act to the audience in the orchestra circle, in the boxes, and on the balconies,” Marinetti demanded. “We have created all kinds of new, mixed forms of seriousness and comicality, of real and unreal persons, amalgamations of space and time, simultaneity, the drama of things, scenic dissonances, staged images, shop windows with ideas and gestures.”

These theatrical effects and moments of alienation, the breaking of rules, especially in the realm of language, the renunciation of the illusory picture-frame stage, and to a large extent of perfectionism had an equally lasting effect on the Dadaists, as had the inclusion of chance, the variety of comical, grotesque, and satirical modes, and the disturbance of the audience in the manifestos and performances. But it was not only the futurist impulse, which initiated Dada’s individualistic productions.

Hugo Ball, interested in the theater even before the Cabaret Voltaire, took the theatrical concepts of Frank Wedekind and Wassilij Kandinsky as models. Wedekind influenced him with regard to satire; in fact, the invention of the word “Dada” and its meaning were influenced by his satire O-Aha, a “world-soul” gone into dementia, about which Ball commented in his diary on April 18, 1916. Kandinsky impressed Ball by synthesizing the different realms of art represented in the theater as a “hidden magnet,” attracting all areas of the arts to itself, “which together present the highest possibility for monumental, abstract art”, painting, music, language, dance. This was where the accent was placed on an important impulse of the theater, and it was taken up by Dada: it wanted to “disturb” in order to appeal to levels of meaning and sense that were encrusted by “rationality”. The Dadaists used forms like simultaneous poetry, sound poetry, manifesto, bruitist spectacles, poème mouvementiste, and dances with masks or costumes.
The Berlin Dadaists, however, added more biting, politically oriented forms of performance, which related to daily events: the political couplet, typical for Walter Mehring; the satire, as performed by Hausmann; and sketches with grotesque-mechanical character. There were also American influences like jazz and the African gigue, as well as short, grotesque intermezzi like the “examples,” as the Parisian Dadaist Paul Eluard called this form of short dialogue and action. Imaginative and spontaneous improvisation and aggressive insults to the audience were just as vehement as that of the Parisian Dadaists. Especially variable dance performances and acoustic noise-spectacles were included in Berlin Dadaism.

Beyond the avant-garde influence, the Berlin Dadaists looked at collective forms of expression and entertainment. With the fictitious bourgeois theater having become obsolete, the cinema, the variety show, the luna-parc, boxing, the Sechstagerennen (a famous bicycle race in Berlin that lasted six days), and the circus stimulated their productions just as much by presenting sensuality and acrobatic dexterity and by the colorful and heterogeneous change of scenes. In their own way the Dadaists lived and played the “Dandyism of the poor” (Hugo Ball), reverting to the Dionysian tradition of the lowbrow art of tumblers, conjurers, puppet players, tightrope walkers, and comedians, who improvised by responding to the reactions of the audience.

The performances of Dada Berlin and their various scenarios were centered on “literary demonstration.” According to Hausmann this expression simultaneously comprised sight, gesture, sound, and sentiment. By presenting language audibly and visibly in its multidimensional possibilities of effects and experiences, from vowels to everyday expressions, and by freeing words of their semantic connotations and syntactic context, the Dadaists radically expanded forms of expression of a literature that until then mainly had been produced for reading. Intonation, rhythm, screaming, whispering, stuttering, howling, and shrieking became actively provoking media that changed poetry into a sensual spectacle, with confusing and exciting effects on the audience. Words and sounds seemed to intercommunicate on their own. By refusing its communicative function and by celebrating negation as a poetical activity, the Dadaists provoked the audience most with their use of language.

While the Cabaret Voltaire (the eighth Dada-Soiree of April 9, 1919, excepted) only drew a small audience, the Dadaists in Berlin, especially on their tour at the beginning of 1920, attracted such large crowds and were so successful that a Leipzig daily paper of February 28, 1920, declared them “court-jesters of the masses.” The place of a small, observable audience was taken over by an anonymous big city crowd. In the provocative confrontation of the Dadaists with the masses, one could also see the overstated role of the Dandy in mass-society, who does not, like Narcissus, take the remote source as his mirror, but the “unspirited, unsophisticated” mass (Hausmann), which he needs as an “anti-spirit” for his scandals and self-presentations, without, however, losing himself in it or making concessions to it.

The Futurists attempted in their performances to distract “from the material and moral pain” in order to rejuvenate the face of the world “with great futurist cheerfulness.” Dada Berlin, however, aimed more at derisive disillusionment and unmasking of its mostly bourgeois audience, which, it hoped, would become more conscious of itself. While the Futurists attempted to change the variety theater with superlatives of sensations and attractions into a “theater of shock-effects, records, and psycho-madness,” the Berlin Dadaists opened up “Cabaret Mankind” with derisive laughter to demonstrate that ultimately “all that razzmatazz and hullabaloo did not make any sense whatsoever.” The Dada-productions were supposed to cut off the audience from its habitualized expectations of resting assured within the everyday world.
They provoked with bruitist, simultaneous, sound-poetical performances, with satirical contributions, and sketches, but also with nothing but monotony. Dada shook up the psyche of the masses, disturbed it, and at the same time exposed its manipulability.

In a subtle way, Dada played with the phenomenon of the “open masses,” whose sudden appearance and growth oriented itself toward the place where most people were gathering, according to Canetti’s analyses in Masse und Macht (Mass and Might). Dada used this type of spontaneous, curious behavior, which was open because it was growing — “everywhere” and “into every direction” — by presenting itself as the imaginary sensational place toward which the masses were drifting. However, by jesting with this “open mass,” Dada infiltrated the expectation of the audience that wanted to feel in a “secure church,” to be a “closed mass,” and that was upset when Dada presented to it the adequate perspective for an open mass of an “insecure whole world.”

Dada unsheathed the audience of transcendental sense-making, of rules, of beliefs, and of goals — in particular of that ideological militarism encompassing the self-aggrandizement of the German people as saviors of mankind. No activity, no illusion lifted the audience beyond itself. This was the real Dada-scandal, which provoked the loud protest and the exalted annoyance of the audience — the “fury of the philistine”: “it gave a new momentum to Dada and a sound guideline . . . with which new attacks could be carried out.” Effects and emotions characterized the activities of the Dada performances; action on stage, the Dadaist tactics of direct attack, and the reaction of the audience were reciprocally electrifying. The Dadaists made sure that they derisively made short work of their bourgeois audience, stressing their triumph not to have given themselves away as artists. “The complete indifference on our part brought the situation to a boiling point,” Huelsenbeck wrote in his autobiography Reise bis ans Ende der Freiheit (Journey to the End of Freedom): “We were head and shoulders above our ‘opponents,’ as long as there was no physical threat. They didn’t know that the ‘nothing,’ the ‘void,’ the ‘negativism,’ which they passionately accused us of, were the basis of our world view.”

Dada pointed out to mass society its impulses, which were fixed on sensations. “We pursued the tactics of direct attack on the audience,” said Huelsenbeck. “Our point of departure was the idea that it is an educational measure of great value to show an audience, which had come out of curiosity and the lure of sensationalism, how unbelievably utilitarian and base the thought was to buy ‘art’ for ten marks. With the crudest means we wanted to make it clear to these people, who came to us with pipes, trumpets, and clubs, that their ideas of art and spirit were only an ideological superstructure which they tried to acquire with money in order to justify their daily racket.”

While this type of scandalous behavior disillusioned the audience like a shock, in the political couplets and satires Dada Berlin also developed types of production in which its interest in enlightenment was dominant. In the satirical periodicals Jedermann sein eigner Fussball (Everyone His Own Football), Der blutige Ernst (The Bloody Earnest), Die Pleite (The Bankruptcy), in the portfolio works of Grosz, and in some manifestos, which also were sold at the performances, the Dadaists aimed at a counter-public to declare their solidarity with them. They could be found in the circles of leftist intellectuals and communists.

The Berlin Dadaists detonated the frame of the stage. The public realm was not restricted to the listening or viewing audience. They used the street for an advertisement parade to introduce their periodical Jedermann sein eigner Fussball (fig. 80) and poetic activities like simultaneous conversations. The street was also the pulse of life, having its effect just as much on the Dadaist productions with their urban dimensions, as the daily press influenced the
activities, works, satires, and political couplets with regard to their subject matter and structure. The newspaper was discovered as a "poetic" Dadaist element: it aroused the public interest through hoax announcements and advertisements of the soirees and Dada activities. In a similar way churches, even the National Assembly, and indeed all of Berlin became the "place . . . da . . . da." Periodicals, leaflets, advertisement slips, posters, lectures, exhibitions, letters, and portfolio works were Dadaist media with publicity effect.

Methodically, Dada Berlin "made use of all forms and customs in order to smash the moral, sanctimonious world of bourgeoisie with their own means." The artists developed a concept of destruction by infiltrating bourgeois culture from within, and by forging their weapons from its own arsenal. Thus the Dadaist became the "desperado . . . who fooled around as prophet, artist, anarchist, statesman, etc., in short as Rasta." The Dadaist also laid claims to being a shaman of contemporary society, enabling people through irritation and shock to have perceptions that brought them to self-consciousness and self-recognition.

From the outset, however, Dada’s play with publicity carried with it the danger of being quietly integrated by those very media that Dada was using for its activities and anti-cultural propaganda. The commercializing ability of society seemed more powerful than the subversive game that Dada was playing with it. This can be observed especially through the example of the Dada evenings. The artistically calculated shock was only able to create disturbances in the beginning; later it was welcomed as an entertaining element. Crossing borders, scandal was created, but it lost its effect in the repetition of the productions.

First Public Impulse — Coldness and Resilience

The members of Club Dada never idealized their group activities or posed for photographs, presenting themselves as a closed community. On the contrary, there existed a number of individual portraits, photographs of two friends and grotesque photomontages of Dadaists. And if they appeared together — as in the photographs of the Dada-Fair — it seemed to be by chance.

Who the real members were became clear only in the course of some years. As a first instance the Vossische Zeitung presented the following writers and artists as members of the Club Dada to the public on January 27, 1918:

A Dadaist Club was founded in Berlin: According to its program, the “Club Dada” sees itself as a branch of the big international cultural movement Dada which, among other things, aims at international communication in the realm of the arts and literature. The new association is going to advertise Dada with a series of lectures, publications, and exhibitions in Berlin, Hamburg, and Munich. Its members are Theodor Däubler, Ferdinand Hardekopf, Tristan Tzara, Franz Jung, Marzel Janko [sic], George Grosz, Hans Arp, Helmut Herzfelder [sic], Hugo Ball, Max Hermann, Titus Tautz, Dr. Anselm Ruest. Its management is in the hands of Richard Huelsenbeck.

This press announcement, probably initiated by Huelsenbeck, introduced the Swiss members of the Cabaret Voltaire (Ball, Tzara, Janco, Arp) together with the Berlin artists and writers as Club Dada. Of the later Berlin members only Franz Jung, George Grosz, and Helmut Herzfeld (John Heartfield) belonged to the inner circle of Club Dada, while the others, Theodor Däubler, Max Hermann(-Neisse), Dr. Anselm Ruest, and Titus Tautz had to be counted as friends or enemies of the Berlin Dadaists.
The news item was published following a reading on January 22, 1918, in the gallery I. B. Neumann during which Huelsenbeck unexpectedly and spontaneously proclaimed Dada. The expressionist evening, during which Theodor Däubler, Max Hermann(-Neisse), and Hans Heinrich von Twardowski were reading and in which Resi Langer recited from the works of Stadler and Lichtenstein, was transformed into a declaration of sympathy for Dada. Huelsenbeck praised the Dadaists Tzara and Ball in Switzerland and also himself as “something new” in the present art and literature scene. He proclaimed Dada “a focal point of international energies” and introduced its forms of production as creative power. “There was an unimaginable Witches’ Sabbath, a racket from morning to night, a staggering of tympanis and negro-drums, a frenzy of tap and cubist dances.”

This exaggeration points to the direction in which Huelsenbeck also wanted to realize Dada Berlin — as a declaration of war unleashed on the battlegrounds of culture.

In the spring of 1918 Raoul Hausmann and Johannes Baader, along with Wieland Herzfelde (the brother of Helmut Herzfeld [John Heartfield]), and Walter Mehring (the friend of Grosz), joined the Club Dada. Hannah Höch, through her friendship with Raoul Hausmann, also gradually was won for Dada.

The press notice of January 1918 makes clear that the word Dada preceded the club itself; it existed in the press before it existed in reality. This incident is illustrates Dada Berlin’s effective strategy. Playing with the public was a conceptual artistic element, which could and should develop its own dynamics. But at the same time, Huelsenbeck wanted to bestow an official character on the loosely existing group by assigning it a fictitious organizational frame with a management, an artifice suggesting stability in a time of instability and making fun of the bureaucratization of clubs for its own sake.

Together with Kurt Hiller’s activist Bund zum Ziel (Association with Goal), founded in 1917, Club Dada was one of the first groups of artists and writers formed before the November Revolution of 1918 and gathering revolutionary energies. During a time when the country was still officially at war and Germany was preparing for the spring offensive in northeastern France, when the German population was tired of war and depressed, 400,000 men took part in the strike of ammunition workers on January 28 in Berlin. This strike announced the onset of a big anti-war movement in Germany. In early 1918, the hope for peace and revolution in Germany was growing mostly in intellectual left circles. It was nourished by strikes in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the signing of the peace treaty of Brest-Litowsk, and especially by the March and October Revolutions of 1917 in Russia and President Woodrow Wilson’s Fourteen Points and his Program for World Peace of January 1918.

After the 1918 November Revolution in Berlin several groups were established which characterized themselves as “radical”: the Arbeitsrat für Kunst (Workers Council for Art), the Politischer Rat geistiger Arbeiter (Political Council for Intellectual Workers), the Gesellschaft für individualistische Kultur (Society for Individualist Culture), the Stirnerbund (Stirner Association), and the Novembergruppe (November Group).

Distinguishing themselves from these intellectual “councils,” the Dadaists called their association a “club.” Harry Graf Kessler, for example, called the new left intellectual circles subsequent to the November Revolution “clubs,” because they reminded him of the times after the French Revolution when political questions were debated and decided in clubs. But the Club Dada rather saw itself in an anarchic sense, ridiculing the “revolutionary boom” of activities and ameliorating ideas of the “intellectual aristocracy” that wanted to gain political influence outside
the Council of Soldiers and Workers. Such activities for Hausmann and Jung were apolitical “intellectual flatulencies.”

“Club,” on the other hand, could just as well be a disguise, as it had often been used in Vormärz (1815–1848, the time before the German revolution of 1848), for the artists had to protect themselves from the control of the police and censorship. At the time when Club Dada was forming, still often monarchist, male societies calling themselves “clubs” were in existence. The discussions of the first publication of “Club Dada” (fig. 36), even the resolution for the initial Dada-Soiree in April 1918, had to be kept secret. The journal was printed in the province. Because of the strict police controls, the Dadaists decided on a tactics of surprise, on a short-term announcement of this event.

But possibly the term “club” also implied an ironic reference to the Dandyism of the nineteenth century whose clubs were the epitome of social life, for the Berlin Dadaists were Dandies, or at least personified in manifold grotesque ways the Dandy type. The symbiosis of art and life in Dandyism was Dadaist at its core as Dada was characterized by performing itself, awakening life into a second artistic life. Both everyday life and stage acts were dominated by eccentric poses and gestures. From the beginning, the Dadaist presentation of self also included dressing up as a significant poetic element. The Da-Dandy was distinguished by the monocle, the shag-pipe, and by American fashion, which Grosz carried as far as using trendy American four-letter words. This American appearance included also the athletic body, the closely shaved skin, the slicked down hair, and a sharp profile as well as an interest in American lifestyle and sports, especially boxing matches. Originality became a cult. Hausmann designed his own clothes. While he was characterized by his patent leather shoes, Heartfield preferred to wear overalls and to present himself as an engineer-artist. Even Hannah Höch was proud to have bought American shoes for the opening of the First International Dada-Fair (1920). Her dandyist peculiarity was a small walking stick. Contrary to the German philistine, the Dadaists underlined their cosmopolitan attitude (fig. 1.1, 4–17).

Dandyism was not only a surface attribute. To look reality into the eye was the attitude of the Da-Dandy, who faced the challenges of life “mit steifem Hut im Genick” (with a stiff hat at the back of the neck, Grosz). True to their times, the Berlin Dadaists actively and aggressively pushed the brusque and ironic tactics of the Dandy forward by their strategies of bluff, scandal, and advertisement for their soirees, works, and publications. They gave the fool a Dandy-camouflage, playing with the inventory and the appearance of society, entering hearts and simultaneously laying them bare. Until then, the Dandy had been a singular appearance in the history of literature and art, his isolation fashioning him into an aristocrat. Now the Club Dada, as a grotesque-eccentric collective, blew up this attitude with the joy of loud, proletarian street-protest against traditional culture.

The Dada-evening on April 12, 1918, gave Dada Berlin its real accent (fig. 24). This evening in the Sezession was the spark that kindled the audience and the press. Dada was called an “unheard-of sensation.” The effective manifestation was to become an essential element of the club. The Dadaists liked to use the manifesto as a declamatory, ostentatious form of communication. Obviously, Huelsenbeck’s manifesto Der Dadaismus im Leben und in der Kunst (Dadaism in Life and in Art), which he sold during the evening as a pamphlet of three pages, provoked a “volcanic eruption” in the audience. Huelsenbeck developed the dynamics and quality of Dada from the opposition to expressionism: the courage “to face the cruelty of the epoch.” “The best and most extraordinary artists will be those who continuously pull together the shreds of their bodies from the chaotic cataracts of life, grimly probing the times’ intellect,
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bleeding from their hands and hearts.” While Huelsenbeck opposed expressionism as an art that was boring, accomplished, and detached from life, he stressed Dada’s urbane delight in the press, advertisement, and the noise of the street: “With Dadaism, a new reality comes into its own. Life appears as a simultaneity of sounds, colors, and rhythms of the mind.” Huelsenbeck propagated the new Dadaist forms of poetry: the bruitist, simultaneous, and static poem. He demanded the “new material in painting.” And he explained the open, democratic, anti-hierarchical form of Club Dada: “Dada is a Club, founded in Berlin, into which you can enter without taking over any obligations. Everyone is president and can make statements on artistic matters . . . Dada is an attitude, which can reveal itself in any conversation.” “The enormous hocus-pocus of being invigorates the nerves of the real Dadaist — this is the way he lies, he hunts, he bicycles — half Pantagruel, half St. Francis, and he laughs and laughs. He laughs at the aesthetic-ethical approach! At the theories of literary nitwits who want to change the world! For Dadaism in word and image, for Dadaist events in the world. To be against this manifesto is to be a Dadaist!” Twenty-one international Dadaists had signed, together with Richard Huelsenbeck, Franz Jung, Raoul Hausmann, for the first time Walter Mehring, and the musician Gerhard Preiss. The open, positive spirit of the manifesto, the polemics against the melancholiness of expressionism, the identification with urbane forms of life, and especially the irony with which the inadequacies of reality were seen as “hocus-pocus of being,” this seeming lightness attracted an audience that was characterized by existential dread and misery and animated it to debates. Huelsenbeck even went a step further by performing the provoking “hocus-pocus” of being on stage. Futurist poems, particularly war-poetry by Marinetti recited by Else Hadwiger, “transporting the wounded,” “bombardment” from Zang tumb tumb agitated the audience. Hausmann remembers that this was accompanied by a soldier’s rolling on the floor in epileptic convulsions. Huelsenbeck accompanied the reading with a rattle, a child’s trumpet, and sounds of a drum. While Marinetti had wanted to glorify war and its dynamics in his poems, the Dadaists transformed it into a bruitist, inane “hocus-pocus” with a cynical undertone, for Dada was against war! The public reacted vehemently, chaotically, and began to stage itself. The Berliner Zeitung am Mittag (April 13, 1918) was incensed about the imitation of machine-gun fire by a rattle.

Willi Wolfradt took part in this evening and wrote the following in Der Friede (The Peace) of May 24, 1918:

One can pass over anything in silence, but not clamor. Thus the vehemence of the shouts of laughter and the chaotic liveliness, bordering on licentiousness, in which the recent Dadaist evening in the Berlin “Sezession” ended, might in reality have been after the hearts of the organizers. During the readings you could walk around, meeting acquaintances, talking animatedly and loudly, knowing that the guy on stage, with his feisty mimics and his crowing sounds could not be disturbed at all in his arrogant loudness. An unbelievable turmoil of whistling, laughter, indignation, and house keys gave their all; a soldier in field-gray fatigues called for the trenches. Everyone stood on chairs; guffawing people who could not hold on any longer fell around each other’s necks, gasping; the more quiet kind leisurely smoked, as if they were at the variety theater. Here and there in the crowd someone waving his arms disclosed himself as a Dadaist with his emphasis, while the whippersnapper, the lout on stage, unfalteringly hurled his grotesque cynicisms at them.
Evidently, the Dadaists were not daunted by this tumult; arrogance on stage as an attitude had already been trained by Huelsenbeck at the *Cabaret Voltaire*. The chaos perfectly corresponded to his idea of a sequel to the Dadaist “Witches’ Sabbath,” which originated in Zurich. George Grosz as well unwaveringly continued to sing his *Niggersongs*, his own poems, written in 1916 and 1917, during which he tap danced or simply danced at those points in the text left blank by a series of dots or dashes. According to the *Berliner Börsen Courier* of April 13, 1918, “George Grosz, with the mien of an American boxer, singing niggersongs, played soccer with the heads of the audience.” Grosz unleashed, true to the Dadaist hocus-pocus, “the turbulences of the world” in contradictory images of urban life, flinging his unbroken spirit, his “Nevertheless,” into the audience. People in the hall were so irritated and so loud that Raoul Hausmann could not read his manifesto *Das neue Material in der Malerei* (*The New Material in Painting*). The management of the hall turned off the lights, fearing that the excitement and the fun in the audience might change to aggression. Possibly it was also the unusual, this unrestrained mood of the audience, which made the management break off the evening. It is hardly imaginable that it was Hausmann’s text, which, according to him, so much irritated the audience.

One element became evident with this first Dada evening in Berlin, which had enormous press coverage. “Dadaist art was not served. It was the audience that had to produce the meaning of the term” — this was the opinion of the *Berliner Börsen Courier* (April 13, 1918). The activities, the manifestation, the activation of the audience and especially of the press was the new artistic quality, which Dada Berlin took over from *Cabaret Voltaire* and developed further. The spectators and the press were involved as an integral and interactive part of Dadaist productions. “We kept the press breathless until April 27 for a cost of 22 marks; they did our advertisement,” Hausmann wrote to Hannah Höch.

In contradistinction to these lively stagings, the small periodical *Club Dada* (fig. 36), published in June 1918 by Hausmann, Huelsenbeck, and Jung, seemed subdued. Hausmann designed the cover, playfully arranging the letters “Club Dada” in an abstract woodcut, still an expressionist technique. He also published, caught in the abstract form as well, a woodcut for *Der Sprung aus der Welt* (*The Jump from the World*), a novel by Franz Jung; for a Dada evening in May 1918 that however never took place, he designed a striking advertisement on the back-cover of the magazine, dynamic by its typographical design announcing simultaneous poetry (six participants), bruitist music, cubist dances (ten ladies). In *Club Dada*, Huelsenbeck wrote a “Preface for a History of Time” and published the beginning of his novel *Dr. Billig am Ende* (*Dr. Billig Ruined*), which would only appear in 1921 from the Munich publisher Kurt Wolff. The text *American Parade* by Franz Jung was printed as well. The texts consisted chiefly of simultaneous impressions, staccatos of urban images, visions, disintegration, concentrated in an “insane moment,” seen from a Dandy’s point of view: “spiritually inaccessible, intellectually unapproachable, mon dieu morally unattainable” — “coldness” and “elasticity” were cultivated simultaneously in the face of tumultuous ecstasies. Set in red letters across the text, Huelsenbeck advertised *Phantastische Gebete* (*Fantastic Prayers*). George Grosz and Johannes Baader, who had not yet appeared as a Dadaist, were also mentioned. According to himself, Baader had met Richard Huelsenbeck “in the office of Franz Jung.”

*Club Dada* appeared as a 16-page *Prospectus of the Verlag Freie Strasse*; here Franz Jung, together with Richard Oehring, Georg Schrimpf, Otto Gross, and Cläre Oehring (who later married Franz Jung), had edited seven issues of a periodical of the same name from 1915 to 1917.
Dada Berlin started euphorically with this soiree and this small periodical. The evening was also a financial success: it made a net profit of 500 marks. War cries like “Dada Triumphs!” and “en avant Dada” seem to have been born from this euphoric avant-garde mood. The artists wanted to provoke with Dada and to establish themselves. Hausmann and Huelsenbeck imagined a Dada gallery, a competitor to The Sturm (The Storm) by Herwarth Walden.

New creative impulses accompanied this success. “I have done different things with Baader,” Hausmann wrote to Hannah Höch between May 1 and May 5, 1918:

simultaneous poems, a simultaneous novel, new wood cuttings; I have enthused, Sent M’ahesa for the cubist dance, will make new costumes for her, have wonderful ideas for a dance and new music, I am also publishing a new periodical . . . there is really a new movement. And it is Huelsenbeck and I who are doing this. Jung is doing nothing. But the two of us really want to live off of it completely seriously! And for you it would also be a nice activity! We could work together.

The eccentricity of this first performance also made waves within the group of Dadaists. Dada kindled the artist into frenzied “Apache dances in futurist cellars,” of which Grosz excitedly told his friend Otto Schmalhausen. Grosz, Baader, Huelsenbeck, Hausmann, Alberts (who also appeared in the First International Dada-Fair as a photographer), Musicdada Preiss, Succi (Grosz’s girlfriend), the gallery owner I. B. Neumann, and the artist Nerlinger, who at the time was under the artistic influence of Grosz, took part in these evenings of April 1918 and conspired into a “Witch-Dances Corporation, Society for the Celebration of Black Masses.” They danced fiercely and exuberantly to Alexander’s Ragtime Band so that Grosz characterized this gamut of experiences, which dynamized the Dada group considerably, as a “turbulent cross-section through April nights.”

But Club Dada was not able to establish itself. The sting of protest and revolt and the aggressive display had already struck the political authorities to such an extent that the publications, Club Dada and Huelsenbeck’s manifesto, were confiscated. “At any rate, the police did not take a long time to react. Monday, April 15 (i.e. three days after the Dada-soiree) at 6 o’clock in the morning two policemen from the station at Alexanderplatz came and arrested me,” says Hausmann in his “Declaration on the founding of Club Dada” (August 1969), “and I had to follow them into the state prison. After several hours of my waiting in a cell, they brought me before the police-commissioner Liebermann to be questioned. Of course he treated me like a criminal, a conspirator against the government, and he took my Dadaist typography of the cover of Freie Strasse 8 (Club Dada, fig. 36) for a secret code.” Because of these police activities, Huelsenbeck at first withdrew from the Dada activities “out of fear,” as Hausmann thought in a letter to Hannah Höch on June 16, 1918. Actually he began his activity as “subordinate physician” in Fürstenwalde/Spree. Dada seemed to disappear. Johannes Baader alone was to be talked about as Oberdada in the same year, keeping Dada in the public consciousness. It was not until the beginning of 1919 that the catchword “Dada” was again used in an offensive, spectacular way.
In the first weeks of Club Dada the contours of cultural critique were already beginning to emerge, which were to develop more distinctly in the following years. On April 18, 1918 Hausmann noted on the importance of Dada:

to definitely prevent this Golgotha (like the high-brow lies of charity or evil, love and hate, of transcendence and utility, the greater value of man over woman — these crucifixions, male drives of repression, disparagement of the world into moral bourgeoisie —) this is what Dada was created for, which does not believe any more in education, in no “melior” (amelioration) — which only knows spontaneous utterances and identifies all ethos as romantic, not as part of life but as flight out of life.54

This Nietzschean vision of Dada seemed to be sealed by the lively mix in the letterhead “Club Dada,” which Hausmann designed already after the first Dada activity.

With the second Dada manifestation on April 30, 1919 (fig. 25), the Club Dada became a group again and reinvigorated Dada’s effect as a signal. Possibly the invention of the Dada-protagonists’ titles occurred at this time and may have been a step toward the playful consolidation of Club Dada; Hausmann and Höch became the male and female Dadasoph, Baader was the Oberdada (Superdada), Huelsenbeck was honored as Weltdada (World-dada), Grosz was entitled Propagandada, Heartfield was Monteurdada (Dada-mechanic); Herzfelde was called Progressdada, and Mehring Pipidada (fig. 5–17).

**Constellations and Strategies**

The activities of Club Dada soon made evident that each of the Dadaists wanted to be an impresario. This situation led to quite a few conflicts. Hausmann has described the dynamic difficulties of the group quite clearly: “The members of Club Dada were jealous, often attacking each other quite narrow-mindedly, and quarreling. The Heartfield-Herzfelde and Mehring admired George Grosz, this pseudo-revolutionary. Huelsenbeck only admired Huelsenbeck; although he had done most of our . . . manifestations with me, he always tended to favor Grosz. On the other hand, I separated myself along with Baader, who unfortunately too often was obsessed with his religious and paranoid ideas.”55 After the Dada activities in autumn 1919, Hausmann complained to Tzara: “There is no real planned cooperation, one can’t talk of camaraderie, at most one can say that each of us has the same right to take the cash and run.”56

There was no continuity in staging and no regular meeting of Club Dada, but the group-dynamics and the circumstances determined the presentation of its activities and “products.” Especially the year 1919 and the time until the First International Dada-Fair (July 1–August 25, 1920) was of greatest importance for the history of Club Dada; this phase was followed by activities of individual Berlin Dadaists until 1922 and 1923. The most extensive documentation of the traces left by the revolts of Club Dada was accumulated through the First International Dada-Fair (cat. 1–174). The multitude of products — periodicals, montages, assemblages, pamphlets, etc. — indicates the efforts of the Dadaists to be noticed in the noise and chaos of the times. The tension also had its effect on the relationships of the Berlin Dadaists, who not only worked with each other but also against each other. They did not have a harmonious group ideal; this would have contradicted the open character of the group, which represented “elasticity” and “creative action within itself.”57 “Each of them” remained “his own football.” By respecting the
individual, anarchic autonomy of each one of them, the members of Club Dada confronted dynamic conflicts, reciprocal slandering, and individual vanities. The feeling of being misread and underestimated often was turned into aggression and discharged against the friends.

The Dadaists affirmed chance and spontaneity of the group constellation. For example, the manifestos never were signed by all Berlin Dadaists jointly. From this spontaneity emerged the joint productions and stagings, which allowed the members to approach each other productively. Joint works were not rare, especially by Grosz and Heartfield, Hausmann and Baader. In the letters of Huelsenbeck, Baader, and Hausmann to Tristan Tzara (Zurich), the “first district attorney of Dada” (Baader), the problems of Dada can be seen most strikingly. The extensive correspondence between Raoul Hausmann and Hannah Höch also gives interesting insights.

It also points to the heterogeneity and inconstancy of the group that there was no steady meeting place. In the beginning, the office of the publisher Franz Jung of Freie Strasse (Open Road) in Steglitzer Strasse 34, Südende (south end), was important. Often the apartment of Huelsenbeck in Kantstrasse 118 is mentioned as a Dada address, but also Hausmann’s in Zimmermannstrasse 34 in Berlin-Steglitz was named in Der Dada (no. 2). In 1920, Malik-Verlag (publishing house of the Herzfelde brothers) in Berlin-Halensee, Kurfürstendamm 76, became a meeting point of the Dadaists. They visited each other sporadically, in Grosz’s atelier (Nassauische Strasse 4, Berlin-Wilmersdorf) and at Bülowstrasse 16 in the studio of Hannah Höch, where Hausmann lived beginning in 1920. The Dadaists also preferred different cafés. While Grosz, the “money making” Dadaist, favored Kempinski, the habitual place of Hausmann and Baader was the Café Josty, and Huelsenbeck was often seen in the Romanisches Café; John Heartfield and Wieland Herzfelde, because of their communist leanings rejected cafés as meeting points of the bohème, although their writing and their artistic activities had started in the Café des Westens. The heterogeneity of the group was also increased by the differences in age. Johannes Baader was the oldest by far. In 1918 he was forty-three, Hausmann was thirty-two, Franz Jung thirty, and Hannah Höch twenty-nine — six years older than George Grosz! Mehring and Herzfelde at twenty-two were the youngest. Huelsenbeck and Heartfield at twenty-six and twenty-seven were of nearly the same age. Therefore, the activities of Club Dada have to be seen as their point of convergence. It was here that the artists created the Club. It seemed to be only the joy of scandal, the violation of convention, and universal aesthetic denunciations, which bound together the unstable group.

Like the Cabaret Voltaire, Club Dada was a “gesture.” But different from Cabaret Voltaire, it established a bluff Dada-Empire as a pseudo “corporate identity,” with the Dada colony “dadayama” (Walter Mehring) in which the times were reflected by the heterogeneity of the individual personalities of Dada as in a kaleidoscope; they were staged as a circus mundi. Where the Dadaist found historical evidence broken up, he began his “Clowns Game from Nothing” in which “all lofty questions” were caught, his “game with the shabby relics.”

The positions, titles, and institutions with which the Club Dada decorated itself and which it attributed ironically to itself were part of its strategic parody of the post-war society. Club Dada had not only “established an office for separatist states [and the] founding of states of any size, according to tariff, here and there;” it also made fun of the Prussian hierarchical thinking, the bureaucracy of the November Revolution, the fixation on authority, and the confusing simultaneity of offices as a sign for the civil service machinery of the monarchy and the new Räte (Councils) signifying the “revolutionary” new government. Club Dada was at the same time Weltbehörde (World Administration) and Zentralrat der Weltrevolution (Central
Council of World Revolution). It posed as *Anationaler Rat der unbezahlten Arbeiter* (Anational Council of Unpaid Workers, or ARDUA), which also parodied the propensity of the “intellectual workers” for such councils. The “dictatorship of the proletarians” was dadaistically fashioned into the Weimarian *Proktatur des Dillettariats* (“proktatorship of the dilletarians,” to be equaled, according to Hausmann, with “power of the asses”).

Club Dada played with the bureaucratized socialist revolution of the Weimar Republic, which tried to achieve an appearance of order in chaos with the help of as many institutions as possible, and to tie down what the inflationary or revolutionary spirit of the times could already snatch away the next day. The bourgeois society, having stylized war into a divine judgment by the Germans, seemed to compensate for its futility with the sham foundations of swindlers. After the war a true cult of setting up clubs broke out, of “Wannabe-politicians, -founders, -philosophers, and -prophets” (W. Herzfelde). On the one hand, the demolished self-confidence of society seemed to bring brilliant confidence men to the surface; on the other hand, it fostered a readiness for illusions. According to Huelsenbeck, “it was a divinely ordained situation for the cheaters of art and of spirit.”

He himself saw the Dadaist as “con man, as Manolescu,” who, as a Dandy, held a mirror up to society. Dada made fun of the fetishism of councils, centralized offices, organizations, institutions, societies, associations, and clubs. Behind all these foundations it recognized the exploitation for profit of an insecure, unnerved society (fig. 31, 32).

The advertisement for Club Dada in 1919 parodied the pseudo-comforting tone of slogans with which big and small organizations tried to get members, especially among the petit bourgeoisie, revealing the absurdity of its membership conditions and expectations of solutions:

Join dada. Dada thus far resisted new members; however, the exigencies of the times in bustling city life require us to acknowledge the enormous seriousness of the situation, which instituted our movement, so that now the thought suggests itself to offer comfort to the indecisive, and support to those who are floundering within the folds of the Dada Society . . . We captivate the individual through the quiet form of unobtrusive promotion . . . This “exoteric” Club takes members from all strata of society into its arms; any grown-up above 16 can take part in its internal events. For this purpose he has to acquire a membership card . . .

Advantages connected to this membership are: 10, 20, and 50% reduction on all Dadaist publications; 10, 20, and 50% reduction for all non-public club events, entrance to the club facilities; special prices for the use of the Dada-graphological institute; the Dada-medical facilities; the Dada-detective institute; the advertisement section; the central institution for private male and female care; the Dada-school for the renewal of psychotherapeutic life-relations between children and parents, spouses, and those that once were or intend to become such.

As Sloterdijk has observed, “Dada builds on a bluff realism and demonstrates a technique of deceit, deception, and self-deception. As a methodology of bluff (of simulation of and interference with meaning) Dada ironically discloses how modern ideology functions; to establish values and to pretend to believe in them, and then to proceed to reveal that one doesn’t even dream of believing in them. With this self-annihilation of any ideology . . . Dada divulges the modus operandi of the modern consciousness with all its notorious lies of sense.”

---

1. *Club Dada Berlin*
The ironic bluff-strategy of Dada showed itself also in the manifesto of June, “What Is Dada and What Does It Want in Germany?” a parody of the program of the Politischer Rat geistiger Arbeiter (Political Council of Intellectual Workers), which Kurt Hiller publicized in Das Ziel (The Goal) in 1919. But, according to Hausmann, it also parodied Wilson’s Fourteen Points. In this manifesto, especially in its first paragraph, simulation of and interference with meaning cannot be kept apart any more. No doubt, considering other Dada statements of this time, some serious utopian ideas of Dada are also lurking behind these first demands of the manifesto: “the international unification of all creative and mentally alert people in the whole world on the basis of radical communism”; “the instant expropriation of property (socialism) and a communist nourishment of all, as well as the construction of cities of light and gardens, which belong to everyone and develop men towards freedom.” After all, in the following paragraphs, the utopian demands of a new collectivism are parodied in such a way that a Dadaist “sense” now emerged, for example in the demand for an “introduction of simultaneous poetry as communist state-prayer” or the “instantaneous realization of a widely spread Dadaist propaganda with 150 circuses for the enlightenment of the proletariat.”

Dada’s Play with Publicity: From “Ecstasy of Nonsense” to Exhaustion

Taking advantage of the masquerade that was hiding under the cover of progress, ethics, culture, even of revolution, the Dadaist proceeded to ironically paraphrase society with its own ways of thinking, illusions, and deceits in order to unmask it, becoming in Nietzsche’s sense a “parodist of world history.”

1917: Increased Consciousness of Publicity

Already in 1917 the Berlin artists as pre-Dadaists attempted to win the public for their artistic activities with the help of the media on as wide a scale as possible. Hausmann, for example, wanted to make use of pamphlets, exhibitions, lectures, concerts, meetings, open letters, and parades to propagate the Expressionistische Arbeitsgemeinschaft Dresden (Expressionist Workers Association Dresden).

In the same year, together with Johannes Baader and Franz Jung, Hausmann planned an activity that intended to leave the ateliers and to conquer the street as a new artistic realm. Believing that “everyone can be divine,” they wanted to found a “Christ, Ltd.” By paying fifty Marks you could become “Christ” and refuse public authority. This antiauthoritarian strategy, which was publicized with a sort of procession and with the help of billboards, already showed early Dadaist signs. But Hausmann and Baader could not carry out this activity because Franz Jung did not give them the money for its preparation.

Early accents were set with Baader’s individual-anarchistic “political gestures” like his letter to Prince Friedrich Wilhelm in autumn 1916, in which he proclaimed that he, Baader, was the sole sovereign in the realm of the mind and thus not bound by any worldly power; he would thus force the emperor into peace. Also his candidature for the Reichstag in Saarbrucken as a “man of the mind” showed early attempts to change art into political activity. “Club Dada” was referring to these activities of Baader.

The circle Neue Jugend (New Youth) around the Herzfelde brothers, Grosz, Jung, and Huelsenbeck also showed increased signs of publicity-consciousness, which manifested in the
public readings in 1916. Even if these were arranged as conventional soirees, during which Theodor Däubler, Else Lasker-Schüler, Albert Ehrenstein, Johannes R. Becher, George Grosz, and Wieland Herzfelde were reading from their works and during which texts of the father of the two Herzfelde brothers, Franz Held, were recited, they were nevertheless seen as “first public manifestations against war.”

The lecture evenings, which were announced in the weekly edition of *Neue Jugend* (fig. 40, 114) in May and June 1917 had, in subject matter and attitude, nothing in common any more with the early ones in 1916. The announcement for the evening of June 20, 1917, on “KINO” (cinema), addressed “decorators, operators, directors, and critics.” Grosz and Heartfield at the time worked on propaganda films and their own film projects for UFA. Toward the middle of June, a “Special Evening of Propaganda for Advertisement Specialists” was set. The tenth evening advertised the “VARIETÉ” (vaudeville theater) with “literary and artistic spectacles” and “the psychology of the lecturer,” an aspect clearly pointing to the futurist and Dadaist influence from Switzerland. In the weekly edition of *Neue Jugend* of May 1917, the theater was criticized as a conventional means of production. “Michaelis should buy up all theaters, these stone boxes, as storage rooms!!!!!!” the last page propagated, which at the same time highly praised “the contending basic tendencies of the vaudeville theaters between mass conquest and cultural tomfoolery” in Grosz’s “Wintergarten.”

Without doubt, Richard Huelsenbeck saw *Neue Jugend* already as a Dadaist publication. In a letter of May 1917 he announced the May edition and the founding of a Dada publishing house to Tristan Tzara, his friend from Zurich Dada times. The links between *Neue Jugend* and the beginnings of Dada Berlin become even more pronounced in a letter written by Huelsenbeck to Tzara on August 2, 1917:

As you may have seen from the circulation and success of *Neue Jugend*, we have created a movement here in Berlin, which in size compares to the Dada movement in Zurich. All the press in greater Berlin, and also the papers in the more important cities in the provinces are at our disposal. If you want, we now will work together closely. In two to three weeks we will organize a Dada propaganda evening in one of the most prominent halls in Berlin. We have enough musicians, painters, and writers to be able to arrange for the most colorful Dadaist dances. I urgently ask you to send me all the advertisement material on Dada, as well as some of your poems, which I personally will recite. In three to four weeks we will then publish our periodical in a brochure as well as an advertisement pamphlet on Dada. For this issue, which will have 32 pages, I would like to ask you for a more extensive, ground-laying statement on Dadaism, possibly your work on *activité Dadaist* that you read in Zurich, which we will print. Arp will be asked to send us woodcuttings, which we always can use. When the time is ripe, you will have to get the Librairie Corray to take 100 of them on commission . . . And finally, in four to six weeks we will have an exhibition here, which will present directly all that which Dadaism wanted. During this exhibition we will have lectures on Dadaism. I entreat you, cher maître Tzara, to let me know immediately, whether you are able to send us paintings (graphics, oil — as much as possible of Janco, Arp and if you can of some French and Italians). You have to do everything in your power to support us in this matter, since we are here giving you propaganda,
which can be of the greatest use in commercial and spiritual matters to you. . . .

Dear Mr. Tzara, be so kind as to act as quickly as possible, since now and especially here in Berlin, everything depends on quick action. I will once more summarize: If you support us, we will arrange I. A propaganda evening Dada, II. A propaganda issue Dada of our periodical, III. A Dadaist exhibition which will directly refer to your movement in words and images . . . With sincere wishes (and best regards to Janco, Arp etc.,) Huelsenbeck, Franz Jung, G. Schrimpf.

Some of the projects were only realized within the next years. Huelsenbeck mentioned Franz Jung and Georg Schrimpf, the collaborators of Freie Strasse, and not George Grosz and John Heartfield who were directly connected to Neue Jugend. It can be possibly deduced from this point how strong the authority of Franz Jung was at this time. Huelsenbeck’s letter clearly shows that the issue of Neue Jugend of May–June 1917 was a Dadaist project — a fact often denied by Wieland Herzfelde later on. With these ideas and plans, Huelsenbeck gave Dadaist impulses, which were then again modified by the Berlin Dadaists.

1918: Dadaist Forms of Production and Individual Activities

The success with audience and press on January 22 and April 12, 1918 (fig. 24), was an incentive for Dada. On the evening in April, a futurist influence still dominated. Apart from the reciting of futurist poems, the Dada manifesto was favored, a declamatory medium, which the Futurists had introduced into the art of the twentieth century.

The manifesto, effectively impulsive and ostentatious, this borrowing of art from political movements, shook the audience out of its aesthetic-contemplative frame. It was a medium geared to an aesthetics of appeal in order to survive in the fireworks of cultural advertisement, especially of all the -isms. It was an activist attempt to build a bridge between art and life. The subjects and concepts of Dada were thus propagated polemically and in a rabble-rousing way.

After the expressionist evening in May 1915, organized by Huelsenbeck and Ball, manifestos were distributed and sold as leaflets; considering their nihilist, programmatic “literary manifesto” they had great effect. The Dada typography for the first time was strikingly styled in order to give an adequate form to the anarchist artistic impulse. The Berlin Dada periodicals had mostly a programmatic character, similar to the manifestos. Apart from the Berlin manifestos, those from other Dada centers were also printed; the nihilist manifesto “Cannibalism” by Picabia, which he recited on a dark stage in Paris, was taken over by Der Dada (no. 3). Through the publications, these manifestos had their effect beyond their readings and were often quoted in the press. They expressed the volition of a whole movement and group. They were a sign of the “active type,” “living only through activity.” The programmatic attitude, however, already incorporated an anti-programmatic disposition.

At the soiree on April 12, 1918, Huelsenbeck closed his manifesto paradoxically with the words: “To be against the manifesto, means to be a Dadaist.” Tzara as well underlined the paradox of the Dadaist manifesto: “I am writing a manifesto, and I want nothing; nevertheless I am saying a few things and principally am against manifestos, as I am also against principles . . . I am writing this manifesto to show that one can do antithetical things simultaneously in one single, cool breath.” Huelsenbeck, who on the following evenings had taken over the recital of the manifesto, accompanied his words with a drum to give them more impact.
Apart from Berlin Dadaists’ avant-garde intentions to revolutionize art, the financial side of their undertaking could not be overlooked: the artists hoped to make some money, which would make them independent of publishers and galleries. Jung was a journalist at the stock exchange, the Herzfelde brothers set themselves up with the Malik Publishing Company, in which Grosz also participated with his portfolio works; Hannah Höch worked three days a week at the Ullstein Publishing House; and Baader as “spiritual” architect and Hausmann as Dadasoph were practically penniless. Therefore it was no wonder that Hausmann and Baader initially wanted to continue Dada as anti-cultural propaganda alone, after Huelsenbeck had been drafted in May 1918 to work in a military hospital in Fürstenwalde. The “big propaganda evening,” however, which Club Dada had planned in May 1918, did not take place. The advertised activist forms of production — simultaneous poetry, bruitist music, cubist dances — were nonetheless kept as characteristic elements of the Dada evenings.

_Simultaneous poetry_ was brought in by Huelsenbeck from Zurich Dada; it was there on March 29, 1916 that the first one was performed by Huelsenbeck, Tzara, and Janco. Simultaneous poetry, or better its performance, was a characteristic of the Zurich Dada repertoire. In Berlin it was considerably enlarged with regard to participants; in some cases up to ten speakers took part. During the performance the Dadaists jointly and simultaneously were reading the same text — usually a succession of sounds — resulting in an enormous acoustic intensity, or they were reading different texts, which overlapped and were orchestrated ironically, so that structures of meaning and sound, even concerts of sound resulted, with breaks and leaps, or just hodgepodge and gibberish could be heard. In Zurich the production of simultaneous poetry was under the direction of Tzara; in the Berlin performances it was taken over by Huelsenbeck. The simultaneous poem with its different voices, varying expressions of feeling, separate subjects and rhythms of the different parts, its changing languages, and sequences full of sound, was supposed to immediately attract the audience, even pull it in.

Under Huelsenbeck’s direction, _bruitism_ pointed to another element of the Dadaist aesthetics of appeal, which was connected to simultaneous poetry. But it could also become independent of it, for example in the “grand bruitist finale” of the Berlin soirees. The noise-music, influenced by the Futurists, mostly consisted of the “Six families of noise of the bruitist orchestra” which Russolo proposed:

1. Humming, thundering, exploding, crackling, plopping, droning;
2. Whistling, hissing, blowing;
3. Whispering, murmuring, buzzing, whirring, bubbling;
4. Crunching, cracking, rustling, growling, flapping, rubbing;
5. Sounds that result from the knocking on metal, wood, leather, stones, terra cotta etc.;
6. Voices of animals and humans: shouts, screams, moans, roars, howls, laughter, wheezes, sobs.79
The Dadaists used drums, trumpets, gongs, children’s rattles, maracas, sirens, cowbells, wooden tongues, lids, keys, and ocarinas. Accompanied by these noises, mostly rhythmically structured, the texts of simultaneous poetry were recited, without boundaries to improvisation.

Ball differentiated between the human voice and the mechanical succession of noises when he mixed simultaneous poetry and bruitist orchestra. Here, according to him, the violence of industrialized reality was countered with the “value of the voice” as a representation of the “soul,” the noises asserting “the individuality in its wanderings with its demonic companions.” According to this juxtaposition, the poem showed “the fact that man is swallowed up in the mechanistic process.” “In a typically compressed way, it shows the conflict of the vox humana [human voice] with a world that threatens, ensnares, and destroys it, a world whose rhythm and noise are ineluctable.”

Hannah Höch pointed to another aspect, when she connected the scenes of bruitist noises with primitivism, with the “cult of the bush.” In this view, the “succession of noises” became demonic and magical, invocative. She recounted the following about the importance of Negro culture for the Dadaists:

At that time in Berlin there was a collector of records — the first ones that had been made with the natives of several non-civilized countries. I believe, once a month he allowed interested individuals to listen to his records in his so-called sound-archive. It was a point of honor, to have been there once. But some of my friends often went there to enjoy themselves. Inspired by this cult of the bush, which entered Europe at the time, and tied to the technique of the new potential of noises added daily, these bruitist creations and noise scenes emerged.

The drum in particular became the instrument to give rhythm to Huelsenbeck’s Negergedichte (Negro Poems) and also to those of Golyscheff, Hannah Höch remembered. The poems were not announced in the programs of the Berlin Dadaists, but they nevertheless played a role in the performances. Doubtlessly they had initially been an active poetical element of the Zurich Dada evenings. The Negro Poems were primitive songs in verse and sound poetry, improvised and spontaneously created “in the mouth” (Tzara). “The mouth contains the power of obscurity, invisible substance, kindness, fear, wisdom, creation, fire.”

The drum accompanying these Negro songs had symbolic character, as Hugo Ball pointed out in his diary Flight Out of Time. He first noticed it as a central element of the carnival in Basle during the war, in which “everything that was buried and uncommunicated is turned out and drummed out. People remember . . . in a word . . . all the terrible and funeral institutions and incidences of this grim existence, and they drum them out from their souls.”

“The time is ripe for the big drum”; Huelsenbeck characterized its importance as a sign of revolt. The Negro Poems of the Zurich Dadaists, and particularly those of Huelsenbeck, their “umba umba,” were changed by Grosz into niggersongs and jungle songs, accentuating the American feeling of jazz rhythms. With the mien of an “American boxer” and with a blackened face, Grosz staged his Songs to the World in the role of the adventurer on hot beaches in the South Pacific and of blacks in the New York jungle.

In addition to sounds, movements went beyond the limits of poetry readings by Grosz. He was the first Dadaist in Berlin to experiment also with syncopations in his readings. The
connection to syncope, which Grosz referred to as jazz-syncopates, now in these delayed rhythms was transferred into movement.\textsuperscript{86}

For Raoul Hausmann, the reciting of sound poetry was a central concern for Dada, which he put into practice at the soiree on June 6, 1918 at Café Austria. Probably he discovered sound poetry without the stimulation of Swiss Dada. In any case, Kandinsky’s influence played a big role. In his history of sound poetry in \textit{Am Anfang war Dada} (In the Beginning Was Dada) Hausmann points out that Kandinsky in \textit{Blauer Reiter} (Blue Rider, 1912) had already designed “a complete description of poetry concepts, without any semantic meaning, that is just phonetical.” Hausmann stresses a passage of \textit{Der gelbe Klang} (The Yellow Sound): “Suddenly, backstage, one hears a shrill, fearful voice of a tenor, screaming completely unintelligible words very fast (often you hear an a: for example Kalasiumunafakola!).”\textsuperscript{87} Hausmann owned \textit{Klänge} (Sounds, 1913) since 1918.

In his history of sound poetry, Hausmann also mentioned some experimental works on language preceding the Dadaist sound poem that were adapted by him: the poetry of Scheerbart and Morgenstern, as well as Russian examples of “Zaoum”-poetry and futurist impulses. Unlike Hugo Ball, Hausmann associated with sounds, not ideas but uncompromisingly autonomous abstracted language. “The poem makes itself out of sounds coming from the larynx and the vocal chords and it doesn’t know any syntax, only continuation and impediment.”\textsuperscript{88} Like Ball, Hausmann was of the Dadaist opinion that only the recital determined the quality of a poem. “Action, action,” said Hausmann on the recital of a sound poem, “the time of poetry on blackened paper, this individualist vanity, is over.”\textsuperscript{89} While Ball underlined his recitals with costumes, Hausmann worked with the volume of his voice; he shouted and screamed, completely dissolving language in heated emotion, thus freeing himself from a pragmatism of language which determines everyday life and culture, by going back to its roots.\textsuperscript{90}

While Ball and Hausmann set off to go back to the elementary foundations of language and to the abstract, Johannes Baader attempted in his own way to condense his thoughts in his \textit{Acht Weltsätze} (Eight World Decrees) as a sort of \textit{Evangelium}.\textsuperscript{91} According to his own account, he only wrote them down on July 19, 1918, in the cherry garden in Plessow. In order to introduce them as the Dada World Essence, he had them published in the \textit{BZ am Mittag} (BZ at Noon) of July 30, 1918, in his own way in a half serious, half self-ironic, megalomaniac tone under the motto, “The Dadaists Demand the Nobel Prizes.” Baader’s poetical activities in the name of Dada, his forays into the press, began with this article. Here the Club Dada was declared “the only institute for humor of this time” and the \textit{Acht Weltsätze} as the wisdom of the times, for which Baader demanded all five Nobel Prizes.

Humans are angels and live in heaven. They, and all bodies that surround them, are world accumulations of the greatest order. Their chemical (Prize for Chemistry) and physical (Prize for Physics) changes are miraculous events, more mysterious and bigger than any end of the world or any creation of the world in the area of the so-called stars. Any intellectual and spiritual expression or perception is more wonderful than the most unheard of event, which the stories of “Arabian Nights” (Prize for Literature) describe. All activities and actions of humans and all bodies take place for the entertainment of heaven, as a game of the highest order that can be viewed and experienced in as many different ways as there are individual consciousesses facing an event. An individual consciousness is not only the human being, but all the orders and shapes of the world out of which he consists and within which he lives, as an angel. Death (Prize for
Medicine) is a fairy tale for children, and the belief in God was a rule for man’s consciousness during a time when we didn’t know that earth, as everything else, is part of heaven (Prize for Peace). World consciousness does not need a God.

_BZ am Mittag_ ended this article with a short ironic commentary: “Mr. Baader and his friends at least understand good fees. One million marks for 25 lines makes an end to all poetry. And for this reason one might even agree with these demands.”

Marked by Dadaist humor, Baader, the Oberdada (Superdada), as he was called for the first time in the _Weltbühne_ (World Stage) 1918 (vol. 14, no. 35, 204), during this year staged himself as an event of the mass media several more times. In these means to produce fictitious identities, he played the architect, the politician, the physicist, the artist, the advertisement specialist, and _Jesus redivivus_ all in one. In September 1918 the _Berliner Tagblatt_ (Berlin Daily) and the _Tägliche Rundschau_ (Daily Review) reported that Baader was running as a candidate for the Reichstag (German parliament) in the first Berlin district and was announcing this to the press on “Futurist Letterhead.” It probably was the stationery with the Dadaist typographical signet “Club Dada” (fig. 22) which Hausmann had designed directly after the first Dada-soirée.

On November 18, 1918, the _BZ am Mittag_ reported under the headline “Der Oberdada im Dom” (The Superdada in the Cathedral) on Baader’s campaign against the deceitful indifference of churchgoers whom he blamed for the war. The words he was able to call down from the pulpit, “What is Christ to you? You could care less!” were only parts of the long speech, which he had wanted to “launch” into the crowd of believers. In a circulatory letter that he sent to the press on this occasion, Raoul Hausmann published the whole text and insisted on free speech in a church. Probably on this occasion, Hausmann and Baader founded the _Gesellschaft Freie Erde_ (Association Free Earth; Berlin-Steglitz, Zimmermannstr. 34). From the title on may deduce analogies to _Freie Straße_ and the periodical planned in 1915, _Erde_ (Earth). This activity was judged “pathological disturbance of intellectual activity” by the _Berliner Landgericht_ (Berlin County Court) on June 5, 1919. Baader felt completely misjudged by this ruling, since, as he said in his answer to the County Court, “this man was the spiritual center of the times and remains so! Baader.”

The performance at the cathedral was preceded by a succession of smaller political gestures in Baader’s style, reactions to political events in a very specific, pseudo-prophetic, individual-anarchistic manner. On September 26, 1918, the magical and fateful date for Baader, the Superdada found it necessary to make it known that he, the “privy central councilor,” had to open the eyes of the leaders of war. On November 9, 1918, when Scheidemann proclaimed the Socialist Republic and Liebknecht the Soviet Government, Baader acknowledged that he was not proclaimed “Dictator of the Proletariat.” As a reaction he published _Die Freie Strasse_ no. 9 (fig. 41) together with Hausmann.

This half megalomaniac, half denying self-image made Baader offer (in the _BZ am Mittag_) his rule to the Germans on December 1, 1918, in the name of the _Gesellschaft Freie Erde_. For, he wrote, “from all sides I am hearing SOS calls . . . The Germans still can choose: either Baader presides, or the Entente will rule.” This was the motto under which Baader presented himself in _Die Freie Strasse_ no. 10 in December 1918 as the “President of the Earth and the Globe” — typographically set in bold letter. “Who is Dadaist?” was on the first page and more mysteriously “D.A.D.A.” “A Dadaist is a man,” according to Baader, “who loves life in all its immense shapes and who knows and says: not only here, but also ‘da, da, da’ (there, there, there) is life! And so the true Dadaist is proficient in all spheres of human signs of life, beginning
with a grotesque self-parody and ending with the most holy word of mass on this matured globe that belongs to all human beings. And I will make sure that human beings will live on this earth, human beings who can master their intellect and who will create humanity anew.”

This is how Baader with the help of media invented new realities, at times ironically laying bare their fictitiousness — not always with the approval of the other Dadaists, who not only saw the anti-authoritarian humor in his publications, but also a “theosophical insanity” (Huelsenbeck), which took itself too seriously.

For the other artists who had taken part in the first Dada evening in April 1918, Dada hardly existed any more. Only Hausmann referred to Dada in October, when he published Material der Malerei Plastik Architektur (Material of Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture) as the third publication of Club Dada (fig. 100). For Grosz, Dada already in July had “sunk into oblivion.” The Dadaists were reorienting themselves. In December 1918, Hannah Höch, Raoul Hausmann, Hans Richter, and George Grosz joined the Novembergruppe (November Group), a group of artists, architects, and designers who saw themselves as avant-gardistic and politically left. Not wanting to be an outsider, Huelsenbeck joined the Politischer Rat geistiger Arbeiter (Political Council of Intellectual Workers), soon distancing himself, however, from its academic pathos and self-exaggeration. At the same time — in November 1918 — Jung attempted to “concretely” tear down the barriers between art and politics. He went, with a regiment of the militia, to the telegraph office of Wolff in order to take it. But the next day he was thrown out again, because troops came to “clean” the offices and governmental institutions “of revolutionary elements.”

For Jung, as for many left intellectuals at the time, the magazine Die Aktion, published by Franz Pfemfert, was a center of cultural and political analysis. Initially, Hannah Höch and Raoul Hausmann went to the circle of Die Aktion after the abdication of the emperor was announced. Wieland Herzfelde, John Heartfield, George Grosz, and Erwin Piscator as well became radically more engaged in politics and at the end of 1918 joined the newly founded Communist Party of Germany (KPD).

1919: Political Awareness and Scandals

Die Pleite (The Bankruptcy, fig. 43) of January 1919 was the political-satiric reaction of Herzfelde, Heartfield, Grosz, and Carl Einstein to the proclamation of a social-democratic republic under Ebert and Scheidemann. “Bankruptcy stares at you. Totally. The revolution was embezzled. Defrauders of the revolutionary idea are governing and are establishing the philistine . . . Government socialists, you have betrayed the revolution.” And, turning to the “intellectuals,” Einstein wrote: “There is one thing to do: the communist community has to be realized.”

When Die Pleite was prohibited, the artists designed Jedermann sein eigner Fussball (Everyone His Own Football, February 1919, fig. 80), naming as collaborators Dr. Salomo Friedlaender, George Grosz, John Heartfield, Tom Heartfield (the Dada-Baby), Wieland Herzfelde, Richard Huelsenbeck, Walter Mehring, Erwin Piscator, and Otto Schmalhausen.

According to Harry Count Kessler, who financially supported the undertaking, Wieland Herzfelde had had the idea to “hawk” the magazine to the public as early as the end of January 1919. Published on February 15, 1919, it would be sold in 7,500 issues before it was banned by the government. Mehring reports: “I may pride myself that my idea of advertisement was used, to rent a charabanc, as they were used for Pentecostal processions, and to hire a brass band in frock coats and cylinder, which usually played at veterans’ funerals, while we, the editorial staff, six of us, were marching behind, packages of Jedermann sein eigner Fussball on our arms,
instead of wreaths.” Not only bourgeoisie played a role in the sales of the magazine, but for the first time also the proletarian public. “While we had become more of a laughing stock in the fashionable West, our business quickly increased the more we advanced into the Berlin North and East of the petit bourgeoisie and workers,” Mehring added. “In the avenues of the projects, gray from garbage, still honeycombed from the bullets of the Spartacus machine guns and slit open from the howitzers of the Noske-regime, the brass orchestra, playing its showpieces, ‘I once had a comrade’ and ‘The mossy bank at the parents’ grave’ on the way was greeted with cheers and heaped with applause.”

The magazine was banned because it took sides for the Bavarian communist revolution. Action was brought against Mehring for his satire “Koitus im Dreimäderlhaus” (Coitus in the House of Three Lasses) published there, and Wieland Herzfelde on March 7 was taken into preventive detention, the month in which Noske was beginning to give orders to shoot by law of court martial. Schutzhäft (Preventive Detention) was Herzfelde’s answer to his imprisonment. With this brochure he exposed the brutality of the government troops, wreaking havoc in the prisons. Also in the same month, Grosz and Einstein were prosecuted. But Grosz was determined not to give up and to continue preparing the publication of Die Pleite. His will to fight was not broken.

According to Kessler’s diary of March 16, 1919, in this skeptical individualism, a “new idea of the proletariat” had developed: “The artist, the intellectual have to adapt modestly. He [Grosz] declares himself a Spartacist. He has seen how near the Hotel Eden a lieutenant executed a soldier, who had no papers and was answering in a rude tone. The companions of the man who had been shot were crying bitter tears, from pain and fury.” On March 21, Kessler noted a more radical view of art by Herzfelde: “He has been to Moabit and Plötzensee [two Berlin prisons] for about a week. His descriptions of the prisons are so awful that I became nauseated from revulsion and indignation. . . . Herzfelde said that now it was quite impossible for him, after what he had seen, to set a light tone in his paper. There would be only battle by fair means or foul.”

Heartfield on March 23, 1919, talked to Kessler about his “absolute loathing to publish poems by Däubler and Becher [those early expressionist authors of Neue Jugend], or any other pure art . . . The main thing was the pulse of the times.”

While Grosz, Herzfelde, Heartfield, and Einstein radically upheld their communist political and artistic interests in Jedermann sein eigner Fussball (fig. 80), in Schutzhäft (fig. 123.2), and Die Pleite (fig. 43), Johannes Baader on February 6, 1919, formulated the leaflet Dadaists against Weimar (fig. 35), in which some of the Dadaists posed as Dadaistischer Zentralrat der Weltrevolution (Dadaist Central Council of World Revolution): Raoul Hausmann, Tristan Tzara, George Grosz, Marcel Janco, Hans Arp, Richard Huelsenbeck, Franz Jung, Eugen Ernst, A. R. Meyer (the two latter only being counted as fictitious Dadaist personalities to point ironically to “law” and “order,” Eugen Ernst as the president of the police in Berlin and A. R. Meyer as former military correspondent, now directing a publishing company). Baader designed this leaflet as an ironical, spectacular reaction to the election for the National Assembly on January 16, 1919, in which he introduced himself as “personal genius.” The tone was anti-authoritarian Dadaist: “We will detonate Weimar. Berlin is the ‘Ort . . . da . . . da !’” At the time of the bloodiest riots in Berlin, the shootings by law of court martial and of the white terror, Baader and Hausmann produced a Dada evening at the Café Austria in Potsdamer Street 28 on March 12, 1919. As the Club der blauen Milchstraße (Club of the Blue Milky Way, fig. 34) they already had announced the evening in the Der Einzige with a fantastic text: “The president of the
REPublic dada [Baader] will arrive by the plane called CASSIOPEIA from Weimar which he left on January 20, 1908. The president of the sun, the moon, and of small earth [Hausmann] will announce the latest radio telegrams. Every visitor is under the obligation to acquire a dispatch.”

Hausmann and Baader announced the founding of the Anationaler Rat der unbezahlten Arbeiter (Anational Council of Unpaid Workers, or ARDUA). Baader introduced his new calendar, in conformity with his anarchic, megalomaniac self-image. Two newspapers took little note of the evening: “Club Milky Way” in BZ am Mittag of March 13, 1919 and “How much does a joke cost” in Vossische Zeitung of March 14, 1919. On March 26, 1919, Hausmann wrote to Tzara, without considering the political facts and turmoil, that he was disappointed about the public disinterest in Dada. Besides, Baader had revealed himself as a priest and developed “deep German thoughts,” so that he, Hausmann, would have wanted to steal away in the mask of Rabelais! It was part of the spirit and play of Dada, reflecting ironically the events of the times, not only to invent a Dadaist Central Council and an Anational Council of Unpaid Workers, but also a Dada Republic.

Hausmann was going to found it together with Baader on April Fool’s Day 1919, playing political con-man like the “Hauptmann of Köpenick.” “We wanted to show,” said Hausmann, “how you found a republic, without violence, without shedding blood, without weapons, with nothing but a typewriter.” Hausmann planned to enter the town-hall, to bluff the mayor with an army of 200 soldiers, to proclaim the independent Republic Nikolassee (a Berlin suburb), and to fine with high sums as ruinous citizens the owners of villas. Hausmann and Baader, who could not carry out this action because they had been betrayed, with this attempt reacted ironically to the bloody self-assertion of the Weimar Republic and also to the tendencies to want to found a republic in Upper Silesia, and to proclaim a “Soviet Republic” in Bremen and Munich.

The Dada activities were given a decisive revival, when Huelsenbeck contacted Hausmann again at the end of March 1919. Obviously, Huelsenbeck was especially angry about Baader’s individual Dadaist activities. “Watch out for Baader, who has nothing to do with our thoughts,” he wrote to Tzara in February 1919. “He is at best a crazy theosopher and has compromised Dada in Berlin to such an extent with his idiocies that I can’t even get small items into the press.” His treatise for the Dada Almanach, “Eine Dadaistische Privatangelegenheit” (A Dadaist Private Affair), was aimed at Baader.

Once more Baader reacted with his fictitious “death” to Huelsenbeck’s decision to wield the power over Dada. In different newspapers, he declared it on April Fool’s Day 1919, but also his resurrection. The BZ am Mittag published “The Superdada in the Hereafter” on April 1, 1919, and the Berliner Acht-Uhr-Abendblatt wrote on April 2, 1919, “The Superdada Is Dead.” Baader’s many publications show that he expanded his individual political activities. On April 19, 1919, he left his calling card in the Ministry of the Reich offering to take over the peace negotiations in Versailles. On September 19 he appointed Scheidemann, whom he had recognized in a tramway, as an honorary Dada and admitted him to Club Dada.

While Baader thus kept Dada alive in the public consciousness with individual fictitious media-activities, while Grosz and the Herzfelde brothers satirized the bloody revolutionary fights in their magazine Die Pleite and were themselves involved in them in March, Huelsenbeck, Hausmann, and Golyscheff made plans for the Dada-evening on April 30, 1919, in the Graphisches Kabinett I. B. Neumann, which Hausmann described to Tzara as a “a spectacular evening” (fig. 25).
Probably Huelsenbeck read Proclamation Dada, the manifesto which he had written together with Hausmann and Golyscheff: “Was ist der Dadaismus und was will er in Deutschland?” (What is Dadaism and What Does It Want in Germany?) For the first time in a program, Hausmann’s reading of Seelenautomobile (Automobiles of the Soul), his sound poetry, was announced, which he partly had printed in October 1918 as well as poster-poetry and which he had set typographically as optophonetic poems. The production of the “Anti-Symphony” by Jefim Golyscheff, a Russian artist and composer who had joined Dada in early 1919, provoked with atonal, disharmonious sounds corresponding to the Dadaist spirit of aesthetic negation.

The reaction of the press concentrated more on the exhibition than on the manifestation. One of the first extensive presentations of Dada Berlin in the press in 1919 was the statement of Udo Rukser in Freie Zeitung (May 8, 1919). Rukser, Hans Richter’s brother-in-law, connected this press item with a grandiose statement of sympathy for the intentions, strategies, polemics, and fight of Dada. He presented Dada as the Dionysian Yes to the world as it is, with all its worth and non-worth, as a hymn to life and experience, all joys and passions of being and feeling. While Rukser thus was stressing the life-philosophical dimensions of Dada, he only briefly referred to the first Dada exhibition in the Graphisches Kabinett of I. B. Neumann, April 28 to about May 10, presenting works of Mehring, Grosz, Baader, Golyscheff, Hausmann, and Höch. The painters Fritz Stuckenberg (1881–1944), Arnold Topp (1887–1945), and Erica Deetjen also took part in the exhibition — not Dadaists themselves but artists who were working with abstract forms in the November Group (see Chapter 3).

The program of the Dada evening on April 30 already announced May 15, 1919, as the next “big propaganda evening.” It actually took place at the Meistersaal in Köthener Street on May 24 (fig. 26) and expanded Huelsenbeck’s, Hausmann’s, and Golyscheff’s repertoire with contributions by Baader, Grosz, and Mehring.

Huelsenbeck opened the evening again with a “Proclamation,” stressing the inaesthetic character of Dada and its ironic attitude against expressionism as well as its Dionysian “yes to the gigantic global nonsense.” Mehring appeared on stage twice. First with “poems” which seemed to insult the audience, like Ihr Bananenrohköstler und Eisomben-Eskimos (You Banana-eating, Health-food Nuts and Ice-cream-cake Eskimos) or Ihr Bananenbanausen und Ausbeuter-Leviathans (You Banana Ignoramuses and Exploiting Leviathans). He also read the Dada-Prologue 1919 or similar couplets, which he collected in his Politisches Cabaret in 1920. He probably also recited, in a scat-like, unique rhythmic accentuation and in fresh, jaunty cabaret style a parody of “Wanderers Sturmlied” (Wanderers Storm Song) by Goethe — without naming the author. It was taken up by the audience with mixed feelings; until — at an agreed upon cue — the gang of Dadaists burst on stage and shouted “End!” The entertainment forms of the cabaret thus were mixed with the spontaneity of Dada-productions. Differing from the arrogantly proclaimed manifesto, the couplet inserted the fast tempo of the city into the performance, made rhythmical by jazzy syncopation.

A Dadaist dance with masks also brought movement on stage that evening. It is not certain whether this dance was done by the then well known Valeska Gert or by Hausmann. Hausmann’s way of dancing was very different from the grotesque dance of Valeska Gert or from Grosz’s more entertaining dances like tap-dances, foxwalk, and cake trot. Hausmann probably already in 1919 tended to present dance as a lively play of elemental movements of the body, like jumping, running, striding, or bouncing. There is a description (1922) of a dance performance by Hausmann in mask, accompanied by a violin, which must have been similar to this dance on stage:
Now, at the beginning of the musical part, the dancer turns on his own axle, stands up front for a moment, then turns around and starts anew. And you have the artistic theme: the movement in silhouette, the *perpetuum* in a firm frame. Everything remains in two dimensions; there is not one pose, not one gesture, which would err into cubism, despite all its rich variety. Everything is precise, there are no platitudes, no fillers, arranged clearly and structured consistently, monumentalizing by accumulation without depending on other works of art, woven only from the flowing lines of the body.\(^{114}\)

While these performances enlivened the production more and more, the two following numbers — Baader’s lecture on “politics,” in which he certainly introduced himself as Präsident des Erd- und Weltballs (President of the Earth and the Globe), and Hausmann’s satire On the New, Free German Empire\(^ {115}\) — rather seemed to have a sobering effect on the audience, then finally to scatter and confuse it with Keuchmanöver (Wheezing Exercise) and *Chaoplasma* “with the participation of ten ladies and one mailman, two tympanis, and ten rattles.”

Hausmann’s first satiric political lecture mixed criticism of capitalist greed, of inflation, of nationalist and monarchist views with an attack against the Arbeitsrat für Kunst (Workers Council for Art) and the Räte geistiger Arbeiter (Council of Intellectual Workers). He created a mega-machine, an Übererdetagenstadt (Above-ground-multi-stories-city), hermetically shielding Germany from international influence — satirically exaggerating nationalism and the utopian city designs, the *Stadtkronen* (City Crowns) of Gläserne Kette (Glass Chain). In his satires Hausmann tended to “strengthen the irony with which he looked behind the events he was examining, thereby bringing them out all the more.”\(^ {116}\)

The following *Chaoplasma* was published by Hausmann in 1923 in *Merz*, vol. 4 as simultaneous poem for ten speakers.\(^ {117}\) The lecture began with a succession of sounds, declaimed “forte” by all speakers: *oaeeuao*. Then, simultaneously, the individual speakers commenced with their respective texts, a conglomerate of absurdly arranged everyday snatches of texts from politics, press, sex, film, culture, from set phrases and fragments of French, beginning “piano” and increasing to the “forte” of the sound poetical end. This part was followed by a phonetical piece recited by all ten speakers, interspersed with parodies like *O Intenstins Full of Blood and Wounds*, parodying the familiar Lutheran choral by Paul Gerhardt: “O Head Full of Blood and Wounds,” of course pertaining to Jesus Christ, loudly accompanied by ten rattles.

The attraction of the evening was the “Race between a typewriter and a sewing machine.” While Hausmann interpreted it as a tremendous bruitist concert,\(^ {118}\) which the two actors, sometimes Mehring and Grosz, sometimes Hausmann and Huelsenbeck, sometimes girls, performed on the instruments; Mehring, Herzfelde, and the American journalist Ben Hecht interpreted it in different ways. Mehring added different rhythmical sounds of the actors to the race.\(^ {119}\) Herzfelde interpreted it in connection with Grosz’s *Poems and Songs*, in which the sewing machine was stitching long mourning veils, joining them, so that they seemed to be almost endless and presented a contrast to the hectic feeding of paper into the typewriter.\(^ {120}\) When Grosz, in the role of a referee, declared Hausmann at the machine to be the winner, Huelsenbeck is reported to have thrown his typewriter to the ground. Ben Hecht, on the other hand, reports that a girl as the winner received a fine collection of false beards.\(^ {121}\) Valeska Gert remembers that she was improvising a dance to the sounds of the two machines to calm down the mad audience.\(^ {122}\)
After this soiree the Club Dada was stabilized again and Hausmann published together with Baader the first issue of Der Dada on June 15, 1919, which included the manifesto “Was ist der Dadaismus und was will er in Deutschland?” (What is Dadaism and What Does It Want in Germany? fig. 37).

On June 28, 1919, when the Peace Treaty of Versailles was signed, Johannes Baader decided on another spectacular act: to hand over the montage of newspaper documents Handbuch des Oberdada (Handbook of the Oberdada, or HADO, fig. 37) to the national assembly in order to draw attention to himself as Justice of World Peace.

According to his own date, around July 16, 1919, he threw leaflets, probably Dadaists against Weimar from a balcony in the chambers of the national assembly and presented himself as President of the Earth and the Globe in order to interfere with the discussion on §117, “freedom of the press,” the paragraph guaranteeing freedom from censure. However, the Dadaists indeed were experiencing the contrary. As Baader had interrupted the sermon in the cathedral, he now intervened on Dada’s behalf. Hausmann reported that this incident was even recorded in the official stenographic report of the national assembly, and “of course the newspapers got all worked up about it.”

It was fitting for the megalomaniac self-construction of Baader through the media that on September 15, 1919 (AI15) he sent a telegram to the Corriere della Sera in which he praised the individualist-anarchic conquest of Fiume by D’Annunzio as a “great Dadaist feat.” It is quite probable that he sent the telegram also in the name of Huelsenbeck and Grosz, without their knowledge. D’Annunzio had occupied Fiume with an army to abolish the influence of the Entente in this area. The daily press of the time was full of reports about this incident.

In the meantime, since April 1919, the Herzfelde brothers were busily working on the Malik-Verlag publications and distributing Die Pleite (fig. 43) through their own agents, which was not accepted at the newspaper stands because of its leftist leanings. Until the beginning of May, Herzfelde was able to sell between ten to twelve thousand issues of Die Pleite at factory doors, according to his own information. In April, Herzfelde published a second edition called Schutzhaft (Preventive Detention, fig. 123.2). (The print run is not known.) Herzfelde took part in communist meetings; the expert knowledge and discipline of the Russian agitators fascinated him.

In the course of the following months, however, belief in the victory of the proletarian revolutions was replaced by a more downcast mood. In September 1919, Kessler had the impression the counterrevolution was marching on and that “monarchy” was “already clearly visible in its wake.” It seems that it was only in this crisis that the Herzfelde brothers joined the Dada movement more consciously, in order to strike blows against society in a different way. Thus it is no wonder that it was only at that time that the Malik-Verlag set up a new “Dada-department” which from April 1920 on issued Der Dada (no. 3, fig. 39), Dada siegt! (Dada Triumphs! fig. 119), Phantastische Gebete (Fantastic Prayers, fig. 124.1) and Deutschland muß untergehen! (Germany Must Fall! fig. 120) by Huelsenbeck and the catalog of the First International Dada-Fair.

The matinee on November 30, 1919, repeated on December 7 (fig. 27) at the Tribüne, a politically left theater, was the epitome of the concerted Dada activities. That evening had a big echo in the press. Baader, H. Ehrlich (a friend of Huelsenbeck and the so-called director of the Dada-Advertisement Agency), Grosz, Hausmann, Heartfield, Herzfelde, Huelsenbeck, Mehring, Piscator (the director and founder of proletarian theater and revues), Schmalhausen (the friend of Grosz), and Jung had to have been present at the event. Apart from the known
elements of Dada, like bruitism and simultaneous poetry, which were dramaturgically placed to provoke an effective scandal in the audience, there were cabaret interludes, the political couplet by Mehring, a satire by Hausmann, and “political items” by Baader. The main part consisted of sketches. According to Hausmann the stage was set with big plans made by Baader (which are now lost) for the Hagenbeck Zoo in Berlin-Jungfernheide, for which he had been working from June to September 1912. Before the show, Hausmann and Huelsenbeck handed out leaflets, which announced the Dada Advertisement Agency (fig. 31).

A newspaper article by E. Neuhahn, who was the only critic to give detailed information about the production in Hannoverscher Kurier, December 2, 1919, sheds light on the evening:

Behind the curtain, rattle and big drum are already endlessly producing noise. Unchecked power, unhindered by the laws of rhythm or melody! Dada?? — After the nerves have become tired from the infernal noise and the spirit is almost without will, the audience seems ripe for the “Introduction.” Sneering, a servant brings the big drum onto the stage and very self-confidently stands next to the speaker, whom he urges to begin with a friendly biff on the nose. “You stand,” the speaker [Huelsenbeck] announces with strong pathos, “at this moment at the turning point of your life.” Big drum beat. “Dada will show you the right way.” Big drum beat. “We intend” is his enthusiastically furious closing statement, “to assassinate German art.” Several thunderous drum beats. I become anxious. The man is looking around, as if he were going to put his words into action, directly here and now. What then? But the servant, in a friendly, appeasing way, pats him on the shoulder and carries out the big drum. I begin to breathe easier.

The curtain opens. “Advertisement Agency Bum=bum=dada,” the program says and the “director of advertisement” informs us that this is not a piece of art, as the press, knowing nothing and to which everything has to be explained, seemed to assume. It is a “sketch” with a plot that not everyone could understand. I was very sorry that he said this. What inner edification it would have been, to come to this conclusion at the end of the performance through my own means.

We are all in the Advertisement Agency in Charlottenburg in the year 30 of the Dada-calendar [this is a mistake: “At 30” of the Dada-calendar would mean November 30, 1919]. The “director” stands at the telephone, understandably angry about the 10,000 Stüwer typewriters, which were not delivered, Stüwer typewriters, with which the Dada poet had become famous! The captivating talk is interrupted by a man [Baader] who repeatedly assures us that Hagendorf’s reading-stands are the best. Neither I nor the director have the time to ascertain this assertion for its truth-value, since very quickly, one after another, the weirdest characters come into the “office.” Outwardly they all behave alike, they look embarrassingly like errand boys, who got home too late after curfew on the first of the month. But they have style and introduce themselves to us. This is how we find out, shocked, that one of them is ill, and is searching for the medical department of Dada, for Dada glues everything, patches everything etc. Dada is no art movement. Dada is a philosophy of life. Another visitor calls himself the “Pinkerton Agency.” This must be something very honorary, because he is greeted in a much more polite way than the poor sick man, who is being pushed
around. A newcomer turns out to be “Master of the Universe, who is carrying the stars in his hand and the ‘gaurisankar’ on his head.” Another is even introduced as the gentleman, who has invented Dadaism. He confirms that himself with the profound words: “I – am – Dada!” In close spiritual unison these men now start shouting incomprehensible raw sounds, interrupted by booms of the timpani and unfeeling drumming on the piano, underlined with unaesthetic stamping and turning, alone, two or three together. The audience is seething. I am already hearing keys rattle, predicting disaster. Then, all of a sudden, the sketch, which is no work of art, closes and the “director” calms the audience down: “Well, you see, ladies and gentlemen, you wouldn’t understand this anyway yet. This is just completely different, since everyone is an actor, primarily acting directly from his own emotion.”

Herzfelde reported on this overture:

After a few sentences, the boss demanded a certain folder. He was played by Huelsenbeck with two telephones on his desk; the clerk was played by Erwin Piscator. He got a ladder, went up, but stayed up on the shelves of the filing cabinet and shouted: “Stop this nonsense, Richard.” The boss of course did not understand what the clerk thought he was doing. “Well, get on with it. I need the files,” he rasped. Piscator answered: “You seem to think we are continuing to act. Mistake.” Grosz entered the office. “Erwin is right,” he said to Huelsenbeck, “that stuff you have written . . . just boring.” The audience was not sure, whether this belonged to the piece. But now they all came to the front. “Yes, Erwin is completely right. Dadaism is not there to advertise for your crazy idea you could do advertisement with it. That’s asking too much!” The audience was silent. Huelsenbeck turned scarlet. We went into the dressing room with him. There he convinced us: we couldn’t do this to him. Such a disgrace. After a while, both of us came out again and started from the beginning. This time the clerk brought the folder to his boss. Now all those applauded, shouting and laughing, who from the beginning had thought this was a put-up job. We, still in the back room, were mad that we had allowed ourselves to be swayed. After we came back on stage after a few minutes, the clerk understood us at once, went to the front and explained: “We only continued to play for a bit so that you could convince yourself: something like this can’t be played.”

Self-presentation was mixed with self-parody underlining the ironic Dadaist style of subversion, of interruption, and making the audience uncomfortable.

Following in the program, after an intermission, Hausmann read *Klassische Beziehungen zur Mittelstandsküche* (Classical Relations to the Middle Class Kitchen), a political satire also belonging to the repertoire of the Dada-tour in spring 1920. Allusions to German culture, especially Nietzsche and Goethe, were mixed with criticism of German lifestyle, eating habits, and their mainstay, the rutabaga. A parody of German poetry was inserted in the form of a sound poem. The dance-interludes of Grosz were not mentioned in the program, but they were clearly impressive. Tap dancing was his forte. Grosz and Mehring staged *Des Dada Totenklage* (Dada’s Death Wail) in a falsetto voice behind a screen, a “Dada dialogue among old men” of which unfortunately no records have survived. Subsequently Baader was to have read *Tretet dada bei!*
(Join Dada). Neuhahn says about his appearance: “The speaker comes on stage: ‘Gentlemen!’ Pause. ‘And ladies! I am supposed to give a lecture, but you can buy that outside. Leave me alone!’ Warm applause. This is ‘primitive.’ That is true nature. This is – Dada!” Baader’s text was printed in Der Dada, no. 2, which had obviously been published for this evening. Neuhahn continues his report: “The following is chaos.” The continuation was Die Schweinsblase als Rettungsanker (The Pig’s Bladder as Sheet Anchor), a simultaneous poem by Huelsenbeck, with the participation of Baader, Hausmann, Huelsenbeck, and Mehring.

Neuhahn described the end of the performance:

One artist after another appears on stage, screams a few words, is interrupted, rebuked, praised, thrown out, asked back, ridiculed, applauded. They shout incoherent sentences on art, politics, morals. The audience is yelling and whistling, trampling and squealing, and climbs on the beautiful red velvet seats, wants its admission fee back and almost storms on stage. Out of this noise, words of the actor reach my ear: “We are our own opponents. We have other limbs on our bodies. We doodle and squeal Dada. There is no more art.” (Heckling: But only since today!). “The absolute impossibility of saying anything is expressionism. Mr. and Mrs. Philistine, show your beautiful tattooed bellies. We don’t give a damn…” The following is again smothered by deafening hoots of the audience. More and more loud shouts of protest come from the masses. More and more rude shouts of abuse answer from stage. I can’t distinguish any more, from which side the individual abuses are coming.

The ushers, who are afraid for the furniture, turn off the lights. The curtain falls. The “artists” appear with rolled up sleeves among the furious audience, screaming, threatening, egging on, sneering. They have had the success they wanted: they want turmoil; they want nothing but derision, dissolution, smashing up.

The evening was repeated because of its great scandalous success; there is a program of December 7 (fig. 27), and almost all Dadaists in their autobiographies speak of a second matinee. But both Tzara’s collection of press notices on the Dada evenings, as well as the research of Karin Füllner on the reactions to the press, show no further notices.

Wieland Herzfelde reports the following about the rerun:

Very soon after this, we announced on posters that the matinee would be repeated the following Sunday at doubled entrance fees. Again the police had to regulate traffic in front of the theater. And we, inside, instead of beginning, declared that we were not astonished that there are so many stupid people who would pay double entrance. We only wanted to see them close up. Now they could go home again. Only when we became pretty insulting the audience assumed that we were serious. The reactions were different. Some agreed with us; others were furious. Riots started, but only among the audience. We were quietly watching the fights from stage, as if it were part of the program. And when it was voiced that anyone could go on stage, like us, we instantly agreed with the people, and asked them to do so. After some back and forth, about fifteen young people volunteered. We
withdrew to the dressing room. And now they stood on stage, and didn’t know what to do. They just were embarrassed. Laughter started. The longer they stood around and deliberated, the more fidgety the audience became. Finally, it was generally demanded that the original Dadaists should continue. And the amateurs became audience again.\footnote{134}

The reminiscences of the Dadaists have saved for us those elements that often were not mentioned in the press: the realm of improvisations, of the audience-insults, and other provocations. If a performance threatened to become too perfect, the production was interrupted. Grosz for example reports: “As soon as Mehring started to rattle on his typewriter and to recite one of his pieces, I or Heartfield came from behind the stage, shouting: ‘Stop! You don’t really want to play anything for these blockheads down there?’ Often, something like this was prepared, but more often it was improvised, since always some of us were drunk, there was also constant fighting between us which just was continued coram publico on the open stage.”\footnote{135}

The strategies to irritate the audience were manifold. Hannah Höch, for example, recounted that the Dadaists acted most coolly when the biggest turmoil broke out. “Then, all of a sudden, the actors on stage stood in a completely straight line — with their backs to the audience, pulled handkerchiefs out of their pockets, put them down in front of them carefully. Took off their jackets, and laid them down on top. Then they smoked a cigarette, lost in thought and taking their time. When this had taken a while, the situation became dangerous. The audience left their seats and tried to storm the stage. All of a sudden, people were literally glued on the ramp. Then Hausmann began to shout ‘programmatic addresses on painting’ into the hall.”\footnote{136} The insults of the audience were aggressive and offensive. “We did not mince matters,” Grosz remembered. “We said: ‘You old heap of shit down there, yes, you with the umbrella, you dumb twit!’ Or ‘Don’t laugh, you idiot!’ If one of them answered, we shouted like in the army: ‘Shut up, or I’ll kick your ass!’ etc.”\footnote{137} Kerr also mentioned Grosz’s talent for repartee; when the audience demanded the continuation, trampling, burning with impatience, Grosz appeared and cynically said: “Be patient a few more minutes — you had unlimited patience for four years.”\footnote{138}

Grosz’s spontaneous ideas were especially remarkable. Hannah Höch remembered: “Grosz knew how to fill a void in the program all of a sudden with a very strange pantomime. He shifted things, was boxing against an imaginary adversary or started painting a picture, which wasn’t there at all. He did that by himself. At most, from some corner, his devoted Monteurdada [Heartfield] backed him up.” Grosz also contrived stories spontaneously, reminiscent of Ringelnatz: “breathtaking fictitious experiences” as Hannah Höch reported. “I believe, he placed himself into a sailor’s bar. He had developed a very personal technique of speaking for this purpose, constantly breaking off sentences and taking up the thread at another point again and continuing it. When the audience became twitchy — since all this got lost in a quite inextricable yarn — and if they just didn’t want to take this procedure any longer, all of a sudden John Heartfield intervened, uttering a bloodcurdling tone — a jungle cry.”\footnote{139}

In November 1919 the circular about the magazine Der Blutige Ernst (The Bloody Earnest, fig. 42) starting with the third issue was taken over by Carl Einstein together with Grosz from the writer and bohemian John Höxter. Grosz was supposed to support the leftist radical stand of the magazine with his caricatures and montages. Here as well the conquest of the masses was the prime target: “Der Blutige Ernst is not directed at literary circles, but to the masses” (Circulatory letter of Trianon Publishing, November 1919).
In December 1919, the Dadaists also began to work in cabarets, however, less provocatively than before. When the papers were reporting the opening of the Cabaret Schall und Rauch (Without Meaning) on December 8, 1919, and especially Mehring’s Puppet Show Einfach klassisch! Eine Orestie mit glücklichem Ausgang (Simply Classical! An Oresteia with a Happy End), the critic (P. W.) in the BZ am Mittag (December 9, 1919) talked of “quite moderate Dadaism.” It was supposed to be a parody of the Oresteia by Aeschylus, which was staged by Max Reinhardt, the famous theater director in Berlin. Even if the Berlin Dadaists distanced themselves from the productions and performances in Cabaret Schall und Rauch, for smaller contributions they still liked to use the programs. Der Dada (no. 3, fig. 39) was published additionally as program of Schall und Rauch (vol. 6) in May 1920.

1920: Dada Tours and Mass Spectacles

The year 1920 started with the tour of Huelsenbeck, Hausmann, and Baader. As some newspaper ads testify, it had been initiated by Baader and organized by the concert agency R. Schönfelder. Their first performance took place in Dresden on January 19, 1920, in the Saal der Kaufmannschaft (Merchants’ Hall). The three had set up a program, which presented them in the individual performances in varied Dadaist typography, even though in a “serious” way. After the evening in Dresden followed a performance in Hamburg on February 18, 1920, at the Curio Haus (fig. 29), staged by Hausmann and Baader alone, while Huelsenbeck was having a Dada-lecture on February 12, in Munich at the publishing house Kurt Wolff. Additional evenings followed: in Leipzig on February 24, at the Festsaal des Zentraltheaters (main hall of the main theater); in Teplitz-Schönau on February 26, at the Kaiserbad (Emperor’s Baths); in Prague on March 1 and 2, both at the Produktenbörse (Stock Exchange) and at the Mozarteum (fig. 28); then in Karlsbad on March 5 at the Schützenhaus (Marksmen’s Hall). A performance in Brno had to be canceled “for security reasons.”

All these performances were extremely popular. The Dadaists had sometimes a mass audience of up to 2,000 people, who from the beginning participated. The program began with an “Introduction” by Huelsenbeck, talking about Dada in a programmatic way. This manifesto was presented arrogantly and was accompanied by timpani and gong; it was followed by a “Simultaneous conversation about knives” by Hausmann and Baader, mostly consisting of improvised word associations. Hannah Höch reports on this part: “Baader and Hausmann did this brilliantly. Some harmless word, let’s say ‘knife,’ was casually dropped, and then juggled. It was treated with wit and sentimentality — was tallied with impudent words and do-gooder ideas or related to some world philosophy. It became the center of a verbal cannonade. But even such a number was provocative.”

Baader’s speech “On intertellurian madness” in all probability was limited to his Acht Weltsätze (Eight World Decrees) or a variation, for Baader was, as Kerr already underlined, “a master of repetition”: “Humans are angels and live in heaven.”

Hausmann then relaxed matters. With his “Dada-trot/Sixty-one-step” he attracted the attention of the audience, even its enthusiasm. In Prague he had bought, especially for this part, black and blue striped silk stockings, which he used up at the rate of one pair per evening. For Baader it was more difficult most of the time to fascinate the audience with the following grotesque “Mein letztes Leichenbegängnis” (My Last Obsequies), referring to Paul Scheerbart’s death in 1915, although this was one of his best Dada-texts. A simultaneous poem by Huelsenbeck, Baader, and Hausmann again called on their improvisational talents and on the nerves of the audience. Clearly distinctive was Hausmann’s “Klassische Beziehungen zur
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Mittelstandsküche” (Classical Relations to the Middle Class Kitchen).\textsuperscript{145} The audience liked the next number in particular, the “End of the World” from Huelsenbeck’s \textit{Phantastische Gebete}, probably because of its already legendary beginning: “The world has come to such a point . . . / Cows sit and play chess on telegraph poles.”\textsuperscript{146} The simultaneous poem “The Pig’s Bladder as Sheet Anchor”\textsuperscript{147} from the matinee at the Tribüne (Berlin) was also included, as was the “Grand Bruitist Finale,” where both the performers and the audience had plenty of room for their own improvisations and interactivities.

The evening in Dresden at the Merchant’s Hall probably had the greatest echo in the press.\textsuperscript{148} This shows that the Dadaists wanted to transform their soirees into a Dionysian chaos with the help of their techniques of ecstasy. The critic F. Z. of \textit{Dresdner Nachrichten}, January 21, 1920, for example, wrote:

\begin{quote}
The whistle was already being tried out before. Wild brass gong songs announced the appearance of the “literary clowns.” Finally Huelsenbeck rose, turned to the audience with an arrogant esthete’s face with monocle, trying to find a witty beginning. It failed. Instead, he introduced his friend Baader, the Superdada and President of the Earth and the Globe, and now we were already hoping to have an experience. But they stuck to fooling around and making fun of each other and boring, meaningless arguments . . . During these tedious preliminaries, the different instruments of noise were tried out. The Superdada was blowing into a cow’s horn with all his might. Huelsenbeck started to read a manifesto, to develop the theory of Dadaism. But he didn’t get far. The audience absolutely wanted to take part. . . . The Superdada was trying to save the situation by reading off the succession of events and started, together with Hausmann, the third member of the trio, to shout a “simultaneous poem” into the hall, as a duo, counting. For about half an hour this meaningless ruckus, which hardly could be understood by most, was surging back and forth, until a crowd of boys with brown curly hair stormed the stage.” After the Superdada had calmed the scene down, a “free discussion, as it were,” was started.

“Sensation-seeking, expectation of real carnival antics, unrestrained delight in rackets was prevalent from the beginning,” was the opinion of F. Z. of the \textit{Dresdner Nachrichten}.

On February 12, 1920, Huelsenbeck gave a lecture at the publishing house Kurt Wolff on “Spirit and Goals of Dada.” Since June 1919 he had been negotiating with Wolff about the international “Handatlas” “Dadaco,” who, however, rejected the project after this rather unsuccessful evening (see chapter 4).

Hausmann and Baader initiated a Dada evening without Huelsenbeck at the Curio House in Hamburg on February 18, 1920, which had a similar effect as the evening in Dresden.\textsuperscript{149} Huelsenbeck’s part was taken over by Hausmann in this program.

The evening in Leipzig on February 24, 1920,\textsuperscript{150} with which Huelsenbeck, Baader, and Hausmann continued their tour, from the beginning was more characterized by the tumult than by the Dada program, the \textit{Leipziger Neueste Nachrichten} said on February 25, 1920. The \textit{Leipziger Zeitung} of February 26, 1920, was even more incensed: “Dada knows only one thing: the ecstasy of nonsense, derision (and behind it the grinning of desolation and the void). But deliver this ecstasy the cold way to a hall full of antidada philistines, with cold froth on the
mouth, as it were, is prostitution of the worst kind. It is an offense against human dignity by these three men, who don’t have any themselves.” The critic ended cynically: “Indeed, Dada is a sign of decay which is becoming dangerous only by finding an audience; but human culture has gone through worse: it will also survive Dada.”

The evening in Teplitz-Schönau on February 26, 1920, was announced in Vogtländischer Anzeiger (Plauen, February 25, 1920) with an advertisement of the Superdada: “Furthermore Mr. Baader is informing the Teplitz public that each Dadaist in the world has declared himself president and they have officially notified the board of directors of the League of Nations in Paris.” Hausmann wrote to Hannah Höch on February 27, 1920, from Teplitz: “The evening in Teplitz was tiring, the audience at first did not react at all, later on, however, there was a brawl, all in all a success. . . . Tonight they really celebrated us — Huelsenbeck and Baader are corpses, I am fine . . . If we can continue (because of the black pox) we will drive to Karlsbad on 5 March instead of Brno. For Prague, by the way, they are promising a thrashing.”

The Dadaists used this threat as an opportunity to ask for double fee from the concert agency. Besides, the entrance fee of 23 Czech crowns demanded by the agency was a thorn in their flesh anyway. That is how they would gain the reputation of getting a thrashing “professionally” for a fantastic salary.

Hausmann planned to influence the continuation of the tour, as well as its reception, by publications in the press. Under the title “What Does Dada Want in Europe?” in the Prager Tageblatt of February 23, 1920, to get the public into the right mood, as it were, he published a programmatic introduction to Dada and its history. This article was preceded by an announcement of the Dada evening on February 17, 1920, in the Prager Tageblatt, appearing under the title “The Dadaists Are Coming . . . Prague Is Becoming a Metropolis.” But the audience in Prague on March 1 only was interested in Dada insofar as it was able to take the initiative itself. According to the critic F. of the Morgenblatt (Prague, March 8, 1920), the audience made come true what the Dadaists had promised — the scandal. On this evening, Baader had chickened out. According to his version, he wanted to plan the program alone. According to Hausmann, Baader became afraid because of the threats of physical abuse and disappeared an hour before the beginning with most of the manuscripts of the Dadaists.

The thrashing obviously did not take place. Afterwards, however, they were happily stylized as an effective element of the Dada-scandal. Hausmann, for example, wrote about this evening in retrospect:

Sometimes it truly demanded courage to even appear in halls of more than 2000 people, who already were going berserk. . . . Some dozen men climbed the stage and gave us a beating. They had pushed me to the edge of the stage, where I fell down. A number of people trampled on me, my pants were torn and my glasses were broken . . . I shouted into the audience: “The thrashing was a pleasant massage for us, but for you it was a disgrace!” We established a discussion for everyone in the audience. Three minutes speaking time were allotted. Already the first one started, but not DADA. For he instantly started: “To the gallows with you.” . . . The audience raved . . . We played them unmoving and attempted to catch the projectiles flying and to throw them back into the hall.
On this evening it became clear that the concept of provocation was fully transferred to the activities of the audience, that one couldn’t distinguish any more between provokers and provoked. The Dadaists had not been able to provide the unleashed Dionysian chaos of the performances with a structuring Apollinian counterbalance of triumph. The audience was prepared for its function as scandalized object and had made a role-play out of it. The effect of Dada was stagnating as ecstasy-nonsense. Intoxication was followed by sobering up.

The second performance in Prague at the Mozarteum was carried out in a completely drained state. “We’ve had it with these soirees,” Hausmann wrote to Hannah Höch on March 3. “Yesterday, for example, we worked like dogs, but the noble Jews from Prague remained noble and found everything very boring, which they also let us know through speakers in the discussion. I think this country of calves, behinds, and double-chins belongs to Karl Kraus more than to us.”

There was a bluff announcement in Bohemia on March 5 about the evening planned in Brno: “From Brno we get the report: The Dada evening planned in Brno has to be canceled for reasons of life, since a crowd of glass workers is planning to drag the Dadaists out of the hall and push them under water in the Biala, until they don’t have enough air for further performances.”

A press item (without date or name of newspaper) from Tzara’s archives refers to the performance at Karlsbad on March 5, 1920, talking of the daring venture of booty-hunters without scruples. A quote from the report of the Freiheit (Freedom) from Teplitz was supposed to warn the public of Dada already. Another tour was to have led through Moravia to Vienna four weeks later; it probably came to nothing because of the general exhaustion of the Dadaists. It becomes clear, however, from the correspondence between Dix and Hausmann of April and May 1921 that Hausmann was planning another tour in 1921 and that Dix was agreeing enthusiastically to this plan. Another letter of October 13, 1921, is known, in which inquiries were made about Dada-evenings in Mannheim and surroundings.

The tour of the three Dadaists had had such an effect on the Prague population that it organized a “Dada-Futurist-Carnival” on April 30, 1920. The provoking elements of the Dada soirees were transformed into a bourgeois entertainment program. Thus the partying bourgeoisie took over Dadaism. The entertaining effect of making fun remained. Dada became a carnivalesque element not only in Prague, but also in Berlin at the 38th Artists Ball of the educational unit of the State Museum of Arts and Crafts, having a party under the motto, “The crazy STAKUGEMU” (STAtliches KUnstGEwerbeMUuseum). The costume ball of the November Gruppe on March 20, 1920, in the Gartensaal am Zoo promised “big tombola and Dadaist cabaret.”

While Huelsenbeck, Baader, and Hausmann concluded their Dada tour, the counterrevolution was marching. On March 13, 1920, the Kapp Putsch took place. That same month there was a fight between the German Army and workers in Dresden, during which a bullet hit the painting Bathseba (1635) by Rubens in the Dresden Art Museum. When Oskar Kokoschka, at that time professor at the Academy of Arts, requested the workers not violate “die heiligsten Güter des Volkes” (the most sacred treasures of the people) and to fight somewhere else in the future, Grosz and Heartfield reacted with the manifesto Der Kunstlump (The Art Rogue) that they published in Der Gegner (Opponent). They took the side of the fighting proletariat and acted aggressively and iconoclastically against bourgeois culture. Dix was angry also. He glued Kokoschka’s newspaper article as a scrap onto the gutter in the painting Der Streichholzhändler (The Match Seller, 1920). The German Communist Party (KPD), however,
reacted angrily to the manifesto; Kunstlump initiated a discussion about the communist understanding of cultural heritage.  

During the spring of 1920, another spectacular activity took place, pointing beyond Dada and still carrying the Dadaist sting of adventure/art/life/politics. It was about a political goal. Franz Jung captured a boat, Senator Schröder, together with the Communist party member Jan Appel to force the joining of their party, the Communist Workers Party of Germany (KAPD), a left radical branch of the KPD, with the Communist International in Moscow. But this plan failed, because the KAPD could not show a clearly defined party program. The “case Jung” occupied a large part of the bourgeois and communist press, when Jung was sentenced to prison at the end of the year. “Communist, Poet, and Pirate” — this was for example the headline of Neisser Zeitung (supplement, no. 285, December 14, 1920). Jung’s novels of his “Rote Jahre” (red years) were written in the prisons of Cuxhaven, Hamburg, and Fuhlsbüttel; they were printed and distributed at Malik-Verlag and were originally meant for the feuilleton of the communist daily press.  

In the meantime, after the Dada tour, Hausmann had disconnected from Huelsenbeck and Baader and had established closer ties with Grosz and Heartfield. Under the “psychofacts” “Groszfled, Hearthaus, Georgemann,” in April 1920 the three edited the third issue of Der Dada (fig. 39). This Dada friendship resulted in the organization of the First International Dada-Fair. Meanwhile the Superdada was also busy; he invented new bluff announcements to carry on his publicity. He wrote Die Botschaft des Oberdada (The Message of the Superdada) on the loss of his manuscript: “When the Superdada was riding back with the W train from Stettiner Bahnhof to Steglitz in the evening of May 13 getting out at Kaiserallee together with both angels accompanying him, the manuscript of his fantastic life story to be published in five installments at Ernst Rowohlt Verlag was left in the car. The finder is asked to bring the manuscript of the Superdada to the Ernst Rowohlt Verlag, Berlin 35, Potsdamerstrasse 123b, where he will get a superdadaist reward. / Since the conference of Spa was postponed until the birthday of the Superdada, it is of the highest political importance and of great public interest to get the manuscript back. (Berlin Steglitz, May 18, 1920. The Superdada).” The Superdada continued inventing such announcements to mystify Dada and himself; especially the 373 secret files of the Dadaist movement, which he kept mentioning until his death, contributed to this media strategy. According to his own statements, he had completed them on July 1, 1922, and added a numerical table of contents. The Superdada was the only one among the Dadaists, who had the idea of producing a sort of Dada performance at the exhibition of the Dada-Fair, in order to attract increased public attention with the help of “sensations.”

The Dada-Fair (July 1–August 25, 1920) became a focal point of Dada Berlin, concentrating the actionist impulses in a realm of total artistic experience. The fair was a highpoint of the Dada activities in Berlin, listing the production of 175 works in the catalog. (See chapter 6.)

Hannah Höch’s trip to Italy (October 7–November 20, 1920) could be called another bold individual activity for Dada, even if it did initiate a distancing from Hausmann. Huelsenbeck gave many addresses to Hannah Höch for her Dada stations in the South, like those of Hugo Ball and Emmy Hennings, Hans Arp, the magazine Bleu in Genoa, and the address of Prampolini in Rome. The most important station on her journey became Rome, where she arrived on November 7. Here she met Prampolini, who had organized an exhibition with watercolors of the November Group together with Marinetti, and here she also initiated the big press article on Dada, with photographs by herself and works of the Dada-Fair, in Noi e il mondo (We and the
Baader quickly sent her a Dada message to Pope Benedict: “Baader is coming to St. Peter’s and will celebrate the first World Dada Mass. Benedict is to blow the trombone.”

A sort of epilogue of Dada is the *Dada Almanach* (fig. 124.2) by Huelsenbeck, which he already was planning, when he came to Berlin in 1917. It was published in the autumn of 1920 by Erich Reiss Verlag in Berlin, and presumably it contains many articles that were supposed to be printed in *Dadaco* (fig. 165.1-165.4).

Dada lost its suggestiveness and its reputation for scandal. In the future, the Dadaists did not advertise with Dada, but with their own name — disregarding Baader. Hausmann and Elisabeth Klockmann were invited to a “cheerful evening” on December 15, 1920. While she was reciting from Scheerbart’s work *Ich liebe Dich* (I Love You) of 1897, certainly also the sound poem *Kikakoku* from that work, Hausmann “unveiled Puffke.” Probably it was his satire *Puffke propagiert Proletkult* (Puffke Propagates Proletarian Cult). He had put it on the program, which he sent to Tristan Tzara.

In the years 1919 and 1920 Dada found immediate imitators in the Club der Grotesken (Club of Grotesques) and with the publishing company Verlag Groteske Kunst (Grotesque Art Publishing House), which Alfred Sauermann founded in 1919 in order to publish his *Da-daträdödie: Das Gewebe reisst oder die Mausefalle* (Dada-tragedy: The Fabric Is Ripping, or The Mousetrap). A groteske kunst-buchhandlung (grotesque art bookstore) (Berlin W 8, Kanonierstr. 2) provided publicity. A Theater of the Club of Grotesques, under the artistic direction of Alfred Sauermann and Kurd Viereck, was announced. One of the “grotesque publications” was called *Harakiri*, published by Fred Hardy Worms in 1920 in the wake of Dada.

Even the title *Oberdada* was now claimed often. The grotesque “words of Dada Bada” were sung by the unknown *Oberdada Hajós* to a *Dadaist Fox-trot*, (published in 1920 by the Bohème Publishing Company Karl Brüll, Berlin) far removed from Golyscheff’s *Anti-Symphony* (1919).

**1921: Grotesques, Anti-dada, “Intertellurian” Academy**

Mynona (pseudonym of Salomo Friedlaender), Hausmann, and Hannah Höch promoted their recital on February 8, 1921, with *grotesques*, the press paying especially attention to Hannah Höch’s *Italienreise* (Journey to Italy). The audience now had clearly dwindled down to friends, those interested in literature, and the people of the press. Hence the *Acht-Uhr-Abendblatt* of February 10, 1921, wrote: “A peculiar triforium, indefatigably reading its outrageously witty grotesques to a dozen of good friends and some people of the press.”

Only for the Superdada the effect of Dada was still unbroken in 1921. Thus *Das kleine Journal* printed a “New Year’s Eve Invitation from the ‘Central Council of Superdada’ to the President of the Reich”: “The Oberdada is the Messiah.” But it only was published on January 3, 1921. In it Baader simultaneously announced his *Dada Carnival Ball* at the Marmorsaal on January 20, 1921: “The superdadaist central office demands to know whether the president of the Reich will take part in the ball, so that a box can be reserved. The participation in the ball is an intertellurian necessity.” The Superdada succeeded in continuing to present himself as the court jester of the Weimar Republic. But the Berlin Dadaists rejected the *Dada Carnival Ball*, since they never saw Dada as amusement. Only Mehring, knowing more about entertainment through his activity at the cabaret, was admitted to the “honorary committee” of the ball, and Hannah Höch visited the ball disguised as a puppet. Even the critic of *Berliner Börsen-Courier*
(January 22, 1921) missed the biting spirit of Dada. Only a big white cardboard horse still reminded of Dada. For the first time, costumes were mentioned in the press.

Baader continued to propagate his world reign and to promote a “radical rehabilitation of the earth and the universe” under his supervision. News like “The World Stewards under the Whip of Dada” in *Berliner Börsen Courier* (January 25, 1921), “The Superdada as Dictator” in *Badische Landeszeitung* (February 1, 1921), and “The New Invention of the Superdada” in *Tagblatt*, Cologne (February 2, 1921) and in *General Anzeiger*, Oberfeld-Barmen (January 29, 1921) went through the press. On March 30, 1921, Baader had a recital at the *Fraenkelische Kunsthändlung*, Berlin, according to which he wanted to found a *Schule der Weisheit* (School of Wisdom) following the example of Herman Graf Keyserling. This is what a journalist reports under the motto *Der zahm gewordene Oberdada* (The Tamed Superdada) in *Berliner Börsen-Courier*, March 31, 1921. Baader expanded this project and sent out invitations for the inauguration of the *Erste dadaistische Akademie* (First Dadaist Academy) in Potsdam at the end of June 1921.

In his introduction Baader referred to his *Acht Weltsätze*! According to the press the “master of repetition” (Kerr) continued by finally presenting his intertellurian concepts: “The Dadaist academy wants to span the whole cosmos, all nations. We have to become alert, strong people. The academy wants to link the smallest and the biggest, the furthest and the closest in their perspective.” He proceeded by reading his letter to Rabindranath Tagore under the heading, “The Dada School Will Surpass All Schools.” The press criticized the performance as a “monstrosity of the German intellectual life.” In connection with this advertisement, the Superdada published a magazine in Potsdam, calling it *Freiland Dada* (Freeland Dada), reminding of his activity named *Gesellschaft Freie Erde* (Association Free Earth), started in 1918 and of the founding of the *Freiheitspartei* (Freedom Party) at the beginning of 1920. Both carried on life-reforming thoughts of the times by which his self-productions had always been characterized.

By the end of May 1921 some Dadaists had formed an opposition to the *November Group*, and they published an “open letter” in *Der Gegner* on June 21, 1921, criticizing it as apolitical and characterizing themselves as “revolutionary forces, instrument of the necessity of our times and of the masses.” The polemics against bourgeois culture were quite Dadaistically tinted and were directed against the “aesthetic racketeers and academics.” This protest was caused by the rejection of two paintings by Schlichter and Dix by the exhibition committee of the *Große Berliner Kunstausstellung* (Great Berlin Art Exhibition, May–September 1921) at the State Exhibition Hall by Lehrter Bahnhof. This probably was the last concerted public activity of Hausmann, Grosz, Schlichter, Dix, and Hannah Höch apart from the Dada-trial in April 1921. (See chapter 6.)

However, Hausmann was wide-awake concerning new activities and publications. When, in December 1921, he complained to Grosz that he was not included in the planning of a new publication, Grosz answered him in his cool irony on December 14, 1921, a letter that reveals a lot about the group dynamics of the Berlin Dadaists:

I didn’t think of excluding you (YOU, old locomotive), I’m just different than you are, I only dish out the plums when I have them. I only told Griebelotte [Otto Griebel, Dresden] about it in passing — therefore not at all ready and final, think of it: clichés and printing costs are immense — of course without Malik-Verlag. I thought of two pages, but biting against everything (you get it, of course not some
bourgeois Mehring point of view, like that swine is doing in his new couplets). . . It’s a pity that you have this closeness with Baader again, but you can’t be helped, as soon as one turns one’s back, you shout “asshole”/ Greetings your Beff / Collaborators I thought you, Muti [John Heartfield] Schlichter and Griebell Otto.

Maybe this concerned first plans for Der Knüppel (The Bludgeon), which appeared as a satirical KPD publication in 1923. This letter shows that Grosz already preferred to work with artists who in 1924 already belonged to the Rote Gruppe (Red Group), while Hausmann tended more to the activities of Kurt Schwitters. On September 6 and 7 Hausmann went on an Antidada-Merz-Tour (fig. 30) to Prague, together with Schwitters, Hannah Höch, and Helma Schwitters. This tour, at the same time, bridged the reservations of Dada Berlin against Schwitters, which especially Huelsenbeck and Grosz had had since 1919.

Rejecting Kurt Schwitters’s request to become a member of Club Dada, which he had made in 1919 at the Romanische Café to Raoul Hausmann, the normally quite heterogeneous Club Dada showed itself as a thoroughly hermetic association. “Dada rejects works like the famous Anna Blume by Mr. Kurt Schwitters fundamentally and vehemently,” Huelsenbeck unambiguously stated in the introduction to the Dada Almanach. He counted Schwitters among the imitators of Dada: “Recently, many publishers have taken hold of Dada for business reasons, and many poets have done so for reasons of ambition.” The main reason for rejecting Schwitters so vehemently, however, was probably the suspicion that Schwitters might use Dada commercially. The success of Anna Blume (1919) was suspect to the Berlin Dadaists as much as Schwitters’s relationship to the hated gallery Der Sturm of the apolitical Herwarth Walden. Contacts with this gallery had existed, since Schwitters had heard a reading of Sturm poetry by Rudolf Blümmer on January 19, 1918, at the Kestner Society in Hanover.

Schwitters had established the entrance of the Dadaist collage into galleries and confirmed Dada as an “ism” at a time when the Dadaists still believed they would be able to connect their aesthetic and political revolts in experiments. They missed the provoking, “demonstrating qualities,” like “recklessness, adventurousness, pressure, acuity, personal punch, and powers of persuasion,” all the qualities which characterized the political broadside of their manifestations and montages. Schwitters for them at first had only “poetic qualities.” For them he was the “genius in the housecoat,” an “abstract Spitzweg,” the “Caspar David Friedrich of the Dadaist revolution,” a “weirdo like the German romantic Jean Paul” (Walter Mehring). Huelsenbeck’s dislike resulted from a visit in Schwitters’s apartment in Hanover in 1919 and 1920, when he was negotiating with the publisher Paul Steegemann about his publication En avant Dada, which was planned as volume 50–51 in the series Die Silbergäule (The Silver Horses). Having got to know Schwitters here as a petit bourgeois, Huelsenbeck remarked later on: “I never could accept how much the bourgeois and the revolutionary worlds in Schwitters resemble each other.” The dichotomy in Schwitters’s character was foreign to the Dadaists while at the same time it fascinated some of them, for example, Raoul Hausmann and especially Hannah Höch.

From the conflict between Dada Berlin and Schwitters it becomes clear that neither side perceived the irony of the other: Huelsenbeck and Grosz were barely able to get into the content of Schwitters’s cultural criticism and its “political” undercurrent; Schwitters hardly understood the often bluffing provocations of Dada Berlin’s politics. He failed to appreciate that Dada Berlin could not be put on a level with Proletkult, a manifesto written together by van Doesburg, Tzara,
Arp, Spengemann. According to them “art, as we want it, is neither proletarian nor bourgeois, for it develops forces, which are strong enough to influence all of culture, instead of becoming influenced by social circumstances. The proletariat is a condition which has to be overcome; bourgeoisie is a condition which has to be overcome.”

However, in 1924 Schwitters differentiated sharply in the judgment of his two Dada Berlin enemies Grosz and Huelsenbeck.

After 1918 instead of Dadaism we had for a few years a general, revolutionary Expressionism, as long as it was fashionable to be revolutionary. Therefore Dadaism also was revolutionary. But while Expressionism, anxious to please, only made revolutionary faces, Dadaism performed revolutionary activities in order to strike the better. Huelsenbeck, one of the most intelligent heads of our era, knew exactly that in this time nothing could better shake up the fattened spirits than communism . . . Grosz created a radical political formula; for him, Dada for a short time was a political means of combat, unlike Huelsenbeck, for whom communism was a Dadaist means of combat.

According to Hausmann’s observation Schwitters was “inviolable and invulnerable deep inside. He had no minority complexes. He was so free, so easygoing, nothing touched him more seriously than his art.” In 1921 the passing acquaintance from the Romanisches Café became a friendship with Hausmann and Höch. The mutual collaboration on De Stijl and Mecano made it easier to overcome prejudices. Van Doesburg was a mediator between them.

Both for Hausmann and Schwitters the tour Antidada-Merz-Program (September 6–7, 1921, fig. 30) was less a provocation, but more a stage activity to further the “forces of the times.” Thus, the sound poems, the Seelenautomobile (Automobiles of the Soul) were made more important for the production. Hausmann’s sound poem “fmbsbw” impressed Schwitters so much that in the following years he developed his Ursonate from it.

Hausmann himself wrote about the soiree in Prague: “On the low podium of the hall of the Produktenbörse [the Urania], appeared two plain men, who alternately started to recite with a clear voice the ‘Revolution in Revon’ by Schwitters. The first sentence, ‘Mama, da s-teht ein Mann’ (Mama, there s-tands a man) Schwitters, the second sentence ‘Mama, da s-teht ein Mann’ (Mama, there s-tands a man) Hausmann, and so forth to the end. Great applause. In the same way we dealt with the poem ‘Zigarren’ (Cigars) by Schwitters; the change of the two voices made the repetition of the same word, with emphasis of different strength, quite full.”

Hannah Höch also referred to this alternating production: “This evening acquired a special flourish through the somewhat malicious atmosphere of rivalry which had broken out between the two actors and which led to the point that they both tried to be louder than the other . . . The audience loved this enormously; it felt the genuineness of the fury of the two pugnacious fighters and cheered them on.”

As all other evenings, the Antidada-Merz evening was introduced with a manifesto. This time, Hausmann presented his anti-Dadaist manifesto PRESentismus in which anti-bourgeois cultural critique and destructive dada gesture took second place to new concepts of art, for example, the demand for “electric scientific” painting. Seeking the utopian, Hausmann tried to combine revolution and art by insisting that a “broadening and a renewal of human emanations of the senses” could only be reached “because the birth of a courageous and unhistorical man in
the class of workers had preceded it.\textsuperscript{186} His \textit{Eccentric dance} must have had a livening effect; it can be assumed that Hausmann approached more the energetic-constructivist concepts of dance which he developed together with Laszló Péri in 1921 and 1922 and which he illustrated together with him in \textit{Absichten des Theaters Pré} (Intentions of the Pré Theater).\textsuperscript{187}

The recital of Hausmann’s satire \textit{Warum Hindenburg ’nen Vollbart trägt} (Why Hindenburg is Wearing a Beard) still contained Dadaist elements.\textsuperscript{188} The audience was directly addressed: “You won’t believe this,” and Hindenburg was introduced in a verbal dialogue with his wife “Ännchen.” The two of them sit in a café and eat cake with whipped cream and drink beer. Bourgeois food for Hausmann and Grosz always was an indication of the cultural lack of their country as well. The next numbers on the program were \textit{Berlin, simultan} (Berlin, Simultaneous, with music “Plant Tramp”), an \textit{Excentrischer Tanz Italien Paris und Prag} (Eccentric Dance Italy, Paris, and Prague) and \textit{Groteske Gedichte} (Grosque Poems). It cannot be assumed that with “Berlin, Simultaneous” Hausmann and Schwitters performed Mehring’s Dada-couplet; certainly they performed their own piece. Schwitters’s part in the evening was the “Grosque Poems,” among them his \textit{Alphabet von hinten} (Alphabet Backwards)\textsuperscript{189} — for Hausmann a precursor of the sound poem — but also his text \textit{An meine Dresdner Kritiker} (To my Dresden Critics) and his now famous poem \textit{An Anna Blume} (To Anna Blume),\textsuperscript{190} which Schwitters had posted in Hanover in 1920. The publisher of this poem, Paul Steegemann, as a result was able to sell the book of the same name in an edition of more than 10,000 issues. The poem induced a large number of associations and irritations, from everyday ones to poetical ones. Anna Blume was, like the times, contradictory, easy to understand and hard to grasp. The attraction and the success of “Anna Blume” was brought about by the mixture of pathos, traditional love poetry, parody, reversal, and alienation, in which anyone could mirror himself and still not find an identification. The evening ended with the unknown sketch of three persons with the title “The Mechanical Man.”

The soiree had been prepared with a lot of advertisement. Schwitters, already in the train to Prague, stuck his Merz-notes everywhere. Announcements in the papers\textsuperscript{191} and posters pointed out the evening. From the press item on this evening\textsuperscript{192} the effect of the two anti-Dadaists can be deduced: “The audience in the beginning was whistling and yelling, but began to get so bored after some time that most of them did not come back after the intermission. Of those few who remained, the boldest of them sat down on stage with the performers and amused themselves on their own, by trying to shout louder than Mr. Hausmann, which, after all, was quite an achievement.”

As for Baader, on October 16 he was in Leipzig where he held a Dada-speech, “The Last Judgment on the Superdada in the Cabaret-belly of Leipzig.”\textsuperscript{193} In 1925 Huelsenbeck commented on the Dada activities of the years 1918 through 1921: “The citizens have never understood the painful mockery of the performances; they understood the jokes, but they didn’t know that their own ridiculousness was on the agenda.”\textsuperscript{194}

\textbf{1922 and 1923: New Artistic Decisions, Political and Elementary}

The diverging artistic interests in international Dada showed themselves by 1921; in Berlin and in Paris the Dada group was splitting. This was spectacularly initiated by the \textit{Mise en accusation de Maurice Barrès par Dada} (The Accusation of Maurice Barrès by Dada) on May 13, 1921. Breton insisted on a moral judgment, while Tzara refused any evaluation, because “all of us are a pack of scoundrels.”\textsuperscript{195} When Breton, at the \textit{Congrès International pour la Détermination et la
Défense de L’Esprit Moderne” (International Congress for the Determination and Defense of the Modern Spirit) finally in March 1922 wanted to come to a clarification of the subject matter of modern art, Tzara declined to participate, making the congress superfluous, because he as an important contributor was missing. At the same time, Francis Picabia, was announcing the “end of Dadaism.” Many German daily papers published his statement, for example the Rheinisch-Westfälische Zeitung from Essen on July 20, 1921.

At the congress of the Union internationaler fortschrittlicher Künstler (Union of Progressive International Artists) from May 29–31, 1922, taking place during the I. Internationale Kunstausstellung (First International Art Exhibition), Dusseldorf, problems became visible which were argued out in a spectacular way. This exhibition, organized by Junges Rheinland (Young Rhineland), saw itself as a counter event to the local, official Große Kunstausstellung Düsseldorf (Great Dusseldorf Art Exhibition), and intended to present itself as an all encompassing show of international artists. At the Department Store Tietz, 812 works of 344 artists from nineteen countries were shown, among them Tomoyoshi Murayama from Berlin, who would later on make Dada known in Japan. While the Dadaists Höch, Grosz, Schwitters, Dix, Griebel, Scholz, Eggeling, Richter, and van Doesburg were in the exhibition with works of their own, the Berlin Kommune (Commune), founded in March 1922, opposed it: Raoul Hausmann together with Stanislaw Kubicki, Otto Freundlich, Doris Homann, Frank Joseph Esser, Hedwig Mankiewitz (who married Hausmann in 1923), Tristan Remy, Felix Gasbarra, Herm. F. A. Westphal, and Stanislowa. In its Second Manifesto the Commune accused the individual groups taking part in the exhibition, among them the November Group, the Junges Rheinland (Young Rhineland), Sturm, Dresdner Sezession: “None of these groups has dared to leave their narrow egocentric party-ideology, none of them thought of dissolving so that the great international community could become reality.” The congress became the protest forum of the members of the Commune, who demonstratively gave up their group name, in order to underline the “meaning of internationality.”

When Hausmann was hindered from reading his declaration, the just founded Internationale Fraktion der Konstruktivisten (International Fraction of Constructivists) joined him: Werner Graeff, Theo and Nelly van Doesburg, Cornelius van Eesteren, Hans Richter, El Lissitzky, Ruger Vasari, Otto Freundlich, F.W. Seiwert, Hans Richter, and Stanislaw Kubicki.

Two events followed this protest: first the Dadaisten- und Konstruktivistenkongress (Congress of Dadaists and Constructivists) at the Bauhaus in Weimar in September 1922, in which the Berlin Dadaists, however, were not taking part. A “constructivist, international, creative collaboration” on the part of the constructivists Theo and Nelly van Doesburg, Lucia and Lászlo Moholy-Nagy, Alfred Kemény, Harry Scheibe, Nina Smit, Werner Graeff, El Lissitzky, Hans Richter, Max Burchartz, and Alexa Röhl was announced, which was joined by the Dadaists Hans Arp, Kurt Schwitters, and Tristan Tzara.

The second event was the Internationale Ausstellung revolutionärer Künstler (International Exhibition of Revolutionary Artists) in October 1922 in the quarters of the Workers Art Exhibition, in which Raoul Hausmann, Hedwig Mankiewitz, Franz W. Seiwert, Jankl Adler, Stanislaw Kubicki, Otto Freundlich and Stanislowa took part. It gave impulses for the political constructivism of the Progressive (Progressives), which had formed a group around Franz W. Seiwert since 1923. With internationality, not only the association of artists was intended, but also the solidarity with the revolutionary workers, on which the utopia and the experiment of a new, international avant-garde were based.
Hausmann did not, however, disapprove of the Weimar meeting of Dadaists and Constructivists. This can be seen from his participation in a matinee on September 30, 1922, Dada Revon, in which some members of the Congress, Theo and Nelly van Doesburg, Schwitters, probably also Tzara, were taking part as initiators. This evening was a sort of dress rehearsal for the Holland-Dada-tour, planned by van Doesburg and Schwitters, which was supposed to start at the beginning of 1923.

Together with Hausmann, Schwitters once more organized a Merz matinee on December 30, 1923, during which he recited his sound poems and performed his dances, the Typsi Wang Wang Rainbow. About this Merz matinee of December 1923, Hausmann wrote in Am Anfang war Dada (In the Beginning was Dada): “We had a small audience, but nevertheless the performance was very good. One of the numbers was: a darkened stage, only I was in contact with a bulb. Schwitters recited in the dark a line of one of his poems, I switched on the light, and one could see me for a moment in a grotesque pose; this alternating went on for 20 lines of the poem.” This type of grotesque movement is a variation of the poème mouvementiste, in which the rhythm is produced by the change between spoken word and position.

Looking at the year 1922 and the developments of the other Berlin Dadaists, we can see that they already were far apart, even spatially. Hannah Höch became the friend of Kurt Schwitters and his wife Helma, visited them in Hanover in June 1922, and celebrated Christmas together with them in the same year. In the following years, she also became friends with Hans Arp and Sophie Taeuber-Arp and Nelly and Theo van Doesburg.

Baader, who had kept in contact with the Dresden artist Otto Griebel, who also was influenced by Dada, and was with him at Whitsuntide 1922, arranged a first open-air Dada exhibition. In the same year, at the end of July, Baader collated the 373 Secret Files of the Dadaist movement and then concentrated his activities on the castle Ludwigstein, a meeting point of the youth movement. For some months he directed the gravestone section of the Stettiner Steinindustrie AG.

After 1920, Richard Huelsenbeck only came to Berlin sporadically. He first lived in Dortmund with his parents, and later, in 1922, he received his license to practice medicine in Berlin, afterwards taking over an internship in a neuro-psychiatric department of a clinic in Gdansk.

George Grosz, after an exhibition in April 1922 at the Garvens Gallery in Hanover, went on a five-month trip to Russia, from which he returned disappointed. In his portfolio work Ecce homo (1923), he concentrated his caricaturist bite to such an extent that he was taken to court for “disrupting public morals.”

In the meantime Malik-Verlag of the Herzfelde brothers was able to establish itself as a left publishing house, bringing out popular editions of books at reasonable prices. It established a new market for art with the portfolio-works of Grosz, and established a sound program for itself with the Rote-Roman-Serie (Red Novel Series), the Kleine Revolutionäre Bibliothek (Small Revolutionary Library) and the Sammlung Revolutionärer Bühnenwerke (Collection of Revolutionary Plays). With the satirical workers’ magazine Der Knüppel (The Bludgeon) the artists leaning toward communism created a new forum for themselves from 1923 onward, after Die Pleite was practically extinct, and Der Gegner did not appear any more. In Die Rosarote Brille (The Rose-colored Glasses), the “satirical election publication of the German communist party,” Grosz, Heartfield, Schlichter and Schmalhausen caricatured themselves as members of the Rote Gruppe (Red Group), the Association of Communist Artists in Germany, founded in 1924.
In the following years, the Dadaist artistry of staging and the concept of montage influenced the theater concepts of Erwin Piscator and stimulated Ivan Goll to his grotesque *Methusalem, or the Eternal Bourgeois* (1922), for which Grosz created the figurines, larger-than-life masks. (See chapter 5.)

Dada had dissolved as an active movement. It now was showing signs of splitting up into constructivist, objective, or surreal directions or into an art that satirized day-to-day events, declaring its solidarity with the workers. Huelsenbeck wrote about Dada’s end:

> The Dadaist person is clearly carrying the signs of his own decay in full view and knows plainly that he is only an ephemeral phenomenon. This he doesn’t mind, since he is negating the values of eternity and his own death that don’t mean more to him than a word, spoken in passing. Death for him is a quite Dadaist occurrence. Therefore he loves to endanger himself . . . He will abolish the idea connected to the word “Dada,” when the time is ripe.\(^\text{203}\)

The new constructivist-Dadaist field of tension in Berlin was marked by the beginning collaboration of Raoul Hausmann with Iwan Puni, El Lissitzky, Viking Eggeling, Theo van Doesburg, Lajos Kassak, and Lászlo Péri in 1921 and 1922. In October 1921 Puni, Hausmann, Moholy-Nagy, and Arp jointly published a manifesto, *Aufruf zur elementaren Kunst* (Call for Elementary Art).\(^\text{204}\) “To create art as something pure, freed of functionality or beauty, as something fundamental in the individual”\(^\text{205}\) was to become the goal of painting.

Iwan Puni (1892–1956) was one of the first Russian artists who contacted the Dadaists. In February 1921 he had attracted attention with an exhibition at the gallery *Sturm*, both with his abstract painted walls combining with his works into a live *Gesamtkunstwerk* (total art work), and with his promotional parade with abstract-cubist costumes.\(^\text{206}\) The *Portrait of a Musician* of 1922 mirrored Puni’s self-image of the time, in the Chaplinesque features of the violin player, with fragments like playing cards, music, violin dancing around him, and supremacist infiltrations, he revealed the daydreaming, melancholy side of the Russian artist.\(^\text{207}\) Like many of his Russian colleagues in Berlin, Puni made contacts with contemporary avant-garde artists in Paris, especially with his fellow countryman Serge Charchoune (1888–1975) who was influenced by Dada. On December 21, 1921, before he followed Puni’s invitation to Berlin, Charchoune arranged a Dada evening at the Café Caméléon (146, Boulevard Montparnasse). It cannot be ascertained whether there were any direct contacts between the Berlin Dadaists and Charchoune. Certainly, Charchoune would have heard of Dada Berlin through his Dada-friend Francis Picabia, who was participating in the *First International Dada-Fair* with works of his own and who also published his manifesto *Cannibalisme* in *Der Dada* (no. 3). Van Doesburg closely connected Hausmann and Charchoune in his Dada publication *Mecano* (Blue) of 1922. Charchoune’s drawing *Cigarette Dada* was published next to Hausmann’s *Manifest von der Gesetzmäßigkeit des Lautes* (Manifesto of the Inherent Laws of Sound).

In 1922 and 1923, Charchoune edited his own Dada magazine in Berlin. During his one-year stay in Berlin, three numbers were printed, which were published in July and in November 1922, and in April 1923 as the *Official organ of the 3 1/2 International* with the title *Perevoz Dada: Transbordeur Dada* (Dada Crossovers).\(^\text{208}\) All in all, Charchoune published thirteen numbers of this publication by 1949. In 1922, the gallery *Sturm* also made it possible for Charchoune to exhibit his works together with Moholy-Nagy and Bortnyk. The automatist-
mechanical flow of lines was especially characteristic of his work. He also contacted Schwitters. The back of *Merz* no. 7 (1924) shows a drawing by Charchoune.

Together with Valentin Parnach, another Russian poet and musician living in Berlin, Charchoune wanted to bring Dada to Moscow. From Berlin, they initiated connections to the group 41°, which Krutschonych had founded. Especially sound poetry was at the center of their joint interests. It probably can be attributed to these efforts in Berlin that in 1923, a *Dada Dossier* with works, manifestos, writings, and poetry was published in the magazine *Sovremennyji sapad* (The Current West), translated by Valentin Parnach. Apart from poetry by Richard Huelsenbeck, only works of the Paris artists Picabia, Ribemont-Dessaignes, Soupault, Aragon, Eluard, Tzara, Péret, Ernst, and Arp were considered. In all probability, the selection was influenced by Iliazd (Ilja Sdanewitsch), a Russian sound poet who had been living in Paris since 1921, who made the *Zaoum* poetry of the group 41° known in Paris.

Clearly visible traces of the art of Berlin Dada can be found in the montages of Alexander Rodtschenko. Majakowski, who came to Berlin during the *First Russian Art Exhibition* (1922) at the van Diemen gallery, brought Dada montages to Rodtschenko, which impressed him with their urban imagery. (See “The Motor of Things: Wheels — Symbols of the Dionysian” in chapter 4.) Among the Russian constructivists who had been living in Berlin after 1922 and who worked together with Hausmann, El Lissitzky (1890–1941) has to be named. He wanted to publish a magazine with Hausmann, called *q n g E*. But El Lissitzky very soon clearly and programmatically drew a line between Dada and his own publication *Weschtsch — Objet — Gegenstand* (Object), which in 1922 he and Ilja Ehrenburg (1891–1967) were publishing with the Berlin publisher Skythen: “We believe the negating tactics of the Dadaists are anachronistic. It is about time to build on ground laid open. . . . We believe that for our time the triumph of constructive matter is fundamental. We find it in economics, in the industrial development, as in the psychology of our contemporaries, and in art. The Object will stand up for constructive art whose job is not to adorn life but to organize it.”

It is possible that this “international review of contemporary art,” in which form, content, and typography were convincingly permeating each other in a constructivist way, gave the impulse for Schwitters’s *Merz* and Hans Richter’s *G*, both published in 1923.

In addition to the Russian, the Hungarian avant-garde represented by Moholy-Nagy (1895–1946) discussed both Dada and constructivism. At the beginning of the 1920s, Moholy’s studio became the meeting place for many avant-garde artists: El Lissitzky, Werner Graeff, Hans Richter, Raoul Hausmann, Theo van Doesburg, Kurt Schwitters, Hannah Höch, Hans Arp, Iwan Puni. During this time, under the influence of Moholy’s wife, Lucia, the photogram and photography became very important in Moholy’s art. Lucia contributed to a large extent to Moholy’s book *Painting Photography Film*, which appeared as a Bauhaus publication in 1925. Certainly, in addition to photography, Moholy was impressed by the Dadaist concept of simultaneous montage (see chapter 4). Possibly also the connection between the Berlin Dadaists and Lajos Kassak (1887-1967), the editor of the publication *MA*, came through Moholy-Nagy.

Kassak also had to emigrate from Hungary and continued his work on *MA* in Vienna. In 1921 and 1922 one could find both Dadaist and constructivist tendencies in it. During the first literary evening of *MA*, on November 20, 1920, poems by Huelsenbeck and Schwitters were read. In 1921 the first Dada issue of *MA* appeared. During an *MA*-evening on November 13, 1921, Dada poems were recited. In *MA*, the Berlin Dadaists and Schwitters found the opportunity to publish their works of 1919 and 1920. Thus Grosz’s montage *The Poet of Kurfürstendamm* (1920) was printed on the front cover of issue no. 7 (1921). Hausmann published fantastic
architecture in issue 5/6 (1922), which he probably had already handed in for the *Exhibition of Unknown Architects* (1919) in Berlin. Moreover, Huelsenbeck, Arp, Richter, Eggeling, van Doesburg, Man Ray, Picabia and others were collaborating on *MA*, so that the publication became an important mouthpiece of international avant-garde.

Analyses of Dada and Constructivism can also be found in the works of Hans Richter (1882–1976), and Viking Eggeling (1880–1931). Already in Zurich, the two artists had developed a polar language of forms for art under the influence of the laws of the counterpoint, toward which the Italian composer Ferruccio Busoni had aimed them. It was a kind of grammar into which, in the Berlin years, they introduced the dimension of time in form of *Rollenbilder* (scrolling images). Based in particular on the “Basso Continuo of Painting” by Eggeling, a syntax of antithetical elements of form, the two artists constructed a “universal language,” which they proclaimed to be the only connecting, elementary language for painting. While Hans Richter was working more on the reduction and effect of abstract forms, Eggeling wanted to reduce form to line. The *Rollenbilder Präludium* (1919) by Richter and *Horizontal-Vertikal-Messe* (Horizontal Vertical Mass) by Viking Eggeling were created. Their dynamics inspired the artists to experiment with film, trying to get support for this in 1920 from UFA.

By 1921 Richter and Eggeling were able to afford a film studio. Here Richter created *Rhythm 21* (1921), *Rhythm 23, Fugue 23* (1923–27), and Eggeling did *Diagonal Symphony* (1923). These experiments with film brought them recognition in the avant-garde circles. Hilberseimer, van Doesburg, and Behne wrote on Richter’s films, which Richter experimentally broadened in the twenties with figurative and montage-elements. *Vormittagsspuk* (Morning Spook, 1927–28), *Rennsymphonie* (Racing Symphony, 1928–29), *Dreams that Money Can Buy* (1944–47), 8x8 (1956), and *Dadascope* (1958–61) were characterized by urban perceptions and integrated Dadaist-grotesque elements.

Theo van Doesburg was so fascinated by Richter’s and Eggeling’s abstract rhythmical works and their “universal language” that he visited Hans Richter in Klein-Kölzig near Berlin in December 1920. The artists deepened these mutual artistic interests when they shared an apartment in Berlin in 1921. Theo van Doesburg (1883–1931), like Richter, was a Dadaist and constructivist; he was both the constructivist *Mécanicien plastique* van Doesburg, and the Dadaist *Gérant littéraire* I. K. Bonset. Under this name he published *Mecano* in 1922 and 1923. The magazine, of which four issues appeared, introduced many international Dadaists, who were in contact with van Doesburg. Among the Berlin Dadaists, however, only Raoul Hausmann was asked to take part in *Mecano*. Here *Der mechanische Kopf: Der Geist unserer Zeit* (The Mechanical Head: Spirit of Our Age, fig. 113) was first printed. Hausmann’s connection to the constructivist publication *De Stijl* is hinted at in the montage *Wir sind Engel und leben im Himmel* (We are Angels and Live in Heaven), in which he glued “N” and “B,” the red letters of the front-cover of *De Stijl* (= Nieuwe Beelding), onto the x-ray of Baader.

Van Doesburg stimulated Hans Richter to publish a magazine as well. *G* was edited in July 1923 with the title *Zeitschrift für elementare Gestaltung* (Publication for Elemental Artwork). The essays and contributions had been collected by Richter since 1921. Even at the congress of the *Union der internationalen fortschrittlichen Künstler* (Union of Progressive International Artists) in May 1922 in Dusseldorf he had promoted his magazine, but had not had the means for its publication then. The name *G* (= Gestaltung) goes back to an idea of Lissitzky. According to Richter, “Doesburg was honored with his square after the *G*, and Lissitzky had his name listed among the editors (never taking part).” The magazine was to introduce
contemporary projects of art, architecture, theater, photography, film, fashion, and poetry, all showing “elemental” artistic concepts.

$G$ created a lively collaboration of constructivists and Dadaists:

Raoul Hausmann, working from the first to the last issue as Dadasoph, as he still was called from Dada-times, as Optophonic, as fashion designer, writer, making photomontages, and as painter, Werner Graeff, who looked closely at everything that had to do with automobile design and new engineering techniques, Arp, Schwitters, Ernst Schoen, Hilberseimer, Métain, Walter Benjamin, Tzara, George Grosz, Heartfield and so on — without their active infiltration and collaboration the magazine would not have been published and the group would not have gotten together or stayed alive.\(^{219}\)

How $G$ was influencing *Merz* can be seen from the interest of Schwitters in Ludwig Hilberseimer’s urban projects, for which he published a separate issue of *Merz* (1925–26).\(^{220}\) *Merz* (first issue January 1923) and $G$ were advertised by Schwitters also in his invitation to the “Merzmatinee” on December 30, 1923.

The mixture of Dadaist and constructivist ideas might be attributed to two congresses: the congress of the *Union of International Progressive Artists*, taking place in Dusseldorf from May 29 to 31, 1922, during the *First International Art Exhibition*, organized by *Junges Rheinland*, and the *Congress of Dadaists and Constructivists* at the Bauhaus in Weimar (September 1922).

**The Unstable Balance of the Dada Activities**

The Berlin Dadaists’ open modes of production that established meaning solely in the moment of the event constituted a permanent demonstration of a new art concept, which played with the notion of an “open mass” (Canetti), freed of the illusions of a “safe cathedral.” Performative activity for Dada was a new genre accompanied by an entirely new notion of the public. In addition to the viewer of the painting and the audience in the theater, the world of media was included in the “clown’s game from nothing”: the street, everyday life, even the public institutions like the National Assembly or the church. Playing with public means and media, the Dadaists attempted to undermine the rapid process of transformation of the world into merchandise, the commercial and ideological monopolizing of its cultural, visual, and verbal realms. They invalidated taboos, freeing their activities of usability and consumption with their spontaneous events. Part of their program of activities was to create scandal as an ecstatic breaking down of inhibitions, as an irritation and increase of movement; they had their concrete and symbolic effects on the senses and thought-processes, knocking the secure foundation out from under them. The tools of the activities — noises, sounds, bruitism, simultaneous and sound poetry, the manifestos, satires and insults, the improvisations and interruptions, the whole realm of physical presence, forms of dance and gestures — produced a synaesthetic Dionysian event, which detonated notions of space and time. Whereas the program from the outside seemed to be a succession of individual performances, the manifestations resembled more scenic montages in which the combinations and improvisations were able to react individually to the play with the audience. The performances shattered into kaleidoscopic particles of an early form of happenings. The time of the program transformed into subjective time — into the time of activity of the artists, into the time of experience for the audience. As time was released of its bonds in
the simultaneity of moments, the totality of space was exploded in a multiplicity of directions. The staged moment gained a life of its own and obtained sensual clarity to such an extent that the logic and semantic elements of the statement diminished. Rapid changes of entry, intersecting and disrupted scenes gave the feeling of time-lapses, while the complete absence of activities or consciously slowed down entries produced the impression of lengthened time. Unusual rhythmic accentuations of language, dance, drums during the performances, and unpredictable repetitions structured the activities and stimulated the audience reaction. Rhythm and movement as the means of production took priority in the Dada programs.

The Dionysian Dada-theater, basically stimulated by Nietzsche’s poetics of drama, wanted to be a place of shock, of transformation, of “rapture” (Ball), in which the division between the production and the reception of art would be eliminated in an unstable balance between frenzied chaos and “controlled” ecstasy.

A communicative element of these Dada activities was only present insofar as it refused communication — only an apparent interaction was created. In the provocative confrontation of the Dadaists with the masses we might also see an overstated, pointed role of the Dandy in mass society. His effort and exhaustion consisted of sparking off methods of ecstasy in the realm of scandal repudiating any space for thought or reflection. Therefore, the Dadaists emphasized the daredevil attitude of their activities. The Dionysian element, the excitement, and unleashing of the audience that was beside itself, often acquired such a strong dynamics of its own that the balance between the Dadaists and their audience — unstable at any rate — was upset so much that an Apollinian consolidation to art was not possible; it merely evaporated in diversion gone berserk. The attempts to succeed in scandal for scandal’s sake were also the reason for the gradual vacuity of the activities leading to tediousness.

Dada’s aim to scandalize society already contained the destruction of that notion, since it could not be programmed, nor could it be premeditated. Scandal formed where it wasn’t expected; it could not be strategically planned.

The press during these activities became part of the Dada-movement itself. Dada happened in reality and even more so in the press. This factor contributed to the fact that the activities were connected with the appeal of sensation, the new forms of reception of the press aiming for fast and high turnover. The scandals as splinters of the Dada-soirees had their medial effects like momentary snapshots. On the one hand, the artists, aware of this, played with this transitory, ephemeral element, breaking open the borders of customary forms of reception; on the other hand, they also became objects of this sensational press and its one-dimensional focus. This way, the Dada activities in the end dissolved themselves and lost the sting of their chaos-strategy in order to orchestrate a “beginning” in which art and life could be linked to each other in a new way.

The Dionysian-Apollinian play seemed to come to a new, productive balance in the collaboration of Dadaism and constructivism after 1921 and 1922. The international conferences, publications, and literary performances testify to that.
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FIRST “PRODUCTS”: EXPERIMENTAL HYLOMORPHISM

*Erzeugnisse* (products) were favored, not accomplished, masterworks. *Producere* (Latin: to make, to produce), for Ball meant to “produce,” to “bring into existence.”¹ In the process of creating directly from material, out of “life” in the broadest sense, a new power of giving artistic form was discovered, affirming authenticity and bridging the gap that separated art and reality. According to Nietzsche, “an artistic view of the world” meant to “sit facing life.”² Form was not a vessel but a transformation of material — or “Hyle” as Hausmann wanted to call his “morphological novel” (1926). The Dadaists intended to interpret the characteristic relationship between matter and form in a new, nontraditional way; they began to experiment with essential, pure matter, using hylomorphism, a central guiding principle that was first introduced by Aristotle.³ Hylomorphism freed Dada from academic value systems and iconographic traditions and allowed for a new aesthetic, which could be created from the sensuality and actuality of the materials, their contexts, effects, and possibilities. This new definition of art’s functions as hylomorphism was to overcome the *horror vacui*, what Huelsenbeck called the fear of the void. Furthermore, the programmatic comments of the Dadaists, especially those of Herzfelde,⁴ made it clear that the exact procedure of mimetical representation available through photography allowed these artists to declare their material (that is, concrete objects of everyday life) as works of art. Instead of emancipating from photography through processes of abstraction, at the center of the new creativity now were these “materializations” (Grosz).

The revaluation of art through working with the “new materials,” however, developed not as completely as the Dada manifestos urged after April 1918. The new materials mentioned in the manifestos, for instance, glass and wood, were hardly used; instead, in the beginning, semiotic and typographic elements, language as material, gained innovative strength. While the first manifestos preceded the hylomorphic montages, the invention of photomontage was never explicitly promoted by the Dada manifestos. As the Dadaists became more and more politicized, advancing into the intersections of the socio-cultural, technical, economical, and political changes of the new republic, reacting with their contemporary means, media, and subjects to the complex, ever changing interconnections of society, they found their new socio-critical media in their montages of photographs, magazines, advertisement, and technical, scientific, and geographical pictures.

“The New Material”

Collages, Cliché Montages, Care Packages, New Typography, Optophonetic Poetry

The first Dada evening in the *Berliner Sezession* (Berlin Secession) on April 12, 1918, (fig. 24) became of prime importance for the promotion of the new material.⁵ The location was predestined for artistic discussion. In 1910 the decisive differentiation of expressionism and impressionism took place here. Now, Dada’s concept of the “new material” opposed the expressionist utopia of “new man,” especially the late expressionist gesture of “O Mankind.” In their manifestos *Der Dadaismus im Leben und in der Kunst* (Dadaism in Life and in Art) and *Das neue Material in der Malerei* (The New Material in Art), Huelsenbeck and Hausmann distanced themselves from expressionism as an “excuse for introversion,” an “excuse to propagate soul”;⁶ they also distanced themselves from the “astral imbecility of using the values of colors and lines to interpret so-called spiritual sounds.”⁷ Against subjective profundity and the
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hubris of the spirit it was necessary to stress the fact that the material objects were free of meaning.

While expressionism was decreed a “sentimental resistance against the times,” the “war cry Dada” symbolized, according to Huelsenbeck, the “most primitive relation to the surrounding reality”8: “The child’s doll, thrown away, or a colorful rag are more necessary expressions than those of some idiot, who wants to root himself in oil forever in the salon,” said Hausmann.9 The material pointed to a reality outside the studio, outside the traditional work of art; it did not operate with the illusion of oil paintings or render colorful emotional concepts. It did not pretend to be something else. It became true through the abstention from representation and from artistic form; it was to be art-free and mobilize powers that originated in the Dionysian material and founded Dada in the pure concept of hylomorphism.

The demand for new material was accompanied by constant experimentation. Dada discovered a great scope of materials, from primary materials to materials of reproductions that were saturated with the spirit of the times. In all cases, it was a matter of the pure “materiality,” which, free of the manner and psyche of the artist, created its own form. The border between art and non-art, between high and low culture was brought into question, even blown up, thereby undermining the level of expectation in both autonomous art and poetry. The body itself became a poetic and material medium: Dionysian and fundamental, its gestures united with the phonetics of its sounds and formed a new, elemental musicality. Beyond this, the manifestos, their publications, and their new typography were part of these processual methods, as was their favoring the banal, the American, and the excluded — the whole spectrum of the Dionysian, which had been repressed by bourgeois ideas of art and representation. The Dadaists interpreted the futurists and cubists in this sense. Demanding new material also connected them to the international avant-garde after World War I, and to Picasso who had renounced the classic ideal of beauty and had started to work with the material of reality in 1912. His cubist papiers collés (fig. 164.1) used hard working materials, incorporating autonomous abstract form. Hausmann, looking back, observed: “We were up to date about the developments in painting in the other countries of Europe. We knew that Picasso was using real materials, newspaper clippings, hair, plaster, following the example of the futurists, and that the same Picasso, simultaneous with the Dutch expressionist van Rees, had made still lifes of different pieces of painted paper — the collage.”10

This widening of the cubist concept of art was at first taken up by the Swiss Dadaists rather in the realm of applied art than in an autonomous one: the couple Otto and Adya van Rees and Hans Arp called their first exhibition at the Tanner Gallery in Zurich Modern Tapestry, Embroidery, Paintings, Drawings (1915). Sophie Taeuber began to work with wool, silk, and fabrics. (cat. no. 94, 95, in the Dada-Fair). Between 1916 and 1918 painting in oil to these artists seemed to belong to “an arrogant, presumptuous world.”11 The Romanian artist Marcel Janco, who had joined the circle of Zurich Dadaists in 1916, tried new reliefs of gypsum and collages of paper masks. These works showed the difference between Dada Zurich and Dada Berlin. While abstraction was of primary importance to Swiss Dadaism, Dada Berlin intended to open up the borders of art to the “real experience of all relationships.”12 In this demand, avant-garde concepts, iconoclastic tendencies, dissolution of artistic genres, the Dionysian view of everyday materials, and things of heterogeneous reality indifferent to art intersected. As in Swiss Dadaism, to this concept chiefly belonged those materials that symbolized stability and consistency in a time of the utmost loss of meaning (i.e. wood for Hans Arp) and the contemporary materials of low culture and of the media.
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After 1917, the Berlin Dadaists observed the experiments of the Zurich Dadaists, but they also decisively altered their own concepts. During the war Grosz focused more on media and possibilities of expression outside the realm of academic art. He used, for example, the “drastic manifestations of the artistic drive, like graffiti, bathroom graffiti and children’s drawings” in order to present the “blunt harshness and coldness of his objects.”

Like his colleagues Schlichter and Dix, Grosz was inspired by trivial culture: trashy literature, Westerns (particularly Karl May novels), the circus, vaudeville, and cinema. He wrote to his friend Otto Schmalhausen on July 9, 1918: “First of all I ask you to collect and buy all pornographic postcards, photographs, folk poetry, drawings, and urinal-graffiti.” The dregs of low culture as a subversive, Dionysian power formed an alliance with Grosz’s works on the breaking of form. From the beginning disharmony, grotesque couplings, mixture of forms, distortion, and alienating effects were prevalent in the productions with the new material of Dada Berlin.

The world of media contributed to the possibility of breaking the bonds of the academic studio and widening the range of means into everyday life: banally, brutally, poetically, and paradoxically. The new typography and the unusual mixture of image and text were in keeping with the urban dynamics, which at the same time was influenced by the American world of media itself. The experiments with the new materials came across vividly in the edition of *Neue Jugend* (1917; fig. 40, 114; cat. no. 13, 99, 150, 151): clichés, material from job-printing, vignettes, photographs, a dynamic typography, above all the medium of the magazine signaled that Dada was getting ready to redefine the function and meaning of art. The “repulsion against the void” (Huelsenbeck) received new contours through these beginnings. It was sensational to have a literary publication appear in the big format of an American newspaper — as *Hong Kong Times* (Grosz) — and it secured a relative good sale before censure could strike. The typography, effective advertising, dynamic connections between word and image broke the familiar, subdued, and dignified frame in which art journals had been published until then. The colorful composition and the lively layout had a striking effect: the May issue (cat. no. 150, 151 of the Dada-Fair) was published in red and black letters; the June issue (fig. 40, 114) in black, green, red, and blue variations; and the third issue (which was not published) was to be printed in white on black background.

In addition to the importance of reading text the avant-garde publications such as *Der Sturm* and *Die Aktion* presented, a visual experience and the dynamization of the reading process now grew to be significant. Color, style, and size of font of words and texts were set up so offensively that they influenced this process; with the help of signs like circles and bars reading speed increased. This enhancement was joined by a new, associative telegraphic style, as for example in the “Chronik” by Franz Jung that introduced two editions of *Neue Jugend*. At the same time a monotonous printing in two columns of connected texts slowed the reading speed. Advertisement was scattered throughout the text like signals, making the pages livelier; now both the text and its gaps were important. A dynamic rhythm was created, which was the expression of a changed, mobile, and urban perception. Time became a Dadaist element of art that had its beginnings in these first projects and was to increase to the frenzy of simultaneity. The mixture of ads and text, of writing and image structured the reading time with surprises — an experience that until then could be had only in the street with its different semiotic elements.

The typographic layout of *Neue Jugend* was the first indication of Dadaist montage work. In the second issue of *Neue Jugend Weekly Edition*, the photograph of the Flatiron Building, this sensational symbol of the American way of life built in 1903 by D. H. Burnham, placed by itself as a photographic quotation between the text columns, illustrated the principle of montage, to
isolate existing materials in order to give them the character of an open sign. The political statement of this skyscraper-quotation appeared as a provocation, demonstrating the solidarity of the editors, especially of Heartfield, with the enemy of the German Empire, which had entered World War I in April 1917 — with the United States. The skyscraper, twenty-three stories high, points to the fascinated view Dada Berlin had of the dynamic America (“America!!! Future!!!” [Grosz]), evoking daring dimensions. At the same time it was consciously used for the “promotional consultation” of the two Dadaists, Grosz and Heartfield, strategically placed above this high-rise in red letters. The photograph of the American skyscraper itself was used as advertisement for a politicized image of *Neue Jugend* — as a contemporary, offensively applied element to sharpen perception. This was new.

Also, new was the effect of the graphically designed ads, such as “VIIIth Lecture Cinema for Decorators, Operators, Directors, Critics” and “Xth Evening: The Psychology of the Lecturers, Vaudeville, Literary and Artistic Demonstrations”: black and blue circles, next to and within each other; the stark abstraction of a flag with horizontal bars and an emphasized vertical direction; the hint of townhouses; and the free, loose distribution of catchphrase texts in simple, plain typography balancing constructive rigor and playful lightness.

Heartfield acquired this way of dealing with text and image that lead to unusual associations in his studies as a graphic designer, by first studying at the Munich School for Arts and Crafts from 1908 to 1911 and in 1914 at the School of Arts, Crafts, and Handicrafts in Berlin-Charlottenburg. He worked according to the demands of a designer, creating with the latest means and calculating aesthetic effects. “Monteur” Heartfield received his education from the principle of advertisement graphics, of “montages,” which he later used for Dada-effects. These included the first politicized photographic quotation; the sentence “WORD-ads beat IMAGE-ads”; the typographic variation of headlines; and the different, stimulating names of firms and companies. He inserted quotations into Grosz’s text, such as “Can you ride a bike?”, which made the “psychological and formal experience of a person riding a clanking tramway” materially understandable: “Force us into blazing navy blues, into bright reds (whole streets of letters), vaudeville green, specialty yellow, woolen grays, and falsetto pink.” These new colored typographic montages, going back to advertisement montages on house-walls, constituted a manifesto against academic art: “Fabulously colorful and clear, like a panel painting never could be — cosmically funny, brutal, material, pale, washed out — threatening and admonishing, piercing your brain over and over like a melody of a ragtime tap-dance — constantly roaring!”

Further down we read, “Tell me? . . . Don’t you dread the art salons? The galleries of oil paintings . . . ? The literary soirees . . . ?”

With the programmatic appeal of the layout of *Neue Jugend* the sensory experience of the street, advertisement, the cinema, and of the trivial urban atmosphere was brought to bear as a Dionysian potential against academic art. The ground was already prepared for the new material, which Huelsenbeck and Hausmann had so vehemently demanded on that first Dada-evening at the Berlin Secession on April 12, 1918. Apart from Dadaist poetry, futurist poetry was also recited (among other things from Marinetti’s *Zang tumb tumb*, 1914). The futurists gave first impulses to the Dadaists to break out of conventional typography. “The book has to be the futurist expression of our futurist thought,” Marinetti declared. “My revolution also is directed against the so-called harmonious division of the page . . . On one and the same page, we will use three or four different types of ink, and if necessary, also twenty different types. For example, italics for a series of similar or swift feelings, bold for violent sound-imagery. With this
revolution of printing and this colorful variety of typography I want to double the expressive power of the words.”

This “freed” typography had its culmination in Neue Jugend with the advertisement for the Kleine Grosz-Mappe (The Small Grosz-Portfolio, 1917; fig. 114; cat. no. 10–12), for which Heartfield used everyday material from job-printing, vignettes, and clichés. Around the skull and crossbones, the sign for poison, the titles of the lithographs whirred, typewritten, interspersed with clichés of a parachute, a dancing woman, the horn of a phonograph, a signet ring, another little emblem for poison, a red coffin with cross, a ship, and many death crosses. “Just published” appears in three versions on the left, black, red and green, with an intense signalizing effect. A dance macabre balances the “end of the world.” The cylinder on the skull reminds us of the princely presence of death in life. Life as “both buffoonery and requiem mass” augments and unmasks the heterogeneous titles like “Riot of the Insane,” “Execution,” “Street,” “Church,” “City Neighborhood,” “Girl and Her Lover,” “Walk,” “Party,” “Murder.” The montage has to be read and seen at the same time; it surprises the viewer with its amazing combinations of image and text, and with the simultaneity of heterogeneous, disparate, and dissonant elements; it opens a grotesque intertwining of death and play, of dread and joy of life, as the hidden game of a world turned upside down.

With this type of advertisement for their magazines, the artists freed themselves of academic rituals and created a public, experimental stage for themselves. Thus, on the one hand, the promotional strategies reflected that art had become merchandise; on the other hand, they beat bourgeois culture at its own game, by letting their works campaign against it subversively and by creatively using a world of signs that was out of joint. The Kleine Grosz-Mappe (fig. 115.1, 115.2) emerged directly out of this context. With its four pink introductory pages, it took up the equally trivial vignettes which were inserted without any order between Grosz’s Gesänge (Songs), printed in two columns: a greeting cyclist, a tattooed pig’s head, a big sailing ship, a locomotive, a vaudeville dancer, and skulls and stars signalizing the grotesque mixture of laughter, aggression, and sorrow. The title page was dominated by a bourgeois’s grinning mask of despair, a drawing by Grosz. In the original, the title appeared in dark blue letters on silver paper.

If the new material so far widened the scope of graphic montage, now the Dada satyr Grosz, as “Boeuf,” also was inspired to new activity. On April 26, 1918, two weeks after the Dada evening at which the new material was announced, he put together a “multicolored care package” for his friend Otto Schmalhausen, who was in a military hospital. Essentially, this was the first Dada assemblage and thus it widened the heterogeneous scope of the montages into a grotesque mix of everyday material.

These packages contain all kinds of things, from a price list of liqueurs to a pull-on-instruction leaflet for condoms, likewise cooking recipes, gothic dime novels — “Ernschte Kunscht” (Searious Ahrt) — food stamps for bread, stock market reports for grain, and fashion gossip — on a small scale all this shows us a more diverse cross-section of life than any single novel, no matter how good, would ever show — hopefully you will get everything in an unpinched state, and will be happy about it.

At the same time Grosz programmatically directed this private gesture against art, intending to vitalize art or to aestheticize life through Dada. The diversified contents of these small packages
mirror in miniature form the Dadaist experience of everyday life and show Grosz’s ironical, associative play with materials of different origin. His Dada correspondence time and again showed his pleasure in playing with texts and picture quotations, evident for instance in the postcard he and Piscator sent to Hausmann on July 5, 1921 (fig. 20) or in his envelope from 1919 and 1920 (fig. 21).

If we can believe the 1930 descriptions of Johannes Baader to the typographer Jan Tschichold (1902–1974), Baader’s first montages initially came from the private realm. “The first put together pieces, according to my recollection, were ‘letters.’ The addressee was Mrs. Elfriede Hausmann . . . They were ‘messages,’ which in the shortest and most evident way, through the tool of the enormous and manifold associative possibilities and stimuli, allowed imparting immensely rich subject matters. Moreover, from the beginning, the individual situation of the recipient, the addressee, the reader, the viewer, varying according to mood and time, were taken into consideration, and thus the abundance of the conveyed message was still increased.”

These beginnings of montage-work in the private realm emerged from a symbiosis of art and life; they showed the intention to revive art to a second, Dadaist life. The Dadaists consciously used the activating effect of montage as an experimental way of communication. While Baader did not pinpoint a date of origin of these letter-montages, Hausmann predated them to March 1918. Cases in point are the postcards Ich liebe Dich (I love you; fig. 18) from Hausmann to Höch on 29 September 1918 and later on Ange (Angel; fig. 19), which Baader and Hausmann sent to Hannah Höch on her birthday on November 1, 1919.

As these first private mixes of materials already went far into methods of montage and assemblage it has to be conceded that the Dadaist demand on the evening of April 12, 1918, for new material was not immediately followed by artistic production. Linos- and woodcuts, watercolors and pen-and-ink-drawings in 1918 still were the preferred media of the Berlin Dadaists.

But in autumn 1918 another variant of typographic production became visible, in keeping with the Dionysian demand of the manifestos: the sound- and poster-poem as a new concept of letters and images. Hausmann’s OFFÉAH (1918; fig. 96) and fmsbw (1918; fig. 97) show his method, different from Grosz’s and Heartfield’s mixture of typographic montages, of taking apart semantic forms, disintegrating them, dissolving them into vowels and consonants, and putting them back together, seemingly following a principle of chance, creating out of the “indifference of the moment.”

The sound-poem for Hausmann combined visual effect and a world of sound: optical letter-signs were deciphered as audible particles of language. They changed the viewer into a listener, the optical into the optophonetic poem.

Seeing with Hausmann the birth of Dada Berlin’s montages from the spirit of music, they acquired a widening and a deepening of their materiality in the realm of typography through the composition of the optophonetic poem; here Dada in an elementary way touched on the Dionysian origin of language. In optophonetics, music, poetry, and art combined as a new synaesthetic unity: without functional, terminological, or utilitarian meaning; living alone from itself; intonated by rhythm and the possibilities of the voice. The “chaotic oral cavity” (Hausmann) gave birth to montage from the spirit of sound, vowels, and consonants; at the same time, writing dissolved into a graphic game and thus subversively deregulated the rules of logos.

With the production of his “Verses without Words” in June 1916, Hugo Ball preceded Hausmann, but he did not make the step to optophonetic montage. Nevertheless, the analogy to music became clear, when he, wearing a cylindrical, “high blue-and-white-striped” shaman’s hat on his head, set up music stands against the audience on all three sides of the stage, put his “red-
penciled manuscript” on them and began “to chant [his] vowel sequences in a church style like a recitative.”

With this new musical expressiveness of language in sound and imagery, Hausmann, like Ball, invoked the energetic, creative Dionysian powers, whose mythic dimension according to them was getting lost in European culture. They wanted to reinvigorate here what Nietzsche had seen blocked by socratic aporia and what Ball had already demanded back in his pamphlet Nietzsche in Basel (1909–10), the archaic Dionysian experience from the spirit of music, which the Greek tragedy had created in an elemental way in the ritualized dance and song of the choir.

By immersing language in its own sensual, tonal stimuli, Dada developed a rich gradation of sounds and tones that was inspired, as already mentioned, by Kandinsky and by the Italian futurists. Marinetti wrote in Der Sturm (1913): “the destruction of the traditional period, the abolishment of the adjective, of the adverb, and of punctuation will necessarily bring the breakdown of overestimated harmony, so that the futurist poet will finally be able to use the onomatopoetic cacophonia emitted by the uncountable sounds of moving matter.” For example, Hausmann’s optophonetic poem kp’eriuom (1919; fig. 98) used different printing pressure, as well as capital and small letters, in order to graphically display piano and forte. Apart from that, he introduced upper case and spaced printing, italics, and a variable system of lines, which gave its own dynamic intensity to the acoustics of the poem developing a new, lively typography of the freed sound.

Hausmann concretized the act of imagination, which Baudelaire had described as sensation du neuf (sensation of the new): “Elle [imagination] décompose toute la création, et, avec les matériaux amassées et disposées suivant des règles dont on ne peut trouver l’origine que dans le plus profond de l’âme, elle crée un monde nouveau, elle produit la sensation du neuf.” (It decomposes all creation, and it creates a new world with the collected materials, which it arranges according to rules found only at the deepest depths of the soul, thereby bringing forth the sensation of the new.) Baudelaire was describing two partial, mutually conditional activities of montage: the de-composition, the taking apart of given material, and its re-organization according to the laws of imagination. Hausmann visualized this process by playing with the most basic elements of language, with vowels and consonants. The sound-poem is the Dadaist outcome of the autonomous artistic poem, having emerged after Baudelaire in the nineteenth century from reflecting its own forms; it had no other content than itself, refusing all lyrical heightening of being. The frame of reference now was not reality; it was created by the phonetic characters in relation to each other. In the photomontages as well the Dadaists were to develop their own stochastic repertoire. The artistic procedure of montage was characterized by the emergence of form from chaos and by the emergence of form from form: language itself was talking.

The interest was always to redefine art by the choice of new material in a new fundamental experiment. In his theoretical essay The New Material in Painting (April 1918), Hausmann furthermore demanded “wonderful constellations in real wire, glass, cardboard, fabrics.” But when and how were they to be executed? His own artistic output in this regard resulted in just three works, which were published in 1920: Abendliche Toilette (Evening Toilette; fig. 101), Industrieller Umsturz im Jahre 1919 (Industrial Revolution in 1919; fig. 102), and Mechanischer Kopf. Der Geist unserer Zeit (Mechanical Head: The Spirit of Our Age, ca. 1921; fig. 113). Admittedly, they associated things of everyday life, i.e. really used items like razor blades, coins, keys, wallet, pocket watch, tape measure; however, in the context of most of his other works like montages, collages, prints, poster-poems, drawings, water colors, and
FIRST “PRODUCTS”: EXPERIMENTAL HYLOMORPHISM

gouaches, they constituted a minority. One may even doubt the “Collage with Cigar Bands” usually dated 1918 that Hausmann is supposed to have made for his manifesto The New Material in Painting, which he renamed Synthetisches Cino der Malerei (Synthetic Cino of Painting) in 1919. Hausmann himself questioned his authorship in a letter of 1966 to Ilse Vordemberge-Gildewart, a former owner of this collage: “The collage with the cigar bands has nothing to do with this text and has to have been added to it by somebody else later on.” It is nevertheless astonishing that in his first retrospective in 1967 in Stockholm in Am Anfang war Dada (In the Beginning was Dada, 1972), he quietly sanctioned this collage as “second version” and dated it 1918.

A case in point was glass, which Hausmann emphasized as a new element in the manifesto Material der Malerei Plastik Architektur (Material of Painting Sculpture Architecture), written in June and published in October 1918: “The sculptural dynamic moment of atmosphere will be exhibited by the translucent quality of glass black velvet iron urban sky above which trembles electrically blue green red spectral . . . and full of lofty reality the nature of creation.” For architecture he demanded equally “different forms of colored glass, delighting and influencing people through its mediation of light.” The effect of the colored transparency of glass may have impressed him as an avid reader of Glasarchitektur (Glass-architecture) published in 1914 by Paul Scheerbart (1863–1915), but Hausmann never used it creatively, like Marcel Duchamp in La Mariée mise à nue par ses Célibataires, même (The Bride Stripped Bare by her Bachelors, Even, 1915–23). Glass was a new medium; its utopian effect, actualized mainly through the group of architects “Glass Chain” (1919–20), played an important role in the Berlin Dadaists’ demands in their manifesto Was ist der Dadaismus und was will er in Deutschland? (What Is Dadaism and What Does It Want in Germany?) of June 1919 to “build light- and garden-cities, belonging to everyone, advancing mankind to freedom,” but had no aesthetic effects in production. The publication of Material was illustrated by abstract woodcuts and a collage for a book cover made from colored sheets of paper, set against each other (fig. 100).

Like the other Dadaists, Hannah Höch hesitantly grappled with the Dadaist demand for working with new material, even though, since her youth she had used collage-like methods. In 1916, by accident, she put together the Weisse Wolke (White Cloud) from covering stencils for wood engravings. One of her first works showing collage work stems from 1918; here she glued into abstractly cut-up forms of linocuts a piece of cardboard onto which series of bed sheet buttons was sewn. Her ironic gesture seemed to juxtapose material quotations about women’s everyday life with the autonomous forms of abstract art (fig. 126).

Painting with abstract forms, initially in watercolors (see fig. 125), continued parallel to her work with montages beginning in 1919 and influenced these: for example, Weisse Form (White Form), Collage mit Pfeil (Collage with Arrow), and Schnittmuster-Collagen (Pattern-Collages). They were made from segments of pattern charts, from cut-ups of her own drawings and linocuts, and also from writing exercises with reed or goose quills. Also to this group of abstract collages belongs the lost poster Ali Baba-Diele, Berlin (1920; cat. no. 19) displayed at the Dada-Fair. Only one work is known that gathers the heterogeneous materials according to Hausmann’s first Dada manifesto: Dada-Plastik (Dada Sculpture, 1919; fig. 127) was an assemblage by Hannah Höch, perched on a painted pedestal made from metal spirals and a shaft, adorned with feathers and squared paper. This lost assemblage, according to Hannah Höch’s statement, was also exhibited at the Dada-Fair. The Dada-Mühle (Dada Mill; fig. 128) also belongs to this context: with its rotating mechanism it emphasizes the Dada motor of
One year after proclaiming the Dada manifestos that demanded the new material, a first presentation of the works of the Club Dada at the gallery of I. B. Neumann took place. Since no documentation or catalog exists, only press reviews can give us an insight. According to them, this exhibition lasted only a few days from about April 28 to about May 10. In addition to Grosz, Mehring, Baader, Hausmann, Golyscheff, and Hannah Höch, other artists, not belonging to the Dada movement, participated in this exhibition: Erica Deetjen (a friend of Baader’s, as Hannah Höch told me), Fritz Stuckenberg (1881–1944), and Arnold Topp (1887–1945). As abstract painters, Stuckenberg and Topp belonged to the circle of “similarly oriented companions,” to which Adolf Behne in Die Wiederkehr der Kunst (The Return of Art, 1919) also counted Paul Klee, Carlo Mense, and Lyonel Feininger. Hannah Höch exhibited two abstract works: Bild XIII: Rot-Gelb (1919) and Konstruktion mit Blau (Construction with Blue, 1919; fig. 125). If we follow the newspaper articles the first eruptive breakthrough of a Dadaist revolt of material did not occur here, however.

Grosz was noticed with his, according to Adolf Behne, “brilliant satire of the field-gray present”: Deutschland, ein Winterrmärchen (Germany, a Winter’s Tale, 1917–18; fig. 76; cat. no. 70). Behne did not, however, point to the fact that Grosz was using for the first time in his work glued-in materials like a food stamp and a newspaper article. Mehring took part with small, caricaturist drawings in pen (fig. 141), depicting urban motives — drunken philistines, dancing couples, urban houses, vaudeville theaters — in a brief staccato, somewhat dilettante stroke of the pen and corresponding to the parataxis of his poetic style in his couplets published in his book Das politische Cabaret (The Political Cabaret, 1920). Only Baader was provoking with “monstrosities . . . glued together from old paper, fragmented combs, polishing brushes and pencils” (Cohn-Wiener). In the works by Golyscheff collage and abstraction seemed to intersect (fig. 69–71). Glaser (Berliner Börsen-Courier, May 1, 1919) spoke of a “carnival-spell . . . from toys and newspaper cuts glued on top of each other.” Hausmann remembered small assemblages made together with Golyscheff from white carton, pieces of paper, and scraps of material. Behne rather stressed the sensitive artist drawing: “Some of his small paintings are of an extraordinary intensity of abstraction; free of all representational art within the surface a system of lines builds into a mystical shape clearly speaking of a peculiar sensitivity.” In his Werkstattbesuche (Workshop Visits) Behne reports of “touching little things,” which possibly integrated paper scraps for the first time: “Figures glued together from colorful scraps, colorful end papers with playful patterns, into which he drew some lines — delightful, atmospheric creations — small drawings glued onto colorful long strips of paper.” The musician Golyscheff, who produced the Anti-symphony and the Keuchmanöver (Wheezing Exercise) at the Dada evenings on April 30 and May 24, 1919, could be found in the formation and rhythmical structure of the abstract drawings as much as the experimental architect Golyscheff, who handed in his fantastic architectural images for the Ausstellung unbekannter Architekten (Exhibition of Unknown Architects), which took place at the same gallery, I. B. Neumann, from March 25 to April 25, just before the Dada exhibition. Hausmann and Baader were experimenting as well, probably inspired by Golyscheff’s architectural fantasies. They constructed antifunctional steel-skeletons into fantastic ensembles, upon which were floating cubic houses in the primary colors yellow, blue, and red. The first Dada exhibition then was more a first experiment with the new material than an eruptive breakthrough of a material revolt.
Meanwhile, Kurt Schwitters analyzed and used the new materials demanded by the Berlin Dadaists in their manifestos in an all-encompassing, radical way, in the exhibition of his first collages as **Merzbilder** in June 1919 at the gallery *Der Sturm* show. Without doubt, the Dadaists had inspired Schwitters; otherwise he would not have been interested in the Club Dada. But the club did neither want to integrate his experimental works in a productive way, nor did it welcome Golysscheff’s works any longer, and after a short participation in the evenings and the exhibition, Golysscheff left the club in 1919. Behne, recognizing the affinity of Schwitters and Golysscheff to Dada missed them at the *First International Dada-Fair* (see *Die Freiheit*, July 9, 1920).

Golysscheff, cross with Hausmann in 1919, founded *Aismus*, but continued to work with the new principle to integrate material from outside of the artistic realm. He presented his collages of materials mainly in the section of the *Novembergruppe* (November Group) during the *Kunstausstellung Berlin 1920* at the State Exhibition Hall (May 21 to end of September 1920). For example in a “bold self-portrait,” the face was a slice of dry bread, the eye was a button, and the mouth was suggested by matches. Evidently there was a Dadaist faction outside Dada at this time. The *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* (July 14, 1920) mentioned, apart from Golysscheff’s collages, works by the artist Edmund D. Kinziger, who composed “water colors from tinted newspaper scraps”; a certain Curt Ehrhardt was named as well: “He glued together toy boxes, coffee mills, and Bantu people.”

Thus, in 1920, working with materials was widely known. The Cologne Dadaists Max Ernst and Johannes Theodor Baargeld in their exhibition *Dada Vorfrühling* (Early Spring of Dada) in April 1920 were provoking in this way (fig. 50). And it is surprising that in Hausmann’s work, as I have already mentioned, only assemblages can be found in 1920 that fulfill his demands for new material, which he had promoted for Dada in 1918. This means that the principle of montages in Hausmann’s work initially caught on with the new typography, the innovative layout, and the sound-poems, and only then spread into works with unconventional materials. In April 1920 Hausmann published *Abendliche Toilette* (Evening Toilette; fig. 101) in *Der Dada* (no. 3) — a decoding portrait of the times with paltry materials. The assemblage *Industrieller Umsturz im Jahre 1919* (Industrial Overthrow; fig. 102, cat. no. 30) was exhibited at the *First International Dada-Fair*. While *Dada-Toilette* was assembled with a small brush, a stamp with the eagle of the German Reich, a key, paperclips, and the signet “Dada siegt” (Dada Triumphs) on a tray creating a mixed Dadaist portrait of the times, in the other assemblage razor blades were cutting into a black wooden board. On it was fastened a drawing board, decorated with the sticks of an umbrella stand and a blue faience plate. On the photograph of the Dada-Fair (view 5) one can also recognize in the assemblage the newspaper heading *Rote Fahne* (Red Flag), and *Athlet*, the fragment of the Dada poster *Athlet gesucht* (Searching for an Athlete). This *Dada Erzeugnis* (product), in execution and subject matter, shows actionist intentions, which clearly demonstrate Dada’s renunciation of representational art. It is the material itself that represents the event.

In the series of portrait montages started in 1919, Hausmann did not get carried away, as did Golysscheff, for example, by the varied “lyrical obsession of matter” (Marinetti). He made collages from paper of different origin only, which had been introduced by cubism and futurism and was not part of the radical demands for “new material” of the Dada manifestos. The portraits of Paul Gurk (fig. 103), Salomo Friedlaender/Mynona (cat. no. 38), and Anselm Ruest (cat. no. 39), the individualistic anarchist of the magazine *Der Einzige* (The Only One, 1919–25), were created with remainders and quotations of Dada publications, with Hausmann’s woodcut
for Franz Jung’s novel Der Sprung aus der Welt (The Jump Out of the World, 1918), and with his linocut “dä ä dada!” (1919). A burlesque quotation on the lofty brow of Anselm Ruest, for example, was “Stirner’s Ass” from Der Dada (no. 1). Hausmann even changed his first name to Max, in order to better identify Ruest with Max Stirner (1806–1856), the philosopher of individual anarchism. For the first time also photographs of portraits were used and put in the place of Anselm Ruest’s eyes. Possibly they were supposed to represent the “rafter” in the eyes of the philosopher. One can see that the material was being used as “paint” in order to suggest physiognomies and to disrupt them.

Hausmann’s series of head-montages began with alienating portraits with Dadaist material: “Man was transformed into a pyramid, a machinery, a being with a skewed, shifted center of gravity by blowing up, by tearing apart his core, by shifting his central organ brain into a part of the body, into his head.”35 The Dada-section through the heads dissolved the philosophies of the individualistic anarchists into simultaneous quotations, possibly a Dionysian, grotesque hint of the alienation from their own center, which they were conjuring up with their own philosophies, In the course of the years, the materials for these heads became more and more machine-like with the photomontages. In Tatlin lebt zu Hause (Tatlin Lives at Home, 1920; fig. 109; cat. no. 28), Tatlin’s brain became the place for a steering wheel; in Selbstportrait des Dadasophen (Self-portrait of a “Dadasoph,” 1920; cat. no. 27) the head is replaced by a manometer in the style of mannerism, while in Elasticum (1920; fig. 108), shown in Mécano (Blue, 1922), parts of machines were compactly assigned to a photo-portrait. In ABCD (1923–24; fig. 105) around the photo-portrait of the screaming Hausmann, the elements of language, letters, and numbers accumulate. Finally, in Mechanischer Kopf. Geist unserer Zeit (Mechanical Head: The Spirit of Our Age, ca. 1921; fig. 113), Hausmann concretized materials three-dimensionally as plastic attributes, attached to the head of a hairdresser’s mannequin: tape measure, wallet, printing cylinder, and others — attributes characterizing the modern spirit, making it function, and simultaneously pointing to the “metamechanical” concept of Dada. (See chapter 5.) The objects obtained the character of open signs through the principle of montage. Here Dada was playing ambivalently with the crisis of the subject. On the one hand it played with the loss of a holistic identity as the bourgeois fiction of the autonomous subject. On the other hand the liberation from the bourgeois pressure for identity and the Dionysian awakening into “simultaneity of self and other” (Hausmann) were shown — the gaining of a new, experimental reality. The fragments of the subject indicated the grotesque deformation and degradation of humanity and, at the same time the hope for a substantial change, for a new “anthropogenesis of dissonance” (Nietzsche). Contrary to the individualistic anarchists, the Dadaist subjectivity no longer saw itself as the activating center of the world. Materials and media began to take over the blown up individual. The mass of quotations in the heads, the increased mechanization, formed a medial construct of open signs. Material things broke through the previous centering on the subject and its energies of expression inaugurating a different order according to a freely chosen rule outside it.

As the portraits show the development of the Dadaist use of material, the cover pages of the four publications from Club Dada (1918) to Der Dada, no. 3 (1920) indicate the changed intentions for the use of new material. (fig. 36–39): While in Club Dada (fig. 36) the woodcut still incorporated the title typographically in organic-expressionist form, Der Dada, no. 1 (June 1919; fig. 37) showed a layout that was characterized only by typographic montage that for the first time introduced numbers as mechanical Dadaist elements and attributed to them — similarly as to the letter — an independent appeal, commented on with the ironic sigh, “Ach.”
Significantly, the ensemble of numbers is characterized by an exercise of division executing mathematically what is immanent to the Dadaist montage: the dismantling, the division into fractions. In his essay Die Großstädte und das Geistesleben (Cities and Intellectual Life, 1903) Georg Simmel stated “that the modern spirit has turned more and more into a mathematical one.” In “dadadegie,” Der Dada, no. 1, with this composition of numbers, dealt much more with the “eminently civilizing consciousness” (Hausmann) than Club Dada was able to. “Dadadegie” also pointed out that the numbering system characterized Dada’s montages just as purely and fundamentally as did the spirit of music or of sound.

Der Dada, no. 2 (December 1919; fig. 38) features a collage of materials from the Dadaist supply deconstructing Dada’s own medial construction. The cover page shows Hausmann’s study of cubist forms. For this collage, Hausmann cut up the first manifesto Was ist der Dadaismus und was will er in Deutschland? (What Is Dadaism and What Does It Want in Germany?) which had been added to Der Dada, no. 1. One also can read fragments like “Spiesser!” (philistine, associating his manifesto Der deutsche Spiesser ärgert sich [The German Philistine Gets Angry]) and a part of the title of his essay Der Besitzbegriff in der Familie (The Notion of Property in the Family). Two other quotations referred to Baader – the “aa” and the fragment of text on the left side presenting his self image as Jesus redivivus: Der da wieder kam in den Wolken des Himmels zu richten die Lebendigen und die Toten (Who came back in the clouds of the sky to judge the living and the dead). Dada siegt! (Dada Triumphs!) and Tretet Dada bei (Join Dada) in varying typographical layout, and the name of the periodical “Der DADA” in big, narrow print give appeal to the cover page.

In April 1920, the title illustration of Der Dada, no. 3 (fig. 39) Das Pneuma umreist die Welt (Pneuma Travels around the World) blew apart the previous layout. The wheel of the Dionysian dada-motor, the photo-portrait of the screaming Raoul Hausmann, quotes like “Circus Dada,” nie geahnten Umschung (never imagined change), Pro-phy-lac-tic (the toothbrush), Bist du mir treu (Are you true to me) mixed daily routine, fragments of Neue Jugend, and the names of the Dadaists Hausmann, Grosz, and Baader. “John Heartfield mont.” pointed to the author of the montage, to the Monteurdada. Dada glass eyes were watching over the chaos.

In the course of the year 1919, the Berlin Dadaists used more material from popular media as an everyday Dionysian raw element of time: newspaper material, headlines, food stamps, names of cafés, advertisements, banners, political slogans. The construction and destruction of the documentary records soon went beyond the first attempts at collage, which still had been characterized by the value of the material itself or by reference to Dada’s own publications. This new tendency was closely connected to the growing political consciousness of the artists since the events of January 1919 and the bloody suppression of the Spartacus Revolt, for simultaneously with the quotation from the newspaper a more public need for reflection was included in the image. This could not so easily be concluded from the previous materials, which ironically reflected more the circle of Dadaists themselves.

The meaning of the first Dada-montages lay in their provoking and activating practical use, since the integration of the new material was performing in its own right and was, at the same time, iconoclastically dissolving genres. The Dadaist developed production as an artistic activity against the traditional values of aesthetics, turning the certainties of art upside down: unpredictable, without style or personal identification, he constantly brought himself back into play. The optophonetic poems in the broadest sense opened up a synaesthetic connection to music and disclosed a new Dionysian area, elemental, material, and phonetical. The open principle of montage was connected to an awakening of new states of an artistic enhancement of
life. In the montages, which from 1919 on mainly were published in the periodicals *Jedermann sein eigner Fussball* (Everyone His Own Football), *Der blutige Ernst* (The Bloody Earnest), and *Die Pleite* (The Bankruptcy), the Berlin Dadaists directed their activities more critically against society; they became more political and anti bourgeois. Quotations from photographs and texts of popular media characterized their statements and arrangements, which often took on the character of a satiric, “optical pamphlet.” “Dada practically creates the world according to its own circumstances; it uses all forms and customs in order to destroy the moral, hypocritical, bourgeois world by its own means“38 — this became the motto of Dada Berlin.

**“Photoplays” or “Taylor’s System of Painting”:**
Beginning of Photomontages and the Tatlin Myth

After 1919, the Berlin Dadaists changed the montage of photographs used for propagandist and journalist manipulation into their own method of creation. Instead of increasing illusion or simulating a fictitious reality, Dada’s intention was to disillusions and to dismantle. Popular photo-montage was widely used in the prefabricated printings, as the reservists from the emperor’s time had received them in vast numbers for gluing onto their photo-portraits. They can be seen, for example, above the sideboard in *Industriebauern* (Industrial Farmers, 1920; fig. 157; cat. no. 93) by Georg Scholz and in the media industry, especially in the postcard industry and in magazines, where the *Berliner Illustrirte Zeitung* (*BIZ*) with its photo-manipulated illustrations already in 1904 had been prominent (fig. 3.1–3.3). Moreover, the architects of the time were using photomontages artistically, by virtually projecting architectural drafts. As early as 1912, Mies van der Rohe began to work with photomontages when he transposed his design for the Bismarck monument into the photograph of the landscape true to scale; then in 1921 he worked in the medium again with his project for the skyscraper in Friedrichstrasse.

The Dadaists made a myth out of having “invented” the photomontage and of referring it back to themselves. In addition to its invention, Dadaists should be given credit for their protest against the manipulating power of photographs as mass media: the alienating break-up of the conventions of perception and of the expectation in the use of photography as a representational document. They questioned the demand for authenticity suggested by photography. But these methods of contradictory alienation did not promptly appear at the same time when photomontage was discovered as a Dadaist medium.

Their Dada-production did not directly mirror the experience in *Heidebrink* (August 1918), when Höch and Hausmann for the first time consciously saw photo-portraits of soldiers glued onto serially produced oleographs; there are no Dadaist photomontages at all following the summer of 1918, the date of “discovery” according to Höch and Hausmann.39 The *Material der Malerei Plastik Architektur* (Material of Painting Sculpture Architecture), published in October 1918 as “Third publication of Club Dada,” still used hand colored abstract original woodcuts for illustration, and a collage from abstractly cut sheets of paper (fig. 100) for a cover page. In fact, the term *photomontage* was not used for quite some time. In 1925 Moholy-Nagy in his book *Malerei Fotografie Film* (Painting Photography Film) used it for the photo-collages of Dada.40 The Dadaists themselves continued speaking of *Kleebild* or *Geklebte Bilder* (glued images).

Surprisingly, Hausmann never programmatically referred to it, in none of his numerous miniature essays, not even at the time of “discovery” of photomontage, which he later on claimed for himself, although it would have been obvious for some manifestos, especially for *Material of Painting Sculpture Architecture*. In 1931, at the exhibition on *Fotomontage* in the
atrium of the former Museum of Arts and Crafts in Berlin (April 25 to May 31, 1931), he made a general statement about this subject, its origin and development. More specifically, in retrospect, he spoke about it in 1972 in his *Am Anfang war Dada*, in which his own role and assessment of photomontage constitute self-centered overrating.

Dada research often dates the cut-up photograph of the screaming Raoul Hausmann glued onto the manifesto *Synthetisches Cino der Malerei* as one of the first verifiable photomontages to the year 1918 (fig. 104). Hausmann himself in *Am Anfang* called it a “first version.” If this now lost photomontage had had any importance, he would have published it during his Dada time! But it appeared neither in the Dada publications nor at the *First International Dada-Fair*. There the manifesto *Synthetisches Cino* was only shown in the context of the photomontage of a double portrait of Baader and Hausmann from *Der Dada*, no. 2 (June 1919; cat. no. 5) together with the optophonetic poem “kp’erioum” as a “printed sheet from the Dadaco” (cat. no. 5). Instead, the screaming Hausmann should be classed with a series of photo-portraits, which John Heartfield made of the Berlin Dadaists for *Der Dada*, no. 3 and for the Dada-Fair (cat. no. 1–3) in July 1919. Before 1920 only more serious photo-portraits of Hausmann are known. The “screaming portrait” appears in the photomontage *Das Pneuma umreist die Welt* (Pneuma Travels Around the World) by John Heartfield (fig. 116), in *Schnitt mit dem Küchenmesser* (Cut with the Kitchen Knife) by Hannah Höch (fig. 130), and especially in Hausmann’s own montages after Dada in *ABCD* (1923; fig. 105), *Dada Raoul* (1951), and *Oanoa* (1965). The motif of the frontal screaming mouth was even taken up for the satiric volume *Hurrah!Hurrah!Hurrah!* (1921). The question is, however, when was the portrait by Raoul Hausmann deconstructed and when did his eyes begin dancing around his “chaotic oral cavity.”

At the Raoul Hausmann archives in the Berlinische Galerie there is a glass negative of the photograph of the photomontage. This glass negative was probably made for the exhibition of *Fotomontage* at the State Library of Art, Berlin, in 1930 or 1931, and at this time Hausmann dated its origin 1919. It can be assumed, however, that Hausmann did not create this work in 1918 or 1919 but that he probably made it in 1930 and 1931 for the *Fotomontage*-exhibition. For, as the Dada-montages show, in 1919 and 1920 it was still unusual to create these types of photomontages. Repeatedly the point was to distort faces as a whole, even in the cut-up photo-portraits by Hannah Höch, to obstruct or to exchange the eyes, to replace the mouth, to deform half of the face, to put together the form of the face by a method of combining, and still to keep the shape, but never to take apart the face completely or to shatter it into individual elements. This “anagrammatic” method of deregulation we find in Hausmann’s work only in 1931, in the photomontage *Eyes* (fig. 106), published in *a bis z* (a to z; Cologne, May 1931) with Hausmann’s essay, also shown in the *Fotomontage*-exhibition in Berlin, 1931. In this later, more constructed montage the dancing eyes around the oral cavity of the Dada-montage are, as it were, a Dadaist version of the polar play between eyes and mouth: both are concerned with the polar unity of the optical and the phonetical, a subject that in fact occupied Hausmann since Dada-times but that he probably was not able to put into effect in this manner of the photomontage. We therefore have to reconsider the date of origin.

*ABCD* (fig. 105) still shows clearly how Hausmann was working on the motif in Dada style. He alienated the screaming portrait, but it remained whole; its senses were challenged by the simultaneous experience of the diametrical effect of the quotations and elements of language. Almost programmatically, Dada as a complex event was being visualized, as “process and subject matter of the simultaneity of world events” of which Dada made itself the indifferent medium.
Why did Hausmann predate this work? From the letters to Jan Tschichold of 1930 it becomes clear how much even at that time Hausmann was fighting for his recognition as the first person to do photomontages; he paid his respects to his friend Baader in this matter and predated his first collages also “March 1918,” but he wanted to achieve at whatever the cost so that Heartfield’s part would be judged less significant than his own, since in his publication Die neue Typographie (The New Typography, 1928) Tschichold had referred to the latter as inventor of photomontage. Therefore, Hausmann sent an example of his montage work on his first Dada manifesto (1918) to Tschichold.

The first published montage-work that can be dated precisely, and which was exclusively put together from photographs is the montage Wer ist der Schönste? (Who is the most beautiful?) (cat. no. 41) by Grosz for the magazine published by Heartfield on February 15, 1919, Jedermann sein eigner Fussball (fig. 80). Ironically it shows some politicians of the new Weimar government with photo-portraits like stars of the stage and vaudeville on a fan, which a dancer could have used: at the center Ebert and Scheidemann, as the axle still Ludendorff, next to him Noske and Erzberger. Besides that, the choice of a fan in combination with the portrait-photographs demonstrates Grosz’s Dadaist affinity for trivial arrangements as they were presented in fanned out form since the nineteenth century on picture-card collections of famous personalities (fig. 80.1). The photomontage in all probability skeptically reflects the new massive use of photographs of politicians by magazines in the beginning media-spectacle of the young democracy. With the title Gallery of German Male Beauties, Prize Question “Who is the Most Beautiful?” it was also shown at the First International Dada-Fair (cat. no. 41).

Grosz and Heartfield were substantially involved in the invention of the artistic photomontage. Even if the date of origin given by Grosz as 1915 and 1916 has to be called into question, the artists certainly were familiar with technical levels of montage methods from their experiments of the graphic- and cliché-montages for Neue Jugend, and from their work with UFA between 1917 and 1919. Both were conscious of the relationship between film-montage and photomontage. If the textual quotation “Photoplays” appears on Heartfield’s Leben und Treiben in Universal-City, 12 Uhr 5 mittags (Life and Bustle at Universal-City, 12:05 Noon, 1920; fig. 117), he was transforming the original meaning “Spielfilm” (film as photoplay) into the process of montage.

After 1919 and 1920 it became obvious that the Dadaist montage oriented itself towards the movement of film and anticipated its own aesthetic laws like cuts, abrupt changes of images, intervals, freedom of space and time. Hausmann’s montage Dada im gewöhnlichen Leben (Dada Cino) (Dada in Everyday Life [Dada Cinema], 1920; fig. 107; cat. no. 24) already in the title produced this effect of the montage as a “static film.” The renaming of the first Dada treatise on The New Material in Painting of April 1918 as Synthetisches Cino der Malerei (Synthetic Cino of Painting) was also supposed to associate the new medium. Hausmann introduced Tzara to the manifesto in March 1919 as “Cinéma psychoanalytique de la peinture” (Psychoanalytical Cinema of Painting). His montage Self-portrait of the “Dadasoph” (1920; cat. no. 27) shows the photo-quotation of a man in sitting position, the back of his head metaphorically interspersed with film reels, while his skull is overruled by the measuring scale of a manometer; the mind without doubt is moved by cinematography. Hausmann, who never made a film, but who, in his artistic and literary works, took the aesthetics of film, both its flow and cut, into account to a high degree, still in 1921 asserted: “Our art today is film! At the same time process, sculpture, and image!”
Dada Berlin connected this view of the photographic montage with other Dadaist discoveries from the sphere of everyday life as an inspiring inventory for new art. It could be something quite insignificant which all of a sudden inspired the Dadaists. The serially made and reproducible objects of everyday life, which before Dada had been boring, because they were insipid, now became for them the Dionysian treasure chest for their debates on the aesthetics of material. “The imagination of the curling tongs, the hair-dryer, and the electric iron” for Hausmann in 1921 was just as important as was sculpture of African tribes for the expressionists. The fascination of everyday objects as external storage of their productions was the characteristics that united all Dadaists: in 1913 the French Dadaist Marcel Duchamp, for example, was inspired regarding one of his first machine-works by a chocolate mill in the shop window of the Chocolaterie Gamelin in Rouen. The discovery of the principle of collage by Max Ernst was just as much energized by extra-aesthetic material and was described by him as a chance coincidence of favorable circumstances:

In 1919, when on a rainy day I was in a city on the river Rhine, my irritated glance was very much taken by the fascination with the pages of a catalog, in which objects for anthropological, microscopic, psychological, mineralogical, and paleontological demonstrations were shown. So many widely different elements of figures were united there that the absurdity of this collection provoked a sudden intensifying of my visionary capacities and caused a hallucinatory succession of contradictory images, double, triple, multiple images.

While Max Ernst stressed the multifarious analogies inspiring him to a de-limiting perspicacity, Dada Berlin soberly stressed that montage was also a time related, economical, and reality oriented method, which derived its principles from the realm of mechanical work. Orienting himself on American notions of an optimal use and calculation of manpower, Grosz described one of his lost montages: Das Gehirn meines Schwagers M. E. Fimmen, New York oder Marschall Grosz fordert Taylors System in der Malerei (The Brain of my Brother-in-law M. E. Fimmen, New York, or Marshal Grosz Demands Taylor’s System in Painting) (Catalog von Garvens, no. 6 of “Geklebte Bilder,” 1922). Dada’s work was comparable to a small, antifunctional machine, in which, thanks to the combinatory capacities of its creator, separately prefabricated items were organized and assembled most effectively into a dissonant whole according to an idea. The self-image of the Berlin Dadaists as contemporary “Monteure” (mechanics) was in keeping with the times: the artistic personal style was depersonalized, work was reduced conceptually to selection and combination of prefabricated parts from the world of reproductive media. The adequate element in this great pure machinery was the photo as a “mechanical” product. Dada took into account the change in production processes, the transition from handicraft to a “taylored” work in a machine-system. While the Dadaist use of the word Klebebild (glued image) for montage still underlined the aspect of arts and crafts, the term Monteur (mechanic), referring particularly to Heartfield, already pointed to industrial assembly work and organization with prefabricated materials, which would in the future structure the Dadaist work of art. In the catalog of the First International Dada-Fair (1920), Wieland Herzfelde pointed expressly to this economy of material and time, this “taylored” and at the same time anti-artistic aspect of the Dadaist decision for the montage methods:

In the past, a lot of time, love, and effort have gone into the painting of a body, a
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flower, a hat, a shadow and so forth; now we only need to take a pair of scissors, and cut out from the paintings, photographs all the objects we need; if they are objects of a lesser size, we don’t even need their representation, we take the objects themselves, for example pocket-knives, books, all those things that are beautifully painted in the museums of old art, but only just painted.\(^{58}\)

This aspect also corresponded to the contemporary demand, stemming from the Russian Proletkult, for a taylorizing of art and a rationalization of artistic work.\(^{59}\) In 1919 and 1920 the Berlin Dadaists were informed about the aims of Russian concepts and took especially Tatlin as a symbolic figure for their intentions to emphasize a paradigmatic change in art. Although they probably did not know any of Tatlin’s works (not the* Counter Reliefs* or the *Tower of the 3\(^{rd}\) International*), Umanskij’s essays on *Neue Kunstrichtungen in Russland* (New Developments in Russian Art), on “Tatlinism” and “The New Monumental Sculpture in Russia” published in the January and February/March issues of the new art magazine Der Ararat (1920), already sufficed to underline their anti-academic concept as “Monteure.”\(^{60}\) Tatlin combined the “tayloring” of art with mechanical engineering and pointed the way to an aesthetics that was oriented on machine construction and concentrated on the industrial material: he “was not afraid to show his machine-heart.”\(^{61}\) He created a machine-art, which stood for the “triumph of intellect and material, the negation of the rights of the mind to detached autonomy, for the essence of today’s reality.”\(^{62}\) Thus Hausmann with his photomontage *Tatlin Lives at Home* (1920; fig. 109) programatically confirmed a spirit that was machinoid through and through. Its imagination was transferred into the complex operational sequence of the steering wheel of a car. At the First International Dada-Fair, this spirit was conjured up several times with the poster “Art is Dead — Long Live the New Machine Art of Tatlin,” both by Grosz and Heartfield as well as by Hausmann (view IV or view VIII of the Dada-Fair). This Dada slogan clearly is a paraphrase of a sentence from Umanskij’s essay on Tatlin’s machine-art in which he said: “Art is dead — long live art, the art of the machine with its construction and logic, its rhythm, its components, its material, its metaphysical spirit.”\(^{63}\) Tatlin became the figurehead for this new Dadaist mechanic concept, although Umanskij never talked of photomontages, but always of materials that the Dadaists hardly ever used, like wood, glass, paper, sheet metal, iron, screws, electric instruments, and nails for the *Counter Reliefs* or the *Monumental Sculpture of the 3\(^{rd}\) International*, which “would be transformed into a dynamic machine.”\(^{64}\) According to Dada, the traditional “artistic imagination,” creating illusions and working with subjective notions, was an act of “sabotage on life.” It was “romantic, retrospective, and stupid compared to the imagination of the technician, of the constructor of machines, compared to the scientist doing experiments and even compared to the capacities of a watchmaker, a welder, or train engineer.”\(^{65}\) Provocatively, Dada demanded the “production of spirit and art in factories” and wanted to send “the intellectual spirit into the art factory for the dissolution of his spirit.”\(^{66}\) The Dadaists underlined this demand with captions like *Tatlinistischer Planriß* (Tatlinist Blueprint) or *Tatlinistische mechanische Konstruktion* (Tatlinist Mechanical Construction).

In the first place this provocative formulation directed itself against “the hypocrisy of expressionism, the false emphasis of futurism, and parlor cubism.” The writer Walter Serner even went so far as to literally establish Dada in the factory.

Painting was treated as a chore; the good painter, for example, was recognized if he ordered his paintings by telephone from a carpenter. It wasn’t about visible
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things but about what function they had for mankind. You made a selection from your world; you made a selection from the world, a strange, wild selection, which you signed.67

Moholy-Nagy took up this suggestion and in 1922 really had Telephone-pictures made in an enameling shop. The Dada engineer destroyed any introverted creation referring only to the psyche or the emotion in favor of an artistic production that came from everyday life alone, and that meant from the rotating world of machines. Beyond the analogy to machine-production Dada Berlin connected Taylor’s demand for an economy of time on the one hand with productive dilettantism, on the other with the political aspect of the montage method.

The dilettante aspect of montage work also was connected to the Dadaist attempt to reformulate the concept of the artist. The artistic occupation was not only supposed to be limited to the “arrogance of an expert from a haughty guild.” It was supposed to be open to everybody. Dada prided itself to become the “champion of dilettantism”68; thus the aspect of montage expanded the general production of art as the reform movements of cultural critique since the beginning of the century had demanded. At their Dada-Fair, the Dadaists exhibited some works by students, which showed the dilettante use of photographic and newspaper material. They were works by the fourteen-year-old Hans Citroën (fig. 54, cat. no. 123–126), the brother of Paul Citroën, and by twenty-one-year-old Hans Stuckenschmidt (cat. no. 109–112, 133), appearing as “Jugendgruppe Dada” (Dada Youth Group).

The fact that the most radical political aspect of the montage procedure was at the same time calculated economically with regard to time is shown above all in Heartfield’s work: Since the photograph as a journalistic form of communication was supposed to transport news as fast as possible, the Dadaist, in order to be able to react, had to strike back according to his tactics with the same means: the pencil was too slow. The lies that the bourgeois press was spreading were to be laid bare with the Dada montage. The medial construction of reality was to be rapidly deconstructed. This underlines the function of the photomontage, which goes far beyond the first products of Dada’s hylomorphism: the deciphering, the political disillusioning, and the intervention in public opinion. The Dadaist in his work adapted to the new industry of media and took off the traditional artistic characteristics: not emotion but matter-of-factness, not contemplation, but reactions and ideas controlled the dealing with the new material. They demanded a conceptual definition of art, which was to define itself socially in the broadest sense.

“Ladies and Gentlemen! Anybody Can Enter!!!”
Action and the Principle of Montage

For the Dadaists cabaret, circus, vaudeville, and the very much up-to-date American cinema, especially the films by Charlie Chaplin, were scenic plays and at the same time clarifying artistic figures of meaning. Here the theatrum mundi, the divine theater of the world, was brought forth as a circus mundi: while in the theatrum mundi the course of the world was run according to an immovable plan of God, in the Dadaist circus mundi “the turbulences of our dear life on earth” (Grosz) were staged. With the same consequence with which the world-theater assured itself of a holistic view of the world, Dada was creating its antimetaphysical negative to it — the breakdown of the world as a farce. After the catastrophe of World War I, the bottomless terrain of the epochal upheavals opened up the experimental stage for Dada’s artistic self-creation. The
actions were inserted as a new genre into the realm of art, activating many inspiring moments for the principle of montage.

The relationship between artistic montage and montage on stage was made by Marinetti in 1915 in his “sintesi. In short theatrical scenes he wanted to create plays with the least number of words by condensing and synthesizing facts and ideas, so that they would turn into momentary images like montages. “In a few minutes, with a few words and a few gestures innumerable situations, feelings, ideas, perceptions, events, and symbols are crowded together.” The audience, like the viewer of a montage, is “thrown into a labyrinth of sensual perceptions, which are absolutely original and interlocked in a completely unforeseen way.”

Chapter two of this book describes the Dada soirees, their concepts and effects. The scenes had the character of fragments and improvised processes. In addition to the Dadaist protagonist on stage, the audience was provoked into becoming involved. The artistic dimension activated the spirit and the senses of the spectators and took away their preconceived assumptions. The performances diffused into particles of events, like in a kaleidoscope. Time was unchained into the simultaneity of moments; holistic space was shattered. Thus the moment was staged and was accorded a life of its own so that logic of expression and semantics disappeared as well. A quick succession of entries, intersecting and broken-up scenes had their repercussion in the artistic montages. They filtered the impression of diffusion: “Ladies and gentlemen!! Anybody can enter!” “Pray with your head against the wall!” “Who can ride a bicycle?” “Invest your money in Dada!” These exclamations came from the periodicals and montages and expressed Dada’s play with the mass media. Heartfield’s advertisement for the _Kleine Grosz-Mappe_ (The Small Grosz-Portfolio, 1917) in _Neue Jugend_ of June 1917 (fig. 114), for example, indicated how the grotesque mixture of the Dadaist actions shaped the Dadaist montage into “both buffoonery and requiem” in subject-matter and form alike.

The manifestations and actions set the tone of the montages: irony and provocation, eccentricity and grotesque, actuality and appeal, irritation and activation of the audience, an anti-academic and anti-rationalist attitude, Americanisms, mixed forms of different genres of art, literature, dance, lecture, music, the clashing of the most different, constantly changing scenes with a diffusing and shocking effect, a-logical and a-psychological, anti-Christian and antimetaphysical elements. Movement as an overriding factor for creation had a dynamizing effect on the process of artistic montage. The bruitist and “antisymphonic” scale of noises, sounds, and tones in the visual experiences of reception triggered an acoustic reverberation, just as the visual process of the montages inversely influenced the actions. “To hear with the eyes” and to “see with the ears” — this synaesthetic concept was followed by the Dadaist.

Beyond avant-garde influences mostly Nietzsche’s poetics of drama inspired the artistic link of the principle of montage to action. For it was he who united art with the power of play, of dance, of music, and of laughter, integrating as well the dark side, the ugliness, and the abyss of being.

You ought to learn to laugh, my young friends, if you are hell-bent on remaining pessimists. Then perhaps, as laughers, you may some day dispatch all metaphysical comforts to the devil — metaphysics first and foremost. Or to say it in the language of the Dionysian monster that bears the name of Zarathustra: “Raise up your hearts, my brothers, high, higher! And don’t forget your legs! Raise up your legs, too, good dancers; and still better: stand on your heads!”
The interpretation of metaphysics was given a new meaning by the artistry: it rose up; it stepped beyond and stood on its head, daring to revaluate all values, in order to advance into new creative possibilities and free the *vis creativa* (creative force).

Thus, the active artistry fundamentally points to the revaluation of montage produced by Dada in the spirit of the times – with both provocative intuition and calculated awareness.
Simultaneous montage makes up the most significant component of Dadaist works. Two kinds of montage can be distinguished, mixing mostly text and images as quotations from media of reproduction: the first is determined by a dominant initial image, most often a portrait photograph surrounded by an associative cluster of images and text; the second cumulatively condenses quotations from text and image.

Many works of the Berlin Dadaists belong to the first group of portrait montage. Often, their descent from the satirical language of type-portrait caricature is discernible, and it is endowed with a kaleidoscope of heterogeneous samples of quotations accomplishing a transition from satirical body language to the simultaneous language of objects and signs. This transition also shows in the mixture of techniques, in the tension between the “aura” of the original and the reproduction. Here Dada’s field of tension becomes evident. On the one hand the deconstructed “anti-portrait” is created that destabilizes self-awareness in the energetic chaos of daily activities, continually exposing it to the flow of events and the change of impressions. On the other hand a progressively typifying process develops that demonstrates social tendencies. This means dissolution on the one hand, on the other hand it means the “masking” of man, which at any rate includes the “death of the individual” (Nietzsche) as well as the death of the cult of artistic originality and individual creativity.

With his Deutschland, ein Wintermärchen (Germany, A Winter’s Tale, 1917–18; fig. 76; cat. no. 70) Grosz began his Dadaist series of satirical type-portrait montages, as yet painted or drawn, such as Der Schuldige bleibt unerkannt (The Culprit Remains Unidentified, 1919; cat. no. 4a), Tatlinistischer Planriss “Schreckenskammer” (Tatlinist Blueprint “Chamber of Horrors,” 1919; fig. 86.1; cat. no. 60), Brillantenschieber im Café Kaiserhof (Black Marketeers Selling Cut Diamonds at Café Kaiserhof, 1920; fig. 86.2; cat. no. 61), Herr Krause (1919; cat. no. 45). These works impressed Dix and Scholz, inspiring them to the montages Kartenspielende Kriegskrüppel (War Cripples Playing Cards, 1920; fig. 60), Prager Straße (Prague Street, 1920; fig. 61), and Industriebauern (Industrial Peasants, 1920; fig. 158; cat. no. 93), among others. Grosz mainly caricatured his initial images using pen and ink or oil. Only his Ein Opfer der Gesellschaft (A Victim of Society or Uncle August, the Unhappy Inventor, 1919; fig. 85; cat. no. 40), Porträt des Dichters vom Kurfürstendamm Wieland Herzfelde (Portrait of the Kurfürstendamm Poet Wieland Herzfelde, 1920; cat. no. 64), and his self-portrait in the spatial image montage “Daum” marries her pedantic automaton “George” in May 1920. John Heartfield is very glad of it (Meta.-mech. constr. nach Prof. R. Hausmann) (short title: Daum, 1920; fig. 86.3; cat. no. 52) were almost exclusively assembled from reproduced photographic material of heterogeneous content, satirically distorting the persons represented. In the photomontage Wer ist der Schönste? (Who is the Most Beautiful?, 1919; fig. 80; cat. no. 41), published in February 1919 as the title page of Jedermann sein eigner Fussball (Everyone His Own Football), the politicians are clearly recognizable as portrait photographs; the context of the fan exposes them as gamblers in a political cabaret.

In contrast to the satirical caricature of the type-portrait, the photo-portrait within the montage has a significantly stronger distancing effect on the viewer. Only if assembled as a fragmented cut-up does the image regain a gesture of action, setting in motion and challenging the gaze. One can also see that once photo-portraits appear in a montage setting, contexts with simultaneous quotations of newspaper clippings and artifacts are substantially expanded. Their
contradictory and stimulating possibilities of relation have an effect on the directness of polemical argument enhancing and multiplying potentials of meaning.

Compared with the satirical drawing, the simultaneous portrait-montage thus emphasizes complex interrelations and diverging influences. The social and medial construction of reality, the conduct of contemporaries and friends is called into question by means of physiognomy, gesture, and posture, and by means of the objects that are whirling around the subject, penetrating his sphere.

For his montage *Das ist die Erscheinung des Oberdada in den Wolken des Himmels* (This is the Apparition of the Superdada in the Clouds of the Sky, 1919; fig. 44), Baader took his own photo-portrait as the dominant initial image. Astronomical constellations of the mythically elevated ego reflect the “secret signs” of global revolution circling round him: he appears to be the galactic center of time and space. Dates and signs of the zodiac symbolize the impending revolution of humanity announced by World War I: “And then will appear the sign of the Son of Man in the sky. And then will howl all species of man on earth and will see the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of the sky, with great power and glory.” On September 4, 1912, the apparition of the cross, “gigantic, formed by eight stars” had already risen in the sky to signify the “Bringer of World Peace”; now, too, they circle round his portrait: “Beta Aurigae, Capella, Saturn, Aldebaran, Bellatrix, Betelgeuse, Pollux, Castor.” According to Baader, “September 26, 1918,” signified the end of World War I: the fall of the German Eastern front with Bulgaria’s capitulation and the simultaneous general attack by Marshall Foch on the Western front — the day until which the “Secret Central Council of the World” had kept the eyes of war leaders shut.

Related to this was Baader’s letter of October 21, 1918, warning the president of Berlin University, in which he claimed that it was not “Wilson, the American” who was “Chief Justice of the World” but “he who came back in the clouds of the sky to judge the dead and the living according to Dadaist principles” — namely, Baader himself. The “Ak 12” whirring around the portrait montage of the Superdada as *Christus redivivus* were signs of Baader’s newly introduced chronology, beginning on April 1, 1919, as “Ad 1.” The “A” signified the first year of *Weltfrieden* (World Peace), “d” as the fourth letter of the alphabet was the fourth month in the year, and 1 the date of the day. “Ak 12” thus denoted November 12, 1919. Could Baader have been wrong when, on flyer “Ak 12,” he announced his manifestation in Werder church for “12 October” (1919)?

The food ration card on the pentagram forming a multi-layered background to the photo-portrait demonstrates the simultaneity of apotheosis and everyday life. In this montage Baader’s art of actionist medial self-staging, quasi fixating its traces in the work of art, are clearly visualized.

Hausmann gave new impulses of alienation to the development of the portrait montage first through his collages of Gurk (fig. 103; cat. no. 38, 39), Ruest, and Mynona, disciples of Max Stirner, then through his double portrait of Hausmann and Baader (in *Der Dada*, no. 2; cat. no. 5), followed by *Der Kunstreporter* (The Art Reporter, 1919–20; cat. no. 37), *Elasticum* (1920 fig. 108), and *ABCD* (1923; fig. 105). Whereas, in the Stirnerian portraits, the material was intended to caricature and at the same time to dissolve physiognomy by imploding the material inside the heads, his other montages developed from an initial portrait around which things exploded into a complex field of relations. A tendency to replace drawn caricature with the simultaneity of clippings could be observed. Contradictions, exaggerations, ruptures within cited material now served not only to unmask the person represented but also to reveal his rootlessness in the real chaos of the epoch.
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*Der Kunstreporter* (1919–20; cat. no. 37) caricatures the new type of artistic journalism, still using the familiar satirical cut between head and body. Simultaneously, the photo-portrait of George Grosz is projected into the image, stuck upon the correctly dressed, stiff body of a clerk carrying a briefcase under his arm, more interested in money than in art. Into his other hand, Hausmann inserted a pen of more than ordinary length, whose brand name *Venus-Drawing American Pencil Co. New York* alludes to Grosz’s predilection for erotic or American topics of urban life. Another hint at this is given by the photo-portrait of a smiling woman on the same level with his head. The stamp “Portait construict George Grosz / 1920” (Portrait constructed George Grosz / 1920), printed twice onto the clothing, was crossed out by Hausmann in red pencil. He altered the physiognomy by distorting mouth and eyes into grimaces, using the same red color pencil on light blue paper. Onto his forehead he pasted a fashionable ladies’ shoe, comparable to the “Vera shoe” Hausmann had cited in the montage *Dada im gewöhnlichen Leben (Dada Cino)* (Dada in Everyday Life [Dada Cinema]; fig. 107), together with a “10 Pfg.-Briefmarke” (10 Pfennig stamp). A cut bill points to Grosz’s commercial interest, as does the newspaper silhouette in which the fragment “merz” can be read, associated with Kurt Schwitters’s Merz art or with *Commerz* (commerce). The background to the caricature of Grosz points to a dissolving, asyntactical new Dada-world, formed by a poster-cum-sound-poem by Hausmann, whose visiting card sticks out clearly: “Raoul Hausmann / Präsident der Sonne, / des Mondes und der kleinen Erde (Innenfläche), Dadasoph, Dadaraoul, Direktor des Circus Dada” (Raoul Hausmann / president of the sun, / the moon and the small earth (inner surface) / Dadasoph, Dadaraoul, director of Circus Dada).

Hausmann’s *Elasticum* (1920; fig. 60), published 1922 in *Mécano* (Blue), creates a compact simultaneous statement on the cover illustration of the catalog of the Dada-Fair. A photo-portrait whose suggestiveness was to be convincing as a type of the new age was pasted into a tire of the *Elasticum* brand. On his forehead, we read “popocabia” and “arppipi” and above it the letters “PIPICABIA.” Doubtless, the dynamic parts of machinery allude to Picabia’s drawings of machines. In thick black lettering (*csrrre*) parts of a sound-poem appear and behind them the pun “ARPPOPO Merde.” This is the first time Hausmann cited photographic material stemming almost exclusively from a single field of meaning, in this case the world of automobiles and machinery. The new spirit was as mobile as these elastic and rotating mechanisms of wheels and tires. The text polemically refers, on a burlesque level, to Arp and Picabia, confronting Hausmann’s verbal satyr play with the Apollinian and matter-of-fact spirit of *Mécano*.

In *ABCD* (1923; fig. 105), the screaming photo-portrait of Hausmann, the primal scream from his “chaotic oral cavity,” carrying the initial letters of the alphabet between his teeth, does not bring logos into the world but its fundamental ambiguity: the globe; Czechoslovak money from the Dada tour of 1921; the letter montage “VOCE” (besides the immediate significance a hint to futurism and to the avant-garde magazine *La Voce* [1908–16] in Florence); an invitation to the first Merz soiree of December 30, 1923, in Hanover, where Hausmann read aloud sound-poems under the collective title *Seelenmargarine* (Soul Margarine); the topographical marker “Harar,” Rimbaud’s new African abode since 1880 (top right); above his forehead, once again the first letters of the alphabet and below, an anatomic cross-section of a female abdomen with hands probing the uterus. As a disseminating chaos of worlds and words suffused by the dynamics of a new logos of complexity, polarity, and fragmentation, the work seems to pay homage to Rimbaud who first demanded a deregulation of the senses to revolutionize literature. Hausmann’s montage portraits were determined by the Dionysian accompaniment of cited
images with sonic elements; they introduced to these portraits a musical, rhythmic component setting them in motion with the vibrations of an energetic, supra-individual process. As a self-portrait, the montage may also point beyond Dada, to Hausmann’s vision of a dynamic “space-time functionality” combining Dada’s search for an “experience of all relations” with a model of future man, who would not only liberate all five senses from their atrophied biophysics but also develop the sixth sense, the sense of motion, by means of which he would soar freely across a world expanding in all directions.

Grosz’s montage portraits were more strongly oriented toward caricatures of the seated bourgeois with the world disintegrating around him. The cited matter pointed at his avaricious possessiveness — the more concrete, the more evidential. The material was part of the crime scene, which Grosz, as detective, secured in the montage. Material evidence goes hand in hand with sensual, haptic experience. Not so in Hausmann’s simultaneous portraits. Here semantic processes of deregulation and particularly the stochastic principle of sound-poetry fundamentally characterize the anagrammatic elements of the portrait montages. Differently, the montage principle allowed Baader to stage his world presidency as a media event between fiction and reality, the sublime and the profane.

Hannah Höch created portrait montage with dominant initial photographs, adding photographic quotations in order to expose certain role clichés of bourgeois society — as in the montages Das schöne Mädchen (The Pretty Woman, 1920; fig. 131) and Der Vater (The Father, 1921; fig. 132). The montage’s scattered images of moving and dancing women (fig. 132.1, 131.2) and of boxing men (fig. 131.1) distract from the “Father” they are hovering around. His portrait was ironically pasted onto a seated female body holding his baby in her arms — an allusion to the escape from traditional role attributions. The petite, posing figure of the Pretty Woman, her head a glowing light bulb, is reminiscent of Picabia’s Américaine in 391 (no. 6, 1917). The replacement of her portrait with a light bulb alludes to the new role of woman: does her electrifying modernity also include sophisticated illumination? Höch’s tendency to dismember bodies as Hausmann took apart language already becomes evident in the portrait montages. She combined fragments of bodies like morphemes into a new construct of signs. “Pretty Woman” appears grotesquely dolled up against the serial massiveness of BMW badges in the background and the boxer’s energetic power in the foreground (fig. 131.1). The hand with the clock face, a quotation from an advertisement, suggests the vanity of this war society heading for the twenties. The novel dynamics of modern life simultaneously destroy and stimulate the experience of people living under its conditions.

Otto Dix’s Matrose Fritz Müller aus Pieschen (The Seaman Fritz Müller from Pieschen, 1919; fig. 57), his Alma (1921; fig. 58), and Abschied von Hamburg (Goodbye to Hamburg, 1921) also belong to the category of portrait montage, although they do not consist solely of reproduced material but reinsert the montage principle into oil painting. Dix consciously used this principle, down to the semblance of cuts, in order to give an effect of alienation to the otherwise homogeneous oil painting. Matrose Fritz Müller aus Pieschen [Pieschen is a suburb of Dresden] does not portray the revolutionary but the provincial seaman who dreams of South Sea adventures, an escapist for whose illusionary spectrum Dix inserted a golden glittering eye with rotating pupil. He dreamed up a world of Dionysian images: his longing for the sun and the pyramids of Egypt, the inhabitants of Africa, the mighty luck-dragons of Asia, the Indians of America. Dix surrounded the oil portrait of Alma (1921) with picture-postcard idylls of a night of love, of fashion models, a factory, a winter garden, a railway, a harbor area; her figure, which appears in a low-cut bodice and a lace-trimmed hat, he decorated with roses. Her dream factory
was that of the picture-postcard industry. She had exchanged her imagination for this manufactured one and had become one of these figures herself. Here, too, desires were exposed with a humorous nod at the vitality of illusion. Dix exaggerated the illusory aspect of oil painting and ironically refracted it by confronting it with the dream factory of trivial media, the artist as producer of “surface from depth” in which life with all its desires becomes visible. It is in the guise of the trivial and banal that life’s Dionysian substance shows itself more intensely and sincerely than in “high art.” Dix embarks on this Dionysian track as an adventurer of the commonplace.

Otto Griebel’s *Dadaistisches Selbstbildnis* (Dada-Selfportrait, 1920; fig. 73), sporting the fighter’s profile of his black silhouette and the fiery “Blick ins Unendliche” (Gaze into the Infinite), shows the artist as *rocher de bronze* (bronze rock) above the jungle of cited matter that makes up the capitalist metropolis. In contrast to the portrait montage works, he stands solid in this world of ruins and clippings from everyday life, “untouched and yet deeply shaken” like Huelsenbeck. A clear Dada sky with lettering extends above the mass of man plunged in misery, revolt, and war. Objects, people, phrases in all their contradictoriness and their different levels of reality and meaning — such as *Krieg* (war), *Darmreinigungsmittel* (purgative), *Umsturz* (revolt), or *Eine glänzende Zukunft* (a brilliant future) — intersect and clash.

From the end of 1919 onward, montages with a dominant initial image increasingly took on the perspectivity of spatial image construction, influenced by the Apollinian technique of metamechanics. The simultaneous, citational montages often intruded in anonymous inner spaces until they were to disappear from them altogether and give way to an irredeemable void. This development can be perceived in Hausmann’s *Tatlin lebt zu Hause* (Tatlin Lives at Home) (1920; fig. 109) and *Ein bürgerliches Präcisionsgehirn ruft eine Weltbewegung hervor* (A Bourgeois Precision-Brain Causes a World Movement, 1920; cat. no. 29), Grosz’s *Daum* (1920; fig. 86.3), Scholz’s *Industriebauern* (Industrial Peasants, 1920; fig. 158), and Dix’s *Kartenspielende Kriegskrüppel* (War Cripples Playing Cards, 1920; fig. 60).

A more sensually enhancing experience gained presence in 1919 and 1920, the less the sobering empty spaces could be felt. The Dadaist was still “simultaneously” moving around in a multiplicity of spaces and times, as if prodded by the electric power of multifarious possibilities: as “simultaneously a monster of self and other, now, before, after and at the same time, an exploding Buffalo Bill of Apache romantics of a most boundless reality in the ongoing most contradictory complexes of experiential relations.”

A second kind of simultaneous montage enhances this Dionysian network of ecstatic *Erleben* (experience): it has no dominant initial portrait and assembles a multiplicity of citations of text or photographed material under the principles of juxtaposition and equivalence; it is the cumulative montage of text and photographs.

In his drawings and paintings, George Grosz paved the way for the technique of juxtaposition with his early urban images, for instance *Erinnerung an New York* (Memory of New York, 1915–16; fig. 82) or *Widmung an Oskar Panizza* (Dedication to Oskar Panizza, 1917–18; fig. 78). Grosz used the dissociative character of urban perception, the diverging impressions showering upon the city stroller and splintering his vision, so that like a detective he could uncover the social pathology and paradoxical physiognomy of his age in a complex and suggestive manner. In Hausmann’s case, the simultaneous technique also inspired his montages and drawings of sound-poetry like “rattatta” (fig. 99), Otto Dix and Otto Griebel employed the associative principle of equal value in drawings of large groups of men: for example *Artisten* (Artists, 1921; fig. 64) by Dix condenses circus impressions in a network of lines and heads:
heads of Blacks, Indians, and acrobats in a staccato of jazz-like syncopated rhythms. In Griebel’s Marzipan-Kriegsgegenblatt (Marzipan War Memorial Sheet, 1922; fig. 74), social contradictions determine the drawing’s kaleidoscope. It shows a cripple parading in goose-step across a “Heldentod G.m.b.H.” (Heroic Death Ltd.), in which the fat bourgeois type and the crippled soldier are juxtaposed, and in which Wilhelmian culture, represented by clergyman and teacher, inculcates the German soldier with slogans. Schlichter used drawing to impulsively capture different scenes, which he transferred from film sequences to the simultaneous drawing, as in Wild-West (1919–20; fig. 151). The density of overlapping trash scenes demonstrates Schlichter’s “intrinsic” approach to simultaneous experience; his position is not that of a superior observer. The adventurous Wild West mobilized Dionysian aggressiveness against the constraints of occidental culture. Hubbuch also employed the principle of equivalence, mainly in his pencil drawings, for instance in Im Rausch des Irrens (In the Frenzy of Error; fig. 140). The drawings seem like a rugged emotional landscape, in the caves and labyrinths of which he kaleidoscopically exposed urban man, his excesses, errors, and fears. He also used this technique of combining images for uncovering political references and contradictions, especially the failure of the Weimar Republic’s bourgeoisie to erect a lasting democracy.

The cumulative montages of text and photographs focus on the abundance of clippings taken from different media of reproduction with a synthesizing and at the same time polarizing force. They challenge the viewer to develop an artistry of perception: of distance and closeness, mobility and concentration. The ruptures and heterogeneity of cited matter, its isolation and collision, never allow the eye to rest, thus activating it much more than was possible through the technique of simultaneous equivalence in the drawings. Schnitt mit dem Küchenmesser Dada durch die letzte weimarer Bierbauchkulturepoche Deutschlands (Cut with the Kitchen Knife Dada through the Last Epoch of Weimar Beer-Belly Culture in Germany, 1919–20; fig. 130; cat. no. 20; short title: Schnitt mit dem Küchenmesser, “Cut with the Kitchen Knife,” or Küchenmesser-Montage “Kitchen Knife Montage”) by Hannah Höch is a paradigm of the procedure of simultaneous montage. The large format of 114 x 90 cm is made up of a sum of assembled montages of small, particular details and fragments.

The viewer’s first impression is that of an unconnected mass of numerous images and quotations, which line up, overlap, are superimposed, and dispersed. The viewer finds no dominant initial image and contemplates the detailed material longer. A man’s head (that of young Albert Einstein) is striking but it does not dominate the picture as in the montage portraits. The montage constructed in two dimensions is enlivened by mechanical, rotating elements viewed from an oblique angle: cogwheels, ball bearings, spoke wheels. These elements form a steep diagonal line that, though seemingly interrupted by a white space at the center of the montage continues in the central figure of a woman dancer who tosses her Käthe Kollwitz head like a ball into the air. This diagonal is supported by the word Weltrevolution (global revolution; fig. 130.1), running almost parallel – a word that the artist, as she told me, removed around 1921. She replaced it with Die grosse Welt Dada (The Great World Dada). Weltrevolution filled the space, colored light red, which now appears above and below these fragments of writing. The original state can still be seen on the photo showing Raoul Hausmann and Hannah Höch at the Dada-Fair of 1920 (view IV). The maze of images also allows constructing relations between condensed areas of photomontage, which can be ordered into oppositional motif groups. Tracing the diagonal line to the bottom left, conglomerates of people and metropolitan buildings appear; top right, on the other hand, shows the antiddaisistische Bewegung (anti-Dada Movement) represented by Wilhelmian politicians led by Wilhelm II himself — although he is almost totally
eclipsed by a large number of elements and portraits. Below the “anti-Dada Movement” is the group of Berlin Dadaists — in keeping with the contradictory concept.

Between these groups of motifs, Höch inserted mechanical elements, animals, and isolated figures: inter alia, the writer Mechthilde Lichnowsky (above the mass of people) and the dancer Niddy Impekoven who is balancing the head of Käthe Kollwitz. Next to their apppellative character, words such as Die antidadistische Bewegung, Weltrevolution or Die grosse Welt Dada and Dadaisten have graphic as well as informational value. These linguistic signals guide the eye through the maze of tiny photo segments and particles, because they are clearly offset from the web of photos and (like scrolls in medieval tableaux) function as clarifiers and amplifiers of meaning.

In her selection of photos, Hannah Höch had chief recourse to an abundance of material from the Berliner Illustrirte Zeitung (BIZ). For this reason, the effect of the montage upon the contemporary viewer is alienating rather than alien. It challenges him because it appeals to what he knows. Here, in a singular way the critical work of destruction and that of discovery and recognition can be connected productively for the montage deconstructs its objects into calculatedly cut-up fragments, into monadic quotations, as it were.

While Hannah Höch in Schnitt mit dem Küchenmesser (1919–20; fig. 130) and also in Dada Rundschau (Dada Review, 1919; fig. 129) predominantly worked with photomontage interspersed with words and letters, George Grosz in Germania ohne Hemd (Germania Shirtless, 1919; fig. 84) mainly sampled headlines and text fragments, accentuating them with photographs. The philistine consciousness made up of phrases revealed its reality as a montage constructed from quotations. Höch’s cross-section through “the last epoch of Weimar beer-belly culture” corresponded with Grosz’s cross-section of Schulzens Seele (Schulze’s Soul). At the center of critique are Wilhelm II and the militarist Prussian mind in the Weimar Republic. Grosz illuminated the anachronism in modern democratic times. Everything appeared simultaneously and dynamically, yet nothing really seemed to change.

The montage Sonniges Land (Sunny Country, 1919; fig. 163; cat. no. 131) by Grosz and Heartfield, which was used for the jacket cover of Dada siegt! (Dada Triumphs! fig. 119; cat. no. 139) by Huelsenbeck, also condensed figural quotations mainly from the conservative press, mixing Christian fairy-tale-like idylls of Gott mit uns! (God with Us) with texts from Wilhelmian war theology. In this de-montage of “black, red, and gold,” culture — the cynical spirit of the “sunny country” of the Weimar Republic — was revealed by the comparison of text to image. Johannes Baader significantly expanded this equivalent and comparative principle of combining headlines, beyond the montage Gutenberggedenkblatt (Gutenberg Memorial Sheet, 1920; fig. 46, cat. no. 153), into a huge oeuvre titled Das Handbuch des Oberdadaismus (HADO) (Handbook of Super-Dadaism, 1919–20):

“Imagine a book that consists of the Berlin newspapers of the first half year after the German Revolution,” his self-advertisement commented, “containing all papers from the Rote Fahne (Red Flag) to the Reichsbote (Imperial Messenger). The lunchtime edition of the B.Z. am Mittag (Berliner Zeitung) of August 1, 1914, is also included, paper heaped upon paper, without supplements, only the main sections with large headlines, until you have a thick book. On the title page are letters in yellow, red, and black, short sharp words, and images, tacked into and over one another, displaced, repetitive, capturing the whole Doomsday orgy like an overture in one single prelude. This book can only be compared with
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Michelangelo’s fresco in the Sistine Chapel in Rome, but in its form it does not connect past and present, but present and future. Relying merely on the exterior of image effects, it achieves a mutual polarizing dissolution of the height of passion and superior tranquility. Until there is, in striking color, the final word, the last that in the cosmic sense can be written about this world. The content shows in inexhaustible fullness the hubbub of the whole world before the eyes of him who stands above and, living, recreates it for himself and the others. Much will yet be heard and read about this book. It is the Doomsday Book HADO.⁸

Baader was staging Doomsday by making the world, “run wild” in its media spectacle, appear to be passing judgment on itself.

HADO illustrates how Baader’s apocalyptic vision of himself as prophetic “Strassenheiliger” (street saint) and “Narr in Christo” (Fool in Christ) at this juncture intersected with Dada’s aim to revolutionize art from the streets, the city and its signs, and media. In the book, the “war of the newspapers” (Baader) presented itself with its own strategies of conquest and sensation overlapping Baader’s exalted consciousness of fictitious propagandist leadership, which he concealed under the jester’s cap and bells of “Dada.” To him, “Dada” was “the creator of all things and God and global revolution and judgment day all rolled into one simultaneously.”⁹ Baader published HADO in Berlin “at the hour of signing the dictate of Versailles.”

Eight pages from HADO I were exhibited separately at the Dada-Fair of 1920 (cat. no. 159). Like no other Dadaist, Baader connected an effective public campaign with his works, as can be seen from his letters to the graphic designer Jan Tschichold of 1930. HADO was announced publicly; a “partial publication” took place during the “great Dadaist mourning soiree” in late May 1919 at the Meistersaal, Berlin, which saw Baader enter with his contribution on “politics,” placing the nearly completed book on the table in front of him and reading aloud from it (fig. 26). What is more, on July 16, 1919, as announced in the Dada-Fair catalog, HADO I was offered to the National Assembly at Weimar in the course of Baader’s anti-Weimar campaign. The catalog also ironically informs us that deputy Friedrich Naumann (1860–1919) had to die because he did not accept this present. Baader did not fail to tell Jan Tschichold that it belonged to the “most brilliant of Dada-typographical works.”

More HADOs were to follow the book-montage. At the Dada-Fair, there was a second one, HADO II: “Here the basis of the montage work was formed by one of those books that publishers have manufactured as ‘trial books,’ which in their exterior completely resemble the finished bound book, but whose insides contain merely blank white pages,” Baader wrote to Tschichold. “As far as I remember it was a medium size book with a black cover shining like leather, and partly gilt-edged.” Baader mentions several other book projects up to 1925, but in his opinion almost all of them were lost, except those remnants of HADO II, which Baader gave in 1923 as a present to Erna Hähne, his alleged fiancée from Burg Ludwigstein (fig. 45).

Baader captured the media chaos of the times in this form of simultaneous book-montage and extended the principle toward monumental assemblage: Das grosse Plasto-Dio-Dada-Drama: Deutschlands Grösse und Untergang (The Big Plasto-Dio-Dada-Drama: Germany’s Greatness and Fall at the Hands of Schoolmaster Hagendorf, or: the Fantastic Life Story of the Superdada, 1920; fig. 47; cat. no. 153), which played an important role in the Dada-Fair (see chapter VI, First International Dada-Fair). The other Dadaists mainly adhered to a montage that could still be grasped in a single image. Hausmann’s Dada im gewöhnlichen Leben (Dada Cino)
(Dada in Everyday Life [Dada Cinema], 1920; fig. 107; cat. no. 24) displays few quotations from politics. It rather stages a hybrid world combining American, mechanical, anatomical, and fashion elements with text. An advertisement for laced boots is pasted next to the cross-section of a pregnant belly carrying a fetus; on top of the belly, an ice skater is dancing. A remodeled tank with a grandstand is moving toward it (fig. 107.2) sporting the slogan *Dada siegt* (Dada Triumphs). Between the skater’s spread legs the photo-portrait of Grosz is glued, while other small portraits like those of Heartfield and Schlichter are distributed all over the montage. The reproduction of the Woolworth skyscraper (fig. 107.1) top left had been taken from the same *BIZ* page of May 2, 1920, as the Pennsylvania Hotel in Hannah Höch’s *Schnitt mit dem Küchenmesser* (fig. 130). *Cannibale* (Picabia’s magazine of 1920), *Dada siegt* (Dada Triumphs), *Meer der Theosophie* (Sea of Theosophy), “Vera American SHOE” clearly stand out from the cited photos. “r. hausmann” is giving birth to this Dada-Dandy movie-world from an energetic stream of overflowing images, suspended weightlessly without connections and apparently kept in balance merely by an arrangement of rhythmic motion.

The simultaneous procedure of Dada led Paul Citroën toward photomontage. Especially with *Metropolis* (1920; fig. 55), the Bauhaus disciple directly referred to Dada. In contrast to the Dadaists’ heterogeneous citations, Citroën attempted a montage with only a single motif: urban international buildings and skyscrapers. Adhering to Bauhaus principles of material aesthetics, which in Itten’s basic teaching related to Dada’s hylomorphic approaches, Citroën tried to organize the photographs’ accumulation and composition, their values of light and dark, in such a way that different views of houses, their various sizes and styles, created a temporal-spatial dynamic experience of perception. This organization exploded the montage and associated the gigantic growth of metropolitan cities — from Chicago to Moscow — as being one great Babel tower. Yet in contrast to the Dadaists, Citroën does not manage to increase the dynamics of the arrangement. The directional impulses do not appear intensified in their dissonances but mutually paralyzed.

The metropolitan montage also had an immediate influence on Lászlo Moholy-Nagy. He had been working with the principle of photomontage ever since the early twenties. His sketch for a film script *Dynamik der Gross-Stadt* (Urban Dynamics, 1921–22) displayed his ability to transfer Dadaist elements of simultaneous montage to cinematic montage and to intensify them by ecstatic methods of polar tensions. The camera eye unleashes a torrent of urban velocities of perception, of abruptly changing directions of the gaze, of heterogeneous impressions, vertigo of space-time experiences, spectral effects of light and dark “intensifying the institutions of civilization in the intersection and penetration of innumerable levels.” Image sequences built on contrasts, audacious pan shots, cuts, unusual angles, abysmal plunges, roller coaster rides, horizontal and vertical circular camera motions combined to create dynamic visual realities, giving artistic perception free rein. This “Typofoto” (typo-photo) produced “the assured relatedness of the smallest parts to the whole” by way of a virtual/medial “synthesis of all moments of life.” The audience was to be “actively integrated into the city’s dynamics” to partake of its ecstasy as well as of its shock effects, in order to come out of this process at the end suspended, hovering. The task here was to gain attention in distraction.

Inspired by Moholy-Nagy, Marianne Brandt began to work with photomontage in the mid-twenties, at a time when this new artistic medium was already becoming established. She still adopted Dada-specific elements, such as the dominance of the circling central element in the montage *Me* (fig. 149), around which the artist herself, Bauhaus teachers, and colleagues are dispersed: Lászlo Moholy-Nagy is standing just above her to the right; there are also Hin
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Bredendieck, Alfred Schäfer (bottom), Wolfgang Rössger (bottom left). The Bauhaus building by Gropius can be clearly recognized on the right. The lampshades Marianne Brandt designed, stacked to form a tower, in serial array, serve to structure the photomontage and eerily begin to hover. Me ambivalently denotes both the designed object one can look into toward the center, and the artist herself who is obviously canvasses the designer’s new self-conception, since she regards design as her main field of work. This new conception is not determined by the cult of personality but by identification with the serial product.

Erwin Piscator adopted the Dadaist montage-procedure and developed it for theater, using revue elements in order to find a form that would both entertain and instruct. Revue Roter Rummel (Red Fairground Revue, 1924) and Trotz alledem! (In Spite of It All! 1925) were kaleidoscopically composed presentations playing with the means of modern urban culture industry: “The [Red Fairground] Revue allowed the possibility of ‘direct activity’ on stage,” wrote Piscator, “and it did so by ruthlessly exploiting all possibilities: music, song, acrobatics, fast drawing, sports, projections, film, statistics, actors’ scene, speeches.”18 The contradictory, mixed media character of the scenes staged a montage-like form of agitation. In 1925, on the occasion of the tenth convention of the German Communist Party (KPD), Piscator together with Felix Gasbarra presented Trotz alledem! — an historical revue of the years 1917 through 1919 in twenty-four scenes with inserted films. “The whole production was one single gigantic montage of authentic speeches, essays, newspaper extracts, proclamations, handbills, photographs and films of war, of the revolution, of historical persons and scenes.”19 In addition, Piscator’s aim was what he called, together with Walter Gropius, the project of Totaltheater (total theater) that is to heighten the effect of simultaneous montage by using technically movable stage elements like removable transparent walls, elevators, projection surfaces, scrims, and conveyor belts. All these were merely means to an end, though, according to Gropius, who created the plans for this Totaltheater (1927).20 They were intended to push the spectator into the midst of what was happening on stage.

Both portrait montage and simultaneous picture/text montage characterize the Dadaist technique of simultaneous montage: portrait montage is characterized by a dominating personal image; simultaneous montage by a cumulative mixture of text and photograph.

The portrait montage places the personal image or type at the intersecting point of references, providing the coordinates to its medial appearance and serving to decipher and deconstruct the person or type represented. As real material, these citations point to their source and, alienated in the montage, to the mental and perceptual habits of the portrayed person and to his monopolization by things exploding his individuality. Anatomic cross-section and montage further create artificial hybrids whose mind and body are separated and can have different identities. This grotesque method triggers a deforming process of dissociation that questions the persons’ identity, visible in many instances, particularly in Cut with the Kitchen Knife (fig. 130). The composite worlds of the portraits expose the unity of the subject as a fiction and, in a Nietzschean sense, postulate its “multiplicity” as an experimental reality.21 The process of dissociation is interpreted in a negative way and finds a positive transvaluation as a plenitude of possibilities. “The Dadaist profits from the psychological possibility that lies in his capability to let go of his own individuality, as you let go of a lasso or let your coat flutter in the breeze. He will not be the same today as he is tomorrow, and the day after tomorrow he is perhaps ‘nothing at all,’ in order then to be ‘everything.’”22

The simultaneous picture-text montage cumulates realism with critical and grotesque elements that combine figurative clips with language: signals of words and sounds, photo-
particles, banners, phrases, news headlines, advertisements. In a deregulated manner the image-pamphlet as aggressive instrument of political and religious struggles since the Reformation appears to live on in the new mixture of text and pictorial clippings of the montage, as does the form of the emblem and its relation between *pictura*, *inscriptio*, and *subscriptio*. The old intentions of satire — injuring the opponent, uncovering his hidden intentions, exposing — or the moralistic instruction are often supplemented by a fundamental ironical sense of uncertainty: ambivalence between “everything” and “nothing.” The simultaneous montage of text and photograph represents world-abundance itself in the procedure of equivalency and interplay. It assumes a world in which nothing substantial, individual, or autonomous exists any more, since life and art are subject to technical, political, and economical conditions. Accepting the dissolution of the “principium individuationis” (Nietzsche) and admitting the chaos of reality, it acquires a new creative possibility with which to balance matters, to emancipate disharmony and discontinuity, to evoke and provoke new connections. The appearance of harmony broken up, and thought and perception are relativized. If everything exists only in relation to other things, the relationship between them becomes more important than the “thing itself.”

**“Cut Through the Times”:**

_The Chaotic World Panorama in Clips and Cross-sections_

The Berlin Dadaist’s montages of photography and text are for the most part montages, which visibly show the destructive cut and allow the viewer to participate in the annihilation of fiction. By this working-technique, professing to be very “tayloristic,” the cut introduced a moment of aggression: there was violence in the act of decomposition. The period and its people were subjected to a Dadaist surgical operation. But the montages are determined by two distinct activities: cutting and the Dionysian dimension of destruction and reorganizing the segments following aesthetic laws that result from the procedure itself and which, in simultaneous montage, Dada often intends as cross-sections.

Let us look at the first partial activity: when Grosz, in 1920, pasted his photo-portrait onto a blade in the montage _Dada-merika_ (fig. 162; cat. no. 113), he signaled his aggressive concept of art as a weapon, which he had already been sharpening in his drawings, and was now about to concretize in the Dada montages by means of the cut. Before Grosz started cutting, it had been the abstract, staccato-like line of his drawings that expressed the anatomy and selection of his gaze, a gaze he could only develop in the dissociating conditions of urban perception. The straight line accounted for the fact that the cityscape, through rationalization and industrialization, could no longer be captured in its totality; instead, it demanded a manner of representation that abandoned the continual experience of space and time, replacing it with a multidimensional network of lines and multiperspective sections of view. The linear gaze penetrated the city body, skeletonized its maze of streets, cut out segments, dissected metropolitan architectures into single views, and atomized the people within by simultaneous superimpositions. This kind of vision was based on the fast change of glances and perspectives in urban life, detective-like seeking to collect and combine evidence (cf. fig. 78, 82, 83). The same discontinuous and dissociating vision was also shaping the abstract graphics and watercolors of Höch and Hausmann, whose asymmetrical rhythms and intersections of segments and lines already anticipated the fragmentary organization of montage by dividing movements, picking them up again, focusing and breaking them. They presented more and more abstract field of tensions caused by rootless urban vision (cf. fig. 125).
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The knife made its first appearance in Grosz’s works around the time of World War I when he diagnosed metropolitan Pandémonium (Pandemonium) as a socio-pathological place in which traumas of dismemberment and slaughter gave rise to a self-annihilating civilization. The city as a haunting scene of destruction and fragmentation demonstrated that in war and in the chaos of urban conflicts man was attacked by destructive forces. These urban dramas of execution focus on the manual, aggressive stabbing rather than on the mechanical aspects of death by war machinery. They reveal the Dionysian, destructive side of life as a brute and brutal reality, plunging the city into uncivilized barbarism. War seemed to free destructive energies, which the Dadaists transformed on the battle fields of culture into symbolic aggression against art: in this battle they seemed to participate in the Dionysian principle of life: “The best and most incredible artists will be those who hourly tear the tatters of their body from the eddy of life’s cataracts, doggedly holding onto the intellect of the times, with bleeding hands and hearts.”

Destruction turned against the artist itself, against ultimate cultural ties and fictions: aesthetic beauty in particular was cut up in the form of the female as the classical muse and the traditional erotic cult object. The artist’s studio became a ritual place where the symbolic crime scene of a sex murder was staged, the knife being the corpus delicti used to dismember in order to reduce the victim to a torso (cf. fig. 77). The body was equated with the picture and its material.

Whereas in oil paintings and drawings these cuts were presented in a dramatic manner, in Dadaist montage they acquired an active part in the montage process, turning against the very work of art by violently destroying the semblance of coherence. In the act of cutting, the Dadaist isolated the objects and created new possibilities of an open allegorical sign language. The anagrammatic principle of the dismembered body corresponded to the anagrammatic structure of semantics: “Perfect skepticism makes perfect freedom possible,” wrote Hugo Ball. “When no definite conclusions can, must, or may be reached about the inner contour of an object, then it is handed over to its opposite . . . . One can almost say that when belief in an object or a cause comes to an end, this object or cause returns to chaos and becomes common property. But perhaps it is necessary to have resolutely, forcibly produced chaos and thus a complete withdrawal of faith before an entirely new edifice can be built up on a changed basis of belief.”

In Dada montage, the fragments were not left on the scene — as after a sex murder — but were reassembled anew according to an ironic combinatory concept. It is not surprising that photography could become an essential element of the Dadaist montage: in contrast to the complexity of paintings, the photograph already follows its own aesthetic principle in cutting out parts of reality. The Dadaist’s tools were his pair of scissors and his glue. Grosz regarded himself as a “paster,” and Hausmann adopted the pseudonym “Algernoon Syndeticon” after the type of adhesive he used. In the “static film” of montage, the fragments, the dismembered codes of perception, the photographs, the newspaper clippings, and the documents were transferred into new contexts. The aim was no longer harmony, but to achieve an “anthropogenesis of dissonance” in which the Dionysian and Apollinian elements were brought into a Dadaist balance of powers.

A condensed technique of combining the dismembered segments of reality developed in the cross-section of the simultaneous montages as characteristics of Dada. The operative procedure, the anatomist’s view of current events, and the decision to make the selection capture if possible “everything” brought the montage into a constant state of incompleteness, presenting a temporary cross-section. Multi-layered and ambiguous, it revealed the heterogeneous plenitude of appearances and incited the dispersed fragments toward possible transgressions: Hannah Höch in Schnitt mit dem Küchenmesser (Cut with the Kitchen Knife, 1919–20; fig. 130), Baader in
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HADO (1919). In Germania ohne Hemd (Germania Shirtless; fig. 84) and Sonniges Land (Sunny Country; fig. 163), Grosz, respectively Grosz and Heartfield together presented a cross-section of Schulzens Seele (Schulze’s Soul). In the montages Das Pneuma umreist die Welt (The Pneuma Travels around the World, 1920; fig. 116) and Leben und Treiben in Universal-City, 12 Uhr 5 mittags (Life and Bustle in Universal City, 12:05 Noon, 1920; fig. 117), they captured the aggressive simultaneity of the complex metropolitan sphere as shaped by culture industry and interspersed with fashionable Americanisms. Programmatically, Hausmann titled one of his comprehensively critical essays Schnitt durch die Zeit (Cut through the Times, 1919). In early 1918 Grosz even saw the “futurist soirees” as “a turbulent cross-section of April nights.” The cross-section also entered graphical works. Querschnitt (Platin & Co) (Cross-Section [Platin & Co], 1919–20; fig. 83) is Grosz’s title of a drawing, which combined many political motifs and social types he had earlier caricatured in single drawings: the matchbook seller, the bourgeois, the war cripple, the proletarian, the prostitute, and repeatedly, military ranks surrounded by urban buildings and advertising. Grosz created his pictorial broadsheets from the impression of the contradictory social dynamics, mediated to him by city life:

My aim is [to represent] this thousand fold coincidence of the most banal today — how hard it may be to render the bustle on a turbulent road, the fabulous motions of the formats, such as people, their machines, animals, trees in bloom, sky-blue or gray – whistles near the station, rattling automobiles, whirring propellers (there is a Gotha hanging above you in the sky!). The fairy-tale forest of all the company signs, i.e. even straight and most matter-of-fact advertising — a terrain covered by tracks of any kind, people and more people, specimens of all races.

In his drawings of 1916 and 1917 Grosz prepared the Dadaist cross-section: the section of Berlin apartment blocks with different scenes of social life exposing the unsolved problems of society. Later on he expanded these sections through a building to include its surroundings, especially the metropolitan street. Widmung an Oskar Panizza (Dedication to Oskar Panizza, 1917–18; fig. 78), one of the first of his large paintings, achieves a cross-section-like synthesis in sight of the abyss. This concept also inspired Griebel to his satirical pencil drawing Ein Stück Europäischer Kulturaufszchnitt (Made in Germany) (Pieces of European Cultural Cold Cuts (Made in Germany), 1922; fig. 72). He dissected postwar society, compiling — as Grosz did — typical physiognomies of all classes from the feasting, avaricious, militant bourgeois to the unemployed lower classes, poor and starving, expelled as war cripples. Whereas in the Dada-works dynamic fundamental activity is added to the cross-sections, the structure of Griebel’s Cultural Cold Cuts appears static and contradictory. Even in overlapping sections every figure maintains its characteristic contours without hidden movement within.

Not only in their cited images, but also in the movement of single elements and their arrangement, Dada montages displayed a specifically anatomical, dissecting view influenced by the medium of film. As early as 1917, Grosz proposed a “caricatured world chronicle” to UFA, for which at the time he was producing two “Propaganda” films in collaboration with Heartfield. The plan was to make one cross-section of the times each month. The title of Hannah Höch’s first photomontage, Dada Rundschau (Dada Review, 1919; fig. 129), seemed like the first step on the way toward a Dadaist “newsreel.”
The cross-section was to make the form and content of life coincide. The cut revealed the chaos of society, a chaos that was balanced and structured in the montage. Life was not to be violated by attitudes, as for example by the “ordering, self-realizing force of our mind” (Pinthus) or in “sense of form” (Schlemmer). In the cross-section, rather chance, disharmony, polarity, decenteredness, and dissociation as immediate expressions of life determined the artistic system of the montage. Here, the fluctuating surface of photomontage and tragic, Dionysian depth of world events formed a polar tension. Programmatically, this illustrates how the technique of equivalence led the Dadaist to abandon the traditional ordering of facts in a hierarchy of values, and to create the simultaneous representation of life with the new materials. For reality was not a priori structured according to preferences or according to units, identities, or causal relations. The cross-section was an optical equivalent of the paratactic style very frequent in Dadaist poetry and song, depicting reality as a disconnected, simultaneous mixture of the most diverse levels, language formations, and habits, from chat via press items to grotesque images.

Cross-section and indifference stood in a conceptual Dadaist relation. Creatively indifferent, the Dadaist placed himself at the point where polar references to reality intersected, for the “indifferent subject,” according to Friedländer, was “the autocrat who rules over all differentiated forces by equilibration.” The indifferention in the cross-section was not aiming at a leveling reduction of content; rather, at the “counterbalancing” multiplicity and Dionysian formlessness of chaos by the Apollinian: “You must be synaesthetized, world-identical, devoid of difference in your innermost in order to make all differences mutually sensible to one another.” The contingency of montage was made more complex with the help of creative indifference. The cross-section as Dionysian-Apollinian synthesis of polar disparities could be regarded as the “American side of Buddhism.”

The Dadaists were at one with other contemporary avant-garde movements in their attempt to desubjectify: futurism demanded the “wireless imagination” and “simultaneity” as essential elements of a futurist sensibility, surrealism conceived the artist as a “recording device” that, through the automatism of “photographic thinking”, extinguished aesthetic and moral restraints. While surrealism liberated the poetic powers of the unconscious, the futurist abandoned himself completely to the appearances of objects. Compared with these movements, a skeptical attentiveness and a heightened tension in the dissemination of the simultaneous determined the Dadaist’s indifferent, polarizing approach.

“Catchphrase and Cliché as a Century’s Foundations”: Dada and the Press

The Berlin Dadaists recognized that the Weimar Republic was on the verge of turning into a media society. As avant-gardists of simultaneity, they used mass media as an appropriate platform from which to launch their attack upon traditional artistic media. They used the media as material for their grotesque play with reality and took advantage of the mechanisms of public reaction to enhance the effect of their work. The beginning shift in perception as a result of the sensationalism and manipulation of the media was met by a subversive critique. At the same time, however, they made their fictional possibilities into their own.

In his manifesto Letzte Lockerung (Last Loosening, 1920), Walter Serner ironically recommended: “Read the political section of newspapers from time to time so that these comedies of comedies may inspire you to comedies — to comedies.” The new images provided by the media, their effect and perception, their mechanisms of distribution and strategies of
implementation entered Dada’s skeptical field of vision. In magazines and newspapers, even in catalogs from industry to fashion, we encounter a prefabricated perception that presented a challenge to Dadaist montage. For it was determined by the material provided by the media and by the new manner of reading and perceiving. The Dadaists would critically condense the flood of illustrations with which magazines swamped the early twenties, their tiny bits of information, their mixture of texts and pictures, and the many portrait photographs into a universal ironic parody and grotesque of the media of the times.

Marginalized by the media, the artists tried to unhinge these illustrations by strategic acts of subversion, using the media’s own statements and picture material. The press photograph as a reproducible image of reality, the headline, the catchphrase treating language as a prefabricated political commodity, these were starting points for their work because only against this background, which would have been familiar to readers, could they weigh their displacement, distortion, and disfigurement. The Berlin montage technique cannot be isolated from the public, political role of the press, in particular of the Berliner Illustrierte Zeitung (BIZ). Wieland Herfelde programmatically declared in the introduction to the catalog of the Dada-Fair: “The Dadaists recognize as their only program the duty to use contemporary events as contents of their art, both with regard to time and space. This is why they do not see the source of their production in Tausend und eine Nacht (Arabian Nights) or Bilder aus Hinterindien (Images of Farther India) but in the illustrated newspaper and the press editorial.”35 With this attitude Dada encouraged a new self-understanding of artists and writers who, in the twenties, employed high sensitivity for their new techniques of production, communication, and transport for their topical creativity in order to operatively intervene in everyday life. This new activity testified to their knowledge of the drastic developments taking place in the media industry, affecting both perception and consciousness and the effects of these developments on society and culture at large. Culture was no longer an unchanging superstructure but a time-bound process of production in the here and now.

With the topical press photograph the artists were processing one of the fastest media of their time. The BIZ developed photography into a form of journalism that increasingly came to replace text reportage, photography appearing to convey to the reader the authenticity of events. Magazine photography became the cornerstone of a media industry, which trusted more and more in optical impressions. Press photography, as instantaneous photography, had to capture a situation at its climax. It had to be effective even at a casual glance. These were the initial conditions of press photography and the photo report. In the end, for the BIZ the visual appeal of the subject matter, more than its importance, determined its choice of a photograph. The magazine relied on the sensational, on submitting “what is new, time and again new” in order to ensure their mass distribution.36

In 1924, Mehring wrote an “aria” on the lust for sensation that characterized the “Grosse Hure Presse” (Great Whore Press):

Whoever can read
Is enthralled by my charms.
Whoever wants to be somebody
Is chasing me.
I keep records of everyone, whatever happens,
Be it a murder or a poem, which the brute has committed.
Sin gives the creeps to the country bumpkin,
And the pale-faced artist is trembling with fear of the critic; 
So is the politician, afraid I might detect his weak spots, 
For I expose the underwear of politics. 
Spicy stories and naughty scandals search for circulation, 
Till the news has been spread all over the globe! 
Thus everyday my child, the newspaper, appears, 
Dressed up in black and white, with innocent makeup. 
A turmoil is in the streets. 
And then, out of the blue, 
Crashes the thunder of rumor: 
EXTRA EDITION! EXTRA EDITION!
And an avalanche of paper 
Swells from the rotary machine 
From the ever growing letters! 
And there’s a whisper 
Lecherous from curiosity: 
What is it I may be hiding? 
Sheet by sheet, 
The mass of sensations is revealed – 
I, Madame Press, bring it to the light!

The “Whore Press” entered into a powerful symbiosis with the rotary machine. Commerce, sensation, and intrigue determined her seductive nature without interest in exploring either causes or effects. Next to film, the magazine advanced into a prime entertainment medium. Conceived for mass consumption, its sensational photo reports were directed at visual diversion. The development from illustrated text to photo report required the new profession of photojournalist (fig. 2.7). It was he who performed the primary act of perception, which he preserved for the reader in the form of photography. He fought for recognition as a serious, uncompromising chronicler: “Illustrative photography is the contemporary cosmopolitan’s microscope.”

The Dadaists reacted with distance, skepticism, and admiration. The unheard-of expansion of popular knowledge, predominantly visual, brought along by the possibilities of the photojournalist fascinated them as did the enormous influence that the big newspaper, as a synthesis of one global day, had on the psyche – as the Futurists had already recognized – instigating a new sense of living in the world. Yet they also knew that the mass of sensations offered was harboring a moment of self-annihilation, and that the process of perceptual change was accompanied by a loss of reality that produced, as the new type of a media society, the “fictional man only reproducing public opinion” (Nietzsche). Dada’s critique of the media caricatured urban man as a product of the press, thereby referring to Nietzsche’s critique and to that of Franz Blei and Karl Kraus:

Everything happens that is in the papers, for nothing would be happening in this bourgeois world if nothing appeared in the papers: no action, feeling, thought, desire or ambition of this disintegrated world would exist without the press, for man now is the press. All his opinions from the start are public opinions; his judgments are common judgment from the beginning; by reading the paper he
takes stock of himself. Quoting the paper, he is quoting himself. Karl Kraus has described this “modern” man on thousands of pages, doing nothing other than describing the press: but this “modern” man has become the press so completely that he believes the concern was about newspapers only.\textsuperscript{39}

Under the influence of press and photography, reality was now about to conform and to adapt to the demands of magazine photography — to become photogenic. This development was further intensified in the twenties: “We must realize that in our conventional lifestyle and its naturalist understanding we are only surrounding ourselves with fossilized, lifeless imitations, with clichés of real life created by habit, smugness, and thoughtlessness,” wrote Hausmann, who criticized the “watering down,” both linguistic and visual, of the media, especially the lack of vigor in instantaneous photography, which he compared to the abbreviated, stenographic forms of casual speech.\textsuperscript{40} His critique was confirmed in 1927 by Siegfried Kracauer, who regarded the “institution of magazines as one of the most powerful means of impeding knowledge in the hands of the ruling society.” “The purpose of successfully carrying out this impediment is served not least by the vivid arrangement of pictures. Side by side, they systematically exclude the context that otherwise is self-apparent. The ‘image idea’ expels the idea itself; the blizzard of photographs betrays the indifference toward the subject matter and its intentions.” \textsuperscript{41}

Montage as Dadaist media critique mirrored this disintegrating reality that was losing its hold on itself. Dada was to intervene both in the inflationary status of perceptions and their restructuring through the media. In the multiplicity of montage, its disparate, ever fluctuating, simultaneous surface, Dada reacted critically toward the exteriorized, fragmented sign language of the media. By alienating signs and grotesquely relativizing them, the artists fundamentally counteracted the magazines’ claim to authenticity. Their play with polyvalence was the Dadaists’ response to the stratagems of the press. It was material and subject for Dada and in the end became a fictitious plaything for Dadaist actions and their strategies of persiflage and exposure. The Superdada launched his exaggerated claims and ideas, reported his Dada death, demanded the Nobel Prize for his “eight world-sentences”, searched for his lost “397 secret files of Dadaism” with the help of the press, and announced the foundation of his “Intertellurian Academy” in Potsdam.\textsuperscript{42} Huelsenbeck, Hausmann, and Golschheff published their Dada manifesto “Was ist der Dadaismus und was will er in Deutschland?” (What Is Dadaism and What Does It Want in Germany?) in a large number of newspapers, so that it appeared in the Kölner Tageblatt (June 16, 1919), in the Ostpreußische Zeitung in Königsberg (February 22, 1920), the Münchner Neueste Nachrichten (February 12, 1920), and the Berner Tagblatt (March 17, 1920). Public Dada events were also announced by misleading press releases.\textsuperscript{43} Media presence became a factor for the movement, in the provocative sense of scandal.

The artists thought of scandal as their only way to “success.” Outrage formed a crucial part of the calculated game, which they played with the public. On September 20, 1920, a certain Dr. Frosch writing in Die Welt am Montag, Berlin, noted about Dada’s advertising strategy:

What is “Dada”? It is the art of becoming the talk of all cultivated philistines without mental exertion, and of gaining a more or less substantial income thereby. Take a pair of scissors and blindly cut out words and bits of words from any kind of printed matter — it may be a newspaper, a catalog of Wertheim’s, a trash novel or “Faust” — and paste them side by side according to some scheme: there’s your Dadaist poem. You will experience the joy of seeing it immediately reprinted in at
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least a hundred newspapers; granted, with a scornful flourish added or even a lament on the depravity of modern literature, but printed nonetheless, and if this happens repeatedly, your name will be familiar to everybody who reads printed matter. Nail a slice of bread onto a baking-tin, squirt some nasal mucus and a few blotches of paint next to it, add six burned matches with glue: there’s your Dadaist painting. Perhaps it is even a “Merz” work. And you will experience the joy of seeing distinguished critics, used to casting but a quick glance at one painting in a hundred, now eyeing this work thoroughly and venting their anger in their paper. With the speed of wings, the paper will spread far and wide the news of your existence. Bestow upon yourself, for no specific reason, the title World-Dada, Super-Dada, Tweedledum-Dada or What’s-Eating-Me-Dada, and your act of self-appointment is going to be published wherever people speak German, with exactly the same promptness as if you had been appointed chancellor of the Reich or awarded with the Nobel Prize.

The Dadaists’ stance toward the press was ambivalent. Dada’s advocacy of “life” required leaving privacy and embracing the public. Playing an ironical and offensive game, Dada tried to take the bourgeois’s medium away from him: by subversive announcements, bulletins, notices of activities, false reports, detailed accounts of its journeys and happenings, sensational advertisements, until Dada itself was infiltrated and intoxicated by publicity and sensation. Conversely, though, above all by adopting well-known techniques of the press for their art — the photograph as political quotation, the mixture of texts and pictures, the dynamized structure of montage — the Dadaists intended to question fundamentally the restructuring of perception inflicted by press sensationalism, using its own means. If the press engaged in the construction of illusions, Dada engaged in their disturbance and destruction. If the press engaged in the leveling of language, then Dada engaged in its disintegration.

“Wanted”:
Selection and Alienation of the Photographs and Headlines

The Swiss group of Dadaists tried to explode “the dreary, lame, empty language of men in society” with the principle of chance. Tzara recommended the following recipe:

Take a newspaper. Take a pair of scissors. Choose an article in the newspaper of the length, which you expect to give to your poem. Then cut out the article. Carefully cut out the words that make up the article and put them in a sack. Gently shake. Then take out each cutting, one after the other. Copy the words conscientiously in the order in which they were drawn from the sack. The resulting collection will be your poem.

The cuts and stochastic techniques made the “immense beams and clapboards of terms” (Nietzsche) collapse. They initiated artistic processes of deregulation, which permitted a new freedom of language. Hans Arp followed a comparable principle of chance: “Words, slogans, phrases that I selected from newspapers, particularly from their advertising section, formed the
basis of my poetry in 1917. Often I would close my eyes and pick out words and phrases in the papers by marking them in pencil. This is the way the poem “Weltwunder” [“Wonders of the World”] came about. I called these poems “Arpaden” [“Arpades”]: “Wonders of the world send card immediately here is a part of the pig all 12 parts combined pasted flat are to yield the clear lateral shape of a cut-out sheet amazed cheap everything buys no. 2 the bandit effective security apparatus useful and funny made of hardwood with banging mechanism.” The arbitrary combination created a unity in which the words’ contents jarred but did not form any thematic or syntactic coherence. Arp saw these poems as precursors to his papiers déchirés, his “torn pictures.” In these, reality and chance could unfold without hindrance along the lines of his imagination and according to new, unforeseeable “laws.”

In contrast to Dada Zurich, the Berlin Dadaists intended not to leave the deregulation of journalistic language and photo documentation exclusively to the artistry of chance. They followed the media spectacle with an intense speed of reaction. It was also a question of revealing the nature of the manipulation of word and picture by the press. A preliminary, specifically literary form of the Berlin montage principle was to be found in the column “Ich schneide die Zeit aus” (I’m Cutting Out Time, 1915–18) of Die Aktion, a weekly magazine on politics, literature, and the arts. The text montage placed quotations of war reports, propaganda, and literary and official comments in a contradictory arrangement. This made possible a subliminal critique of the propaganda hype of Word War I and an exposure of its contradictions. From this same purpose Karl Kraus developed the citational montages culminating in Die letzten Tage der Menschheit (The Last Days of Mankind, 1918–1919), which first were published in special editions of Die Fackel. As early as 1914, Kraus had recognized: “My task was to put the times in quotation marks, to have it distort itself in print and placed in parentheses, knowing that what was most unspeakable about it could only be said by itself. Not to proclaim but to repeat the state of the matter, to imitate the appearance of things, to quote and to take photographs, and to recognize catchphrase and cliché as the bases of a century.”

With the Berlin Dadaists, the media reality itself was to have its say in both word and picture. It was characteristic of Dada Berlin that the quotation remained identifiable and legible. The reality of demonstrable facts, even if decomposed, deformed, and disfigured remained their point of reference. The new and alienating context in which the citations were inserted was not to extinguish its memory but on the contrary to present glimpses of its old meaning behind the new contexts. The citational and montage aspects of text and images was pulled into a network of allusions inciting reflection, challenging, and activating judgments, setting the world in motion and penetrating into political spaces of action. “The alienation of photography . . . and the free use of its reality segments for political attack, that was the new Berlin dimension,” knew Hans Richter. Alienation was necessary to offer those contemporaries who had exchanged their view of reality for the commercialized perception of the media a renewed access to agency and responsibility. The combinatory, assembling force of irony and the Dadaist play with media worlds — fashion, ideology, language, visual culture — enabled them to reach those dimensions that allowed the “real” to be perceived and the familiar to be recognized for what it was.

As the press photographer was no longer able to point out the guilt of the guilty parties, Dadaist photomontage had to reactivate an investigative perception. The montages Dada Rundschau (Dada Review, 1919; fig. 129) and Schnitt mit dem Küchenmesser (Cut with the Kitchen Knife, 1919–20; fig. 130) for example resemble a collection of criminal evidence, each photo like a potential warrant of arrest. By the act of selection, Hannah Höch identified the perpetrators who were otherwise concealed in the mass of photographs of the magazines. Their
multitude in magazines can be compared to the crowd that hides the fugitive criminal. According to this principle, does not Wilhelm II in the *Kitchen Knife* montage become a picture puzzle, venturing only a one-eyed squint out of a cumulative human hiding-place? The Dadaist who assembles a photomontage can be understood as a detective-hunter who, though from a distance, meddles with the actual, the criminal, the sensational. Sherlock Holmes appears as a metropolitan type at the center of the montage *Leben und Treiben in Universal-City, 12 Uhr 5 mittags* (Life and Bustle in Universal City, 12:05 Noon, 1920; fig. 117), a reminder of the fact that according to Walter Benjamin the detective story as a new literary genre was born at the same moment when photography was for the first time able to capture traces of a person.

Höch stands out among other Berlin Dadaists as an especially avid collector of small “wanted” photographs from magazines. She seemed to have compiled a file of numerous clippings for her montages, which constituted an encyclopedic survey of her times, mainly taken from the *BIZ* published between 1915 and 1920 with emphasis on clippings from the last two years most frequent in *Schnitt mit dem Küchenmesser* (fig. 130). Raoul Hausmann also from time to time used her material, as can be seen from *BIZ* clippings in *Dada im gewöhnlichen Leben (Dada Cino)* (Dada in Everyday Life [Dada Cinema], 1920; fig. 107.1 and 107.2). Grosz in his first photomontage was challenged by the personality cult that had only become possible through mass media access to photography. That is why his question *Wer ist der Schönste?* (Who is the Most Beautiful? fig. 80) alludes to the complacent marketing of political celebrities: their portraits were placed on a ladies’ fan so as to associate their parvenu politics with the demimonde of show business and honky-tonk. In the new Vanity Fair of images, politicians, film actors, and vaudeville girls seemed equally attractive alongside other sensations in the marketplace of magazines. Newspaper fame was the new criterion of magazine photography, as dismantled by Dada. The Berlin Dadaists were the first to use photomontage in order to present the powerful interplay of media and politics as one of the most incisive developments in this age of change.

With their satirical and grotesque distortion of personalities, the Berlin Dadaists questioned social hierarchy, the classification of social mimicry. Opposing the fixed role behavior of the pretensions of society as represented by the historic personalities, Dada advocated the ironical play with identities, the protean *gestalt* of continual departure, and the adventure of destiny. Marcel Duchamp with his *Ready-made rectifié Wanted / $2,000 Reward* (1923) showed the multiplicity of artistic identities by distorting a warrant of arrest: he pasted his passport photograph (both frontal and in profile) onto a poster searching for a criminal who was using various pseudonyms and lived with fluctuating identities. The subject as “multiplicity” (Nietzsche) — no longer a conscious autonomous unit structured around and controlled from a center — led Duchamp toward connections between artist and “criminal”: both destroy bourgeois ideas of identity. The passport photo as an authentic document is exposed as a fiction. In 1921, Duchamp had disguised himself into *Rrose Sélavy*, a femme fatale photographed by Man Ray. Moreover, in the portrait photograph of Tatlin, Hausmann opened up a field of associations without directly representing him (fig. 109). He and Baader played with changing identities by exchanging their portraits and names on the postcard “Ange” (Angel; fig. 19).

“Germania Shirtless”:
The Combination of Text and Picture
The interpenetrating of language and figure superseded the traditional relation of word and image that had mostly been determined by captions. Dada Berlin introduced the satirical distortion of political citations to montage, as is documented particularly well by Sonniges Land (Sunny Country, 1919; fig. 163) by Grosz and Heartfield, Herr Krause (1919; fig. 165.3), Germania ohne Hemd (Germania Shirtless, 1919; fig. 84), Das Geheimnisvollste und Unerklärlchste, was je gezeigt wurde (The Most Enigmatic and Inexplicable that has Ever been Shown, 1919; fig. 42) by Grosz, Dada Rundschau (Dada Review, 1919; fig. 129) by Höch, Baader’s HADO (Handbook of the Superdada; fig. 45) and Griebel’s Dadaistisches Selbstbildnis (Dada-Selfportrait, 1920; fig. 73). In most cases, the clipped piece of text has an immediately unmasking or ironical function in relation to a reproduction, above all to political photo-portraits. The viewer is asked to read and relate the texts to the photographic clippings. In Germania ohne Hemd (fig. 84), Wilhelm II appears on the left-hand side in civilian dress, wearing a top hat. Onto his shoulders are pasted wafers ironically displaying the angel of peace, while he is surrounded by slogans like Rettet die Ehre (Rescue honor), Respekt vor Gesetz und Staat (Respect law and state), Stirb und werde (Die and become). There is also a reminder of the alten Helden vom Skagerak (old heroes of the Skagerak) and an unmasking citation Judenpogrom (Pogrom houses) and in larger letters Heimatglocken (Bells of home). Top right, sitting next to a grave, is a headless woman with her arms akimbo, allegorizing Die junge Kunst (Young art). Clippings and hints of the old “Anton” von Bismarck (bottom right) are not lacking in this wartime panoply, nor is an advertisement of the Dörflinger-Bein, bestes Kunstbein der Welt (Dörflinger leg, the world’s best artificial leg). As an allegory of stupidity a monkey is depicted with the Iron Cross and a soldier’s cap. Into the monkey’s mouth Grosz inserted the dubious slogan, “Germany is now the most democratic and peaceful state in the world.” Opposite him we see a photo of soldiers marching. A Prussian infantryman immediately confronts him with a spiked helmet. A text reading Germania ohne Hemd (Germania Shirtless) ironically is placed above the monkey, and above that a general’s bust — beheaded, corpulent, in a uniform covered by decorations, out of whose throat is looking an angel of peace as “the new-born babe.” The montage displays clippings from daily papers whose mixture produces a grotesque effect: “M. Kempinski,” Massenmord (Mass murder), “Noske in Potsdam,” Blasenschwäche (Incontinence), next to the clippings Triumph der Wissenschaft (Triumph of science), Hautjucken (Itching of the skin), FOX-Troici, Auf Goethes Pfaden (On Goethe’s tracks). The power of the military as a state within the state and, what is more, the consent of a largely reactionary public — stupid as monkeys — were threatening the unstable democracy. Its stupidity rested in the public’s readiness to be gullible by ideological slogans — an insight in danger to be lost in the media kaleidoscope of everyday life.

In Grosz’s work especially, such as his Gott mit uns (God for Us, 1920; fig. 79.1–79.9) already the title has an unmasking function because its heading clashes with the content of the image. Reality is confronted with contradictory hypocritical slogans, as in Licht und Luft dem Proletariat (Light and Air to the Proletariat; or, The Workman’s Holiday, 1919; fig. 79.4), Die vollendete Demokratie (“The World Made Safe for Democracy”; fig. 79.7). It was the political truth that unmasked the title — namely the imprisonment of workers in revolt, their poverty and their unjustified execution by order of a court martial.

Heartfield also adopted this revelatory contradiction of image and title for a photograph of soldiers killed in action. Published in Die Pleite (The Bankruptcy; vol. 6, 1920), he gave it the cynical title Hindenburg-Frühstück (Hindenburg Breakfast), at the time a favorite meal in
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restaurants. Moreover, the montage titles were often inserted as part of the image process, as in Grosz’s *Germania ohne Hemd* (Germany Shirtless, 1919; fig. 84) and in the *Kitchen Knife* montage (1919–20; fig. 130). The latter’s caption was cut out of the catalog to the First International Dada-Fair of 1920 and inserted bottom left into the painting of a mass event: “20 Hannchen Höch: Schnitt mit dem Küchenmesser Dada durch die letzte weimarer Bierbauchkulturepoche Deutschlands.” The text is political and emblematic; it is also a part of the composition. As the cross-section of this montage plays with the mix of semantic levels, the inscription again takes up this principle. Höch amalgamated verbal fragments of diverse origins with elements of contemporary history. The result is a grotesque, associative compilation, pithy in its brevity — a well “decided mixture” (Hausmann).

By inserting linguistic elements — letters, syllables, words, sentences, texts — presented in a great variety of designs, sizes, and styles from advertising and headlines to signets, trademarks, captions, and newspapers, the montages incorporated a second semiological system that changed the viewer into a reader. Visual perception and verbal processes were linked to one another. The integration of language into the montage, particularly the many Dada signs and Dada variants, indicated at the same time that alongside works of art actions, manifestos, statements, pamphlets, magazines, notes, essays, and poems were also necessary ingredients in the Dada movement. Photomontage, bordering on film, induced a transgression of genre boundaries, resulting from the integration of language-components: language in the montage, as an iconoclastic element, discredited the purist concept of “pictorial image” and opened up its dimensions toward the “speaking image” and “static film” (Hausmann).

This dissolution of artistic genres, provoked by the integration of language, referred back to cubist and futurist combinations of text and image. Simultaneous montage using textual and pictorial quotations took part in a gradual “lingualization” of art and “iconization” of language, which had been in progress since 1910. Images transformed into semiotic icons; characters entered configurations of images. These processes of dissolution reflected the avant-garde’s attempt to react to a differentiated society with the complexity of creative work in multi-media arrangements. In Boccioni’s exemplary formulation, “No fear is more stupid than that of transgressing the limits of an artistic genre we are working in. There is no painting, sculpture, music, poetry. There is only creative activity!”50 Futurism already used language as a semantically alienating, pictorial element inserting it into the row of art-indifferent real materials: paper, wood, metals, fabric, leather, glue, oilcloth, glass, twine, consonants, vowels, numbers. Severini’s intention was, by integrating language and by “using onomatopoetic signs, liberated words, and every possible kind of material . . . to enhance realism.”51 Especially Carrà, in his *Manifestation on Entering the War* (1914), created through the integration of words an appellative level of language reminiscent of newspaper strategies. Simultaneity suggested a synthesis of reality and futurist worldview. Similar to the headline in newspapers and advertising, he used different types, fonts, and colors to intensify expression. They were dispersed vectorially so that deformations, fragments, accumulations of vowels produced an inflation of types, thereby pushing the energetic turbulence of words as “free expressive orthography” (Marinetti) to the limits of legibility. The cubists in 1913 first integrated language in their collages as a new stimulus from everyday reality, the world of business and of firms, of posters, billboards, and the newspaper.52 The word inserted most often into cubist simultaneous views of a still life was “journal.”

The Dadaist use of language in montage had many facets: linguistic elements were a means for the self-reflection of art as well as the reflection of the surrounding world. The
mixture of text and photography mirrored the pictorial and textual structuring of illustrated magazines and modern experiences of rupture and shock; it reflected the rapid changes of information, images, and the increasing semiotization of urban streets by traffic signs, billboards, advertising pillars, newsstands. Just as they did in the hustle and bustle of metropolitan life, texts appeared in the montages directly as sound, verbal compound, or complex sentence structure. As early as 1917, Heartfield transformed Grosz’s impression as “someone rolling along in a banging city railway train” into a new vital and colorful aesthetics of typed characters in the weekly edition of *Neue Jugend* (fig. 40, 114). This verbal power, combined with effective typography, incited both artists to the slogan for their “promotional consultation”: “Verbal advertising beats image advertising.”

53 The title pages of Dada magazines show how the handling of text and image was gradually revolutionized from experiments with numbers and letters to the penetration of semiotic and photographic quotations (fig. 36–39).

This artistic handling of language was stimulated by skepticism with regard to its loss of significance, as the Swiss Dadaist Hugo Ball proclaimed:

The word has been abandoned; it used to dwell among us.
The word has become commodity.
The word should be left alone.
The word has lost all dignity.  

54 The voluminous *HADO* (Handbook of Super-Dada, 1919) compiled from newspaper materials, predominantly from the front pages of newspapers and their headlines, expanded into a comprehensive literary montage. It was the powerful, obsessive impression of journalistic language that led Baader to claim that World War I had been a “War of Newspapers,” which never took place in reality. In the cumulative compression of language, *HADO* signaled the unfinished and unfinishable state of a development that began with *Germania ohne Hemd* (1919).

The arrangement of text clippings in Hannah Höch’s montage *Schnitt mit dem Küchenmesser* (Cut with the Kitchen Knife, 1919–20; fig. 130) are unequaled among the Dada montages with regard to variability and functions. They appear in various fonts, types, sizes, and in multi-shaped forms tied up in appellative sentence structures, as single words or compounds, as vowels and consonants, and as elements of language applied to things. Their different intensities and uses as signs created a temporally divergent dimension of its own, both visual and phonetic.

In critical, ironic refraction, Dada montages mirror the semiotization of metropolitan life. The textual and semiotic quotations, which were to be interpreted in the context of the pictorial elements, constituted also a completely autonomous semantic level. Beyond the montages text and image determined whole experiential installations — like the *First International Dada-Fair* or the ateliers of the Dadaists, for example Grosz’s studio or Baader’s home.

“Annihilation of all Absolute Values”:
**Convergence of Scientific and Aesthetic Perception**

The portrait of Albert Einstein in the *Kitchen Knife* montage (fig. 130) was clipped from the title page of *BIZ* (December 14, 1919, no. 50; fig. 130.2). The original text to this portrait photography read: “A new great man in world history: Albert Einstein, whose research constitutes a complete revolution of our thinking about nature and is equivalent to the findings of

The montage reflects the portrait’s publicity effect for the scientist while his research results were hardly intelligible to the general public. Einstein’s success was celebrated by a society that, after the lost war and in the face of economic breakdown and social unrest, began once more to gauge its self-confidence by the measure of scientific progress. After the war was lost, one liked to believe in the invincible national power of the natural sciences. Relativity became a popular phrase, Einstein was a newspaper celebrity, and a gigantic “relativity buzz” developed after 1920 — above all in Berlin where Einstein had been appointed director of the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut für Physik (Emperor William Institute for Physics) in 1913.

The Dadaists could integrate Einstein’s whole personality into their cultural revolt. Einstein immediately entered the Dadaist circle by applauding the foundation of the *Neue Jugend* by a letter of support. An extract was printed in the two-page advertisement of the *Almanach der Neuen Jugend auf das Jahr 1917* (Almanac of New Youth for the Year 1917):

> Your enterprise is of great interest to me, like any effort that may serve the purpose of international understanding. I am convinced that the cultural height of Europe can only be maintained if a political organization is established, which has the power to make war on European ground unnecessary, even impossible. In order to reach this most crucial aim, it is necessary to revive the mutual understanding of different nations, which has been so severely damaged by the events of recent years and to take more diligent care of it than before the fatal war. May your work happily overcome the difficulties of birth and take fruitful effect!

It was not only Einstein’s cultural commitment and democratic consciousness that the Dadaists appreciated; their aim after the cultural breakdown and after the dissolution of norms of value and truth was to integrate the non-artistic realm of science into their concepts, and to reflect its revolutionizing results in their own skeptical and productive way. Within the avant-garde, an interest in science had already been prepared. It made an outside view of their own situation possible, liberating them from the traditional fetters of art. Marinetti for example was fascinated by the autonomous dynamics of matter. According to him “its capabilities of compression and expansion, of cohesion and dissolution, its mass swarms of molecules and swirling electrons” were accessible only to the a-syntactical poet “who made use of isolated words,” freeing himself of leaden logics and the “psychology of man.” Max Ernst took his inspiration for many surprising collages mainly from the new ways of seeing, mediated by instruments, in anatomy, botany, astronomy, microscopy, and in technical diagrams as a trans-optic reality. Influenced by the cubists, Duchamp skeptically and ironically referred to the results of para-scientific speculation. Hugo Ball in 1917 noted the revolutionizing impact of the theory of relativity on Dada: “As philosophy redeemed the minds of illusion, physics redeemed the bodies.” The theory of relativity broke with traditional physics and classical mechanics by questioning previously stable quantities of space, time, and motion — just as Dada, in Ball’s view, broke “with the tradition of a thousand years.” As Ernst Bloch saw it, these revolutions were based on certain historical and economic conditions. Bloch points to the “connection of the unsteady quantum world, of non-Euclidean relativity and field theory to civil slackening and conceptual crisis.”
Dada Berlin’s montage appears as an aesthetic reaction to the revolutionizing worldview of the theory of relativity: the new concept of atoms as energy, the universe as an amorphous continuum subject to constant transformation, the negation of absolutes, the relative relatedness of space and time. The empirical world no longer had stable reference points. Dadaist montage turns these scientific phenomena into an energetic parable and seems to ask, “What is Dada? . . . is Dada real energy?”

In the *Kitchen Knife* montage, Albert Einstein’s portrait (fig. 130.2), in his pensive, melancholy gesture as “the intellect of the age” is striking. The microscopic enhancement of an earwig (fig. 130.3) signals a trans-optic, scientific manner of seeing. Above his head was mounted a steam engine and above this a block and pulley — machine elements referring to physics: the steam engine associates the fundamental question of speed, and the pulley is one of the earliest felicitous technical innovations. The head is surrounded by a large number of strange images: on the left by balloons and big letters “dada,” which rest on two thick trouser legs taken from a title page of *BIZ*. To the left, their other part below the portrait presents a sensation, according to the *BIZ* text, an “idyll from the Zoological Garden,” the “raising of a young lion by the bottle.” Next to Einstein’s ear are pasted two horses, while beneath his pensive-looking portrait there is a line of text reading ironically “*He, he, Sie junger Mann, Dada ist keine Kunstrichtung*” (Hey you, young man, Dada is not an art movement). The ball bearings below him and the distributor (from a tower 250 meters in height used for wireless telegraphy) appear to support the Einstein photograph while to its right the surrounding images belong to various contexts: out of his ear, a receptacle is pouring the words *Dada siegt!* (Dada Triumphs!); above the ear, Ebert’s (fig. 130.7) outstretched arm is grabbing the foot of an ice skater. These elements are arranged around Einstein. On his forehead, held in place by the earwig, is the title of Salomo Friedlaender’s essay *Der Waghalter der Welt* (The Equilibrist of the World’s Scales; 1915). At the time, words on a forehead were doubtlessly read as an allusion to the Golem, featured in Meyrinck’s novel of 1915 and Paul Wegener’s film (1915, 1917, 1920) as a fear-inspiring creature. The magic words united the polar forces of creation and destruction. According to Höch, Einstein’s possession of scientific knowledge made him “Keeper of the World’s Scales.” The two wheel-like interlocking chains that distort his eye allude to a basic connection of Dada and the theory of relativity: the expansion of reality toward the infinite possibilities of matter dissolve in relativity and breaking up into variability. The scientific assumption of an empirical world was as questionable as the philosophical appeal to a metaphysical world. Höch therefore links Friedlaender and Einstein because both the philosopher and the scientist introduced Dada to revolutionizing insights. The essay referred to on Einstein’s forehead contains the essence of Friedlaender’s *Creative Indifference* (1918). In the simultaneous montage, these recognitions were transformed into an event that was set in motion.

Einstein’s theory of relativity gave up the traditional Cartesian image of the universe as a machine and changed it into a dynamic totality whose parts were related to each other in constant motion. “A piece of matter,” as Bertrand Russell described the new concept, was not steady and fixed to a spot, but was “dissolved into a sequence of events.” Motion became one of the most important factors of the theory — the factor of relativity. Simultaneous montage aspires to construct a parable of the energetic physical world of forces, filtering the processual activity of moving particles, variable energetic quantities, although the theory of relativity cannot be related to the objects surrounding us. Atomization, particularization, and relativization of the individual parts of montage demonstrate how abbreviated and superficial is a measurable spatial and visual way of perception. It shows that things are subject to a kinetic process based on varying
impulses. Things are no longer defined by history only, but by a “supra-historical” field of “events,” continually moving. “Dada could never have agreed to a materialism, which would not at the same time have been ‘relative,’ that is changeable in its basic essence.”

Connected to the idea of the world as a series of “events” was the negation of absolutes, a consequence of the theory of relativity that influenced Dada. Johannes Baader in 1916 concluded that the “principle of relativity” became “more and more the nuclear principle of all real things” and that “the way of the world” was proceeding on its path of “annihilation of all absolute values.” Motion as a relative phenomenon, dependent on the observer’s standpoint, no longer allowed the existence of absolute fixed points. Dada started its adventure of constantly changing points of view: “Dada made use of the possibilities of physical motion à outrance.”

The process of atomization and dynamization of particles found its aesthetic correspondence in the atomized and dynamized picture-quotations. Everything seemed to be the function of another thing. The relation between things became a fundamental component of their existence. In the montages history turned into energetic fields of force whose tensions, repulsions, attractions, vibrations, fissions, deformations dragged the individual detail into this process, threw it around, and activated it. Reality became a relative, energetic quantity of many possibilities. “The world is a sea of energy,” wrote Hausmann in 1921. The Dadaists demanded an energetic view of life, which would recognize the dissolving concept of matter into a variable of speed as much as the explosive insight of the Theory of Relativity that matter was energy: “The individual regarded as an atom has only one task to fulfill: to find his own law by working on his petrified ego, against this ego by all means and manners – in this new contemporary world we must realize the voluntary release of the forces residing in the atom!”

Dada developed into a vital field of energy, which also reacted to the “dissolution of the atom” as one of the phenomena, “which shook the foundations of contemporary art” (Ball). The atom turned into an “open concept of potentialities” whose realities could only be accessed by theoretical calculations. The hypothetical, speculative nature of modern physics challenged the Dadaists and fundamentally confirmed them in the ambiguity and groundlessness of their concepts as well as in the transformation of things into unlimited possibilities. The “crisis of the object” received a productive transvaluation that was continued in surrealism: art itself, according to Breton, in analogy to science became the force field of imagination and intuition, which was able to expand the realm of the possible beyond given reality by means of a “physics of poetry” (Eluard).

In 1921, Hausmann demanded “electric scientific painting,” the dissolution of the materiality of bodies into light. He used his physical knowledge to found a Gesellschaft für magnetische Atomzertrümmern (Society for Magnetic Nuclear Fission) for the production of energy and in 1922 began to work on the construction of an “optophone,” a machine that photo-electronically transformed music into kaleidoscopic reflexes of light. Here the polar tendency of Dada acquired its conception, which not only saw art in the “perspective of life” but also tried to perceive “science in the perspective of art” (Nietzsche). Irony and skepticism prevented the Dadaists from committing themselves on this issue, because according to their belief any man was an “ideologist” who turns “freedom” and “relativity,” in short the overall insight that the contours of any object will change and that nothing is stable, into a ‘fixed Weltanschauung.’

“Expansion of Visual Consciousness”: Relative and Simultaneous Perception
The aesthetic experience of montage was formed by disproportions in size, variable perspectives, changing directions, spatial divergence, different modes of representing velocity and motion, and varieties of temporal experience ranging from punctual moments to energetic flow. It was influenced by the avant-garde concepts of cubism and futurism, at the same time anticipating the aesthetic peculiarities of film. Cubism had wanted to alter traditional, representational, mimetic modes of perception toward an active visual process. Futurism attempted to outdo it by a dynamic sense of motion. These avant-garde concepts integrated extra-aesthetic material, which was indifferent to art, into their dissociating perception of objects, thus opposing the visible cited objects to perceptual levels of the subject, which were meant to dissolve and abolish the relation of subject and object. Carl Einstein, who dealt with cubism mainly in theoretical terms, regarded representational painting as bourgeois “conventions of petrifaction”: In “the object, tradition is accumulated.” “The ways of seeing died in the objects, which in their turn, as carriers of worn-out vision, became obstacles for achieving the autonomous subjective act of seeing.” It was thus the function of art to “destroy the object in order to save humanity” — to “de-objectify” through the visual act. It was not up to the object to define seeing, but “the object was forced to be identical to the visual act.”

But the autonomously composed image of cubist montage did not satisfy the Dadaists. Alluding to Carl Einstein, the “corrected masterpieces” of the First International Dada-Fair included the montage Pablo Picasso-La Vie Heureuse. Dedicated to Dr. Carl Einstein (1920; fig. 164). Here Grosz and Heartfield alienated and politicized the cubist view with Dada citations: Picasso’s Girl’s Head with Little Bird (1913; fig. 164.1) was turned around by ninety degrees and given an effect of alienation by inserting photographic and textual clippings. A soldier’s photo-portrait is even associated with “Grosz,” and the text citation “Noske” (the German secretary of defense) introduces a realist, sociopolitical dimension to cubist montage. While cubism performed the dissolution of regularity on the single object, the simultaneous montage of Dada was intended to relativize the whole worldview. Its intention was to achieve a liberation of perception whose heterogeneous and discontinuous structure broke open conflicts and contradictions. It was also a crusade against representational art, against what Duchamp called “retina art” for the sake of a critical epistemological concept: civilization, experienced as an enormous real montage, no longer seemed consistently representable as a totality. The contemporary world was decentralized, insecure and challengingly chaotic. Perception had to conform to the new conditions if it was to account for the Dadaist claim to a tragic Dionysian simultaneity. Dada was indebted to Nietzsche’s radical perspectivism according to which art was of greater value than “truth.” Truth was no longer defined by logical identity and essence, but by life in its multiple materiality, its difference, polarity, temporality, and relativity. It is striking that the Dadaists again and again highlighted the motif of eyes in their montages, eyes that were distorted, mutilated, obstructed, replaced in order to blast the one-dimensional gaze, for “there are — according to Nietzsche — many kinds of eyes. Even the sphinx has eyes: and for this reason there are many ‘truths’ and therefore there are no truths.” The many references to eyes in Dada thus take part in a process of dissolving an absolute claim to truth. It was the male gaze in particular that was critically deformed in many ways: Hannah Höch derailed many of the male gazes in her montage Schnitt mit dem Küchenmesser (1919/20) (fig. 130); Grosz gave to the Opfer der Gesellschaft (A Victim of Society, 1919; fig. 85) a basilisk, distorted view of things, and the eyes of Hausmann’s Kunstreporter (Art Reporter, 1919–20; cat. no. 37) are unseeing. As one of their signets, the Berlin Dadaists chose a glass eye — possibly signaling the hardened, encrusted, and mutilated vision of their age, possibly also a sign for a new way of seeing,
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expanded through technology. They used it on the title page of Der Dada no. 3 (fig. 39), on Grosz’s and Heartfield’s montage Dada-merika (fig. 162) and on Pablo Picasso-La Vie Heureuse (fig. 164) in the catalog of the First International Dada-Fair, even on their calling cards (fig. 6). Dada emphasized a dynamic manner of perception against the one-dimensional, coarsened view of things. For Dada, to see was “to recognize in the mind, to perceive from all directions.”

The distortion of and injury to the eye were basic Dada motifs, which stood for the transformation and expansion of vision. A further Dionysian intensification of perception and expansion of sense experience were effected, according to Hausmann, by “eccentric sensibility,” a new combination of the senses of sight and touch, which Hausmann discovered already in 1916 in the work of the philosopher Ernst Marcus. “There is no sense experience in the ‘central organ’ of the brain,” he wrote to Hannah Höch at that time, “but in the act of seeing the rays are guided, for example, concentrically through the eye into the central organ; from there, they emit eccentric rays, so that for example this letter you are reading is not felt somewhere inside the brain but at exactly the position it has outside your body. Thus the limits of the body are not the limits of sense perception but these perceptions, by dint of eccentric rays, can be located at the most distant places.”

These new ideas condensed in the visual realization that the eye was able to establish an organic connection not only to the mind but also to the senses and to concentrate upon itself even the body’s extension. The eye was the new point of crystallization, which connected all the senses and reflected an age that was characterized more and more by visual perception, in which the effects of images and their reproductions in mass media became more important than reading.

This development not only raised the eye’s value but also exposed it to ever-changing contemporary demands. The Dadaist intensified his attentive gaze on the increasing velocity and network structure of new means of transport, production, and communication. This innovative combination of perception and new technology led Hausmann in 1921 to speak of an “expansion of visual consciousness”:

The railway, the airplane, the photographic apparatus, the X-rays have practically given our visual consciousness today such capability of distinction that, through the mechanical enhancement of naturalist possibilities, we have been liberated for a new visual cognition and for the expansion of visual consciousness in a creative manner of living, which can once again become a parable of the forces that move the world.

The new artistic means of simultaneous montage included the relativizing of size, combined with the rhetoric of grotesque micro- and macroscopy. For example, in the Kitchen Knife montage (fig. 130), the figures of people are tiny compared to the portrait photograph of Albert Einstein. A displacement of relative size is made particularly clear by the mechanical elements and the earwig whose exaggerated dimensions make it look dangerous, whereas the other isolated animal figures seem downgraded and harmless – except for the elephant’s body, whose mass appears to resist the ball bearings’ dimensions. Compared to the mechanical elements, the American architecture is also playfully minimized in the montage. Except for the figure of Wilhelm II, whose proportions remain vague because they are concealed by superimposed images, the other persons are of similar sizes, forming a network of isolated minimized figures. The dancer and the general in the center seem to serve as yardsticks; their sizes roughly fit the diameter of the
mechanical elements. The architecture and isolated letters are related to the General’s size. By his measure the persons appear particularly small. The same purposeful contrast can be noted around Albert Einstein, little Ebert next to the large portrait of the scientist and the enlarged earwig. One of the smallest portraits at bottom right is that of the artist herself, her face half submerged in the mass of montage elements. Particularly in its play with sizes one can see the relativizing and caricaturistic spirit of montage: for example, to the right, Däubler’s head has been placed on top on an immensely large fat baby’s body, in ironic analogy to his solemn and weighty appearance. The hypertrophy and minimizing of heads and bodies leads to a contradictory statement. The variable dimensions forming among themselves an autonomous network of relations contribute to the formal instability and semantic ambiguity of the montage.

By displacing dimensions of size, simultaneous montage also presents the experience of traumatic relations. The logical and pragmatic, meaningfully representable spatio-temporal relations are dissolved into grotesque proportions as they occur for example in fairy tales. Lewis Carroll in Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland (1865) masterly disposed of his characters’ physical dimensions and altered their proportions in calculated arbitrariness — which may also be read as an affinity to the new medium of photography. The simultaneous montage of Dada Berlin is structured like the clear-sighted vision of a daydream, which takes the production of preselected material and its deformation beyond the limits of rational classification, a real psychopathological hallucination of everyday life. “What was big became small, what was small grew enormously large. The world became monstrous, uncanny. The yardstick of proportion, of reason and convention disappeared.” There is a noticeable ambivalence between diminution and enlargement of things. The melancholy facet of montage, which was feeling threatened by the weight of things, is as present as the serene gaze of fancy that minimizes the world and makes things manageable in the form of collectible objects. Hannah Höch had a penchant for miniature worlds and kept the tiniest objects in a glass case, such as the cogwheel and ball bearing, which are enormous in the Kitchen Knife montage (fig. 130), or the little doll, a present from Hausmann, which hangs from the arm of the tube in Er und sein Milieu (He and His Milieu, ca. 1920; fig. 136). Magazines also played an important part in miniaturizing the world, in their manipulation of reality by the size of photographs.

The ambiguous, open structure of montage corresponds with the variable standpoints from which people and things are photographed. Bottom, frontal, and plan views alternate with each other. Only rarely did Höch arrange the photos in a way that no longer allowed their original documentary statement to be recognized. Most of the isolated figures are frontal shots, portrait photographs from magazines. Objects, on the other hand, are shot from different angles and convey a stronger dynamics than people. Beside alternating frontal and side views of the mechanical elements, of architecture and vehicles, the plan views have a confusing effect, in particular the photo of a balloon seller (fig. 130.5), which appears between the mechanical elements, left of center, between the solid rubber tire and the ball bearing. It was published in BIZ on December 28, 1919 as a “puzzle photo” and is one of the earliest instances of experimental photography, showing the beginnings of a new dynamic camera optics as first documented by Moholy-Nagy in his 1925 photo-book Malerei Photographie Film (Painting Photography Film). Compared to other details, the balloon seller loses her corporeality and turns into a two-dimensional image. It is significant that the vertical plan view of objects was Marinetti’s futurist precondition for the “intuitive psychology of matter”:

It originated in my mind high above in the airplane. As I contemplated the objects
from this new perspective, no longer from front or back, but vertically from above, thus foreshortened, I could destroy the old fetters of logic and the lead of the old concepts.\footnote{91}

The different perspectives and dislocated positions of isolated persons, their groundless hovering, prancing, balancing, associate panning shots of a camera continually in motion. The Dadaists presented the change of perception metaphorically: they conceived themselves as figures permanently departing and permanently on the road.

Comparing the multidirectional layout of simultaneous montage with early graphical works by Grosz, for example Erinnerung an New York (Memory of New York, 1915–16; fig. 82), one sees clearly how the montage was prestructured by the straight lines of drawing with their continual stops and starts. In his montages Germania ohne Hemd (Germania Shirtless, 1919; fig. 84), in Sonniges Land (Sunny Country, 1919; fig. 163), also in Baader’s Gutenberggedenkenblatt (Gutenberg Memorial Sheet, 1920) (fig. 46) or in Griebel’s Dadaistisches Selbstbildnis (Dada-Selfportrait, 1920; fig. 73), the montage is punctuated by a staccato of linear text citations. In miniature, the overlapping quotations translate the metropolitan experience of perceptual discontinuity into art. Urban space was narrowed and at the same time expanded without direction. Intermediate spaces grew increasingly abstract. Space evaporated. What remained were meaning-laden particles, which by their speed as quickly attracted the subjective perceiver’s attention as they slipped away from him again. He was pulled into an inflationary whirl of conflicting impressions that displayed no connection.

The particles as well as abstract intermediate spaces of montage express this lack of connection. The dancer in the Kitchen Knife montage (fig. 130) claims the biggest empty space, unformed space as an intermediate space into which bordering details are moving. A similar space surrounds Ebert’s balancing act in the upper half of the montage. He needs the frame of the black medallion in order to be at all noticeable among all the elements infringing upon the empty space around him. Lest the contrast between white environment and accumulations of pasted photos be too sharply felt, Höch used colored priming. Otherwise the black and white accentuation would have led to a predominance of monotonous shades of gray. To the randomness of empty spaces corresponds the concentration of different photo citations of crowds in other places. This continually fluctuating process of montage conveys the impression that the constellation might be about to change at the next moment. The structure is determined by abrupt alternations from two- to three-dimensionality, two-dimensional strata, irritation of dimensionality, and the vague randomness of intermediate spaces.

Dada Rundschau (Dada Review, 1919; fig. 129), which in its simultaneous buildup resembles the Kitchen Knife montage, also scatters image references across the surface. A comparison to works of the other Dadaists shows that the construction principle of empty interspaces is a part of Dadaist montage technique. Exceptions are Hausmann’s simultaneous montages like Dada im gewöhnlichen Leben (Dada Cino) (Dada in Everyday Life [Dada Cinema], 1920; fig. 107), which rather compress image citations, while ABCD (1923; fig. 105) clearly emphasizes free spaces and diverging directions. The empty spaces carry a semantic “anti”-meaning, which can be traced to poetic models in French poetry. Mallarmé and Reverdy for example employed constructed gaps between words that, as it were, introduced a dimension of silence into their poetry. Breton took these up again in connection with his technique of automatic writing. The use of gaps as non-citations, non-images, was based on the Dadaist’s aim to allow the unperceived to also take effect. At the same time, the associative chain between
images was to be abruptly severed and the artist’s considerations intentionally suppressed. The Dadaists offered their montages to the interpreter as an open work, which only he could legitimize.

With empty intermediate spaces, the Dadaists also adopted an essential element of film: intervals. In film montage, intervals were the elements of the art of motion supplied by the medium itself. Russian filmmaker Dziga Vertov placed particular emphasis on the effect of intervals in film: different angles, perspectives, values of light and dark, images per second were related by the interval. The more condensed the image quotations were in montage, the shorter the interval and the more shock-like the collisions of relations. This principle of intervals/intermediate spaces was also expanded to Dadaist magazines and exhibitions. Intervals between type-montage and image-montage alternated; turning the page also constituted an interval. Even the Dada-Fair was structured by the restless alternation of different intervals on wall spaces.

The montages matched the multiplicitous range of perception with “a multiplicity of times”, which, comparable to the acceleration montage in film, rose almost to simultaneity in a standstill. Nearly every particle of a simultaneous montage is characterized by simulation of a temporal moment of its own, which is presented as unique. The totality of montage is broken up into single events. There is no systematic temporality. Time is connected to motion, acceleration, and mutability. Cars, railway trains, airplanes simulate velocity, which is visualized predominantly by the mechanical elements in Schnitt mit dem Küchenmesser (Cut with the Kitchen Knife; fig. 130). Here a temporal sequence seems to be suggested by the transmission of energy from cogwheel to ball bearing and likewise on the left by placing the ball bearing on top of the rubber tire. They seem like energetic forces measuring the motion of single montage details. They appear as catalysts or transformers of velocity and motion. Mechanical and natural motions intermingle. Natural motion is mostly tied to images of women; it was as new to the time as urban velocity. Modern women broke from the corset of traditions, asserting their new mobility in sports and gymnastics as signs of a new movement of female emancipation. Next to her appearance in Schnitt mit dem Küchenmesser, the modern woman in motion is featured in Dada Rundschau (Dada Review; fig. 129), in Der Vater (The Father; fig. 132) by Hannah Höch, and Dada im gewöhnlichen Leben (Dada Cinema; fig. 107) by Hausmann.

Isolated people and objects, rhythmically activated in their sequences, alterations and intervals of motion, seem to be connected with another major series of motion relating the punctual, instantaneous experience of time to the energetic temporal flow of the material universe and, as eternal cycle, remaining open for time as a simultaneous “whole.” This is suggested by the wheels, which point to a world set in motion without aim, eternally circling. Simultaneity evidences Nietzsche’s assumption of the equivalence of all instances of becoming. Against metaphysical speculation, this assumption is not based on notions of causality but solely on the interplay of a cyclical process. For according to Nietzsche the mobility of being is the precondition for the transformation of man he envisaged, a revaluation of his values and norms, which were so far being kept in tutelage by morals and metaphysics. “Everything . . . has evolved; there are no eternal facts, as there are no absolute truths.” Simultaneity for this reason was the highest form of expression of being and becoming, in a presentist focusing of diverse moments. Simultaneity was an experience of time as a “whole” and signified the fulfilled time of the dynamic life-will: “To live is to compress all possibilities and actualities of the second into
Simultaneous experience that made temporal flow and temporal segment become one: that was the Dionysian culmination of Dada.

Consequently, two aspects of time overlapped in simultaneous montage: on the one hand the temporal segment mostly related to individual motion, on the other hand temporal flow, which was open and connected to the eternal cycle of the material universe. Whereas instants, moments, and intervals determine the first experience of time, the second is characterized by the infinite extension of simultaneity as a complex activity.

As these experiences of time were perceived in Dada’s Dionysian perspective, there was also the opposite view, which experienced simultaneity in ambivalent terms, as a stagnant perpetuation of the present in an endless here and now. When Hausmann referred to montage as “static film,” he grasped the polar qualities of simultaneity and declared the coincidence of dynamic and static elements to be fundamental “life components” for Dada.

Ball moreover saw a kind of “self-deception” in simultaneous art, noting that the “whole associative art” merely served “to catch time and to bind it.” The present that evaporated in the speed of the city was to be compensated for by the eccentric chase of time. Simultaneity thus was not seen as a culmination but as a loss of temporal experience perceiving temporal uniqueness from the perspective of its ending. In the medium of photography this Janus-headed modern notion of time was already established. Kracauer saw the “completely eternalized present” in the photographs as turned over to exactly its opposite. “The present seems to be rescued from death; in fact it is surrendered to death.” The camera’s view of the instant, which captures life in its temporal uniqueness, does so with a look of farewell.

Huelsenbeck recognized the Dadaist’s eminently civilizing capability to create out of his mind the “pace of time” and the “paralysis.” This ambivalence of a fulfilled experience of simultaneity and the loss of time in a stagnant present induced the Dadaists on the one hand to the eccentric coincidence of montage, on the other hand to the presentation of coagulated time in the empty spaces of metamechanical construction — as if the endless extension of simultaneity had turned into a “perpetual interval.” The interval, which becomes ever smaller in simultaneous acceleration montage, is now spatialized in metamechanical constructions. The Dionysian eccentric and the Apollinian melancholic mutually determine one another in their experiences of time.

In particular Johannes Baader, with the pathos of subjective revolt, tried to counteract the de-qualification of time. In the HADO he conserved contemporary history with manic obsession in the form of headlines and newspaper clippings, blending them with his megalomaniac interpretations of signs. With a bookkeeper’s accuracy and solipsistic symbolization, he related historical dates to his prophetic clairvoyance. His own chronology beginning in 1919, the year of “world peace,” as year one, demonstrated his individual anarchist game of outdoing time.

Hausmann saw dance as an artistic way of reconquering spatial extension to the subjective experience of time, an extension that had been taken from it by the pace of metropolitan life. While the ecstatic speed of time was driven by dynamics of change that were subject to constant wear and tear themselves, he unfolded in the dance “the synthesis of spatially moving man” as “perfect regularity and clarity of spatio-temporal motion in the unity of body, image, and sound.” The experience of space and time was Hausmann’s central concern. In 1932 he based the conception of his novel Heute und Übermorgen (Today and the Day after Tomorrow) on it: “Mankind experiences many kinds of times, both their own kinds and those of others . . . This experience of time is represented in the daily physical and spiritual relations of people to one another and then out of this process again in relations to themselves.”
conception resembled that of Hausmann’s friend Schwitters, whose experiences of subjective time were shaped in a new architectonic process of montage. He built a metamorphotic internal architecture — his *Merzbau* (Merzbuilding, 1919–32) to give expression to “the whole impulses of life,” the current stream of consciousness, the net of all his relationships by an always changing and growing architecture formed by materials and things he collected. This labyrinthine ritual cave incorporated realities, imaginations, the daily round, and myth in an architecture full of exploded boundaries, melting space, dissociations, contradictions, fathomless depth and mutations (or “merz”ations).

The multiplicity of motions, which in simultaneous montage was still tied into a static result, occasioned Russian director Sergei Eisenstein to see the literary and pictorial montage principle as the limit of their genres. In his view, the combination between segmentation and continuity was only realized in film.

“The Motor of Things”:
Wheels — Symbols of the Dionysian

Motion, speed, and dynamics that in the early twenties equally dominated technological, economic, social, and cultural processes fascinated Dada Berlin as well. “We want to let ourselves be thrown around and torn apart by the mysterious dimension, by our sixth sense of motion! So that we realize our being alive, alive today!” The photograph “Varieté” in the weekly edition of *Neue Jugend*, June 1917 (fig. 114) shows an artist who is thrown around inside a wheel by its momentum and yet keeps his balance. He passes on the challenge of dynamics not only as ecstasy and vertigo, but also in its great danger. Being present within the moment meant “all” or “nothing”: intensification or annihilation of life. The artist’s creative energy straining to surpass itself could be likened to the rolling wheels of life re-creating itself at each instant.

The demand for mobility was basically directed against a bourgeois culture paralyzed by a tradition remote from reality. The dynamic, activating, simultaneous citational process of montage was powered by a hunger for motion; it did not want in the least to be reminiscent of static compositions, which might give rise to contemplative considerations. The montages were to trigger impulses of motion. They were indebted to “becoming,” to the dynamic, to the processual, to change. Thus their effect upon the recipient was one of activation. The wheels symbolized the Dionysian moment of destruction and the utopian transgression of all limitations previously imposed upon mankind. We have to ask: did technology create for the Berlin Dadaists a new cult of life with new symbols, or did the Dadaists undermine the power of technology with its own means and effects?

With the dynamic, machinoid aesthetics, the Dadaists at first joined a discourse, which was common to the international avant-garde in general. Technical advancement created a new world language that could be universally understood. Not only the Italian and Russian futurists, but also the French Delaunay and Léger promoted the connection of the cultural revolt to technological revolution. For the Dadaists of France and America, especially Duchamp, Picabia (cat. no. 47–49, 103), Man Ray, and later Ribemont-Dessaignes and Crotti, machine elements were multi-layered signs of the mechanization of life and culture. The “motor of things” (Huelsenbeck) governed most of Berlin Dadaist simultaneous montages: *Schnitt mit dem Küchenmesser* (Cut with the Kitchen Knife, 1919–20; fig. 130), *Das schöne Mädchen* (The Pretty Woman, 1920; fig. 131), *Hochfinanz* (High Finance, 1922; fig. 134), *Elasticum* (1920; fig. 108), *Das Pneuma umreist die Welt* (Pneuma Travels around the World, 1920; fig. 116), *Dada*
cordial (1919–20; fig. 159), *Dada-merika* (1920; fig. 162), *Dada-Tanz* (Dada-Dance, 1922; fig. 133), *Leben und Treiben in Universal-City, 12 Uhr 5 mittags* (Life and Bustle of Universal City, 12:05 noon, 1920; fig. 117) and others.

With their colossal, oversized effect, the rotating wheels could also refer to the traditional, mythic sense of those Titans created by nineteenth century heavy industry: the steam engines invented by the new Prometheus. Wilhelm Kaulbach’s sketch for a fresco titled *Die Erzeugung des Dampfes* (The Generation of Steam, ca. 1859; fig. 118) displayed, next to the union of Vulcan and Nymph, whose elements fire and water produced steam, a rolling iron wheel as a symbol of the industrial age, its energy and dynamics; the three-quarters view is quite comparable to Dada’s rubber wheels and ball bearings. But Dada montage showed the shock of industrialization, which opened a wide and unsecured space, removed boundaries, and challenged the subject. Grosz in 1917 highlighted the audacious, unprotected self-assertion of the individual in the violent stream of things: “An apartment block is ablaze — a child is falling into boiling spinach, you’re cycling on spare tires already — don’t give it up, boy, even if it should take you six days.” These lines suggest a daring ability to cope with reality in the face of the threats of technology. The Six Day Races became synonymous of the lifestyle in modern sports conditioned for the demands of modernity by hard training without giving up — always focusing on the here and now, affirming toward “this thousand fold simultaneity of the most banal today.” Grosz presented the fact that the wheels could indeed lose their air in the montage *Ein Opfer der Gesellschaft* (A Victim of Society, 1919; fig. 85). The victim’s bicycle tube was rolled up on his shoulder: the war had taken the air out of him and mutilated his body and his face.

In 1917, even before the pictorial montages, the dynamization of life entered literary language in the form of the simultaneous poem creating the Babylonian Confusion of Tongues of the Dada choirs. In Hugo Ball’s words the simultaneous poem meant to express “that man is swallowed up in the mechanistic process,” “the conflict of the *vox humana* (human voice) with a world that threatens, ensnares, and destroys it, a world whose rhythm and noise are ineluctable.” Influenced by this new form of art, presented at Cabaret Voltaire, the Berlin Dadaists on April 30, 1919 staged a simultaneous poem with seven persons and a bruitist poem by Huelsenbeck, tellingly titled *Dada – machinel* (fig. 25), at the Graphische Kabinett of I. B. Neumann. The effect of the simultaneous poems was intensified at another soiree on May 24, 1919 by two kettledrums and ten rifles; this time the cast included “ten ladies and a postman”: *Chaoplasma* (fig. 26).

The shock inflicted by mechanical violence upon people in World War I belonged to one of the most basic, tragic-Dionysian, Dadaist experiences. It was the catastrophe initiating it. Already at the beginning of the war, Otto Dix in his oil painting *Das Geschütz* (Artillery, 1914) arranged the rattling machine guns and cannons in a fan-like superposition of levels. At the center is an erect gun barrel, cogwheels rotate and the war apparatus rages while man loses his place among all this machinery. The war developed its own energy potential, which took effect on the sea, on the ground, and for the first time in air, thereby not only transcending previously known dimensions but also releasing very high velocities. The kinematics of aviation, of tanks and troop movements caused a breakdown of the traditional spatial continuum and literally exploded not only perception: humanity itself was blown to bits.

The war intensified the sense of catastrophe, which was generated by the development of nineteenth century technologies:

Machines were created that replaced the individuals. Complexes and creatures of
super-human, supra-individual horror were constructed. Fear became a creature with millions of heads. Power was no longer measured by that of the single man, but by tens of thousands of horsepower. Turbines, boiler houses, iron hammers, and electricity created fields of force and ghosts that kept whole cities and countries in their horrible thrall . . . A world of abstract demons devoured the single utterance, consumed individual faces in towering masks, devoured private expression, deprived individual things of their names, destroyed the ego.\textsuperscript{111} More than ever, people felt physically threatened by, even annihilated by technology. Fear was a fundamental mythic experience, which Dada creatively overcame. Dionysus was dismembered on the battlefield. Yet Dada tried to sublimate this experience as a cruel law immanent in life by artistic activity, by the “game from nothing” — by creating montages. The Dadaists included destruction in their creations and developed it further into a new means of aesthetic production in which Dionysus was reborn and reassembled by Apollo. In the context of current events, this process of “anthropomorphization of dissonance” was never ending, and the points of breakdown were conceptually used in the principle of montage for a criticism of civilization and culture. That is why the rolling wheels in the montages denote an energy that symbolizes both the destructive and the creative aspects of life: the life that, through violent transformation, intensifies itself as the “will to power” in Nietzsche’s sense.

The ball bearings and wheels appear as incalculable, oversized rolling matter. In the montage \textit{Schnitt mit dem Küchenmesser} (Cut with the Kitchen Knife, 1919–20; fig. 130), for example, they enter the picture abruptly, as do the cars, planes, and railway trains. Their impulses, exits, and destinations cannot be defined. They announce transitions, a processual indeterminacy whose powerful motion can be sensed. The machine elements have freed themselves from human control and, similar to the atomized linguistic signs and numbers, begin to provoke independent communications. Regardless of human presence, their rotation continues unflaggingly. “The motor of things” sets the accelerated pace of life, sets its “subject-less” course, ultimately sets the cycle of the material universe. Nietzsche backed this cosmological concept of “eternal return” with the physical theorem of the conservation of energy: in all possible connections its amount will always remain the same.

The wheels seemed to take on the “meta”-dimensions of enormous supra-individual elementary forces. They inspired the Dadaists to grotesque images, which displayed a mixture of fear, irony, and fascination. In Dionysian terms, the wheel was described as \textit{grande roue du monde} (great world-wheel) in Huelsenbeck’s novel \textit{Doctor Billig am Ende} (Doctor Billig Ruined, 1921). Dr. Billig is afraid of the wheel’s violent course because it does not stop even at murder or death. At the same time, the unleashed power opens up a dimension of life to him, access to which his narrow bourgeois world has previously denied him. “The great wheel, \textit{la grande roue du monde}, began to turn, spraying squibs and colorful fireworks in all directions across the earth.” Here its dynamic potential is combined with the idea of Eros as transgressive immoralist forces, which Billig sees embodied in the prostitute Margot. Margot appears like a car decorated with flowers, driving down a street he saw in a dream: “‘Margot!’ he shouted, ‘Margot’ — and he saw the room begin rapidly to move on great, white-hot wheels.”\textsuperscript{112} Beyond the borders of bourgeois European culture, Dada also discovered the Dionysian force of the driving life-wheel in the myth of America. \textit{Hjulet} (Das Rad, The Wheel, 1905), the novel by the Danish writer J. W. Jensen, sequel to his epic depiction of the young America \textit{Madame D’Ora} (1904), was Grosz’s cult book of modernity. It was so important to him that he
sent a copy to his friend Otto Schmalhausen, in the “memory of July 1918 (military hospital) that we share making us brothers.”113 From the perspective of wartime and post-war time Berlin, Jensen’s *The Wheel* at first appeared like a dream of the great urban America of motion and intensified life, which concentrated in Chicago:

> While city traffic now resembled an excited inland lake in a thaw storm, the drift of long-distance traffic, the trains seemed like the long pregnant breakers of the sea. In the deep hollow between Michigan Avenue and the water, the trains departed from and arrived at Illinois Central, hundreds of long, heavily laden trains from all regions of America, from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, from the polar regions to the gardens of Florida, a rolling of thousands of wheels.114

In the novel, American technology receives the utopian dimension of perpetual Dionysian motion. The Dada montages seem to be kept swinging by this Americanized myth of the wheel, pointing toward a different, better world that supersedes the old world of Europe: *Dada-merika* (fig. 162) by Grosz and Heartfield seems to yield tribute to this myth; even if the crowds amid rotating images of progress still show traces of panic – both in the novel and also in Grosz’s graphic in the center of *Universal City* (fig. 117).

The wheel symbolism is driven by the American myth and by the energy of the Russian revolution. Berlin after World War I became a focal point of these driving forces, which overlapped in the city and contributed to the shape of twenties culture. Tatlin’s machine-art for Dada Berlin combined cultural revolt with the communist and technological revolution of Russia. In this sense the mechanically rotating elements in the montages, overrunning the dismembered remnants of society, could also be carriers of a concrete utopia. “Revolutions are the engines of world history” – this Marx quotation had a programmatic place in *Jedermann sein eigener Fussball* (Everyone His Own Football, February 1919). In the same manifesto in which Hausmann demanded the “literary factory,” in his *Alitterel Delitterel Sublitterel* (1919), he praised the “communist élan against the bourgeois.”115 In his novel *Die Eroberung der Maschinen* (The Taking of the Machines; fig. 122), begun in 1921, Franz Jung conjured up the revolutionary idea of a united workers’ army, which was to set the conquered machines in motion on a changed social basis. No doubt, at this time, Heartfield, Herzfelde, and Grosz still shared this utopia. On the title page of the novel, Heartfield symbolizes the power of revolution in the convergence of wheel and pistol taking aim.

The effect of the wheel symbolism was so strong that it reflected from Dada Berlin back to Moscow. Alexandr Rodchenko, who in 1922 was given reproductions of Dadaist photomontages that Malevich had brought from Berlin, was inspired by them: car and tire with Charlie Chaplin on the cover of *KINOFOT* magazine (1922),116 cogwheel and car tire in a self-portrait (1922)117, or airplane, wheel, metropolitan architecture and the crowds in one of the photomontages to Mayakovsky’s poem “Pro eto” (1923; fig. 150). Rodchenko’s daring attempts to balance on the wheel demonstrates the physical and mental presence, aptness, and endangerment of the New Man — resembling a Chaplinesque feat. He confronted the determination, widespread among Russian avant-gardists at the time, with which they embraced technology, with the artistic daring of the artist’s approach to the new dynamics, in an ambiguous way comparable to Dada.

Influenced by Dada, in 1919 and 1920 the Hungarian constructivist Lászlo Moholy-Nagy also discovered a new basis for art and design in industrial culture. He tried to sharpen people’s
sensibility to the changed conditions of life. Die große Gefühlsmaschine (The Great Machine of Emotions, 1920; fig. 148) emits numbers, letters, wheel motifs, and machine elements out of a circular red center. The signal colors red, yellow, and black vitalize them on a ground of darker yellow. The circle is broken up, and the result is a lively dynamic rotating game between inside and outside. In the sketch for his film script Dynamik der Gross-Stadt (Urban Dynamics, 1921–22), he intensified the perceptual shock of motion by contrastive sequences of images, superpositions, wild panning shots, views from below and above. The unleashed technology was placed in analogy to the ferocity of wild animals. The dynamic forces, which once emanated from nature and of which man had freed himself in the course of history, now faced him as qualities of his own products. The second nature of the city seemed wild and indomitable; only the film montage, which focused the metropolitan chaos, could capture it for a moment. If man could manage to adapt his senses to these new conditions, Moholy-Nagy thought, then he would attain an undreamed-of weightlessness and Dionysian intensification of life. While the constructivist artist wanted to programmatically sensitize his audience by combining art and technology, Dada Berlin still kept in mind the Dionysian abyss of man’s dismemberment by the machinery of war. For Dada’s pessimism of strength, the intention was to make the tragic become grotesque.

The rotating wheels, therefore, symbolize Dada’s ambivalent transvaluation of experience, of perception, and of creation. The man-machine interface was shocking, brutal, grotesque. A contrastive combination of organic and mechanical elements is represented in Otto Dix’s Kartenspielende Kriegskrüppel (War Cripples Playing Cards, 1920; fig. 60). The cripples’ dregs of life, painted in oil, possess a striking intensity, as of decaying flesh; they enter a grotesque symbiosis with the glittering pseudo-animation of artificial clattering limbs that are executed as a montage of materials (tinfoil, buttons, medals, playing-cards, etc.).

In Ein Opfer der Gesellschaft (A Victim of Society, 1919; fig. 85; also known as Uncle August, the Unhappy Inventor), Grosz distorted the painted portrait of a man, especially his sense organs, by reproduced photo-particles of machine parts, which transformed the face into a terrifying mask. In connection with the war cripples in Otto Dix’s 45% Erwerbsfähig! (45% Fit for Work! 1920; fig. 59), upon whom the montage at the First International Dada-Fair was fixed, it is the image of a soldier victimized by the belligerent interests of society (View VII of Dada-Fair).

In different ways Otto Dix, Rudolf Schlichter, and Hannah Höch designed montages that included the female body in the process of mechanization. In Altar für Cavaliere (Altar for Gentlemen, 1920; fig. 56.1, 56.2), Dix composed the prostitute as a combination of machine and erotics, which could be undressed down to the skeleton like in anatomical folding panels. Her shadow, unfolded, exposed a body made of hand grenades. Dix connected Eros and death with the experience of war, which beyond its nationalistic ideology — represented by the soldier-type citizen with swastika and glued-up brain — reveals a Dionysian unbounding long repressed — symbolized in the analogy of hand grenades and erotic ecstasy. By contrast, Schlichter disillusioned the female body by the machinery he inserted into the torso of the woman in Phänomen-Werke (Mysterious Products, 1919–20; fig. 152): in the dressed-up cocotte, he saw a mechanistic image of the allegory of Frau Welt (Lady World), behind whose dazzling façade was revealed not the skeleton but tubes and regulators as symbols of death. In Höch’s montages the interface woman/machine is more ambivalent: on the one hand we experience alienating appropriation of the bodies by technological machines, on the other new electrifying possibilities. Is this the reason for the electric light bulb in the place of a young woman’s head
SIMULTANEOUS MONTAGE — ART IN THE PERSPECTIVE OF LIFE

(fig. 131)? Hausmann created the male equivalent in the Tatlin-montage (fig. 109). Beyond the polar tensions between nature and technology the interfaces also point into the realm of transfer from artistic imagination into energetic technical innovations — in the sense of a possible symbiosis of art and technology. It was Grosz who made the machine heart of the Dadamechanic Heartfield beat for a new art (cat. no. 62).

Beside the confrontation of man/woman and machine, a process of hybridization among machines and among people was developing, a process that led to meta- and mechano-morphoses. In Schnitt mit dem Küchenmesser (1919–20; fig. 130), the elephant at the center of the circus mundi between trunk and cogwheel is holding a grotesque, androgynous hybrid: an Indian boy who blends into a white-skinned female body. The process of hybridization becomes particularly clear in dance, in movement: in Dada-Tanz (Dada-Dance, 1922; fig. 133) it is performed on spiral machine parts as on a volcano — by a dancing woman’s body from which a black man is protruding, proportionately diminished.

Examples of mechano-morphosis are the block and pulley sticking out from the steam engine close to Einstein’s head in the Kitchen Knife montage; the grating superposition of machine parts in Hausmann’s Elasticum (1920) (fig. 108). Schwitters raised “fusing fusions” to the monumental concept of the Merzbühne and its “most conscientious violation of technology.”

Take a dentist’s drill, a food chopper, a tramway track cleaner, omnibuses and automobiles, bicycles, tandems and their tires, wartime spare tires too, and deform them. Take lamps and deform them in the most brutal fashion. Make engines collide. Make curtains dance spider web threads with window frames, and break whining glass. Make steam boilers explode to generate railway smoke.119

In Mechanischer Garten (Mechanical Garden, 1920; fig. 137) Hannah Höch creates a landscape of mechano-morphously machinoid, dysfunctionally rotating cogwheels, ball bearings and machine parts in bloom. A railway track, having lost its straight line, crosses the mechanical garden in a zigzag pattern. Technical elements robbed their environment of its vital energy and began a dysfunctional, purposeless independent game in a cold beauty and sensuality of their own.

In this work, endlessly generating, these machine elements seem to create their own poetical hybrid worlds held in balance ingeniously by an inner mechanism. The artist as constructor plays with the mechanic repertoire of her imagination and creates a hortus conclusus (closed garden) of pure production. The illusory effect of these artifices taking on the character of montage intensifies by the medium of watercolor. Quality and mixture of colors seem to argue out the contrast between nature and technology. Between steel blue, green, yellow, red, and brown their discord is balanced.

With the same intensity with which the Berlin Dadaists unfolded the artistry of metamechanics in their Dadaist game, they tried to cast a critical glance outward into rotating reality: mobility of traffic and communications corresponded to the urban circulation of commodities. Berlin was one single machine pulling “everything” into this cycle: people, animals, language, machines, arts, and culture. The cumulative condensation of image quotations in the montages resemble the multitude of commodities into which formerly familiar single objects had been turned: “The continual cycle of the two oppositional metamorphoses of goods or the rapid turnover of buying and selling shows itself in the unceasing currency of money or its function as the perpetuum mobile of circulation” (Marx).120 The hybrids of montage were also
parts of this unceasing circulation, revealing its leveling effect. Circulation determined the relations of people, replacing social contact. Its motion reveals the universal interlocking of social relations through the economic principle of commercialization.

Dada Berlin pointed to contexts, which exposed the fact that the power of rotation was connected to the power of economic strength. The literary and artistic montages signaled the social dimension of technical relations of power. For example, Hannah Höch in *Der Milliardär* (The Billionaire) or *Hochfinanz* (High Finance, 1923; fig. 134) associated the wheel metaphor with portrait photographs that were oversized in relation to their bodies. These portraits resemble Stinnes (in profile) and Kirdorf (frontal), the two most powerful business leaders of the time, who in the montage stride across their empire. In fact, the worried-looking right half of the face belongs to so-called chemist Sir John Henschel from *Die Dame* (no. 15, May 1920, p. 5). The wheels are a cipher for the power of technology in union with capital whose inescapable laws ruled the city by force. Moreover, the barrel of a gun associates violence.¹²¹

Comparable to the wheel’s momentum is the dimension of numbers in simultaneous montage. In *Dada-merika* (1919; fig. 162) the inflationary number 100,000 appears – as it does in the montage *Herr Krause* (1919; cat. no. 45). In a typographic montage for *Dadaco* (1919–20), it is associated to the following text by Grosz:

> Occasionally a little run for the banks/Or:/Stock-market panic! /The apoplectic vein is swelling up to the size of a finger!!/While even auntie is fingering for her purse! /Silence! The gramophone begins to crow: /Suez Canal 4645/4650/Caoutchouc 217/. . .¹²²

The numerical dimensions of money after 1920 were to rise immensely while its material value took an abysmal decline up to 1923. A pound of lard, for example, cost 1,200 marks. Devalued bills formed one of the main elements of the paper dimension of the rotating city body. Dada numerics were connected with money and to the urban way of life, which included the feeling of being only a number: thus Hausmann in *Mechanischer Kopf* (*Der Geist unserer Zeit*) (Mechanical Head (The Spirit of Our Age), ca. 1921; fig. 113) pasted the number “22” onto the forehead of a mannequin. The war had enormously expanded the Dadaists’ sense of vast numbers: “13 million dead, 11 million crippled, 50 million soldiers marching, 6 billion bullets, 50 billion cubic meters of gas” (Piscator).¹²³ The events of the revolution also mobilized large crowds of people, which left their traces in the Dadaists’ drawings and montages.

To detach numbers from commercial contexts and to lead the counting and speaking consciousness back to a non-dissociated primal base where letter and number still mutually determined the logos – as in numerical mysticism and magic, this may have been Baader’s motivation in introducing his own chronology. Years and months were counted as letters; the days were counted as numbers. Hausmann, also in *ABCD* (1923; fig. 105), arrived at an equivalent position: as elementary parts, letter and number are kept in suspension — letters are arranged like numbers and numbers are spoken like sounds.

Dada reacted also with an ironic distance to the motor of things, whose power had become detached from people: “What good is a mind in a world that runs on mechanically?”¹²⁴ The “idle nonsense”¹²⁵ placed the “meta”-constructions of traditional culture in question: hermeneutics of meaning, human emancipation, teleology of mind. The body of the young artist Niddy Impekoven in the *Kitchen Knife* montage (1919–20; fig. 130) performed a light, suspended, graceful, headless dance amid threatening machine elements. One of Man Ray’s
photograms of ready-mades (fig. 147) confirms this ambivalence of Dada toward the mechanical elements. The title of the machine body, which is assembled from cogwheels, has a metaphorical, artistic double meaning: the C of “DANCER” could be read as a G, “DANGER.” Dada’s reaction consisted in the balancing resistance of a dancer, artistically unassailable. “In opposition to a so-called freedom that proceeded like a machine,” Dada Berlin pursued “a tendency of the non-tragic.”

Dada Berlin reacted with the paradoxical attempt to capture the “motor of things” (Huelsenbeck) by letting it run. It mobilized qualities, which stemmed from the rotation process itself. In this enterprise, the Berlin Dadaists received impulses directly from Friedlaender’s *Schöpferische Indifferenz* (Creative Indifference, 1918): As the creator was “the living ball bearing and absolute stabilizer of the world,” the Dadaist transformed himself into a *Seelenautomobil* (soul automobile, Hausmann) and was “like a child in a thousand amusement parks / And like a strip of tape, film / Turning red and yellow / . . . Someone is constantly turning the crank” (Grosz). For, according to Friedlaender, “We need the most powerful, world-superior, Dionysian initiative.” The wheel set in motion then triggered the poetic process of montage and destructively as well as constructively moved toward a constant state of incompleteness. According to Friedlaender it was “particularly the explosive, the destructive, the creative” energy that needed the counteracting force of the Apollinian, “of the polar ordering economy of its inexhaustibility.” In the child’s playing that, according to Nietzsche, was the highest level of the mind, the process of creation attained a newly won freedom and new values: “The child is innocence and forgetting, a beginning-anew, a game, a wheel rolling by itself, a prime motion, a sacred affirmation.” The “wheel rolling by itself” symbolized the ecstatic return of creation to its origins, which had been lost in the process of civilization. It became identical to the “World-wheel, the rolling one,” which, as Nietzsche wrote in the first of his *Lieder des Prinzen Vogelfrei* (Songs of Prince Outlaw), “strolls along from one destination to another: / The resentful man calls it ‘need,’ / The fool calls it ‘play’ . . . / World-play, the mighty one, / Blends reality and appearance: – / The eternal foolishness / Blends us – into it!”

Although the Dadaists themselves only related the concept of metamechanics to Apollinian constructions, the wheel symbolism constituted their polar equivalent: the supra individual “will to power,” driving force behind global events, ultimately is the metaphysical version of the Dionysian process of rotation. The wheel symbolism remained ambiguous in the Dadaist context: it was both life-enhancing and life-destroying, a leveler of values; it was an explosive force of revolution and of aesthetic revolt, and it moved indifferently. Two distinct interpretations can be inferred: one saw Dionysian rotation supra-historically, as an elementary transgressive driving force in a Nietzschean sense; the other concretized it in the context of history and combined it with Dada’s topical social and critical ideas. For the wheel symbolism did not stem from a naive yearning for origins: Dada first had to struggle for the new beginning and the child’s play, using all contemporary forms of resistance and contradiction. It related to that phase of transition in which Dada Berlin found itself in the early twenties.

“Cut with the Kitchen Knife”: Montage as Grotesque Political Allegory

The world-wheel was directing perception to existence as a game of dice and was, according to Nietzsche, characteristic for art as a parable of this game. Likewise, we can recognize in Dada’s wheel-montages a contemporary experimenter’s workshop in which the artistic “ideal of a mind”
is operating, “which . . . from an overflowing plenitude and power is playing with all that was previously named sacred, good, untouchable, divine.” Dada montage was a game “based on the earnestness,” the bloody earnestness” of a generation of artists who experienced World War I and the persecution of communists. Dada montage thus mobilizes a politicized *artistische Weltdeutung* (artistic world-interpretation) tearing the *facies hippocratica* (decaying facial expression) of the age, its fragments and remains into a whirl out of which life emerges as a work of art engendering itself, restless and aimless, overflowing and empty, dynamic and rigid at the same time. Life is aestheticized and art is vitalized, integrating into its form the “dissonances” that had not been previously perceived, and forcing them to come to light. What counts is not the appearance of a truth discovered once and for all but rather, the work of art, the montage, manifests itself in the incompleteness of an ever changing, incalculable activity.

In the process of montage, the Dadaist “balances” the “given facts of this finite world, apparently exploding out of *nihil* and plunging back into this *nihil* for the sake of its own amusement.” Contemporary history became freely maneuverable, consisting solely of removable parts, which the Dadaists ironically disposed of. The act of sovereign sense making entered a relativizing process that seemed to negate any construction of history as can be seen in the *Kitchen Knife* montage (fig. 130). Social, cultural, and political authorities were degraded in the montage to figures lacking in substance — fools, clowns, “nine days’ wonders” who disappeared as quickly as they came. The short-lived political effect of persons expressed itself in the volatility of the medium, especially of magazine photography. The immense accumulation of photographs and their disparately placed items of information leveled history to a meaningless conglomerate of people and objects.

This insight into the medium corresponded to Dada’s conception of contemporary history as a *Kabarett zum Menschen* (Cabaret Mankind, Hausmann), a futile world theater whose vanity and constant actuality, devouring itself in the instant, the Dadaist wanted to satirize and dismantle in his grotesque montages. Behind the social fabrication of the subject, Dada Berlin was to uncover the real “multiplicity” of the individual.

The basic impulse of such a desire transforms the ego into a multiplex, into a *We* as the certainty of union, of strict universality of all being however isolated it may appear; being not as a firm given concept but as an ever changeable and changing enforcement, an attainment of living relations (contradictions), as a restless experience constantly fighting for the balance point of community, the experience of a certainty that it is the ego’s task to realize all of them in itself.

By a dynamic process of deregulation, Dada wanted to create a multi-layered network in which the total body of society with all its ramifying isolated functions and meanings was to be integrated, so that it might issue from this process as a living, Dionysian-Apollinian new genesis of artistic work. In such a manner Dada’s laughter received that Aristophanic meaning accorded to laughter by Nietzsche: “We are the first age studied that has truly studied ‘costumes,’” Huelsenbeck quoted from *Beyond Good and Evil* in his introduction to the *Dada Almanach* (1920):

I mean those of moralities, articles of faith, tastes in the arts, and religions — prepared like no previous age for a carnival in the grand style, for the laughter and
high spirits of the most spiritual revelry, for the transcendental heights of the highest nonsense, and Aristophanean derision of the world. Perhaps this is where we shall still discover the realm of our invention, that realm in which we, too, can still be original, say, as parodists of world history and God’s buffoons — perhaps even if nothing else today has any future, our laughter may yet have a future!\footnote{138}

Reality was the great storehouse whose inventory laughter dissolved into ironic relativities. The montage as visual pamphlet agitated against “an old world of being, of what has become, of firm manners and customs, of rigid claims for possession and of beauty limited to the world of objects,” against “the fetters and boundaries of a world-perception ossified in the rational and tied to possession” (Hausmann).\footnote{139}

In Hannah Höch’s \textit{Schnitt mit dem Küchenmesser} (1919–20; fig. 130), people appear as images of the culturally uprooted European “hybrid” (Nietzsche), who is constantly changing his costumes. Their position and degree of caricature isolate them. The tie is now torn that, binding people to their class and social status still had given them some stability. The social connection of life is replaced by the public system of communication and mass media as a second reality, fluctuating and uprooting. Hannah Höch seemed to see the dispersion principle of magazines as a socially disintegrating symptom of the new democracy. The commercial interests of the media make man become the sensational plaything of the culture industry. Artistic sensibility and attentiveness enter the new regions of media. People are abandoned to this dispersion like products of chance — suspended without ground. They represent unconnected individuals who, completely given over to their vanity, perform an artistic number.

All seem to be without rules, subject to a grotesque game: fullness and emptiness, the “nothing, that is everything” (Hausmann) becomes the form of representation of the turbulent montage-cabaret. Apocalyptic end-time and the pace of city life dissolve in the present nothing: history as something volatile and accidental in which only the mechanical objects form an unchanged substratum. Into the center of this “Clown’s game from Nothing,”\footnote{140} Hannah Höch in \textit{Schnitt mit dem Küchenmesser} (fig. 130) placed a female dancer, her Dada-specific “feat of elasticity,”\footnote{141} surrounded by the polar themes of her topical “cabaret mankind,” both Dada and anti-Dada: Ebert, monarchy, Weimar Republic, Club Dada, America, et al.

The upper third of the photomontage is dedicated to the cabaret’s anti-Dadaist artists: first the politicians, led (between Einstein and Wilhelm II) by Friedrich Ebert,\footnote{142} first president of the Weimar Republic. Whereas Wilhelm’s face is distorted in the kaleidoscopic montage, his authority dissolved, Ebert appears as the dismembered product of the “epoch of Weimar beer belly culture.” Höch pasted his portrait onto a balancing woman’s body, into a medallion, a form that the nineteenth century used to frame authority figures as role models. The medallion at the same time is the image parody of a mandala. Höch transformed Ebert into a distorted grotesque. She isolated him from the masses on the lower end of the montage, a people’s deputy without a people. The slogan \textit{Dada siegt!} (Dada Triumphs!) subversively calls his political self-understanding into question. Top right, next to Einstein’s head, he reappears, this time in profile. The original photograph (fig. 130.7) was familiar to contemporaries, showing Ebert’s reception of homecoming soldiers on Pariser Platz, waving his hat. Here his raised hand is no longer greeting, but pulling at the shoe of a female ice skater, who wants to cling to her dancing partner, and calls for help: “Komm!” (Come!) Höch seems to subtly allude to the SPD’s (Social Democratic Party) strategy of promising women the right to vote before the National Assembly was elected in order to secure their votes for themselves.
In her montages Dada Rundschau (1919; fig. 129) and Staatshäupter (Heads of State) (ca. 1919) Höch used the widely known photo of Ebert and Noske, the then minister of war, wearing bathing suits, from the BIZ title page of August 24, 1919 (fig. 129.1). In its philistine, trivially comic effect and its ugliness, this was itself already a caricature. She unmasked as ridiculous the two politicians’ strategy to gain politically by giving the impression of being ‘of the people.’ The photo in BIZ was published a few days after Ebert’s solemn inauguration in the National Assembly at Weimar, and had already constituted a journalistic affront in its own right. Höch’s disrespectful repetition also served to ridicule the outrage caused by the photo at that time. In a great part of the population, used to seeing Wilhelmian parade uniforms, this outrage was inescapable. The montage Dada Rundschau also shows Clémenceau in a sleeping cap (fig. 129.2) and Wilson as a prancing figurine (fig. 129.3) (on the montage’s upper edge). Dada at the same time represents the fact that mass access to photography created a kind of publicity, which more and more intruded upon a politician’s privacy—a sign of the gradual democratization of perception that was employed manipulatively by the media and which was called into question by Dada. The new Weimar Republic did not by itself seem to find appropriate forms of communication; the media were more powerful.

Dadaist critique of Ebert and his cabinet was in connection with its critical distance to the newly founded Weimar Republic, which according to the Dadaists did not represent the people’s interests but decorated itself with Kleinbürger-Exzellenzen (petit bourgeois excellencies) (Huelsenbeck). This anachronism was satirized by the label Hohenzollern-Renaissance (1920) (fig. 81). Onto a Hohenzollern picture postcard (fig. 81.1), Grosz pasted the portraits of, inter alia, Kapp and Lüttwitz and Ehrhardt, the right-wing putschists of March 1920, together with those of high political officials: (from left to right) Bauer (chancellor), Müller (foreign minister), Ebert (president), Gessler (secretary of defense), Severing (secretary of the interior), and General Walter. Ebert was caricatured wearing a crown in Die Pleite no. 1, 1919. Huelsenbeck’s critique was:

Can people like Ebert and Scheidemann, good petit bourgeois, be leaders to our goals? Liebknecht knew the answer on 10 November: No. How miserable . . . are these people’s representatives who no longer know what “people” means. His excellency Scheidemann, Fritzchen Ebert, the honest upholsterer. That Noske, a miniature Hindenburg . . . The discontent grows when you see these petit bourgeois excellencies act in exact conformity to the old pattern.

The defamation of Ebert and other politicians was part of a great intellectual opposition against the Weimar Republic, which saw it exclusively as the liquidator of the Spartacist revolution: the photomontages Jedermann sein eigner Fussball (Everyone His Own Football, 1919; fig. 80) with the motto “Wer ist der Schönste?” (Who is the Most Beautiful?), Germania ohne Hemd (Germania Shirtless, 1919; fig. 84), Sonniges Land (Sunny Country, 1919; fig. 163), and Das Geheimnisvollste und Unerklärlichste, was je gezeigt wurde (The Most Mysterious and Inexplicable that was Ever Shown, 1919; fig. 42) remind one of a chaotic variety show or a bloody circus but not of the formation of a new government. The Berlin Dadaists’ magazines and publications Der Dada, Der blutige Ernst (The Bloody Earnest), Die Pleite (The Bankruptcy), and the Dadaist manifestos also critically and satirically concentrated on the Weimar Republic. A caricaturistic dismemberment and distortion is always an attack, which has to be understood as symbolic of a physical injury. This satirical intention goes back to the defamatory images of the
Renaissance, which were used to hang or burn in effigy a condemned person who had managed to escape. This gesture was indeed intensified by Grosz when he demonstratively hanged the embodiments of capital and military (in *Die Pleite* no. 1, 1919).

In the *Kitchen Knife* montage, the zone of the *antidadaistische Bewegung* (anti-Dadaist movement) is dominated by Wilhelm II in his parade uniform. The clipping testifies to his ideological presence in the Weimar Republic. On the same level as the head, there is Kapp escaping in his airplane, above him a soldier wearing a steel helmet. The top hat on Wilhelm’s head, much too small in proportion, reminds one of the popular phrase about his resignation: “He gave his crown for a top hat.” This transformation of a linguistic image into a speaking picture recalls associative forms of rebus, which had been frequent in picture puzzles since the eighteenth century. The generals, who are tellingly positioned in the top right corner, are wearing civilian coats instead of uniforms: Hindenburg, Ludendorff, next to him probably Generalfeldmarschall (five-star general) von Mackensen, and von Falkenhayn. In front of Wilhelm, on the right hand side, a plan view of “movable gambling dens in the streets of Berlin... near an employment agency.” Unemployment after the war was one of the most disquieting facts, especially among homecoming professional soldiers. Metaphorically, machine guns and an airplane are connected to the “anti-Dadaist movement” as signs of the new dimension of warfare.

The lower left part of the anti-Dadaist motif group seems to betray the continuation of military conspiracy — as in the Empire, thus in the Republic. The present encounter between Noske — *Einer muß ja der Bluthund sein* (Someone must be the bloodhound) — and a figure resembling Seeckt, the military commander-in-chief of the Weimar Republic, takes place in the niches of the Kaiser’s imperial pose. During the Kapp putsch, the right-wing revolt of March 1920, Noske had to depend on Seeckt’s assistance in order to put it down. Seeckt’s refusal and the hesitation of Reichswehr and government to help fight the right-wing uprising confirm the strength of the monarchist, anti-republican army as a power within the state.

Between the general and Wilhelm II, the supple movements of dancer Sent M’ahesa create a compositional connection. On her shoulders she carries Hindenburg’s head instead of her own. The ironic exchange of male for female role behavior, of military uniform for the belly dancer’s glittering costume, must have struck a bourgeois public as sacrilege. A central element of this scene is the spoke wheel whose mechanical aimlessness exposes the “anti-Dadaist movement” as nonsensical, idle motion.

On the whole, the different and disparate levels — the changing perspectives and proportions, the suspended single parts and the caricatured, disassembled personalities — create images, which dissolve in all directions. A comparison with the satires of Hausmann, Huelsenbeck, and Grosz, especially with the latter’s painting *Deutschland, ein Wintermärchen* (Germany, A Winter’s Tale, 1917–18; fig. 76), shows the differences in technique and statement: Höch focused on personalities of the Wilhelmian era and the Weimar Republic, whom the media brought to the surface, whereas Grosz chose sociological types of bourgeois for his caricature of the Weimar Republic, especially the monarchist philistine, the submissive soldier, the priest, the teacher, the capitalist. While Grosz ordered society according to class and social standing, satirically exposing their antagonisms, Höch wanted to see even this social context dissolved and superseded by forces, which could no longer be measured by typological criteria. Her personalities — political as well as cultural — have lost their bearings and are presented as grotesques. The new power is negotiated in the seemingly system-less distraction of the media industry, which influenced the perception of the contemporaries mainly through magazines.
Whereas Grosz illuminated the continuing power of bourgeois capitalists and their avarice in satirical caricature, Höch aimed at the media’s pervasive leveling system of commercialism and distribution, which turned her montages into political allegories. Her main focus of critique was no longer the capitalists’ lust for food and drink and sensual pleasures, but the eye’s hunger for continually new sensational information — the excessive hunger for images as the symptom of the twenties’ new media society. Furthermore, behind the facts of perception, of consciousness is the driving force of a supra individual “will to power” — the beat of the wheels, which hides in the representational form of history as the opposing impulses of transgression or retardation. Only rarely did Grosz try, for example in the montage *Germania ohne Hemd* (Germania Shirtless, 1919; fig. 84), to replace the body language of caricature with the simultaneous principle of quotation, in order to reveal the heterochrony in simultaneity.

Nothing was more present to the Berlin Dadaist than the crowds of people (cf. fig. 130) who formed in protest demonstrations on streets and public squares. In the anonymity of the crowd, the Dadaists saw the tendency of an indifferent leveling of personality as well as a liberating collective de-individualization that installed the incognito as a new artistic self-conception. The Dadaists in their soirees consciously addressed the metropolitan crowd that had replaced the small circles of a cultural elite. Especially when on tour, they abandoned the intimacy of the cabaret that was still largely preserved in Zurich.

The masses of people in the *Kitchen Knife* montage (fig. 130) form not a homogeneous stratum acting effectively but a heterogeneous conglomerate of diverse groups; bottom left, for example, is assembled out of two photographs: children who are looking attentively and challenging at the viewer, jammed into a New York street scene. The buildings, among them the New York Stock Exchange, were referred to as the “heart of the world’s economy” in *BIZ*. Attached to the right is a crowd of people who, turned away from the viewer, are obviously listening to a speech by agitator Georg Ledebour. Next to Ledebour is an orator then very well known, the seamen’s leader Tost who was depicted in *BIZ* of January 19, 1919 as “flying agitator” in the context of an article by Stefan Grossmann on the politicizing of the people. Tost commanded the people’s naval division, which was on the side of the revolutionary workers. His montage is assembled from two different photographs: one is the address of an anonymous worker speaking from the roof of an ambulance to the crowd in front of the castle shortly after the proclamation of the Republic in 1918.

Höch adopted not the content but the pathos of agitation, ironically distorting it in the slogan *Tretet Dada bei* (Join Dada) (from Der Dada no. 2, 1919, title page). Dada thereby contradicted the earnestness of propaganda; it was not presented as a politicization of the masses but as a phrase, as the hollow shell of language. Dadaist critique most prominently addressed the paradox of depoliticizing through agitation. Hausmann judged the masses as *ungeistig* (unspiritual), whereas he understood himself as *antigeistig* (anti-spiritual) in the Dadaiist sense. Does the vowel “e” above their heads symbolize their speechlessness? A hierarchy of mass representations in Höch’s montages is conceivable: the insight into the National Assembly is placed at the top, as it were slipped over the masses. The conflicts between agitational orators of the November Revolution, “Republic of Councils vs. National Assembly” were thus already historically superseded.

In the *Kitchen Knife* montage, the cumulative representation of masses appears to be formally set off from the disparate and dispersed single elements. The tight concentration symbolizes the “mass stratification of the population” (Ball). This is not characterized by collective solidarity though, but expresses rather the diverging interests of the street. Höch was
of the opinion that a common ideology of the mass — in the sense of Carl Einstein — merely simulated a *consensus omnium* (consensus of all).\textsuperscript{161}

Quoting American skyscrapers needs to be seen in connection with depicting masses as signs of the increasing urbanization, which began to spread from America to Europe. They became an important feature of Dadaist imagery, for example in Höch’s city montage *New York* (1921)\textsuperscript{162} and Citroën’s metropolis montage (fig. 55). Berlin, too, with its rapidly growing number of inhabitants, had developed into a metropolis and thereby turned more and more into a great colossus of stone. In 1880, the first million had just been exceeded; at the turn of the century, the population approached the second million, and in 1920 (including incorporated districts) the fourth. Berlin had become a city of stone, in particular through its innumerable *Mietskasernen* (tenement blocks) creating unspeakable living conditions. In the *Kitchen Knife* montage, Höch blended Berlin’s reality with photo clippings of American skyscrapers, whose enormity and choking massiveness cramped the children in the narrow street. The new urban reality seemed to create problems that predicted dire consequences for the following generations.

The dangerous aspect of the mechanical elements directed toward the masses is turned grotesque by the flying posture of an ice-skater,\textsuperscript{163} the distorted figure of Mechtilde Lichnowsky. The Princess, born Countess von und zu Arco-Zinneberg (1879–1958), great-granddaughter of Empress Maria Theresia and, after 1904, the wife of Prince Karl Max Lichnowsky, was at that time a respected author. Höch had obviously taken an interest in her modern themes, such as emancipation, marriage, artistry, and politics. In her flight above the masses, Princess Lichnowsky is flanked to the right of the ball bearing by Count Mirbach, the German ambassador to Moscow who was murdered there.\textsuperscript{164} In the place of eyes he has two portraits: one, wearing a turban, is, according to *BIZ*, “the famous prisoner of the Mahdi,” German merchant Karl Neufeld;\textsuperscript{165} the other one is the head of one of the “bathing nymphs.”\textsuperscript{166} Höch took up these effects of obstructing eyes with portraits from Hausmann’s montage *Dr. Max Ruest* (1919; cat. no. 39). On the ambassador’s head is an exotic curiosity, an okapi.\textsuperscript{167} The tip of dancing Niddy Impekoven’s foot\textsuperscript{168} (fig. 130.9) lightly touches the count’s head. On the right beside him, large in the background, we see the architecture of an American skyscraper, an aesthetic innovation of the time: the *New York Times* building.\textsuperscript{169} Aesthetic attractions and sensations of the age, the okapi, the American skyscraper, the murdered ambassador, the exotic prisoner, and the swimmer detach this conglomerate from the framework of political references and mark the reality of the time, which is swamped by sensations.

Höch’s manner of capturing masses of people was far from the representations that preceded photomontage — for example Grosz’s mass of people irrecoverably tumbling toward the abyss in *Widmung an Oskar Panizza* (Dedication to Oskar Panizza) (1917–18; fig. 78) with their images of madness, illness, panic, and death. In the *Kitchen Knife* montage eschatological elements are outweighed by grotesque interpolations, perhaps serving as a reminder of the fact that the hovering, clownish lightness of montage had its origins in deepest doubt.

This also holds true for the caricature of Club Dada. The Berlin group of Dadaists claims as much space in the *Kitchen Knife* montage as the “anti-Dadaist movement”: size and bulk reflect the Dadaists’ self-understanding and self-assessment. *Weltrevolution* (global revolution; fig. 130.1) originally framed the group on its left flank and offensively traversed the lower center of the montage. Dada Berlin brought an eruption of ironic protest, of mountebank manifestos, toward a culture that in the majority of the population still remained Wilhelmian — a protest with which bourgeois society had never previously been confronted. A youthful type entered the elegant world of art salons and galleries, challenging the public with the revolutionary élan of
Dandies whose concentration as a group gave them their antisocial impact. This type was the product and at the same time the antipode of mass society: on the one hand they wanted to combine art with revolution; on the other hand they desired autonomous revolt. With this contradictory stance, the group modeled the attempt in the Weimar Republic to radically connect art and life.

Höch’s inspiration for the quotation *Weltrevolution* probably came from Hausmann’s programmatic essay “*Zur Weltrevolution*” (Toward Global Revolution; 1919). In this essay, he overestimated the postwar situation of change as the “most enormous revolution in all areas of human organization. Not only capitalist economy but also all truth, order, right, morality, even all that is masculine or feminine is in dissolution. Possession is disappearing, mutual exploitation is disappearing; any economic, moral, spiritual profit of the old world order is in the process of dying. It will be replaced by a new form of being that is only beginning to be perceived here and there by those least terrified by the self-destruction, and whose first germs now can be realized.” Hausmann declared the “resignation of the masculine spirit” to be the “innermost nuclear point of the revolution,” in continuation of the demands in *Freie Strasse* (Open Road): “The ‘true’ men today advocate the abolition of men’s possessory rights over women and of the inferior family, and they advocate the communist economic community, which goes hand in hand with an expanded attitude to sexuality.”

The originator of the quotation *Weltrevolution* (renamed as *Die große Welt Dada* (The Great World Dada, ca. 1921), Raoul Hausmann, also forms the focus of the group of Dadaists in the *Kitchen Knife* montage. The portrait used shows him as a screaming Dandy with a monocle, grotesquely clad in a “novel iron diving suit” that, according to *BIZ* of Jan. 18, 1920 was “supposedly usable in twice the depth for which ordinary diving suits are fit” (fig. 130.8). Hausmann appeared as a Dadaist homunculus who, having just slipped from the machine’s uterus, was uttering his first scream. The new man Dada, the “infant of a new age” (Ball), was a stenciled, robot-like serial product. One year earlier, in 1919, Höch presented him in a similar motif, in the watercolor *Er und sein Milieu* (He and His Milieu; fig. 136): as a small doll, helplessly suspended upside down, tied to the tube of a gas lantern.

Next to Hausmann’s machine apparatus and the groß*e Welt Dada* we witness the resurrection of *Jesus redivivus, Oberdada* Johannes Baader. In filmic succession, headless bathing nymphs placed on top of one another suggest the imposture of his appearance; the heads of Radek and Lenin are placed on little acrobats’ suits, it seems, giving the impression of a clown’s number, and in-between is pasted Baader’s head. In this way they parody his revolutionary affectation. His megalomaniac importance as “President of the Earth and the Globe” appears ironically exaggerated, distorting the actual historic significance of the Russian revolutionaries with whom the Berlin Dadaists had shared common hopes in 1917.

Between Hausmann’s armor and Däubler’s obesity, which reminds one of circus freaks, is a playful caricature of Grosz: the body of a ballet dancer in classical costume, performing a pirouette, is furnished with his portrait and with that of the European heavyweight champion Georges Carpentier (fig. 130.4). Like a small product of this dance symbiosis, the Swedish sportsman Appelgren is playing with a watering can at her feet. The grotesque combination of ballet and sports presumably was to make ironic Grosz’s fascination for boxing and sports competitions as an expression of the modern American way of life. Grosz wanted to see the artist’s technique determined by provocation and aggression as demanded by competitions: “Yes! To become elastic again, flexing in all directions, — bending — and striking! Chin or stomach punch!” The pirouette movement symbolizes his “mobility in all bones.” The dancer
also reminds one of the American ballet dancer Lillian Elmore, who was admired by Heartfield and Grosz. At the same time, this toe dance associated Grosz’s light, graceful, and quick line, which Höch admired.

Dancer Niddi Impekoven as a children’s nurse is washing Heartfield as a Dada baby in a tub. Niddy’s portrait was cut off from her dancing body (at the montage’s center; fig. 130.9) and transplanted onto the nurse. Heartfield’s portrait is taken from a photo in Der Dada (no. 3, 1920) showing him together with a donkey and carries the subscription: “Der Monteurdada John Heartfield lehrt den [sic] intellektuellen Eseln Dada” (The Dada-mechanic John Heartfield teaching Dada to the intellectual donkeys). Heartfield’s brother Wieland Herzfelde,179 director of Malik-Verlag and editor of Dadaist writings, is vainly dressed in the Empress’s crinoline.180 Höch concealed him between the letters “Dadaisten.” Also in this grotesque distortion, the doll-like cross-dressing of her male colleagues has an androgynous effect comparable to the montage Hindenburg/belly-dancer. On the same level, Baader appears a second time as a Dandy with Dadaistically distorted eyes, accompanied by Pola Negri,181 a movie vamp just about to become popular at the time. Her bust was placed onto the kneeling lower body of the prophet Elihu, a figure from the Hiob (Job) group of sculptor Joachim Karsch, as shown in the Freie Secession summer exhibition of 1920.182 The clipping may allude to Baader’s role as Doomsday judge. His picture is cut out of a double portrait montage183 (cat. no. 5) whose other half is the semi-profile of Hausmann, which is pasted onto the Balkan train.184 The very small portrait of Walter Mehring at the lower end of the Kitchen Knife montage also stems from Der Dada (no. 3). An overdimensional athlete’s body caricatures Mehring’s dainty appearance.

In this playful use of proportions, of combinations of portrait photographs with disparate bodies, the richly varied disposal of persons turns into the surprise game of their evaluation. Portrait photos previously used in photomontages and publications are detached from their contexts and combined anew. The material appears to be in continual motion, completely abandoned to the Dadaist imagination. Here we can realize how the principle of montage preceded computer-techniques.

Höch told me that she did not include the Weltdada (Worlddada) Huelsenbeck in the group of Dadaists because of his quarrels with Hausmann. The actress Asta Nielsen, placed at the right edge, is accorded a special position. She did not belong to the Berlin Dadaist circle and was nonetheless integrated because Höch admired her. In her view, she was the first actress to achieve artistic expression in film beyond the theatrical effect. The press photographer, who had climbed up to the very top of a ship in order to take a picture of a naval parade in the New York harbor, supplied the basis for the image.185 At the time when the Kitchen Knife montage was assembled, Nielsen was shooting her famous Hamlet film (1920), in which she cross-dressed as the title figure: a king’s daughter who, for dynastic reasons, grows up as a boy and man. For this reason she wears trousers in this montage; self-confident, she faces the viewer. Five years later she would again be cited by Höch: in the oil painting Roma (1925; fig. 139), which connects Nielsen186 as Hamlet (fig. 139.2) from the year 1920 with a portrait of Mussolini187 (fig. 139.3), taken from BIZ. Her gesture, which signals “Get out!” seems to command the Duce to leave Rome as quickly as possible. She transforms his 1922 “march for Rome” into a “march out of Rome.” This oil painting reveals the influence of the montage principle, because it presents image citations and the remaining traces of cutting. The painting was prepared by the montage Pax (1923; fig. 139.1), which is now lost. Here a church dignitary appears as a hollow form of Mussolini’s body, an allusion to the growing power of the Duce. The cutout empty space...
determines the image in the same degree, as do the image citations themselves. In this manner Höch also cited what was not representable.

Compared to the other presentations in the montage, the members of Club Dada most clearly display an isolated, suspended, artistic character. The word “Dadaisten”\textsuperscript{188} extends across the group directly attached to the driving Balkan express train, as if the train were transporting the letters. It signals the Dadaists’ attitude to simultaneity: “The elevators are rushing . . . Train wrecks, catastrophic explosions . . . the Balkan train is speeding right across Central Europe, but there’s also flowering trees and rationing of luxury jam.”\textsuperscript{189} Significantly, both one half of Hausmann’s profile and of Höch’s portrait are placed on the Balkan express train, their “rattling soul motor” Dada. They appear in connection with a map of Europe\textsuperscript{190} displaying those countries where women have been granted the right to vote, as a unifying life-vein of emancipation. Maps, like mechanical elements, belonged to the iconographic stock of Dadaist productions. They were inserted as scientific image media into the interiors of Hausmann’s montages \textit{Tatlin lebt zu Hause} (Tatlin Lives at Home, 1920; fig. 109) and \textit{Ein bürgerliches Präzisionsgehirn ruft eine Weltbewegung hervor} (A Bourgeois Precision-Brain Causes a World Movement, 1920; cat. no. 29). Höch’s cartogram, on whose edge is pasted one half of her portrait, also recorded statistic measurements: women’s right to vote. Working, as all the Dadaists did, toward liberation from social conventions, Höch criticized especially the contradictions between women’s newly won right to vote, their politicization during the war, and the fact that they afterwards faded back into privacy during demobilization. In Germany, women’s vote was introduced at the beginning of the Weimar Republic (1919). Yet their real integration into the work process failed to come: the percentage of working women remained the same as before the war. For the time the right to vote was reduced to merely a formal equality, and the kitchen knife was reintroduced as largely the only means of production available to women.

For this reason, Hannah Höch seemed to call into question these political rights of women in her montage \textit{Dada Rundschau} (Dada Review, 1919; fig. 129). In the top left corner, a text reads: “\textit{Deutsche Frauen in die Nationalversammlung}” (German Women into the National Assembly); the bodies of two dancing female figures\textsuperscript{191} carry the heads of three women. Full of expectation, unpoltical and naive, barefooted, still rooted in a pre-industrial romanticism, they enter Parliament. Höch obviously distrusted the political consciousness of contemporary women. The fact that one of the heads can be identified as belonging to Deputy Anna von Giercke, a Potsdam member of the nationalistic party,\textsuperscript{192} proves the renewed tendency of conservative selection. For Höch the postwar relegation of women to marriage and family and the media’s commercialization of the new type of women in the twenties constituted a constant focus of critique: she was skeptical about the departure from the traditional role into a new self-confidence. The hovering, prancing and jumping female montage figures — do they give an impression of this departure? Höch refers to the image of modern woman that pervaded the last pages of magazines as sensation: as springboard diver (fig. 129), dancer (fig. 132.1 and 132.2), ice skater, swimmer. Like the politicians, they fit into a photogenic magazine reality. Höch’s contrast of these women to predominantly static male poses reveals clearly a new mobility invoked by her with the new type of woman. Yet at the same time she shows this mobility as groundless, looking like a stance of departure frozen in instantaneous photography, for these movements appear grotesque, suspended in empty space; aimless, in vain, they seem to scatter in variations, resulting in distraction but not in transformation. Höch thus begins to question this new type of woman at the moment of its first appearance, lest it coagulate in a photogenic stereotype. The gaze was to be broken again and again, perpetually dismantled, reassembled,
irritated, and sharpened in order to claim a multiplicity of potential self-realizations and roles for women.

Other Dadaist montages also blended autobiographical with topical references, with the intention to mutually relate art and life and to stage it by all means. George Grosz caricatured the Club Dada in the montage (now lost) *Vierundzwanzig Dada-Spiesser besteigen einen Pudding* (Twenty-Four Dada Philistines Climbing a Pudding). It was listed as no. 4 in the catalog of the Dada-Fair and was last mentioned in 1922 in the catalog of the Grosz exhibition by Garvens, Hanover. *Dada im gewöhnlichen Leben (Dada Cino)* (Dada in Everyday Life (Dada Cinema)) (1920; fig. 107) by Raoul Hausmann shows the portraits of his friends Grosz, Heartfield, and Schlchter. They are not deformed in their physiognomies but exposed to the different interferences of the montage. Isolated portrait montages of friends Anselm Ruest and Salomo Friedlaender, the individual anarchists around the magazine *Der Einzige* (The Only One), were exhibited by Hausmann at the Dada-Fair (cat. no. 38, 39). In addition, he caricatured Richard Huelsenbeck in the montage *Ein bürgerliches Präcisionsgehirn ruft eine Weltbewegung hervor* (A Bourgeois Precision Brain Causes a World Movement, 1920; cat. no. 29). Grosz and Heartfield in their turn ridiculed Hausmann in *Henri Rousseau. Selbstbildnis* (Henri Rousseau. Self-Portrait, 1920; cat. no. 73) and themselves in *Der wildgewordene Spieße wie zu viele. Electromech. Tatlin-Plastik* (The Philistine Heartfield Run Wild. Electromech. Tatlinist Sculpture, 1920; cat. no. 90). Grosz assembled Wieland Herzfelde in *Porträt des Dichters vom Kurfürstendamm* (Portrait of the Poet from Kurfürstendamm, 1920; cat. no. 64) for the latter’s publication *Tragigrotesken der Nacht* (Tragigrotesques of the Night, 1920; fig. 123.1), which recorded dreams from his army time, and he introduced Heartfield as *Monteurdada* (Dada-mechanic): *Der Monteur John Heartfield. Nach Franz Jungs Versuch ihn wieder auf die Beine zu stellen* (The Mechanic John Heartfield. After Franz Jung’s Attempt to Put Him Back on His Feet, 1920; cat. no. 62). And himself he alienated as a machine in “Daum” marries her pedantic automaton “George” in May 1920. John Heartfield is very glad of it. (Meta-mech. constr. nach [according to] Prof. R. Hausmann [1920; fig. 86.3; cat. no. 52]). Hanoverian Dadaist Kurt Schwitters interwove autobiographical traces into a life-artwork in his “Merz building” growing since 1923. Each friend was accorded a grotto in this house; the Berlin friends Hausmann and Höch were even allowed to design theirs for themselves: the former exhibited himself as *Monna Hausmann, “consisting of a copy of the Mona Lisa, with the face of Raoul Hausmann pasted over it, which has robbed her completely of her stereotypical smile”*; Hannah Höch designed her grotto as a *Bordell von einer Dame mit drei Beinen* (Brothel of a Lady with Three Legs).

A similar gathering and reassembling of friends’ self-portraits, determined by irony and self-irony, can be recognized in the texts of Dadaist magazines and in the portrait photographs, particularly in *Der Dada* no. 3 (Berlin 1920) and *Dada* no. 6 (Paris 1920). In his draft of an exhibition poster (1921), Max Ernst presented an anti-monument to himself as “Liar, Legacy-hunter, Con Man, Horse-trader, Slanderer, and Boxer.” Comparable to graffiti on houses and walls, Picabia in *L’Oeil cacodylate* (1921) assembled the witticisms of his friends around the drawing of an eye, complementing them with photographs. Hannah Höch in *Meine Haussprüche* (Proverbs to Live By, 1922) took stock of her Dada time. She used citations of her Dada friends emblematically, which led to inspirations and leaps of thought that were never to exhaust their meaning. In the montages, biographical traces and enigmas of life are blended with Dada’s intention of aestheticizing and politicizing one’s own life.

The personal allusions and caricatures in the montages were part of the Dadaist procedure of staging one’s own person, which could involve self-contradictions to the point of a
paradoxical self-cancellation. In an age that regarded history as decline, an age dominated by political pessimism and inflationary commercialism, the traces of one’s own life story became signs of an artistic stance. In the combination of art and life, this ultimately strengthened the common fighting spirit and despite all its unfathomable nature pursued a strategy of upgrading the self. At the same time portrait photography was for the first time in media history discovered as an experimental field of artistic creation.

The Dionysian force of the wheels and the montage as political allegory mutually increase their effect by their polarity. Whereas in the allegory the contemporary facies hippocratica disintegrated kaleidoscopically, the elementary dynamics served to upgrade the processual aspect. The weightlessness of buffoonery, the exchange of roles and costumes, of bodies and heads, the polar play with female and male characterize this Dadaist game floating above the epoch’s abyss.

“Yes to the Gigantic Global Nonsense!”:
Creative Indifference

“The great world Dada” presented itself in the ambivalence of negating affirmation, in the simultaneity of ecstasy and emptiness. The Dadaist circus mundi put people into a state of weightlessness, ranging from serene balance to grotesque show numbers. Everything was touched by this game and drawn into its dance. The artistic aspects of these pieces of life-art devoid of bottom or sky were still traceable in every single montage.

Hannah Höch concealed the key to her Kitchen Knife montage (fig. 130) in the hint at Salomo Friedlaender’s essay “Der Waghalter der Welt” (The Equilibrist of the World’s Scales), the title of which she pasted onto Albert Einstein’s forehead. The essay was first published in 1915 in the Weissen Blätter and republished in Friedlaender’s philosophical treatise Schöpferische Indifferenz (1918) under the title “Weltperson” (Person-of-the-World). The chaotic incoherence in the photomontage from the perspective of creative indifference also meant exactly the opposite: “the other extreme of extreme coherence.” To Friedlaender the person-of-the-world appeared as a synthetic, equilibrating, Dionysian-Apollinian “mediator of all quantities without ever “reconciling” them in any other way than in difference, polarity, and magnetic tension.” To “reconcile” is not to harmonize but to indifferentiate polar differences, vivaciously balancing the oppositional tensions. Polarities and their reciprocity were premises for the world-person Dada and his complex cut through the times. They collided at zero, the point of indifference as coincidentia oppositorum. By the force of its humorous, magic, dynamic will, the subject, supremely aware of polar differences, was able to create indifference:

I am the indifference, man is my plaything, time is the driving wheel of my eternity, my eternal present. I am present. My interior nothing is the synthesis of the world, wherein all its antitheses are personally made indifferent. My name as a man was Nietzsche, and I died of the indigestion that humanity caused me.

Indifference transformed contingency into complexity: the “absolute soul” became the “most conscientious equilibrist of its own counterbalances.”

Albert Einstein seemed to take on the part of this pensive “person-of-the-world” in the montage, who was able to create his “own divinity,” looking down on the world of the montage with a Friedlaenderian, thus Dadaist, consciousness. The infinity symbol in his eye, pointing to
the infinite possibilities of a world dissolving into relativities and variable magnitudes, also underscored the idea of infinitely polarizing “elasticity” that was able to creatively produce its own balancing middle. Transcending beyond a torn and chaotic world, beyond its “exteriority,” this elasticity achieved a subjective synthesis, an “interiority.” At the basis of the montages was the aesthetic-philosophical will to a “general relation” redeeming all relations, balancing infinity, “the + and the -, at the point zero of the world.”

Einstein thus was the greatness of the Individuum (individual), the undivided, to which the Dividuen (individuals), much divided and dismembered, could be playfully attributed. He embodied the instance of indifference, which dynamically regulated the opposite extremes in a polar way. Creative indifference in its conflicting tension was a supremely skeptical attitude with an appraising ability:

To be able to doubt you need a hinge around which it is revolving, the central nothing of this gyration. Doubt, which shies away from any affirmation, any negation as if from fire, here finally finds the balance of its extremes in the pure nothing of their collision, discovering itself as the equilibrist of all its opposites.

In this way Friedlaender overcomes the “spirit of gravity,” and in the Nietzschean sense approaches the ultimate superior level of consciousness in the spiritual-mental self-metamorphosis: the “child’s innocence.” This intensification is allegorized in the montage of the woman dancer as the Dionysian equivalent to Einstein’s contemplation.

At the center of the Kitchen Knife montage, the dance of Niddy Impekoven represents the equilibrist of all opposites, that well-known, graceful, child-like dancer of the time in a Pritzel costume who is, herself headless, playfully throwing into the air the head of Käthe Kollwitz (fig. 130.6). With this artist Dada associated a “spirit of gravity”: moral social accusation, concern, and suffering in an unjust world. In the montage, her social conscience became a plaything for the dance because Dada knew neither a reassuring nor a reassured cultural conscience, not even in social commitment. It was the “dance above the moralities of the earth” (Huelsenbeck) that separated Höch from Kollwitz. The dance gained its life-enhancing power only in the standpoint of having no standpoint, freed from the orientational purpose of cultural hierarchies of values as much as from domineering ideologies. It symbolized in the Nietzschean sense “a supreme state of affirming existence, from which even the highest pain cannot be subtracted: the divine lightness, levity in the most serious gravity.”

In playing with the remnants and tatters of meaning, the dancer affirms “the gigantic global nonsense” (Grosz) and serenely counterbalances Kollwitz’s social commitment and pain. “To be able to dance as a star in the chaos of all positions and negations,” this makes her capable of approaching the weightlessness of dancing Zarathustra. “Precisely in . . . this accessibility to all opposites Zarathustra experiences himself as the supreme being of all beings” — thus Nietzsche’s Ecce homo is quoted as the motto to the Friedlaender’s essay “Der Waghalt der Welt” (The Equilibrist of the World’s Scales), continuing in the text:

The soul that has the longest ladder and reaches down deepest – the most comprehensive soul, which can run and stray and roam farthest within itself; the most necessary soul, which plunges joyously into chance; the being soul that dives into becoming; the having soul that wants to want and will; the soul fleeing
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itself and catching up with itself in the widest circles; the wisest soul that folly persuades most sweetly; the most self-loving soul, in which all things have their sweep and countersweep and ebb and flood.208

Zarathustra in the new role of the female dancer seems to have gone over from the caves of contemplation, from the mountains and lakes into the chaos of civilization, doing his dance amid the world of machines and media, the grotesque montages of men and beasts. Did he not always have the idea that he “composed and gathered into one what is fragment and riddle and terrible chance?”209 Niddy Impekoven is weightlessly, headlessly dancing fate — in the way Dionysus himself appeared — transforming history into an artistic venture and the Dadaist himself into a balancer of reality’s infinitely polar opposites rooted in the same basic stream of life: “One is a piece of fate,” wrote Nietzsche, “belonging to the whole, being in the whole — there is nothing which could judge, measure, compare, or sentence our being, for that would mean judging, measuring, comparing, sentencing the whole . . . But there is nothing outside the whole! . . . — that alone is the great liberation.”210

The movements of the dancer are, similar to Kleist’s puppets, so gracefully “antigrave” because “their dance completely plays across into the realm of mechanical forces.”211 She is unconsciously “non-artistic,” comparable to that doll in the “Museum of Paltry Paralysis” of Carl Einstein’s Bebuquin — a doll that has been blowing a kiss ever since she came into being.212 Höch’s dance of Niddy Impekoven seems related to that of the jugglers in Ernst Blaß’s sonnet “Die Jungfrau” (The Virgin, 1911):

Jugglers take off their heads
And throw them whistling sharply up into the air.
The bones are bleating when with a loud bang
A head fizzles out into the universe.213

The grotesque, more connected with moments of fear in Blaß, seems to be counterbalanced in the montage by the process of indifference. Nonetheless Hannah Höch admits an opposing perception, making the dancer’s indifference transparent in its ambiguity. The achievement of elasticity, the instant of fulfillment — the “all” — can also be related to the horror vacui (Huelsenbeck) perceiving the dance from its ending — the loss of equal weighing. Behind the search for the fulfilled instant lurks the fear of the empty instant’s nothingness.

The dance as an allegorical proof of the Dadaist artist’s immediate existence in mass culture also makes the dancer seem locked up in the dynamics of social machinery. Her independence is revealed as an illusion, for she needs society to which, however, she will not make any concessions — although the public echo forms the basis of her narcissistic existence. Does this make the dance an illusionist showpiece in the circus of society? Is she herself not more than a reflection of the seeming liveliness of the circulating world of commodities? Her movement appears frozen as in instantaneous photography. If we read the montage this way, the presence, concentrated in the mutual polarities of creative indifference, will again disintegrate into single particles lacking all connections; the dancing and hovering figures all around will dwindle to isolated, attention-seeking show maneuvers, leaving open the gap between opposites.

Thus, the dance allegorizes the artist’s realistic situation of being at the disposal of the modern culture industry and depending on the audience’s forgetting as well as its lust for sensations. The Dadaist was artist and impresario all in one, conscious of the fact that, isolated
from the crowd, he was performing a clown’s dance. As the last impresario of a bankrupt cultural enterprise the Dadaist willy-nilly became the artist of his existence. As a result of this understanding the Dada movement was in its essence production and performance: the dancer staged the tragic problem of the artist’s isolation as grotesque. The dance was an eccentric pose that seemed self-stabilizing.

With the motif of the female dancer, Höch referred to the modern artist’s identification models — the clown, the circus acrobat, and the tightrope walker. “To fling oneself across space, above the void, from one point to the other with agility and confidence, this is the supreme skill of the clown and I imagine that it is also the only skill of the poet.” Thus, in 1917 Mallarmé characterized the situation of the poet. Dada related this eccentricity emerging out of nothing to “clown’s game” — and especially to the metaphorical act of the tightrope walker who appeared coincidentally as “a transition” and “a downfall” in Zarathustras Vorrede (Introduction) (Nietzsche). Many Dadaists invented grotesquely intensified figures, for example Kaspar by Hans Arp, and Machetanz, Tenderenda, and Koko, the green god, by Hugo Ball. In the rotation of Machetanz the world was dissolved into a fantastic nothing: “He rents the big momentum and clatters breaking in the ascent through the tangle of spokes of the imaginary Titan wheels. Threatening him are the faces of quick decision, of the enterprising scalp, of bleating skepticism. With broken lungs he leaps out of a goblin’s hand . . . He wants to have the experience . . . ‘Quantity is everything,’ he shouts . . . ‘Originality is an air-bubble bladder catarrh.’” Machetanz ends in paralysis; his dance reveals itself as the paroxysm of an idle protest facing an abyss.

In this ambivalence between divine weightlessness and grotesque dissembling of the emptiness the dance oscillated, growing into distorted motifs of motion put together in abrupt dissonance, represented in Höch’s montages like Da-Dandy (1919), Bürgerliches Brautpaar (Streiti) (Bourgeois Bride and Groom (Tiff, 1919), Der Vater (The Father, 1920; fig. 132), Dada-Tanz (Dada-Dance, 1922; fig. 133). In Dada-Tanz two grotesque beings meet: a lady in fashionable dress, her head replaced by a photo-portrait of a black man, much too small, associating ragtime tap dance, and a female creature who only exists down to the bottom of her skirt. They are performing a dance on spiral machine parts and metal filings — an abysmal dance, beneath which is the quotation: “Hell’s profit goes to the funds of parson Klatt for innocent children of criminals.” In the montage FIAT MODES (Let There Be Fashion, ca. 1920), Hausmann depicts women’s legs fanning out in a grotesque rotary motion against a background of sound-poems and female athletes taken from BIZ. A dancing female figure is inserted as an ice skater into the simultaneous activities of Dada im gewöhnlichen Leben (Dada Cino) (Dada in Everyday Life [Dada Cinema], 1920; fig. 107).

Dance, for the Berlin Dadaists, was not only an allegory but also an art of living. For the transvaluation of art and culture was only possible via the “will” to the body and its very own laws, which seemed to be independent of cultural valuations. The dance had to be performed “unconsciously”: “Dancing, the body realizes the place and the second. Without idea, without soul, without eroticism . . . The runner runs without idea. The boxer boxes without soul. The swimmer swims without eroticism. Likewise the dancer expediently proceeds from the second of the place.” Carl Einstein had admired in 1911 this antipsychological, anti-illusionist, functional concept in the dancer Napierkowska. Hausmann’s dance unfolded in analogy to the onomatopoetic sound sequences out of its own motor functions moving in space.

Already Swiss Dadaism had actualized the dance as a free spatio-time experience. Pupils of Laban, Maya Chrusecz, Suzanne Perrotet, Mary Wigman, Claire Walther, and Katja Wulff performed new dances at Cabaret Voltaire. Sophie Taeuber was the first to give a Dadaist
potential to dance by her synaesthesia of word and movement for Ball’s poem Gesang der Flugfische und Seepferdchen (Song of the Flying Fish and Sea-horses): “It was a dance full of tiptoes and fish bones, full of iridescent sunshine and brilliance, and of cutting acuteness. The lines splintered on her body.”

Grosz in 1918 emphasized the fact that the Dada artist was a dancer through and through, that his body’s multiplicity of movements was related the closest to his art and found expression in the accelerated rhythms of his work: “bönn’sch o bläckberri’s, tap dancing all night on the studio floor – enormous mountains of paint and canvas deserts – streams of linseed oil and copal cinnabar! Cinnabar, dear Oz!” The eccentric brisk movements of the tap dancer could no longer be distinguished from Grosz’s staccato of lines of quill pen and brush.

It was from the elementary experience of dancing that the Dadaist captured the rhythmic organization of his montages. Therefore the dancer’s levity and weightlessness were both artistic and allegorical, a “hovering between two worlds” between an old, perishing world and a new one, which could not yet be shaped. The question of the tolle Mensch (raving person) in Die fröhliche Wissenschaft (Gay Science) “Whither are we moving?” remained unanswered: “Are we not continually falling? And backwards, sideways, forward, in all directions? Do above and below still exist? Are we not erring as through an infinite nothingness? Do we not feel the breath of the void?” In a world in which much seemed available, disposable, easily reachable, and legible, yet in which the meaning of appearances remained elusive, history turned into randomness, reduced to the moment, and revealed a chaotic void behind its dynamic facade. The Dadaist tried to hover over this abyss by dancing and to transvaluate it into a place of transition.

“The Hour of Noon”:

Photoplays Unleashed — “This American Electric Brightness”

In Hannah Höch’s montage, the dance is performing a balancing feat in which all contradictions, all fragmentations are concentrated in the polarizing indifference of a “cross-section.” Likewise in Heartfield’s Leben und Treiben in Universal-City, 12 Uhr 5 mittags (Life and Bustle in Universal City 12:05 Noon, short title Universal-City, 1920; fig. 117) the achievement of weightlessness is represented by the filmic gaze. Whereas the female dancer in Höch combines the acrobatics of the moving body with the conception of montage, Grosz and Heartfield use film as a new mechanical allegorization of their creative indifference. Grosz feels like a film running off and at the same time like an unbiased observer who is captured by his perception: “like a child in a thousand amusement parks,” “someone is constantly turning the crank.” The eye seemed to become identical with the film camera, ideally corresponding to the unprejudiced gaze of Nietzsche’s “self” that, like the child, is again capable of abandoning itself to the randomness of the world’s play, without perspective, without meaning or purpose, “with the eyes of the senses” and the “ears of the mind.” The Dadaist, in Huelsenbeck’s idea of the “New Man” feels like the “god of the moment” and concentrates the new media, the sampling they are offering, into a multifaceted configuration of montage. As the “last neutral medial indifferent,” he believes himself identical with the innumerable possibilities of the present — with vibrant life at rush hour, around noon. Universal-City aims at the ecstatic experience of a new immediacy. Nietzsche experienced this as the “hour of noon” in nature. The Dadaists did so in the Americanized, chaotic turbulence of the city and the media, as the unity of subject and object, moment and eternity in the sense of neutralization of time in simultaneity: “five minutes past twelve” means: beyond time, “time without aim”: the clock is falling out of the montage.
The montage attempts to create a complex synaesthetic experience of the visual and acoustic possibilities of signal- and communications-media developed by technology and science. It mainly deals with titles of magazines, advertisement, and films of American extraction, reproductions of photos of American actors. Objects, words, buildings, people are exposed to the same dynamic process of an unleashed lifeworld of media. In the “hour of noon,” Zarathustra let the light of sunshine take effect upon him: “Here I sat waiting, waiting – but for nothing, /Beyond good and evil, now enjoying / Light, now shade, wholly only play, / Wholly lake, wholly noon, wholly time without aim.” The Dadaists, on the other hand, refer to the medial effect of the light of “Photoplays” and to “this American electric brightness” which freed itself from the “obscure death-wish of the civilized occident.” In the montage Dada-merika (1920; fig. 162) Grosz inserted himself into a scattered crystalline mosaic showing a fantastic world of lights in which the elements of numbers and wheels blended. The Dadaists regarded the American influence as a possibility of a Dionysian-Apollinian transvaluation of Weimar culture: “With the light we want the great undiscovered America, life!” Hausmann wrote in his 1921 manifesto PRÉsentismus: “In the annoying gray of Protestant despair we want to open all the valves and make the electric fans revolve in a frenzy . . . We are faced with the most extreme decision toward the possible world!”

Here the culture industry of America, which in the early twenties powerfully entered the “decomposing” culture of Europe, is passing in review. At the center, next to a white-bearded Uncle Sam type probably taken from a tobacco advertisement, is a black man, possibly Paul Robeson, a well-known African-American singer, with whose social role as outsider Dada identified. The Italian-American movie actor Rudolph Valentino seems to appear below their heads. The girl with the gun (right) may be the actress Lillian Gish. Top right, there is the name of a western movie hero, “Broncho Bill,” protagonist of the first westerns like The Great Train Robbery (1903), played by G. M. Anderson. Below “Dadaing,” as it were the present progressive of “to dada,” the term “Trade Show,” as a commercial American movie fair, points to the ironic naming of the First International Dada-Fair. The biggest word in the montage is “Fox,” the name of one of the most important American movie companies: 20th Century Fox. Below it is a filmstrip, which reappears twice in the left half of the montage. Universal-City also concretely refers to the “city of film” in Hollywood, which the producer Carl Laemmle from Wurttemberg (Germany) had built up with a lot of effort in the San Fernando Valley after 1915. Laemmle, identified as the fictitious owner of the montage in the catalog of the Dada-Fair (cat. no. 152) was probably known to Grosz and Heartfield from their work as prop designers at UFA (1917–19). He possibly also impressed them with his mentality of a boxer for having asserted himself in Hollywood with his corporation of production, distribution, and movie theaters under the name of Universal against Thomas A. Edison’s powerful trust, the MPPC (Motion Picture Patents Company).

Film as perception set in motion gave Dada access to the complex experience of media reality. The cinematographic motion culminates in the centrifugal force of the wheel. Its velocity makes the scenery of advertisement and movie photos explode in hectic dispersal, discontinuity, and stimulus satiation. The wheel indicates the autonomous motion of a great simultaneous rotation — via “Son of a Gun,” “Dadaing” (top left), the mouthpiece of a telephone with a figure leaping out of it (with “Photoplays”), and the beams — back to its point of origin. This circle is crossed by the diagonal direction of a city street (from left to right, across the whole montage). Dada defines itself in cinematic/photographic playfulness: it is moving in the montage as “Ad” or “da,” losing itself as “D” in the spokes of the wheel, resurfacing in the advertisement letters,
finding itself again in the fragments of words, and gathering twice in “Dadaing” (top left and right).

In the simultaneous registration of moving, spatial fields of relation, structured by lights, one can see the transfer of cinematic techniques into montage. In its dynamics, this already points forward to the future superpositions of images, variations of exposure, image rhythms, and intervals in film: “This work of art, of which the poet Wieland Herzfelde says that he likes it immensely, illustrates the life and bustle in Universal-City with the means of film. It is not a Futurist painting, because it is a Dadaist picture, and an excellent one at that.” Film with its structure of motion serves as a model to the Dadaists for reorganizing people’s modes of perception – away from the static mode of central perspective toward an energetically charged multifocal vision.

Phonetica complexity takes over the montage. The most prominent element next to the wheel is the telephone horn, a signal of the incipient age of worldwide communication. It marks civilization’s newly gained possibilities of communication and gives an aggressive acoustic intensity to the words that are faded in, such as “Cheer, Boys Cheer,” “Son of a Gun,” “The Sun Bleaches ‘Old Bleach,’” “Gripping,” “Kady”; this intensity refers back repeatedly to “Dadaing,” because its size directly next to the telephone horn associates the biggest volume. “Cheer, Boys Cheer” was probably the name of a musical, as was “Son of a Gun.” The homophony of “Son” and “The Sun” next to it is reminiscent of simultaneous and bruitist poetry. “The Sun Bleaches ‘Old Bleach’” is probably an advertisement for a bleaching agent, meant to associate the bleaching power of the sun. “The Sun,” like “Firefly” cited next to it as if handwritten, intensifies the luminescence of the advertisements. Relating to the mouthpiece we read “Photoplays;” in its original American meaning it denotes early films and also associates the Dadaist play with photos. In the montage, it establishes references to The Play, an English theater magazine (fig. 117.1), and in the Nietzschean interpretation, an expression of the eternal cycle of the world’s play without meaning or purpose. Identifying with chaotic simultaneity, the Dadaist again reaches for the play of creativity. According to Oberdada Baader, “Dada” and The Play enhanced his idea that Dada was “the creator of all things and God and world revolution and judgment day all rolled into one simultaneously.” It is five minutes past twelve. Does the citation “The Kady” [= Kadi: short for legal court, BP] ironically allude to the Superdada’s Dionysian Judgment Day?

In its Hoch-Zeit (high time), the play reveals also its deepest insights: they cannot be conveyed by media citations but are by Grosz’s pen at the center of the montage. People are at the disposal of their own unleashed creations and react with panicked midday shock. The distorted modern soul, the physiognomies marked by angst concentrate in Grosz’s vibrating lines of a labyrinthine net. The Dadaist is dragging out the “Gorgon’s head of terror” hiding only far too often behind petit bourgeois’ idylls; as detective he enters an inextricable maze, cool and distanced, masked as Sherlock Holmes. The Da-Dantesque inferno culminates in the mass culture of the modern city. This Dionysian, chaotic city vision is Grosz’s focus: “The songs of the signboards . . . the circular dance of letters — and the port-red, kidney-devouring nights in which the moon is next to infection and swearing cabdriver, and where in a dusty coal cellar someone is being strangled to death — oh emotion of the big cities!” This associative chain of coincidence, in which everything happens in a tragic Dionysian motion, visualizes the “indifference toward happiness and death, joy and misery,” “the self-evident, undifferentiated, unintellectual life.” The cruel, living simultaneity as a Dionysian force of life, has its climax in the vision of the American metropolis (which Grosz at that time had never seen). While the artist
can enhance his experience toward “overman” (Nietzsche), the mass of people is dissociated and deformed. The “emotion of the big cities” (Grosz) not only destroys everything “anti-vital” but produces the self-destructive drive of man. The artist’s draftsmanship becomes a “bouncy excitement” (Grosz).  

New York I

Don’t know if it’s red suns burning, moons shining,
Neon signs are thin inflammations of blue,
Don’t know if this is God’s lightning
Or that of the blasphemous chewing-gum ads,
Overhead railroad rockets are shooting from my eyes
And the Negro is dreaming at the quay.
Signposts stumble and stiffen in red.
Human bodies lie like lumps of old clothes
(Smoking, singed, inflamed, half dead)
As cattle lying on a knacker’s yard,
In the parks close to the quays.
Stare with bloody eyes,
Sit on beams and boards.
Jackals, hyenas.
Human waves throw dead tank on the shores of New York.

New York II

101 degrees! Wamamaker [sic]! Six Day Race Track!
The people are like hot sausages in this swelter, wet!!
Towering 50 cent bazaars keep vomiting people out into the streets,
Stinking and stewing.
101 degrees!
A breeze like in giant dynamo halls, humid, oily,
Somewhere red bones are growing out of the ground,
All of iron and steel, towering —
—Signs are grinning, letters dancing
Blue, red, – Bethlehem Steel Works —
Towerling high up like bird boxes
Finished floors, human spots and cranes
Hanging in iron fishnets.
Thundering fast overhead railroad and roaring hot.
Newspapers explode from out of cars —
And on 28th St. a girl jumps
From the eleventh floor because of the heat
– 101 degrees —
Everything is drying, seething, hissing, bawling, blaring, trumpeting,
hopping, whistling, reddening, sweating, vomiting, and working.
The Dionysian glance into the American Hexenkessel (witches’ cauldron, i.e. chaos) is connected to the Dadaist advocacy of life in an unadulterated form — direct, brutal, and therefore true. The land of unlimited possibilities admits the coincidence of all opposites in a single instant, both the cruel and the cheerful. That is why the Dadaists played out the fascination of American life against the philosophical extravagance of European culture, against the sublimated spirituality of expressionism and the “eternally grumbling trifles of the German soul” (Hausmann). This is why the black’s vital punch, which beheads the European intellectual, is the central motif in Erwin Bloomfield’s montage “Marquis de Sade” (1921) (fig. 53).

The “Hour of Noon” was both a culminating and a turning point for Dada. The frenzy produced its own sobering effects and the vastness of simultaneity created its timeless presence. Since the end of 1919, the Apollinian gained acceptance over the tragic Dionysian frenzied chaos: the eccentricity of heterogeneous abundance turned into the “Nothing” of concentrated abstraction. The “transcendent repulsion against the void” (Huelsenbeck), which had created the “introduction of the new material,” and which had given rise to the ecstatic techniques of the montage now again admitted the void. But the Apollinian claims redefined it. According to Nietzsche, the Apollinian had its basis in the measuring, ordering, and balancing of the “appearance” of artistic forces. It inspired Dada to create its Berlin variant of metamechanics. From the dissonant montage of man and machine a new unity emerged, bringing the automaton and the manichino to life. “The time of destructive psychologies and relativities is over . . . we are confronting the utmost decision of a possible world,” Hausmann reflected this new tendency in 1921. “The beauty of our daily life is defined by the mannequins, the wig-making skills of the hairdresser, the exactness of a technical constructions! We strive anew to conformity with the mechanical work process: we will have to get used to the idea of seeing art originating in mechanics.”

Metamechanics in this sense appeared as a polar counterpart to the montages, and not only as Dada’s epilogue.
METHANECKAL CONSTRUCTION — SCIENCE IN THE PERSPECTIVE OF ART

The most sobering contrast to the simultaneous montages is George Grosz’s oil painting Ohne Titel (Without Title, 1920; fig. 87), created in the same year as Heartfield’s Universal-City (fig. 117). Ohne Titel offered the Apollinian counter-image to the Dionysian chaos of montage: an isolated automaton in a city street with schematized factory and office buildings. Mounted on a plate, placed at the corner of a house, the automaton is also reminiscent of a crippled existence. Its dark dress enhances the impression of desolation: the torso seems to be a melancholy image of modern man forced to function in a rational world of never-changing living conditions, mechanisms of commerce, and laws on which the dynamic machinery of civilization is based. Its arms, without hands, are ready for a demonstrative gesture: a man without face or qualities, a painting without a title — reduction, de-individualization, and anonymity remaining transparent for the dismemberment and mechanization of man both in war and in the social and industrial realm.

Nietzsche saw the Apollinian as a simplifying, schematizing, contemplative view of the world, creating order out of its Dionysian origin, reciprocally referring back to it. The more abysmal the chaos, the more strongly the Apollinian counterforce would develop. Ohne Titel belongs to the set of “metamechanical constructions” determined by this new dominance. Whereas Dada’s Dionysian intuition would unleash the mass of images in a fire of simultaneous montage, the Apollinian will to order emptied and cooled off the world of images in metamechanical construction, thereby creating a new aesthetics of the mechanical in matter-of-fact spaces of emptiness. While in the montages the individual was exploded into Dionysian chaos, in these new works the typified manichino appeared. The Dadaist became a constructor resulting in a new type of artist who prevailed over the ecstatic techniques of the Monteur as Apollo prevailed over Dionysus. And yet both extremes conditioned one another and together formed Dadaism: the Apollinian would otherwise end in paralysis; the Dionysian in complete disarray.

Simultaneity as the Dionysian climax of complexity turned into its extreme opposite; time was brought to a standstill in timelessness as a perpetuation of the present in the here and now. The plenitude of possibilities dissolved the transgressions of boundaries into loss of reality and stagnation. The motor dynamics of wheels no longer signified the temporal flow of an eternal cycle; it signified progress run wild, progress as idle motion annulling whatever could be perceived as a position or a value. Dada was a coincidence of opposites in “nothing at all, i.e. everything” (Hausmann).

The metamechanics of spatial image constructions belongs to Dada Berlin’s artistic approach to polarities, as does the dynamics of the “thousandfold simultaneous” (Grosz) of montage. As an Apollinian-Dionysian concept, Dada included mechanics, sterility, torpor, as well as this epoch’s energy, dynamics, and motion. According to Nietzsche, the “continuous development of art” was bound up with this coincidental “Apollinian and Dionysian duality.” Dada attempted to fill the emptiness of metamechanics with new content and to gain for it a new interpretation of art and technology, which was to have an elementary constructive effect and to base the strength of the rational on an Apollinian vision.

For — to speak with Nietzsche — the greatness of an artist is not measured according to the “beautiful feelings” he evokes . . . but according to the degree in
which he approaches grand style... To master the chaos which one is, to force one’s chaos to become form, to become necessity in form, logical, simple, unambiguous, to become mathematics, to become law — that is here the great ambition.²

It can therefore be maintained that in the metamechanical constructions Dada began to conceive of geometry and mathematics productively as a function of art, while the simultaneous montages perceived art as a function of life — following Nietzsche’s position in The Birth of Tragedy to look at science with the perspective of the artist, but at art with that of life (“die Wissenschaft unter der Optik des Künstlers zu sehen, die Kunst aber unter der des Lebens”).³

But, true to Dada’s skepticism, metamechanics produced ambiguous worlds above the abyss. It proceeded on the one hand from the experience of a shock-like alienation of man and world, leading to the mechanistic worldview of industrialization ad absurdum; on the other hand, it opened up the traditional scope of art by using geometry, a science that once was part of the seven artes liberales (liberal arts). Here again we can see how the negating assertion of irony formed the artistic basis for further exploration — now in relation to the world of science.

The Dadaists Grosz, Hausmann, Höch, Dix, Griebel, Schlichter, and Scholz had begun to design Apollinian constructions with empty spaces and automatons, puppets, jointed dolls in the final months of 1919 and continued from 1920 onward. Only two artists, Johannes Baader and John Heartfield, did not take part in this work: Heartfield continued to concentrate exclusively on photomontage and typographic work, especially for magazines and book covers of the Malik-Verlag, although he tried to give these a constructional kind of formal treatment. Baader was too much caught up in his obsession as President of the Earth and the Globe to be capable of such sobriety; his pathos and his manic compulsion to secure traces of his reign made a matter of fact view of things impossible for him.

Hausmann gave a vivid realization of the strict discipline of metamechanical construction in his Mechanischer Kopf (Der Geist unserer Zeit) (Mechanical Head [The Spirit of Our Age], 1921; fig. 113). He instrumentalized the content of constructions in a sculpture and achieved one of the most effective Dada creations with the hairdresser’s head: a Dada Apollo. The minimalist attire consisted of a measuring rod (originally by Hannah Höch), a screw, a number, the casing of a watch, a mold roller with a silk-lined case, a ruler, an used old purse of crocodile leather, the bronze segment of an old photo camera, and the extendible aluminum drinking cup used by Hannah Höch’s father when he went hunting; all of these were commonplace objects from the world of order, measurement and calculation. This selections contrasted with the voluminous assemblage Das große Plasto-Dio-Dada-Drama: Deutschlands Größe und Untergang durch Lehrer Hagendorf oder Die phantastische Lebensgeschichte des Oberdada (The Great Plasto-Dio-Dada-Drama: Germany’s Greatness and Fall at the Hands of Schoolmaster Hagendorf, or The Fantastic Life-Story of the Superdada, 1920; fig. 47), which was based more on the simultaneous Dionysian principle.

In their manifestos and public performances, the Berlin Dadaists up to 1920 stayed true to the Dionysian power of eccentric, dynamic activism and an aggressive pamphlet style. Hausmann, Huelsenbeck, and Baader displayed the greatest mobility in their Dada tour of Dresden (January 19), Hamburg (February 18), Leipzig (February 24), Teplitz-Schönau (February 26), Prague (March 1 and 2), and Karlsbad (March 5). In March of 1920, Grosz and
Heartfield fought an iconoclastic crusade against bourgeois culture in their manifesto Der Kunstlump (The Art Rogue).  

With the exception of a few sculptures (Dada-Plastiken), the metamechanical constructions concentrated on images. They were also presented as Tatlinist Blueprints. For the Berlin Dadaists Tatlin was the protagonist of machine art. Not only did he introduce a decisive process of transvaluation in art; he could also realize it under changed, revolutionary social conditions. In this sense the Berlin Dadaists tried to define mechanics also in utopian terms, “by demonstrating the puppet-like aspect and the mechanization of life, to allow us to make out and to feel, through the apparent and real paralysis, a different life.” The anthropomorphic artifact therefore embodied depersonalized and alienated modern man as well as the new collective man whose de-individualization constituted a liberation from traditions, from old patterns of value and sense-making, while it opened up creative possibilities of combining art and technology in a revolutionized society, for example, Grosz, Hausmann, Heartfield, and Schlichter in “Die Gesetze der Malerei” (The Laws of Painting, 1920) and Grosz in his comment “Zu meinen neuen Bildern” (On my New Paintings, 1921) were demanding.

On what kind of ironic brink did the Berlin Dadaist wander introducing those metamechanical constructions into art, thereby on the one hand appearing to affirm the rational world of technology and science, while on the other hand using the same means of expression in order to question the contemporary industrialized world and its validity, presenting its ossification? The perspective and the stage that the Dadaists chose for their spatial constructions was ambiguous, although in Die Gesetze der Malerei (The Laws of Painting) they demanded unequivocality, true to the Apollinian sense: “Painting is a language, which has to intensify the optic conceptions of mass into unequivocal clarity.” They invoked perspective as “the rein and helm of painting” and as “an object presenting evidence.” But what did perspectives prove in the constructions if not doubt at a world, which had lost its anthropocentric orientation? What did the elements — geometrical, architectonic plans, stereometrical bodies, maps, anatomical models — show if not the fact that this world could not be grasped by way of measurement and planning? Everything was a skeptical quotation, with no universal validity. Did not their perspectivism rather reveal the relativity of their constructions and the dubiousness of science in which the mathematical rules had their origin? The machine’s platonic ideality, its rational and regular behavior could no longer be regarded as absolute. Despite their rigid order, the structures seemed unstable. These contradictory phenomena essentially distinguish Dada’s metamechanics from general constructivist tendencies at the time.

This was the effect the Dionysian underground had on the new Apollinian ordo. On insecure ground the Dadaists undertook to standardize and typologize their new imagery of tectonic, technoid rigidity. Metamechanics illustrates the fact that the “repulsion against empty space,” which Huelsenbeck recognized as the original factor for assembling real material, was abandoned in spatial constructions and that Dada finally came to see emptiness as the only reality that could be experienced.

The enigmatic ambivalence of imagery announced the influence of pittura metafisica (metaphysical painting). As early as 1916 the Swiss Dadaists organized a De Chirico exhibition; they showed a small reproduction of his The Evil Genius of a King (1914–15) in the journal Dada (no. 2, 1917). Huelsenbeck was in Berlin at this point, so probably none of the Berlin Dadaists saw this exhibition. The influence of pittura metafisica began only with the journal Valori Plastici (1918–1921), established in Rome by Marco Broglio. From June 1919, no. 6 until
1920, Theodor Däubler was a co-author of this journal, writing a five-installment essay titled “Nostro retaggio” and treatises on Chagall and Rousseau (until 1921). It was probably Däubler who spread the word in Berlin about the concept of *pittura metafisica*. The Goltz gallery in Munich and the Flechtheim gallery in Dusseldorf distributed *Valori Plastici* in Germany. Because Goltz in April and May of 1920 presented the first individual exhibition by Grosz, it is possible that these contacts brought Grosz’s attention to this journal. As early as October 1919, *Das Kunstblatt* pointed to Carrà’s influence on the works of Grosz and Heinrich Maria Davringhausen (1894–70). In its words, what characterized their approach was a “a correct, hard line suppressing any trait of individuality.” Even the *BIZ* in November of the same year (no. 47) presented the new and uncommon style in the example of Carlo Carrà’s *The Son of the Engineer* (1917; fig. 144). The Berlin Dadaists may also have been familiar with Max Ernst’s set of lithographs *FIAT MODES — pereat ars* (Let there be Fashion — Down with Art) (fig. 68), published in 1919, which assimilated the influence of *Valori Plastici*. Hausmann even quoted the title of Ernst’s portfolio in his work of the same name in 1921. In January of 1920, Leopold Zahn, another co-author of *Valori Plastici* published an essay, “Die Metaphysische Malerei” (Metaphysical Painting) in *Ararat*: “A strangely quiet, almost uncannily quiet world is built up ... Things are not there for the sake of their materiality, but as symbols of mathematical and geometrical laws.” He announced — as did *Das Kunstblatt* in February 1920 — “a small volume with 12 photo-types” by De Chirico as a special edition of *Valori Plastici* (1919). Perhaps Carl Einstein’s comments of April 1920 ironically referred to this special edition: “For six weeks now, futurists from Berlin suburbs have been studying ‘Valori Plastici.’ Chirico, who had his manager in Paris in 1911, landed in Berlin in ’20, and we are soon going to be treated to perspective.” Raoul Hausmann owned a copy of this De Chirico edition and gave it to Hannah Höch, “the sun of his life,” “in memory of her Italian journey of 1920,” as a present for her birthday in November of the same year. In September, he probably wrote the manifesto *Die Gesetze der Malerei* (The Laws of Painting), which emphasized the significance of De Chirico and Carrà. As co-authors Grosz, Heartfield, and Schlichter were named, although it is debatable whether this happened with their agreement. Hausmann never published this manifesto. Two works by De Chirico were chosen for the *Dadaco* (1919–20; fig. 165.3): *Der Seher* (Le vaticinatoeur) (The Prophet, 1915; fig. 145) and *Der geographische Frühling* (Le printemps géographique) (Geographical Spring, 1916; fig. 146). In April 1921 the Dadaists saw originals of *pittura metafisica* in the former Kronprinzenpalais in Berlin, under the heading *Das Junge Italien* (Young Italy): works by De Chirico (such as *The Troubadour*, 1916; *Hector and Andromache*, ca. 1918), by Carlo Carrà (e.g. *Oval of Appearance*, 1918; *Loneliness*, 1917; *Daughter of the West*, 1919), and more works by Morandi, Martini, Melli, Edita zur Muehlen, and Ossip Zadkine. The eighty-nine paintings, 120 drawings, and eight sculptures offered an excellent overview of the new motifs and methods of *pittura metafisica*.

Like the Dadaists, De Chirico and Carrà were influenced by Nietzsche. Theirs was an art in the sign of Apollo, who tried to capture the Dionysian world by the “eternity” of beautiful form. *Metaphysical Painting* created enigmatic visionary metaphors, which constituted their own spaces of emptiness and plenitude, of inside and outside, of light and shade, to re-create a new myth, the myth of modernism. They constructed poetical-architectural spaces and a “new metaphysical psychology of things” (De Chirico). De Chirico did not see the “meta” as beyond physics, but following Nietzsche, as grounded within physics. In the same way, Dada Berlin regarded the “meta” of mechanics as within mechanics. Dada’s metamechanics was “Artisten-
Metaphysik”, a “metaphysics of artists” that also marked the turn from the “Monteur” to the “Constructor”, who wanted to redirect geometrical reason from its life-negating paralysis and its isolation from the living world back into a new creative relationship to art. The metaphysics was grounded in the creative act itself.

The Dadaists took over De Chirico’s and Carrà’s tendency toward abstraction, spatial illusions of urban constructions, the sobriety of architectural conceptions, geometrical elements, multifocal perspectivism, abrupt vanishing lines that only converged outside of the painting, ground planes that suggested depth, the timeless blue skies, and above all the “manichino,” the staple of pittura metafisica. Yet the Berlin Dadaists deprived their variety of anthropomorphous artifacts — lay figures, automata, dummies, anatomical models, mechanomorphoses — of their aura of the uncanny and sublime. They trivialized them by dressing them in banal costumes, robbed them of their contemplative immobility, and inserted them into the spaces with a more appropriate sense of proportion. In contrast to De Chirico’s enigmatic stage sets, these constructions were meant to refer to real life. Grosz, in his explanatory text Zu meinen neuen Bildern (On My New Paintings, 1921) emphasized the rational impulse he gained from Metaphysical Painting: in it, he recognized a purifying process, which forced him to artistic self-reflection. “The striving for a style of clear simplicity will automatically take you to Carrà. Nevertheless everything separates me from him because he wants to be enjoyed very metaphysically and because his problems are of a bourgeois nature.”

Hausmann emphasized the regular and solid impression of this painting:

Anything forced into limits is more difficult than that which knows no rule. Plasticity requires knowledge of the rules of shadow; the mathematics of size relations with regard to bodies is safeguarded by stereometry. The construction of bodies is translated into the drawing. The lighting is a scheme for illuminating the plastic aspect of bodies. Color exists to give them solidity . . . Furthermore one should be a good constructor for the representation of buildings and machines. For more exact studies, one should not refrain from using photography.

The instruments of geometry and the architectonic principle are employed likewise by metaphysical painting and metamechanics. But there are differences. De Chirico’s metaphysical paintings emphatically unfold “the glowing sunset of culture” (Nietzsche), pessimistically invoking the past in the paralyzed present of civilization. He presents contemplative figures of departure, which the artist as a stranger within civilization knows how to remember, in Nietzsche’s sense, in their mythic significance: “What is best about us is perhaps an inheritance from the sensations of previous ages to which we can hardly find immediate access at this time; the sun has already set, but the sky of our life is still glowing and gleaming from it even though we cannot see it any more.” The disappearance of culture is presented in the semblance of art — on infinite stages allowing the “uncannily sublime,” the mythic power and beauty of sunken culture to become transparent behind the Apollinian veil.

Not so in the production introduced by the Berlin Dadaists. Art unfolded its expressiveness in transvaluation. Civilization also resulted in a liberation of culture from age-old shackles. Dada’s Apollo cleared the streets of cultural found objects; they no longer gave rise to melancholic reflection. Re-ligio, the tie to origins, was no longer invoked. If cultural objects appeared, as for instance in the guise of Greek sculpture in Schlichter, they became objects of
Dada iconoclasm because they were regarded as ideologically abused in the claws of bourgeois culture. Dada’s metamechanics constituted liberation toward a new aesthetics of Apollinian rationality, which evolved from an alliance of art and technology: productive, “objective” and skeptical at the same time. Metamechanics rather served to do away with the errors of traditional metaphysics; Apollinian rationality was supposed to clear up rather than to transcend the world’s enigmas. In *pittura metafisica*, the artist appeared like a stranger, a lonely survivor in a deadened civilization romantically celebrating the memory of a mythic Arcadian state. The Dadaist, on the contrary, acknowledged the scientific core of civilization, applying its new laws to his metamechanics as someone working and playing within it. Whereas De Chirico looked back in melancholy contemplation upon the artist and his sunken culture, using the Apollinian crystallization of a logical-rational schema, Dada encouraged the artist to proceed toward new shores of rationality — as a constructor, clear-headed, sober, skeptical, active. The constructor initiated an Apollinian transvaluation of art. His Dionysian dimension was grounded in the catastrophe of the war that he had suffered rather than in a supra-historical mythic origin of culture.

In his “*Kontrolle über Strich und Form*” (control of line and form, Grosz), the artist proved his *Sachlichkeit* (matter-of-factness) and discipline, which completely determined his personality: he was an engineer and a trained athlete and an ardent revolutionary. Behind the scattered surface of time his clear and perceptive intellect enabled him to unmask the power structures, the negative repressive forces, which violently suppressed the revolutionary dynamics of the Weimar Republic. His pen drawing *Licht und Luft dem Proletariat* (The Workman’s Holiday, 1919; fig. 79.4), part of the portfolio *Gott mit uns* (God with Us, 1920; fig. 79.1–79.9), is an early example of Grosz’s presentation of the emptiness and statics of space for the purposes of social criticism. The high bare prison walls reinterpret urban spaces as spaces of “law and order.” The circle of revolutionaries, getting some air in a prison exercise yard, contradicts the social-democratic promises proclaimed in the title unmasking them as hollow phrases. Revolutionary action is forced into the restricted pace of imprisoned workers: revolutionary élan is broken by force; control is instituted. The motif is inspired by Gustave Doré’s *Newgate Exercise Yard* (1872). Grosz reduced the scene to precisely delineated outlines. On the title page of *Die Pleite* (The Bankruptcy; no. 5, December 1919), he called control, personified by the scowling prison guard, *Die deutsche Pest* (The German Plague). This controlling gaze characterized the violence of the Weimar Republic. Escape from this circular motion, supervised by state authority, seemed impossible. Dix, Grosz, Hausmann, Höch, Schlichter, Hubbuch, and Scholz used metamechanical construction to reveal military violence and results from bureaucratization and the rationalized interlocking of technology, capital, economy, and politics.

The labyrinth of houses in Grosz’s *Berlin C.* (fig. 90) seems itself to become a prison with no escape. We see the city with the policeman’s attentive eyes. Order, control, and repression in prison are experienced in everyday life. People rushing through the streets appear mechanical, puppet-like, with no hands, no freedom of action. Only the policeman has hands, so that he can pull his gun quickly. A pictogram of a mechanical hand, signaling, replaces agency with command. The persecution of the Spartacists in March 1919 and the growing influence of right-wing forces supply the political background to this situation of rigid control in the Weimar Republic and the fact that the army was becoming a state within the state. The Dadaists critically linked the state of seemingly restored peace and order with the ideologically ossified worldview of their time: “The imperial Philistine world-revolution was the greatest and the last, but also the
most thorough-going revolution,” Hausmann cynically remarked. “After that, life rolled along nicely, like a machine — and that is the heart’s desire of all decent people and coupon cutters. The Philistine revolution was the rebirth of Western culture from the spirit of the infinite profit rate.”

Grosz took stock of Dadaist techniques in his watercolor montage ‘Daum’ marries her pedantic automaton ‘George’ in May 1920. John Heartfield is very glad of it. Meta-mech. constr. nach Prof. R. Hausmann (1920) (short title: Daum; fig. 86.3). Pen drawing, montage with reproduced parts, and geometrical construction are dadaistically united in a single work: equal, dissonant, polar. The emotional pen line belongs to the bride, subtly following her body’s sensual charms. Photo clippings of machine elements are used to assemble the groom, a mechanical automaton. The couple is surrounded by an anonymous space of prismatically shifted dimensions. A photo of Daum in the top left corner serves to document the biographical context. The polarity of man and woman is conveyed as a tension between Dionysian and Apollinian styles of representation, between “auratic” art and mechanically reproduced art. The emotional line (of woman) is contrasted with the machinoid montage (of man). The anonymity of space allows for identification of the artist’s work with that of an engineer. It is depersonalized by “control of line and form” (Grosz). The unrest of the space itself, however, connotes Dionysian resistance; it combines those oppositional forces, which are separated in the couple. Yet repression is omnipresent. The narrowness of space is perpetuated in the background view of metropolitan architecture. The processes of abstraction reflect the all-pervasive process of rationalization against which the emotional trait of the line can hardly hold its own.

In contrast to his drawings, which he signed manually, Grosz used self-made stamps for his montage works and metamechanical or Tatlinist constructions. These stamps replaced the traditional pinxit with “Grosz mont.”, “Grosz constr.”, or an oval stamp with his address. Dada reflected the negative consequences of rationality in its domination of modern life and discussed it in a positive light, as the deployment of scientific method helping to support and enhance life and to clarify its conditions. The Dadaist saw himself not as an object but as the subject who creatively connected art and technology.

The black-and-white reproduction of the Daum montage was included in the portfolio Mit Pinsel und Schere (With Brush and Scissors, 1922; fig. 86.1–86.7), which pursued a gradual reduction of reproduced citations in seven stages of “materialization” ranging from montage, initially still dominated by a mixture of watercolor, pen drawing, and reproduced elements, including abstract and technical construction and diagram. This development from material to abstraction comprised in Grosz’s work the period from late 1918 to 1922, at the same time marking the transition from the Dionysian aspect of montage to the Apollinian technicality of construction. The year 1922 also established the utmost temporal limit for shared aesthetic conceptions among the Berlin Dada group. All work after this year was based on individual decisions, with no group-specific commitment.

Like Grosz’s constructions, Hausmann’s metamechanical works were preceded by illusionist spatial image montages: Tatlin lebt zu Hause (Tatlin Lives at Home, 1920; fig. 109), Ein bürgerliches Präzisionsgehirn ruft eine Weltbewegung hervor (A Bourgeois Precision-Brain Causes a World Movement, 1920; cat. no. 29). The photo clipping from the realm of machinery was to prove most persistent in metamechanical surroundings. The rational, the technical, and the regular entered art, increasingly favoring processes of abstraction.
In this phase what was typical of Grosz and Hausmann, the mixture of spatial image constructions with photo citations, was excluded in the work of Hannah Höch. She strove to use only one aesthetic technique consistently. But she did try to achieve the effect of stage-like depth in her photomontages, for example in Dada-Tanz (Dada Dance, 1922; fig. 133). With Er und sein Milieu (He and His Milieu, 1919; fig. 136), Bürgerliches Brautpaar (Bourgeois Bride and Groom, 1920; fig. 138) and Mechanischer Garten (Mechanical Garden, 1920; fig. 137), she created watercolors clearly reflecting Dada’s metamechanical spirit.

Grosz and Höch also introduced the mechanical Dada figures to theatrical designs: Grosz in grotesque figurines after Ivan Goll’s satire Methusalem oder der ewige Bürger (Methuselah or the Eternal Citizen, 1922), Höch in fantastic figurines for the anti-revue Schlechter und Besser (Worse and Better), which she wanted to produce in collaboration with Kurt Schwitters and Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt in 1924 and 1925.

“Law and Order”:
The Social Theater of Metamechanics

Rudolf Schlichter’s watercolor Dada-Dachatelier (Dada Roof Studio, ca. 1920; fig. 154) achieves an exemplary significance for metamechanical constructions comparable to that attained for simultaneous montage by Höch’s Schnitt mit dem Küchenmesser (Cut with the Kitchen Knife, 1919–20; fig. 130), Hausmann’s Dada in Everyday Life (Dada Cinema) (fig. 107), and Heartfield’s Universal-City (fig. 117). The interpretation of Dada-Dachatelier gains important clues from Schlichter’s autobiographies Das widerspenstige Fleisch (The Disobedient Flesh) (1931) and Tönerne Füße (Clay Feet, 1933), which record his life story up to World War I. Dada-Dachatelier bears no date. In November of 1921, Tucholsky in a minor contribution to the Weltbühne described it as a “demonstration against the province Germany.”

Like Grosz and Dix, Schlichter in 1920 had already produced a considerable number of works, which were first presented in the gallery of Dr. Otto Burchard from May 20 to June 15, 1920 at 13 Lützow-Ufer: paintings, watercolors, drawings, among which were also the Dadaist montages Tumult in Filmstadt (Riot in Film City) (fig. 153) and Phänomen-Werke (Phenomena-Works; fig. 152), as is documented by the catalog illustrations. Burchard, whose catalog announced, “Old and new Art. Paintings. French furniture. Selected arts and crafts of all peoples and ages. Archaeological objects. East-Asian art,” appears to have begun his program of avant-garde art with this exhibition. Two weeks later his gallery became the venue of the First International Dada-Fair. Schlichter intensively engaged in the transvaluation process of Dada art, with both the Dionysian and the Apollinian tendency. The works depicted in the catalog of Schlichter’s individual exhibition show the urban demimonde: scenes of variety shows, brothels, and streets blend social criticism with Schlichter’s fascination for the rakish, un concealed aggressiveness of urban lowlife. In his preface, Wilhelm Fraenger highlights the turn from a Dionysian “chaotic world-picture” toward a constructive one. Titles such as Der Maschinen-Mann (The Machine-Man) and Künstliche Menschen (Artificial Men) point to the new connection between art and technology:

But out of chaos he escapes to the discipline of the strictest law of form. He goes so far as to break with his previous work . . . His limitless broadsheets are replaced by tight and strictly centered arrangement. The sensuality with which he
has up to now allowed his images to unfold in ornamental rhythms is now subdued by calculating reason striving for the discipline of an inexorable rational tectonics . . . Herein we acknowledge artistic self-reflection and likewise an act of rigorous self-discipline.\textsuperscript{28}

\textit{Dada-Dachatelier} is therefore to be included in this new metamechanical phase. Yet there are no documents to prove that it was actually shown in this exhibition, although this is possible because it probably received its title only later. Next to his watercolors, Schlichter produced another work influenced by metamechanics, titled \textit{Tote Welt} (Dead World; fig. 156), which has been dated 1926 but belongs to the Dadaist range of metamechanical construction and must for this reason be dated earlier to 1920 and 1921.

In \textit{Dada-Dachatelier} Schlichter abstracted the typification of social criticism prepared in his drawings and montages. The philistines, previously rendered in sensual caricature of their repulsive ugliness, are now, in the new Apollinian construction, reduced to their functioning according to fixed social patterns. They are transformed into artificial men synthesizing the anthropomorphous with the mechanical, without the offensive confrontation that still characterized the montages. The closed-off composition and the genre of social scenery as stage situation contribute, in their clarity and strictness, to an unmasking of bourgeois life styles. Furthermore, the studio presents a complex allegory of Dadaist metamechanical production. A mixture of commercial and domestic buildings renders the roof studio’s background typical of Berlin, dominated by a schematized edifice resembling the \textit{Rotes Rathaus} (Red City Hall, 1861–69). This tower slightly traverses the central vertical axis. Its prominence makes it likely to be the central administrative structure of the metropolis. Following this interpretation, this picture is set in the district of Berlin-Mitte. Narrow street-canyons can be inferred from the houses that are set very close to one another.

All buildings appear to be abandoned. Some have dark holes for windows, neither frames nor glass panes. This ghost-like set-up makes survivors of the persons on the roof. They all give the impression of dummies or jointed dolls; their rigid faces, artificial limbs and necks give them an awkward kind of stiffness. The uncanny effect of the picture results from the figures’ bizarre, odd autism, their hovering between life and death. Two of them are unquestionably puppets. An anatomical model, placed on a turned-out pedestal in front of the balustrade, which crosses the picture’s middle is without arms and legs. It displays ribs, sinews, and inner organs; the red aorta and blue vein can be clearly discerned. The second one is a female dummy, a dark rag doll without arms, perched on the farther end of the pedestal up front, wearing dark buttoned boots and a blue garter. With her legs crossed, she affects an elegant seated pose. High above her on the pedestal is the composition’s most important figure: a hybrid of showcase-dummy, gymnastic dancer, and young woman. She has a markedly masculine face and wears a rider’s or soldier’s cap pulled down over her forehead, which enhances the androgynous aspect of her face. She is dressed in a short, sleeveless, low-cut, blue-striped leotard, wearing beige-colored, high-buttoned boots, which are featured as a sensual fetish in many of Schlichter’s pictures. The insecure position of this figure on the frontal right-hand corner of the pedestal shows that she has no choice but to find a compromise with the mutilated dark rag doll placed behind her on the pedestal’s edge. Gesture and pose of the protagonist remind one of a dummy. This impression is confirmed when one notices the obvious fact that her head is artificially fixed onto her neck and that her lower right arm and both legs are attached likewise. The prosthesis of her right arm is
strikingly extended toward the picture’s middle. There is a correspondence between the figure on the pedestal and the medical model both in perspective and in content: the model anatomically denudes, even dissects the figure in the foreground.

On the left, between the table in the middle of the roof studio and the chimney cut in half by the picture’s edge, a couple is seated on a stiff-backed, undecorated bench, the figure’s audience. Their elegance marks them as members of the upper class: the gentleman in a night-blue suit and top hat, the lady in a long dress of light red. The scars and staples in his face point to severe injuries in the war and loss of his eyesight. Scars running down across both cheeks replace his eyes. The strange cuts on his ear may even denote loss of hearing. The right half of his body seems to consist solely of prostheses: out of his sleeve protrudes a spiral stump of metal with no hand. In place of his right leg we may assume a wooden prosthesis, especially because of the awkward way it is thrust forward. The narrow, elegant trouser leg is cut off above the knee, thus baring sock, garter, and skin-colored stocking drawn over the wooden leg. His left arm overlaps the woman who sits next to him; his index finger, though limp and without direction, reminds one of a mechanical hand-sign. This gentleman, blind, lame and deaf, seems to be more automaton than human being. On his left, his partner or wife is bored. Her gaze is disinterested, lethargic. Her legs are crossed, and her right hand lies in her lap.

Behind the table, the elegant gentleman with the top hat is positioned in such a way that his left arm, lying on the gray tabletop, is almost on the picture’s mid-vertical. His posture is turned toward the dancer and what surrounds her, but he cannot see anything because his eyelids are nearly shut. His right hand points at the figure up front, his left (prosthetic) hand at the anatomical displayed torso. He pays no heed to the geometrical tools laid out on the table on his left: a T-square above a large flat notebook and two triangles, a three-sided pyramid, and a rod-shaped instrument. Parallel to the black notebook lies a small thick book whose black cover does not conclusively bespeak its function.

On the opposite side, in the picture’s right half, stands a child wearing a deep blue sailor suit. Only at first sight does this child appear more animate than the other figures. The fringe, the posture, the proportions not in agreement with a head that is, again, too large — all of this is doll-like. Still animate are the folds of flesh above the knees and the way the arms and hands are represented, one hand holding the little bucket, the other hidden behind the back. Yet the big bright eyes, appearing at first to show amazement at the figure-dummy on the pedestal, are in fact staring past her. The lipless closed mouth seems speechless. The face repeats that of the figure on the pedestal in a childlike, rounded version. The almond-shaped eyes and the large nose are comparable, even the blond fringe covers the forehead in a similar way, as does the dummy’s cap. The form of the belt, the child’s short smock, and blue pants showing underneath resemble her dress. If both, at different ages, are seen in relation to the dark, mutilated faceless rag doll, then the latter forms a pronounced contrast to the former. It might then be read as an allegory of vanitas. On the child’s right, closer to the foreground, a stereometrical pillar-like object, a cylinder is placed. Its blue color relates immediately to the child and is repeated in a slightly different shade in the stripes of the dummy’s dress on the pedestal.

Behind the child, close to the balustrade, cut off by the picture’s edge, the frozen figure of a bald man wearing a respiratory mask and a white smock is seated on a wooden stool. The mask gives his head a bird-like appearance, screening his gaze even through the effect that its glass reflects the blue of the sky. The easel standing between the white-smocked man and the figure on the pedestal is empty. It has been shoved toward the right-hand balustrade and is turned
away from him. The man is not facing the dummy directly, although she appears to be related to him as a muse and a lay figure. From him also, life seems to have departed.

While viewers can observe from a certain distance the network of relationships connecting these manichini, both in form and content, they may be shocked by the sudden appearance of the dark figure in the foreground that has already risen up chest-high. He provokes a threatening lack of distance, muffled up as he is in a dark jacket with turned-up collar and aviator’s mask, staring at the viewer with a fixed but empty gaze from behind glasses. His darkness extends across the mutilated rag doll up to the black glass screen behind the dummy, appearing in the dark holes of the windows, which are suddenly associated to the eyeless glasses. It is varied in the top hats and suits, scattering over the props of the picture: the black notebook, the book, even in the tone of shadows.

This carefully composed picture has a strange effect because of the almost unnoticeable ruptures in its well-ordered proportions, which seem not to allow for dissent. Sterility, boredom, and passivity characterize the artificial figures of this deadened, deadening company. Schlichter’s work attempts to make transparent, in the style of metamechanics, the ambivalent conflicts of Dada with the rational and technological transformation of life and culture.

“Spatialized Dead Time”:
The Architectonic Principle

Space is segmented by urban architecture into public exterior space on the one hand and the roof studio on the other, which has the character of an interior. Both obey the same tendency to abstraction and rectilinearity. The dancer’s pedestal is related to the tower of the Red City Hall in the background; the table, parallel to the balustrade, corresponds with the factory. Its frontal point repeats the angle of the corner of the Red City Hall, which is turned toward the roof studio, while the table leg continues the line extending from it. The line of the balustrade is repeated at a slightly shifted angle by the architecture of the buildings: on the right by the street front exiting the picture, in the middle and on the left also by street fronts. Their lines of perspective, emphasized by those of the floor, are not strong enough to open up the roof terrace, which is hermetically screened off by the balustrade, onto the surrounding city. The vanishing lines converging mostly beyond the top left corner of the picture furthermore intersect with the direction of the viewer’s frontal gaze.

Despite the schematization of commercial and domestic buildings, their architectural styles can still be clearly discerned, ranging from historicist fronts of domestic buildings, the Red City Hall (1861–1869) to the functional style of the factories. The artist’s tendency to de-historicize the buildings by schematization blends with the undecorated fronts typical of functionalist architecture. Schlichter denudes the picture of any traces of urban activity. The sterile presentation of architecture may allow the conclusion that the streets also will be devoid of life. “Control of line and form” (Grosz) makes animated city views impossible and unrealistic. The trash romanticism of urban haunts, the Dionysian underworld that man could enter into as a reservoir of unconscious forces, all this has to give way to order and control. The city has exchanged its face for an anonymous functionality.

Schlichter has cleaned the firewalls of traces of advertising; all sensual appeal in architecture has been annihilated. Only the green blinds in the foreground, in different states of being pulled up, as well as the windows, one closed, one open, and the crumbling stucco to the left of the staircase, retain a moment of disorder. Otherwise, the architecture would be
immaculately sterile. This extreme reduction of life is uncanny and troubling. The roof studio’s
hermetic closure keeps people confined in self-imposed boundaries and despite the seemingly
open and wide space deprives them of possibilities for free development. Openness appears
merely as an infinitely self-perpetuating enclosure. The coincidence of spatial confinement and
immeasurability within the infinite sea of stone conveys a disturbing, suggestive expression.

Schlichter strikingly highlights the *Red City Hall* and the factory as institutions securing
the smooth functioning of the city. Both are used as metaphors of order and control. The city
hall, representing administration, the law, and a host of civil servants and employees, resembles a
fortress. The factory, on the other hand, stands for the smooth running of the mechanical work
process. The picture shows how architectural clarity, simplicity, and sterility are immediately
connected to the constraints of social and industrial conditions. The schematization of
architecture makes visible the objectification of human relationships. Schlichter presents the city
in the way he perceived Berlin suburbs when, as a boy, he arrived by train for the first time:
“Everything looked so new, so clean, so chemically purified. This bare sobriety was terrifying, as
if a student from the polytechnic had designed streets, squares, and tree plantations with the help
of ruler and T-square then painted it all in hard tasteless colors. The complexes of buildings
looked like cartons of stationery or cardboard boxes in various colors. The blue-gray or light red
roofs, which were much too large gave them the touch of somber boredom.” For Schlichter, the
city was to retain the boring anonymity of the interchangeable, even when he experienced Berlin
with the eyes of an artist living in Karlsruhe before the war: “Without any noticeable emotion I
left the well-regulated desert of stone and asphalt in which everything was functioning so
excellently and where even vice had organized itself into a positive institution for the
advancement of society.”³⁹ The city’s lack of physiognomy is in great contrast to the shrill, noisy
media of everyday urban life as treated in the montages. Schlichter appears to have been inspired
by Nietzsche’s vehement critique of architecture. Zarathustra’s wanderings led him to a “row of
new houses,” which could not become a parable for the “noble soul”: “Had then a stupid child
taken them out of its toy box?”³⁰

This distanced and sober representation of the streets’ chilly strictness and lifelessness, of
the windows’ blindness, light sandstone-colored architecture and its strict schematization needs
to be compared with the metamechanical watercolors by other Dadaists. In contrast to Schlichter
they usually allow a view into streets and onto squares. The forms of their architecture range
from the schematization of house types via cartons of stationery to solid cubic blocks.³¹ Höch
also created stereometrical spatial metaphors such as geometrical bodies of glass — sphere,
pyramid, cylinder — in her watercolor *Er und sein Milieu* (He and His Milieu, ca. 1920; fig.
136). All of these works reintroduce the architectonic principle inspired by De Chirico and the
perspectival illusion of three-dimensional space according to the schema of fore-, middle-, and
background. But perspective does not restore the unity of space and time, as may often appear to
be the case (as in the *Dada Roof Studio*). Perspective is multifocal and does not function along
the lines of classical notions about space. The Dionysian tries to penetrate Apollinian regularity.
If perspective since the Renaissance was an expression of an orderly balance between man,
society, and nature, it was questioned here in the form of distortion and displacement.

Immediately connected to schematized spatial construction is the symbolic dimension of
metric time. For Dada, the clock on the tower of the *Red City Hall* in the background of the
*Dada Roof Studio* symbolizes quantitative measurement of time, a regular, calculable, linear
temporal continuum that serves to constrain life into a calculable schema. The clock is an
instrument to which city dwellers have to adjust their working hours and whose control dominates their lives. It shows qualities analogous to sterile space: abstract normativity. The clock belongs with the rigid principle of a dead mechanism, which led Carl Einstein to conclude, “calculated mathematical, quantitative time – thus no time at all but spatialized dead time.”

Some metamechanical constructions therefore represent clocks without faces as a mere circle – as for example in *Republikanische Automaten* (Republican Automatons, 1920; fig. 93), *Konstruktion* (Construction, 1920–21; fig. 86.6) and *Ingenieure* (Engineers, 1920; fig. 110). For the Dadaists, temporal measurement and spatial schematization were an abstract and rational, Apollinian standardization.

The view of the city appears to negotiate the topical pessimistic view of civilization as put forward by Oswald Spengler in his *Untergang des Abendlandes* (Decline of the West) published in 1918. Here the stony masses of gigantic cities represent the “quite sublime death symbolism of what has ultimately ‘become.’” According to Spengler’s cultural morphology, they represent a civilization, in which the living evolution of culture and the last possibility of a meaningful existence have come to an end: “The decline of the West . . . means nothing less than the problem of civilization . . . Civilization is the inescapable destiny of a culture . . . Civilizations are a termination; they follow after becoming as that which has become, after life as death, after development as paralysis.”

But the view of the city, as that of civilization, was not as negative for the Dadaists as in *Dada-Dachatelier* it might at first glance appear. They received Spengler’s visions of decline with skepticism. To them, identification with the loss of culture and history also meant liberation from the anachronism of traditional ballast, from its semiotic and symbolic function, while making them receptive to a purifying, rational-aesthetic attitude in search of a new self-definition. The Dadaist Apollo was turning into an urban nomad, a “distinguished foreigner” (Daimonides) for whom the contingency and anonymity of the external world was stabilizing and provided the utmost spiritual mobility. While traversing the empty space of culture, viewed pessimistically by others, the Dadaists transvaluated it toward a new liberated experience of space.

The *Dada Roof Studio* recalls De Chirico’s stage-sets. Grosz, too, adopted the technique of evoking depth by emphasizing the vanishing lines of the floor in *Der neue Mensch* (The New Man, 1920; fig. 94), and Hausmann did so in *Tatlin lebt zu Hause* (Tatlin Lives at Home, 1920; fig. 109), *Kutschenbauch dichtet* (Kutschenbauch Composes Poetry, 1920; fig. 112), and *Porträt Felixmüller* (Portrait Felixmüller, 1920; fig. 111). Scholz used perspective for example in *Ordnung, Gerechtigkeit, und Nächstenliebe* (Order, Justice, and Charity, 1920). Here the meanings of stage and interior space intersect. For De Chirico the stage as an enclosed spatial situation was an adequate means of achieving “poetic depth” in a thoroughly rationalized world.

The company of the *Dada Roof Studio* (fig. 154) has retreated completely, turned away from the city buildings. By applying the rational laws of the external world to the interior, Schlichter makes clear that a retreat into privacy is no longer a genuine option. The law of paralysis affects anything and anybody. The stage of world theater, which is at the same time constructed as its own box seat, seems absurd: the actors are not gazing outward like an audience into the city; in their boredom and emptiness, in which contemplation has obviously been perverted, they demonstrate the succession of eternal sameness. Their social constraint toward conformity produces the stagnation, removes the present out of time, and transforms space into
the compelling performance of a deadened urban landscape. The tension between limitation and delimitation of spaces in *pittura metafisica* is more strongly systematized here.

The table with its geometrical tools, such as T-square and triangles, forms the center of the picture. The instruments on the table seem to have been laid aside but can at any point be picked up again. They identify the elegant gentleman with the top hat as a constructor, engineer, or architect who may have constructed these spaces without qualities. The composition emphasizes triangular figurations among the drawing tools, the architectonically repeated corner construction, and in the distribution of the actors. Overlapping triangular connections can be found, for example, on the lower seat level between the figure dressed in white (on the picture’s right edge), the elegant gentleman (in the middle), and the dark figure in the foreground; also between this figure, the cripple on the left, and the gentleman in the middle; on a higher level, between the figure on the pedestal, the anatomical model, and again the dark foreground figure. Regarding the influential *pittura metafisica* the triangle achieves not only a real significance in construction but also a more disquieting, even disturbing “meta”-level because it was held “of old to be a mystical and magical sign.”

In the *Dada Roof Studio* the geometrical tools take the place of the politicized material, which Grosz cited in his montages, placing them on the table of the *Spießer* (Philistine) — objects connoting a bourgeois-nationalist frame of mind, security and rapacity: for example in *Deutschland, ein Wintemärchen* (Germany, A Winter’s Tale, 1917–18; fig. 76), *Der Schuldige bleibt unerkannt* (The Culprit Remains Unidentified, 1919; cat. no. 4a), and *Brillantenschieber im Café Kaiserhof* (Black Marketeers Selling Cut Diamonds at Café Kaiserhof, 1920; fig. 86.2). Also Georg Scholz placed his degenerate family of *Industriebauern* (Industrial Peasants, 1920; fig. 158) proudly behind their acquisitions, which relate on the table in a macabre way: modern domestic appliances (a novel butter machine, a puncher), the conservative Christian paper *Der Bote* (The Messenger), the frog that is blown up by the boy with a straw, and the cup that reads *Dem Hausvater* (For the Father of the House). If the philistine’s table in *Deutschland, ein Wintemärchen* (1917–18; fig. 76) is shaky, if the quotations *Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger* (December 21, 1918) and the call to “Arbeiter! Soldaten” (Workers! Soldiers) recall the time of revolutionary unrest; the table in the *Dada Roof Studio* seems to be standing on more solid ground again. Citations of ideologies and old frames of mind are supplanted by the new ones of mechanization. The tools on the table suggest that, by introducing the architectonic principle to painting, measurable and calculable order appears to have been restored and the sober rationality of technical, normative power is valid. In a number of metamechanical drawings — for example, *Der neue Mensch* (The New Man, 1920; fig. 94) by Grosz or *Kutschenbauch dichtet* (Kutschenbauch Composes Poetry, 1920; fig. 112) by Hausmann — the technical impression is heightened by including the engineer’s diagrams as pictures within the picture. Yet Schlichter maintains that technical rationality leads to an ideology-free vacuum, and he symbolizes in his portrayal of the Red City Hall how the normative power of the technical is connected with the rigid order of a mechanistic worldview, which has become institutionalized and now functions schematically. The Dionysian, anarchic underground seems almost suppressed.

“Prosthetic Sale”:

The Cripple-Automaton
The clear arrangement of the architecture and its visibly spatial composition in no way correspond to a wakeful clear-sightedness of the persons represented in the Dada Roof Studio. There is a paradoxical polarity between the picture’s precision and the figures’ inability to see.

The reason for these visual limitations of society — physical blindness, lethargic or vacant stare, downcast or even closed eyes — can be located in Schlichter’s antipathy toward the upper class, an antipathy that had affected him from his early youth: “But when I looked at the hard, bored faces of those rich people I envied so much, it seemed to me as if wealth could not be bought but at the cost of utter dullness, annihilating boredom, and spiritual emptiness.”

Schlichter grotesquely intensifies the atrophied look of his subjects through the prosthetic cocooning of their bodies, allegorizing their simulation of survival both as carriers of prostheses and as puppets of the upper class. Striking in this context is the gentleman who is seated front left, whose posture of “correct” stiffness pretends his intact social functioning. By highlighting his restructured state, Schlichter also makes transparent the mutilation of his nature. The elegant dress makes society’s self-staging appear even more hollow: it is a prosthesis of status whose status has become questionable; after all, this is the class that provided the officers of the army at war: “In the plutocratic and noble-blooded upper-class circles, the somewhat stiff elegance of the Prussian officer was to remain directive for quite some time. High collars, waist-fitting jackets, precisely creased pants of a military correctness, high buttoned or laced boots that were sharply pointed, this generally formed the dress code of a gentleman.”

A jointed doll in similar apparel, black waist-jacket, and at pains to convey distinction in its rigid posture, is shown in Schlichter’s montage *Phänomen-Werke* (Phenomenon-Work, 1919–20; fig. 152). Here, too, the legs betray the figure’s stiffness and the artificiality of a jointed doll. Prostheses are an extreme expression of the reification and standardization of human beings. In one of the store windows of Dix’s *Prager Straße* (Prague Street, 1920; fig. 61), prostheses are offered right next to a selection of wigs. Dix cynically demonstrates how the market supply of prostheses ambiguously serves to keep up appearances. In contrast to the expensive prosthetic joints in the store window, some curbstone cripples who are clearly lacking those artificial limbs crouch on the pavement. They are excluded by society as “a disgusting proletarian eyesore,” as Hausmann noted in his critical, satirical essay on *Prothesenwirtschaft* (Prosthetic Sale). This type does not exist on the superior level of the roof studio. The socially acceptable war-disabled person commands a wealth that permits him to maintain an almost unblemished, intact appearance. Mutilation, ugliness, and physical disproportion are seemingly relieved by the technical sophistication of “Reich-patented” artificial limbs. They create a second nature that is technical and insensitive. From Apollinian appearance emerges a mechanized “beauty” seeking to veil the horror of mutilation, which is closer to death than to life.

The cripple-automaton furthermore serves to debunk the ideal of the invulnerable war hero, a staple of World War I propaganda. The athletic spear-carrier by Polycleitos (440 B.C.), which wartime propaganda abused as a classical paragon of the brave and forceful soldier, inspired Schlichter’s disillusioning montage *Phänomen-Werke* (Phenomenon-Work, 1919–20; fig. 152). He distorted the torso of the *Doryphoros*, a Roman copy of Polycleitos’s famous spear-carrier, Schlichter could see in the Alte Museum in Berlin (fig. 152.1), crippling him with citations of prostheses and thus, by placing him on the pedestal, erecting a cynical monument to the cripple. Through this distortion and deformation, Schlichter questioned propaganda’s exaggerated view of the war/culture hero and his virility, pointing out how the male body was violently transformed into an object to be disposed of by the machinery of war, and he unmasked
the abuse of humanistic education as a prosthetic cultural tool for propaganda. With this Dadaist “improvement” of the classical antique “masterwork,” the artist dismissed the traditional ideal concept of art as perfect, absolute beauty, using the iconoclastic device of deforming montage to free himself from the aura of antiquity that it had accrued in the course of traditional art history. In this way the montage principle reacted provocatively and destructively to the bourgeois proclamation that wanted to restore Western culture in the spirit of the Greeks. At the Dada-Fair, Schlichter gained attention by some other Improved Masterworks of Classical Antiquity (cat. no. 117–121): beside the torso of the Doryphoros, he “corrected” the Apollo of Pompeii, the Youth of Tenea, the Wrestlers and — even twice — the Venus of Milo, mostly by deforming photomontages of the heads. These works are now lost.

Schlichter with his cripples showed a final stage of life that — deaf, blind, and lame — fit in with the paralysis of society. Grosz, conversely, placed a stronger emphasis in his metamechanical constructions on the aspect of conformist functioning. The machine, which made these metropolitan puppets tick, represented their obedience as subjects, their unflagging nationalist cast of mind. Grosz placed the Republikanische Automaten (Republican Automata, 1920; fig. 93) within a schematized street perspective of functional and domestic buildings whose conception is comparable to the urban surroundings of the Dada Roof Studio. Another similarity is the correct bourgeois dress of the cripples and the grotesque crossing of automaton and cripple. Their top hats indicate an upper middle-class, monarchist frame of mind. The republican automata are wearing racketeer bowler hats and bear other nationalist and militarist attributes: the flag of the German nationalists and the Iron Cross. The number 12, usually indicating the center of a target, identifies them as victims but also as perpetrators. The hollow head of the dummy in the foreground has been indoctrinated with the “1, 2, 3, Hurra” (hooray) of jingoist patriotism. Whereas Schlichter’s cripple figure depicts decay in torpidity, Grosz’s republican automata are functioning marionettes of the conservative and militarist forces in the Weimar Republic, and they are devotees of the SPD’s policy whom he accused of treason because of their bloody suppression of the rebellion. Tatlinistische mech. Konstruktion. den sozialistischen Reichstagsabgeordneten, die für den Krieg gestimmt haben, gewidmet (Tatlinist Mech. Construction Dedicated to the Socialist Members of Parliament who Voted in Favor of the War; fig. 86.4; cat. no. 71 of the Dada-Fair) also emerged in 1920 out of this profound distrust of the ruling party, which in 1914 had already lost its credibility through its conformist stance. Grosz illustrated the functioning of the Republican Automata in a macabre fashion: the frontal figure strikes a boxer’s pose, ready for attack, by pointing its raised arm stump toward the viewer. An analogy can be found in Hausmann’s middle-class type Puffke whose obedient mind is one-dimensionally presented in a sequence of pen drawings (cat. no. 35 and 36), mechanically functioning little puppets with sabers, decorations, and phrases: “Puffke from Perleberg, who was the greatest because in place of the thinking organ he had a retrograde machine in his head for turning out paragraphs and dividends and hollow phrases, working with monarchic-patriarchal precision.” In his Pamphlet gegen die Weimarine Lebensauffassung (Pamphlet against the Weimarian Conception of Life), Hausmann refers to the bourgeois as “the honest security brain, this libretto machine with exchangeable moral disk.” Whereas Grosz presents this mechanization by a leveling of the senses, Schlichter uses a doll-like physiognomy to point out the process of sensual paralysis. Through the analogy of cripple and automaton, he convincingly shows the antidemocratic weakness inherent in the newly constituted Weimar
Republic, a weakness that easily falls prey to monarchist indoctrination by a militarist Junker ideology, conventional morality, prefabricated roles, and lifeless mechanization.

Otto Griebel in his *Menschen aus verschiedenem Material* (Humans Made from Different Materials, 1923; fig. 75) also evokes different degrees of self-disclosing paralysis. These mechanical men are constructed from expressive material and are caricatured according to their social types: the bloated capitalist is dissolving in his own fat; the athletic new man has conditioned himself to fit his numerical collective role; the armless dress forms and a businessman, programmed in a completely one-dimensional way, who consists exclusively of bargain prices are also directed toward the robot, a *danse macabre* figure in the foreground. A skeleton, drawn on the wall, represents a *memento mori* that warns of the self-produced decline of society. In thoroughly planned urban spaces, this society has a view to an equally planned, self-perpetuating cityscape of tower blocks. Mechanical death is masking itself as the new technoid beauty of progress unleashed.

Metamechanical constructions also enter sculpture in the form of Tatlinist machine-art. At the First International Dada-Fair (1920), Grosz and Heartfield had their photograph taken, together with the programmatic Dada sentence “Die Kunst ist tot. Es lebe die neue Maschinenkunst Tatlins” (Art is dead. Long Live the New Machine-art of Tatlin), in front of the “electromechanical Tatlin Sculpture” ironically titled *Der wildgewordene Spiesser Heartfield* (The Philistine Heartfield Run Wild; cat. view VIII of Dada-Fair). The sculpture’s black rump and prosthetic legs present a ruined, grotesque monument to the army. According to newspaper reports, this puppet’s backside was decorated with an Iron Cross. Its head was replaced by a lightbulb not unusual to Dada iconography: Schwitters chose it for the *Heilige Bekümmernis* (Sacred Affliction, ca. 1920), Picabia employed it in his representation of *Américaine* (1917), and Höch used it as an image citation for the head of *Das schöne Mädchen* (The Pretty Woman, 1920; fig. 131). In view of “definitive decay,” Grosz ambiguously announced: “The synthesis will be created from light-bulbs.” (See chapter 6, First International Dada-Fair.)

The Dadaist series of mechanized automaton-citizens also includes Grosz’s designs of figurines (1922) for Ivan Goll’s *Methusalem* (Methuselah), a satire of the “eternal citizen” who appeared as a shoe factory owner. Goll’s conception of a “super-realistic” theater took the stage as a magnifying glass, which achieved its effects with the help of masks and giant figures walking on stilts; therefore the figurines for this play also were larger than life. Methuselah (fig. 92) appeared as an obese caricature of a militarist patriot, exaggerated by its attributes, such as the head that is boarded up with planks, the Solingen knife (made by Zwilling J. A. Henckels), the Distinguished Service Cross, the wine glass, the black red and gold flag, the slipper, the spigot, and the bandaged foot to hint at his immobility. His smart son Felix, according to Goll’s ideas, was to “have a copper sound projector in place of his mouth, a telephone receiver in place of his nose, a typewriter in place of forehead and hat, and above that antennae sparking every time he speaks.” Grosz designed a composite montage with gramophone horn, cardboard tubes, a machine heart, arm stumps, and castors. The first edition of *Methusalem oder der ewige Bürger* (Methuselah or the Eternal Citizen) published by Kiepenheuer (Potsdam, 1922) had illustrations of Methuselah, Felix, and Ida. Among the ten sketches Grosz listed in his account book for the year 1922, there was also the revolutionary student who finally changed back into a citizen. Characteristically, Grosz satirized his delusions by having a candlestick protrude from the figure’s skull. The “*Cocotte Veronika*” appeared in a cape of black and violet silk, a tight corset, and red-dotted signals. “Alogical thinking” as “the best weapon against the phrases that dominate
our whole lives” was to be the basis of this satirical mechano-play, which premiered in Berlin in 1924 without the figurines. Alogical thinking was to “ridicule all our everyday utterances.” “But in order not to be a cry-baby, a pacifist, or a Salvation Army soldier, the poet needs to do a few somersaults in front of you so that you become children again. For what is it he wants? To give you dolls, teach you to play, and then to scatter the sawdust from the broken dolls in the wind again,” as Ivan Goll wrote in his preface.  

Whereas these prosthetic and automatic humans were largely characterized by the Apollinian typification of metamechanics, Otto Dix created his cripples from the open polarity of the mechanical and the organic, on the basis of his more contradictory language of the grotesque. His Kartenspielende Kriegskrüppel (War Cripples Playing Cards, 1920; fig. 60) shocks the viewer by brutally revealing both the remnants of living organisms and the pseudo-animate limbs and prostheses. By confronting oil painting and material montage Dix concretizes the polar tension of the medium on the content level, which can be seen in the collision of the increasing mechanization with the decay of organic life and in the clash between the expressive ugliness of the remaining bodies and the sensual charms of glittering material. Embodiments of living death or of dead life, these creatures seem terrifying and ridiculous at the same time: the cripple on the left, for example, is a clownish acrobat given the way he holds his legs up high, showing his cards with the spread toes of one foot and maintaining his balance with the other (the wooden) leg. He has played his card with the prosthetic of his right arm, although it is an open question how he has managed to recognize its value because there is only an eyeless hole in the scarred disfigured flesh lump of his head. Dix’s grotesque conception of bodies and prostheses leaves little hope for an elementary, emancipatory force of renewal to emerge from these ruined figures. Their eschatological finality coexists, however, with a certain sense of apocalyptic pleasure. The visionary power of blackness celebrates in triumphal splendor. The elements of playfulness are in constant danger of giving way to the hidden horrors. Dix’s ironic pessimism gleefully acknowledges the Dionysian ugliness of life. The work clearly reflects the interaction of the contradictory forces of the grotesque: fear and irony. Dix does not admit the dominance of the Apollinian. On the contrary, he expresses the Dionysian resistance of life. The slapstick of prostheses allows the suffering of dismembered human nature to shine through.

While the mechanical cripples and automata grotesquely question ideological and material mechanization as an alienation of human beings from their nature, Hausmann tried to go beyond the negative view of “prosthetic sale,” pointing out the creative intent of metamechanics in his Mechanischer Kopf (Der Geist unserer Zeit) (Mechanical Head [The Spirit of Our Age], fig. 113). The tools of weighing and measuring fixed on this wooden head were meant to devaluate mechanization and rationalization, criticizing the enormous industry of artificial limbs as symptoms of scientist strategies and to point the way to a “different life” allowing a new and productive, purpose-free combination of art and technology. It was in Mécano (Blue) in 1922 that Hausmann’s Dadakopf (Dada Head) appeared in print for the first time, under the title Plastique.  

“The homme machine”:
The Anatomy of Venus

The anatomical model on a turned wooden stand, with its organs on display, belongs to the highlighted vertical sections of the Dada Roof Studio like the female dummy on the pedestal and the dark figure in the foreground. Especially the red arteries and blue veins streaking the body
testify to its functioning mechanics. Its physiognomy is merely hinted at; mouth and eyes are sketched in a deadly pale outline, and the light-colored skin is waxen. In the context of the roof studio, the figure has manifold connotations, pointing to a thoroughly rationalized reality as well as to Dada’s metamechanical concept.

The anatomical model uncovers the scientific view of the human body as it was presented in hygiene exhibitions before and especially after World War I. These exhibitions were meant to contribute to an enlightenment of the people, to improve hygiene education, and “folk health.” Display cases and plastic diagrams (moulages) supplemented the folding display boards of the nineteenth century. Schlichter regarded anatomical models with a mixture of fascination and repulsion. He had seen the earliest when as a child he visited the Great Panopticon in the Kaiserpassage, a show assembled from teaching aids for medicine. Yet in connection with the hygiene exhibitions these anatomical models were not presented neutrally but as ideological manifestations of the intact “folk body.” Following the rationalization and industrialization of all contexts of life, the revelation of the body’s physical functioning was connected to technocratic and militarist strategies of achieving maximum efficiency in controlling the body and maintaining its smooth, machine-like performance. This model of availability was a modern consequence of “l’homme machine” as designed by La Mettrie in 1748 and 1749, a machine that could walk upright and wind up its own mainsprings. This mechanistic, materialist conception of human nature blurred the line between man and machine. The enlightening impulses of La Mettrie’s position in the twentieth century turned into the ideology of manipulatable men. The model of the intact functioning body appeared cynical in view of the mutilation of the roof studio’s deadened protagonists. It was the exploitation of nature they bore witness to, pointing to the fact that they had become, or could become, the physiological, biological, and anthropological testing ground of psycho-social conditioning and ergonomics (the Taylor System). In order to challengingly represent the object and commodity character of bodies, Dix mixed various anatomical models next to prostheses in the store window of Prager Strasse (Prague Street, 1920; fig. 61), while at the same time confronting the viewer with the impoverished cripples who had to do without prostheses. La Mettrie’s mechanistic-materialist worldview began to show cracks and rifts in view of the destructive intensification of technical and functional rationality. The ideology of a nature of steel and of a machine-anatomy was reduced to absurdity.

The anatomical model as an object lesson is part of Dada’s metamechanical “chambers of curiosities” like the cross-section of a machine. The Dadaist had expropriated it from the natural scientist who had become the engineer of a physiological system of efficiency, thereby liberating it from its purpose-bound economy of human use and placing it in the context of art. Centrally placed in the montage Tatlin lebt zu Hause (Tatlin Lives at Home, 1920; fig. 109) is an anatomical torso, also mounted on a turned wooden stand, showing the colon, vein, aorta, and pancreas in the three-dimensional arrangement of “moulages.” The effect is strangely anthropomorphous, recalling the “humanization” of matter, whereas the body itself is being mechanized and materialized. The cross-section through a female abdomen belonged to the hybrid worlds assembled by Hausmann in Dada im gewöhnlichen Leben (Dada Cino) (Dada in Everyday Life (Dada Cinema), 1920; fig. 107) as well as in ABCD (1923; fig. 105). The brain as “man’s displaced center of gravity” (Hausmann) occurred in several of his works as an object of the pleasure he took in dissection: in the cross-section through a steering wheel in Tatlin lebt zu Hause (Tatlin Lives at Home, 1920; fig. 109), as an x-ray of Baader’s skull (not before 1921),
also as a section through the coils of Huelsenbeck’s “precision-brain” in *Ein bürgerliches Präcisionsgehirn ruft eine Weltbewegung hervor* (A Bourgeois Precision-Brain Causes a World Movement, 1920; cat. no. 29). In the *Selbstportrait des Dadasophen* (Self-Portrait of the Dadasoph, 1920; cat. no. 27) the head is connected as a manometer with the anatomical view of the upper body. The transition between body and machine seems to be fluid. In the montage *Ein bürgerliches Präcisionsgehirn* the display of human physiology belongs to the mechanical innovations and artifacts of the “precision-brain” as do the typewriter, adding machine, serially fabricated door locks, the football, and the woman’s shoe. Hausmann ironically alludes to a well-known contemporary advertisement of a brochure called *Der Gehirnwecker* (The Brain-Alarm), declaring “This is your inexhaustible vault if you know how to raise its treasures.”

While we can on the one hand regard these quotations as the final outcome of a desire for knowledge that had refuted itself through the excess of its mechanistic and scientific materialism, we can, on the other hand see the Dadaists constructing stages for a new encounter between science and art. Art was also to respond to the call for hygiene and be purified to its essential core. The cross-section through man as through the machine offered anaesthetic, analytic techniques: precise, without soul and emotion, but with an interest in detail. These techniques were to be discovered in art as a precise process toward the organic, physiological, mechanical and functional of the work itself. The anatomical model as Dada’s new metamechanical guiding image served to disillusion traditional, mimetically oriented art. It functioned as the opposite of the *Prussian Venus* as it were, demonstratively laying it bare. The analogy of artist and surgeon made by Apollinaire in 1913 with regard to the cubist Picasso here finds its continuation in Dada metamechanics. Nothing was to escape the dissecting process, not body, machine, city, houses, media, modes of thought, or perception. The image itself was skeletonized to its basic outlines.

There is no doubt that the dissecting technique also interacted with the complex hermeneutics of creation as seen by Nietzsche: the effects of art as a “suggestion on the muscles and senses.” Art and philosophy were perceived as “an interpretation of the body,” thoughts as “symptoms of the body.” The purpose was not to reduce the artists to “devices of objectification and registration with neutralized intestines,” but to enable them to “incorporate” knowledge and to make it “instinctive.” The mechano-company on the roof studio symbolizes the inhibition of such incorporation by annihilating coercions.

However, the anatomical model itself, if seen as a guiding image of art, seems to give rise to the question whether any “naturalness” of the body still exists at all, any “order of the body” (Hausmann), which is not already a projection made to compensate for losses of meaning. Was it enough to invoke the hygiene of the body in order to exorcise false sentiment? After all, how “artificial” was nature itself?

---

**“Prussian Venus”:**
**The Apollinian Muse**

The female Muse, whose dismemberment still belonged to Dada’s Dionysian theme of rapist-killing in 1918, here appears in a new form, assembled according to the Apollinian ideal of beauty. She is the roof studio’s main attraction. She is presented as an object on display, set off against the dark background of the screen. It seems as if she is meant to entertain the company. Judging from her disciplined appearance, Tucholsky in *Weltbühne* called her the *Prussian Venus.* Though the classicist pedestal would suggest a muse of aesthetic perfection representative of a classical canon of art, Schlichter doubly disillusioned this expectation: first in
the triviality of her appearance and second in her insecure position on the pedestal she has to share with her alter ego, a rag dummy, an allegory of mutilated Eros.

Schlichter’s new Venus relates in a complex way to contemporary influences, in particular to the new prototype of modern woman forming in the early twenties in the Weimar Republic under changed political and social conditions after World War I. Her dress marks the “New Woman” as an athlete, a significant new field of activity symbolizing her freedom of mobility and action. Carrà had already presented his Metaphysical Muse (1917) as a tennis player. Sports intensified the active influence of the New Woman who began to consider her own powers. “Gymnastics” signified a “school of the will.” For Hausmann, too, athletic “women who are conscious of their bodies, women who are functioning” formed the “only counterpart” against a German Innerlichkeit, which found its highest expression in flat feet and beer bellies. Grosz presented the gym girl as a central type of the new age, seated self-assertively on a railing in his mural for a workers’ gym (1920) titled Rhythmische Erneuerung durch Box- und Base-Ball (Rhythmic Renewal through Boxing and Baseball; fig. 88), printed for the first time next to Radfahrer und Schwerathletik (Cyclist and Heavy Athletics) in Der Ararat. Carl Sternheim recognized connections between women’s emancipation and World War I as a disaster produced by men: “Man has disgraced himself by the war; woman has realized his shortcomings and those of his world. So she wants to shape her own destiny and then that of the world at large because she has lost the illusion of the hero she can rely on.” Schlichter’s artificial figure thus inaugurates a new guiding image of the age. Emancipation had been strengthened further after 1919 by the new right to vote, by free access to universities and academies of art, and by a slow but steady integration in working life especially in white-collar jobs. There was talk of “effemination.” Nevertheless Schlichter does not represent woman as acting but as a metamechanical creature. This is a multilayered reaction to the media images prevalent at the time — bobbed hair included. As a mixture of store window dummy, Amazon, goddess of victory, gym, or revue girl, athlete and self-assertive woman, the figure on the pedestal, is dismembered into single topical effects.

Although next to the child she is the only one on the roof studio who still seems to be alive, she too is exposed to the danger of paralysis. She seems doll-like in her stereotypical smile, the gesture of her arms, the prosthetic right arm, and the hints at artificial joints between head and body as well as above both knees. The large nostrils, broad face, and shadows around the mouth make her something of an Amazon. She could also represent the parody of a “goddess of victory” or an “angel of peace,” which official art mostly dressed in pseudo-classical costume. The buttoned boots were the only attribute for Schlichter that gave sensual charm to a woman. For him these kinds of boots had been an object of desire since his youth, “placing the main emphasis on the shape of the tip, the soft leather, and the tight fit at the base of the calves.” As a boot-fetishist he also noted “the curiously dippy, hovering walk generated by the high heels, the narrow tapered shape of the foot whose downward reduction approached the supernatural,” and admitted, “all these moments stirred up inside me a whirl of the most painful and acute desire, a tempest of the wildest passions.”

Yet this sensual effect is completely subordinated to the figure’s metamechanical appearance. Her paralysis makes clear that even female eroticism was to be influenced by the processes of rationalization, which penetrated all regions of life in the course of the twenties, from the sphere of production to that of culture. The Prussian Venus embodies the disciplined training that conditioned her for the new challenges and the drill of women athletes and dancers.
at the time. Fritz Giese noted about the *Revuegirls* (fig. 2.8) of the mid-twenties: “The body was our enemy, erotics and powerlessness our torture. Now we are drilling it.” The desensualizing reification of woman belonged to the characteristics of American cultural feminism as it attempted to assert itself within the more patriarchal European culture.

The tired post-war upper-class company of the roof studio no longer reacts to the new appearance of the metamechanical *Venus*. In these surroundings the woman is not granted the possibility to realize and assert herself effectively. And in view of the numbness, blindness, lethargy, and boredom of the upper ten, she has also lost her suggestive force as a projection of desires. Idolization does not open new realms of action for her but rather appears to aggravate her isolation and paralysis.

Schlichter also relativizes the idealization of her youth: even as a child she appears unchildlike, stiff, isolated. Here Schlichter may have been inspired by Carrà’s oil painting *Il figlio del costruttore* (The Son of the Engineer, 1917; fig. 144). It was printed in 1919 in *Valori Plastici* (no. 4–5) and in *Das Kunstblatt* (no. 10), even in the *Berliner Illustrierte Zeitung* (no. 47) in November 1919. Carrà’s child also shows a doll-like rigidity, dressed in a sailor suit; in his hand, instead of a bucket, he holds the modern sports attribute, the tennis racket, a metamechanical construction showing that there no longer is any enclave untouched by the grasp of rationality. The connection of child and creation myth is here disillusioned by paralysis.

Schlichter includes the *Prussian Venus* in the mechanistic cycle of life: created from dead matter (cylinder base in right corner), via her child-state (in sailor’s dress), at her apex (on the pedestal), and in death (on the pedestal’s hindmost edge). As a rag doll she still keeps her leg stretched out in a graceful, coquettish fashion toward the black figure in the foreground. This figure, a modern appearance of death in an aviator’s suit with black facemask and leather jacket, seems to be waiting for her. With this new *Venus* Schlichter at the same time raised an anti-idol onto the pedestal, which disillusioned former male projections of woman as a sensual cocotte, for example in the watercolor *Tingel-Tangel* (Honkytonk, ca. 1920) and the lithograph *Tanz* (Dance, ca. 1919). In the Dada montage *Phänomen-Werke* (Phenomenon-Work, 1919–20; fig. 152) he clearly departed from this previous projection toward a first stage of mechanization, yet he did not invest it with the significance of the New Woman as he did in the *Dachatelier* (Roof Studio; fig. 154).

In the confrontation of the metamechanical *Venus* with the seated lady of society, who is wearing a strikingly elegant long red dress, Schlichter opposed two female roles of the time: the “New Woman” and the married wife. The latter is integrated by her role in the (seated) company of men. This was critically noted by Hausmann in his essay “*Der Besitzbegriff in der Familie und das Recht auf den eigenen Körper*” (The Concept of Possession in the Family and the Right to One’s Own Body):

The bourgeois marriage turns the woman into the husband’s property; it suppresses the woman into inferiority. Marriage is the projection of rape into right . . . The rightlessness of woman, the injustice, consists in the fact that the bourgeois marriage produces a false right of property out of the possibility of possession, by following the fictive superiority of man (and thereby the patriarchal family).
Hannah Höch reacted ironically to the stereotypically fixed role of married women in the watercolor _Bürgerliches Brautpaar_ (Bourgeois Bride and Groom, 1920; fig. 138), presenting a reified bride as a clothes rack with a wind-blown veil. Max Ernst similarly alluded to the tailor made roles of the age of costume in his constructions influenced by metaphysical painting; he called his collection of eight lithographs _FIAT MODES – pereat ars_ (Let there be Fashion, Down with Art, 1919; fig. 68).

The “New Woman” was autonomous but not free. As a metamechanical fiction she presented the suppression of the sensual in favor of an objectification and typification; and yet it was a vital cocooning in which the Dionysian and Apollinian forces were both active. In her surrogate existence without consciousness, a liberating moment had been preserved that had an anti-cultural effect upon the artists. Dix did not disagree to this in _Suleika, das tätowierte Wunder_ (Suleika, the Tattooed Marvel, 1920; fig. 62). In her masquerade, the Dionysian force is conjured up to great effect. The flood of images on her tattooed body condenses into an aggregate of innumerable particles of male desire: love, wartime adventures, the South Sea, the circus, acrobats and jugglers, a rose, the German Reichsadler — a mixture of the “Staatskokotte Germania” (State Cocotte Germania, Mehring) and the port prostitute Suleika. But her seduction is mere professionalism, her gaze is empty, her pouting lips are drawn up artificially, her arms are gracefully twisted. She freezes into an ornamental pose and so do the desires she promises to fulfill. Dix also elevates her on a small round pedestal and reifies her. In _Suleika_ he designs his trivial muse, a Dionysian appearance in an Apollinian mask. Hannah Höch, in her montages _Aus einem ethnographischen Museum_ (From an Ethnographic Museum, 1924–31), for example in _Denkmal I_ (Monument I; fig. 135), destroys any illusion. Sections between heads and bodies, parceling of faces and dismemberment of limbs are united with the uncanny magic of ethnographic masks to an “anagrammatic” body. The construct assembled from body fragments, which allows the association of a stalking figure, sabotages projections of femininity as representative of the “natural” ideal of beauty as well as expectations of a normative aesthetics of a holistic body ideal and a stable identity. Her unusual and shocking hybrid appearance evokes a departure whose message is yet to be deciphered. It is above all new that by deconstructing the “Monument”, Hannah Höch attempted to undermine the monopolizing of the female body by the image-producing mass media. She provocatively staged an “identity of non-identity” — the female body as an allegory of mass media, grotesquely presenting its multiplied presence together with its absence. While in _Suleika_ the female body carrying signs has become complete surface, in Höch’s _Denkmal I_ it becomes an exchangeable particle of a complex medial sign-system that has to be called into question. The _Prussian Venus_ and its fictitious appearance as “New Woman” rather oscillate between _Suleika’s_ surface and Höch’s deconstructed monument. It is clear that Schlichter strives to give the impression that she has created her own image (of her appearance) and now is confronting a society, in which she is isolated.

The unbridgeable gap between her and the paralyzed world of male society is a typical Dada topic. Grosz presented it in _Daum Marries her Pedantic Automaton ‘George’_ (fig. 86.3). Beyond Dada Berlin, Marcel Duchamp in particular expressed it in _La Mariée mise à nu par ses Célibataires, même_ (The Bride Stripped Bare by her Bachelors, Even; New York 1915–23). The lower part of Duchamp’s work corresponds to the level of Schlichter’s male mechano-creature dressed in black: the “Century of Uniforms and Liveries,” the “nine mannish moulds”: priest, delivery boy, gendarme, cuirassier, policeman, undertaker, flunkey, busboy, station master. They are “bachelors” who, according to Duchamp, “unable to step out of their masks,”
represent “the weary life, the vicious circle, masturbation, the monotonous wheel, the cheap stuff of life.” In Duchamp’s work the upper level of the Bride corresponds to the level of the Prussian Venus and the medical torso as anatomical muse; it hovers above the bachelors, amorphous, created from interpenetrating organic and mechanical analogies. In contrast to Schlichter, Duchamp abandons the traditional mimetic representation of the body and opens her figuration to his unlimiting mechanoid, diagrammatical play. There are no connections between the level of the bride and that of the bachelors, only projections. Both function as autoerotic systems. However whereas in Duchamp’s work projections are still legible, such as the desire for sexual union or a sexual aggression that transforms Bride into Hanged Woman, these projections seem frozen and encapsulated in Schlichter’s Dada-Dachatelier. And yet even the projection of the hanged woman (fig. 157) was present in Schlichter’s work. This is visible in his fantasies of strangled women, which he staged in the same anonymous spaces as can be found in the roof studio. Emotionally charged representations are banished from the bachelors’ mechano-world. Woman can only appear in it when she is transfixed in the Apollinian order.

Art had created a unique and timeless female ideal in the marble Venus de Milo (late second century B.C.). As a Dadaist, Schlichter in his modern version freed her from this age-old cult. In Tote Welt (Dead World, 1920; fig. 156), a torso recalls her classical appearance, but it seems without function, a citation of an antiquity that has become unfamiliar and strange, a useless piece of cultural flotsam in the modern urban surroundings. At the Dada-Fair, Schlichter reintroduced her timeless perfect beauty to “our senses’ range of understanding” (Herzfelde) by placing photo-portraits on her torso, implementing medial construction and deconstruction on the same object, a method that also inspired Baargeld to his photomontage (fig. 51). Here, in the Dada-Dachatelier her “modern” appearance is inserted into the construction of metamechanical aesthetics and ambivalent perspectives. It is the viewers’ gaze only that she faces, challenging them to new questions — questions about the relation between reality and medial simulation, absence and presence, wholeness and dissection, Eros and death in the new aesthetic landscape of Dadaist metamechanics, in which anatomical and geometrical guiding images ambivalently determine the new visions of art.

“Systematic Work on the Ball”:
The New Constructor as Dada Apollo

In the Dada Roof Studio (fig. 154) we perceive two different types of artist shown as mechanical figures. On the one hand there is the excluded academic painter of the old school, wearing a white smock and seated in front of an inverted easel; he marks a farewell to the traditional art of accomplished “master works.” On the other hand we have the metamechanical constructor who sits at the table, in front of his geometrical utensils, doing nothing.

The means and forms of representation of the “academic artist” seem to be used up, his messages no longer relevant, his visionary abilities extinguished. He has nothing to say: his easel is empty and turned away from him. His hands are not visible, only part of a wooden arm prosthesis. His old concept of the artwork is no longer of interest. He is a “leftover,” still reminiscent of periods of art to which access has now been lost. Not even the Prussian Venus can still inspire him.

The artist shocks by his anonymity. Was this actually a role behind which the anti-academic Dadaist could conceal himself, presenting anonymity and de-individualization not as a loss of personality but as an Apollinian camouflage? The gas mask of the artist heightens the
impression of a personality that wants to make itself unapproachable, invulnerable to the traumatic experiences of the outside world. Whoever has faced terror, according to Nietzsche, will search for the mask of Apollinian art. The Apollinian appearance emphatically highlights paralysis and lack of emotion toward the exterior world, making of the artist an uncanny enigma, for the origin of his mask points to his knowledge of the horrors of World War I. The mask appears as a relic reflecting the past, allowing the conclusion that the artist is passive, in mute and melancholy revolt against a culture devoid of meaning. Through his paralysis, moreover, he liquidates his senses, which were directed toward conformity and habit and a convention-laden traditional notion of art. This attitude expresses Dada’s tendency to depart from what Duchamp called “retina art,” a notion of art relying on mimetic representation. Therefore, the work on the easel has ultimately become unnecessary; what counts is solely to regain art as a new idea, a conception in keeping with the period.

And one more facet of Dada Berlin can be discerned in the artist’s passivity. It is connected to his social position and his negative fixation on the upper class as his customers. He seems to retreat from this “ruling class” by way of his lack of productivity; yet at the same time we realize his isolation from the “proletarian masses.” Schlichter was working for a functional change in art and shared Grosz’s opinion that only if art no longer “flows anemically through the lives of high society,” only then will it become alive again and “communicate to all of working humanity as a full stream.”

What then does this figure of the old artist and his attitude mean with regard to the Dionysian process of destruction in the montages? What was conceived in the Dionysian techniques of ecstasy now was consistently brought to an end, the disappearance of the traditional picture. Let us call to mind once more how in the procedure of montage a constant process of reflection on the medium of the picture, referring back to itself, was excessively stimulated by crosswise joining acts of destruction, aiming as much at the picture as a symbolic form as at the human body as the object of representation. Especially the deconstructing montages of the Dadaists’ own and their friends’ portraits showed paradoxically, ironically, grotesquely how much the body was equated metaphorically with the picture and its materiality. By continually dismantling themselves, they simultaneously performed the “execution” of the picture. The attack on the picture, however, does not mean the end of it. The Dionysian dissolution of the picture in actions simultaneously gives birth to the Apollinian metamechanical constructions. The universalist and ubiquitous signs of technology as an anaesthetic language introduced a new vision into the void: to see art in the perspective of science and technology. The designs of abstract functional models, diagrams, and typecasts seem to keep open all forms of representation. They look as though all limitations of unchangeable shaping and stylization can be overcome, representing themselves, pure and free of ideology.

Thus, the other type of artist on the roof studio may embody the new Apollinian role of the Dadaist as constructor. In this role he seems to perceive the problem of rationalism without prejudice, matter-of-factly and in a playful experimental way. His instruments are the geometrical tools with which he competently plans a new rationalized world, creating a metamechanical culture that emerges out of the combination of art and technology, and including also the natural sciences (represented by the anatomical model).

Whereas De Chirico in the unfamiliar realm of civilization recalls the former mythic significance of art, and does so in a melancholy vein, the new Dadaist artist appears to be concerned with the persistence of art in the “gay” union with the rational ability of science,
METAMECHANICAL CONSTRUCTION — SCIENCE IN THE PERSPECTIVE OF ART

perhaps with a “further development of the artistic” in scientific man, as Nietzsche demanded it in the phase of Human, All-Too-Human (1878).66 Grosz recognized a new artistic guideline in the “matter-of-factness and clarity of the engineer’s drawing.”67 By responding to the mechanistic challenges, the Dadaist wanted to give a new foundation to the problem of rationalism by means of art as metamechanical play. For this reason the engineer’s drawing, the diagram, plan, and blueprint were often introduced into the constructions as a picture within the picture: in Grosz’s Der Diabolospieler (The Diabolo Player, 1920; fig. 95) and Der neue Mensch (The New Man, 1920; fig. 94); also in Hausmann’s Kutschenbauch dichtet (Kutschenbauch Composes Poetry, 1920; fig. 112). They testify to an artistic indifference beyond any traditional aesthetic pretensions, marking a closeness to Duchamp’s anartistic, “dry” concept of art and to Picabia’s mechanomorphous and machinoid sections: Tamis du Vent (ca. 1918; fig. 142; cat. no. 103), Cannibalisme (ca. 1918; cat. no. 48), Oeil Rond, Buschmannzeichnung (Round Eye, Bushman Drawing, 1919–20; cat. no. 47) were selected for the Dada-Fair. Furthermore we find, in Kutschenbauch dichtet (fig. 112) and in Diabolospieler (fig. 95), the metamechanical activity intensified to a hermetic systematization that, compared to the Roof Studio (fig. 154), has already achieved an absolute, equilibrated order. Mechanics has become a second, abstract, artistic nature — an automatism, the “Seelenautomobil” (soul automobile). Hausmann’s Kutschenbauch (1920) represents an artificial figure taken from the ambiance of Baader’s assemblage Das große Plasto-Dio-Dada-Drama (The Great Plasto-Dio-Dada-Drama, 1920; fig. 47), and resurfacing in Der Verfasser des Buches der “Vierzehn Briefe Christi” in seinem Heim (The Author of the Book of “Christ’s Fourteen Letters” in His Home, ca. 1920). Hausmann makes him churn the coffee grinder like a prayer wheel. With his big blue eyes he stares blankly out of the picture, his head slightly bowed. Grosz’s Diabolospieler (1920; fig. 95) functions unconsciously from out of the interior of his mechanism, the little cogwheeldirecting the motion of his arms. The Diabolo game, which had spread to Germany in 1908, belonged to the American fashion in toys. In Ein kleines Ja und ein großes Nein (A Small Yes and a Big No), Grosz writes:

One day we were suddenly all playing Diabolo: with a string tied between two sticks held in our hands, we would throw an hour-glass-shaped top up into the air and catch it skillfully with the string when it came down. Doing this we would be humming the tune of the day: “Since my old man caught the latest craze of Di-Ei-E-Bi-Olo.”68

Kutschenbauch with his coffee grinder and the Diabolo player are reduced to stereotypes by their jointed-doll movements. They escape human unreliability and subjectivity by their perfect metamechanical functioning. The Dionysian has been transposed into its Apollinian counterweight. The “inner necessity” of expressionist creation has been ironically replaced by the metamechanical automatism. The Diabolo player’s feat, which lives off of the tension of his balancing act, becomes a uniform motion, back and forth, up and down, a perfect equilibration in the context of Dadaist indifferentiation. Its hermetic functioning allows the child’s Diabolo game to be seen as equivalent to the metamechanical plan in the picture. Both represent an independent, autonomous, self-generated system, a stringent formal reality with an interior consistency. This new model of metamechanical creation no longer needs to engage with the creativity of the psyche. Hausmann used the male tailor’s dummy; Grosz used men that were stereometrically assembled from cylinders and balls. They are the new metamechanical
production machines of art. Yet in contrast to industrial fabrications, they are devoid of function and use, independent and autonomous; as “transcendental-immanent perpetuum mobiles” (Hausmann), they apply a visionary mathematics, which makes art and science equally enigmatic.

What they state is so void and purposeless that they are at the same time an ending and a beginning, an ending because their automatism does not negate their origin in the mechanics of society. The Diabolo player still contains the prosthetic cripple, and Hausmann’s Kutschenbauch, if we relate him to the satire written in 1920, is a product of German convention and education. Viewed in this light their mechanism would be an “unspiritual and unintellectual” one (Hausmann). But the Dadaists are able to reduce to absurdity their meaningless motion and ironically change it into an “anti-spiritual or anti-intellectual” nonsense.

In Grosz’s Der neue Mensch (The New Man, 1920; fig. 94) the new artist’s seclusion in the roof studio, the automaton-like equanimity of Kutschenbauch, and the Diabolo player are transformed into a more reality-related quality of metamechanical activity: “My works can be recognized as works of training, a systematic working at the ball.”69 We also meet these new types in Hausmann’s watercolor Ingenieure (Engineers, 1920; fig. 110), intruding into the small town like “American exploiteure,” surveyors of new plans, exorcising the old spirit. While the engineer in the foreground makes his measurements on a flat base, the other one, immediately behind him, seems to take on the function of a supervisor. The influence of Carrà’s painting Mother and Son (1917; fig. 143) cannot be overlooked, not only in the arrangement of the frontal figures but also in a certain resemblance of the dress, as well as in the relations to base, measuring rod, and ball. The walking figure in front of the house wall in Ingenieure is a motif repeated frequently in spatial image montages to emphasize dimensions of depth. Grosz’s neue Mensch (New Man, 1920) is also walking with resolute steps through a clear space toward an engineer’s drawing showing a cross-section of a two-cylinder V-engine. He passes the geometrical utensils lying in the foreground and the punch ball hung up in the middle ground, his most important training device; he is an engineer and a boxer. Ingenieure and Der neue Mensch show a new understanding of rationalism. The figures appear to be living in an empty space free of contradiction, in a perfect functional context, as opposed to the crushing apathy of the Dachatelier (fig. 154). The type of the artist as a boxer and an engineer is an embodiment of a new identity of art and technology, art and life. The metamechanical Dadaist became a boxer (steadfast and with quick reactions, always wary of a possible attack) and an engineer (coolly reasoning, calculating, up-to-date). In order to live modernity, one needed such a “heroic constitution” (Benjamin). Hausmann’s engineers (fig. 110) were artists approaching a functioning world that demanded “stability, construction, expediency,”70 — conditions, which assumed the elimination of the artist’s personal traits, of his emotions, and of any psychologizing interpretation. His acuteness of mind reduced art to a pure elementary simplicity, avoiding even in clear coloring any association of expressivity and “frenzy” (Hausmann). The new type of artist was further characterized by a calculating view of life, replacing traditional rootedness by a higher degree of mobility: not the cycle of nature, but the pace of the city; not the German small town, but America; not the individual, but the type; not the organism, but the apparatus. These were the new binary oppositions dominating the critique of culture and civilization, provoking in part and in part defensive. The new challenges of modern technology and the urban living space, as an attack on body and soul, conditioned the artist and his senses to a metamechanical, highly performative consciousness — planning, measuring, constructing the new Apollinian man.
This concept gave rise to Hausmann’s *Mechanischer Kopf* (Der Geist unserer Zeit) (Mechanical Head [The Spirit of Our Age]; fig. 113). His thinking according to number and measurement announced a new creative combination of art and technology: a metamechanical transvaluation of aesthetics, viewing science in the perspective of art. Apparently the head was first exhibited in the *Große Berliner Kunstausstellung* in 1921 as part of the *November Group* and titled *Kopf in exzentrischer Bewegung* (Head in Eccentric Motion; no. 1086 of its catalog). Although Hausmann is inclined to an earlier dating of this item as well, favoring the year 1918 or 1919, it has not been found at the Dada-Fair or in the Berlin Dada publications. It only received the title *Geist unserer Zeit* in the course of Hausmann retrospectives since 1967. In *Mécano* (Blue, 1922) the Dadaist for the first time programmatically integrated his work into the antie-expressionist, anti-psychological, and anti-erotic concept of this journal that was edited by van Doesburg using his Dadaist pseudonym I. K. Bonset. The journal triggered a polemic of “mechanical” against “natural” man, above all in order to oppose esoteric notions of Bauhaus teacher Johannes Itten and the subjectively expressive, energetic pathos of the expressionists. The dedication below Hausmann’s “Plastique” in *Mécano* needs to be understood in this context; it addressed all “neo-classicistes et esthéticiens du compas et du nombre en France et en Italie” (neo-classicists and aestheticians of compass and number in France and Italy), which probably meant Le Corbusier, his *L’esprit nouveau* circle (October 1920–January 1925) and the artists of *pittura metafisica*. The instruments on the head point to a manner of living and of perception determined rationally and materially. In contrast to the Dionysian, emphatic eccentricity of the montages, the head inaugurates an Apollinian, concentrated perspective toward things. This perspective is made more precise — note the brass screws of the photographic plate camera — by photography as a covenant between the eye and the apparatus. The creation of the *Mechanical Head* is also, apart from its affinity to van Doesburg’s concept, related to a new, scientifically motivated understanding of art. This was represented at the meeting of *Union fortschrittlicher internationaler Künstler* (May 29–31, 1922) in Dusseldorf by the constructivists El Lissitzky, Hans Richter, Werner Graeff, Lászlo Moholy-Nagy, Cornelius van Eesteren, and Max Burchartz together with Hausmann, and it further asserted itself in the concepts of the constructivist group in Berlin and in the *Bauhaus* in Weimar.

Hausmann’s thoroughly Dada-Apollinian creation of the Head was preceded by drawings: one of them represents the portrait of Conrad Felixmüller (1920; fig. 111). His three-quarter profile is schematized; his physiognomy typified as that of the intellectual. His head is placed in an empty room on a flat base, comparable to those *manichini* by De Chirico that invite contemplation. The painter Felixmüller also strove for a change of function in the combination of art and industry, art and revolution. In his manifesto *PRÉsentismus*, published in number nine of *De Stijl* in 1921, Hausmann declared: “The beauty of our daily lives is determined by the models, the hairdressers’ art of wig-making, the exactness of a technical construction. We are striving again for a conformity with the mechanical work process: we shall have to get used to the idea of seeing art produced in the factory!”

This metamechanical decision supported “the will to style” Hausmann called for, in October 1921 together with Hans Arp, Iwan Puni and Lászlo Moholy-Nagy, in their “*Aufruf zur elementaren Kunst*” (Call for Elementary Art) in the next edition of *De Stijl* (no. 10): “Turn away from styles. We demand stylelessness in order to achieve STYLE!” Van Doesburg explicitly saw this will to style in the union of art and technology by setting determinacy against
indeterminacy, simplicity against complexity, synthesis against analysis, logical construction against lyrical constellation, mechanism against handicraft, collectivism against individualism. Grosz related the metamechanical transvaluation of art in a utopian perspective to a new communist social order, connecting it to his notion of Tatlinism, the synthesis of revolutionary and technical art. For Grosz, the new man was “a bright healthy worker in the collectivist community.”

The clarity of technical reason seemed identical with the idea of a transparent social order as described by Lenin: “After the fall of the capitalists, after the destruction of the modern state’s bureaucratic machinery, we will have before us a mechanism freed of all parasites and of a high degree of technical perfection.”

The new man as a collective prototype inspired Grosz to further mechano-constructions, abstract Planrisse (Construction; fig. 86.7). This new man appeared to reflect the Russian constructivist utopia of progress underlying the proletarian culture revolution, which systematically connected artistic and industrial production, intending to revolutionize art as part of the shaping of everyday life. At the center of this culture-revolutionary desire, the constructivist placed the work of the “Monteur,” the “Constructor,” and the “Engineer,” who had to take into account the state of technology and production in building up a culture of the future. The contrast between aesthetic and material production was to be abolished. The real production of art took place in the factory and the laboratory. Influenced by these ideas, Grosz undertook his trip to Russia in 1922, only to return disillusioned. After that, the new collectivist type was no longer to appear in his works in this utopian conception.

Yet in contrast to the constructivists, Dada’s new Apollinian “conventionality” of the artist, his type-castings, hermetism, and Sachlichkeit were to retain an unresolved remainder of Dionysian disquiet. As yet, the old roles of the artist, though dismissed and in anachronistic paralysis, could not be clearly distinguished from the new constructivist creations. The constructor on the Roof Studio (fig. 154) is passive and lethargic, as yet apparently unable to exhaust the possibilities of a “cultural will to style of the machine” (van Doesburg). The Dadaist employed also boredom and lack of productivity as a denial, in order to denounce the growing normativity “of our hollow, empty epoch.” He consciously made ironic the stagnation of the monotonous and paralyzed society allowing glimpses of the repressed horrors behind its surface. His ennui was meant to expose the loss of culture. The denial of subjective, work-oriented productivity was a Dandyist attitude common to Dada. With regard to French Dadaism, Jacques Vaché wrote: “The man of humors should not be creative,” the Geneva Dadaist Walter Serner said: “The best book: the one left unwritten,” and co-founder of Dada Zurich and Paris, Tristan Tzara, claimed: “I would have become an adventurer of great style and fine gesture if only I had the psychic and physical power to complete this one task, not to get bored.” Salomo Friedlaender used the argument of “creative indifference,” and Carl Einstein had his protagonist Bebuquin ask: “Indifference, of what stuff are you created? Was excessive sensibility your origin or the force that equals opulent nature?” Marcel Duchamp created silence and achieved a great influence among the avant-garde. Although the new metamechanical artist seemed already to master the new technical regularities, the themes would not adapt so easily and without contradiction. As yet, the stereometrically assembled New Man (fig. 94) remained in a fixed polarity to the war cripple patched up with prostheses. As yet, metamechanics could not conceal its fragmentary nature.
Schlichter appeared to be rather skeptical toward the alliance between art and technology. Art seemed not yet able to have a productive effect on technology and industry and to transvaluate it in the sense of a poetic and artistic experiment. By contrast, mechanics without its Dionysian counterpart generated deadly, paralyzing powers in the semblance of the Apollinian work. The dark figure in the foreground of the Roof Studio (fig. 154) — muffled and covered up in a buttoned leather coat with upturned collar and an aviator’s mask — faces the beholder with a fixed stare through its glasses. It is close to the lower edge of the picture, visible only to the level of its chest, so that its presence can compellingly assert itself. Its mask hypertrophically enhances the impression created by that worn by the white figure of the old artist. The dark figure faces the viewer like a constant, immutable bulk of threatening paralysis. It is the negative, pessimistic correlative to the comparable figure in Grosz’s Automaton George (fig. 86.3). Whereas this “bachelor machine” invoked the productive union of art and technology, the dark figure here embodies rational order as an already-produced presence of death in “life”: made of steel, uncompromising, a trauma of anonymity and incalculability, it appears as the warden of the roof studio’s company. It seems to be the unfeeling servant of a thoroughly rationalized world, of an iron god of mass battles and mass destruction risen to power in the war. Its omnipresence of control over life gives rise to fears of torpor, paralysis, and interior and exterior immobility. To see mechanization as a life-denying phenomenon corresponded to a general insight of cultural pessimism, voiced for example by Walter Rathenau in 1922:

We must accept that as long as there is human life on earth there has never been a global mood that dominated such an immense circle of beings in this uniform fashion as does the mechanistic worldview. Its power seems inescapable, for it dominates the sources of production, the forces and goals of life; and this power is based on reason. But though mechanization has not reached its zenith by far . . . it is today carrying death in its heart.82

The embodiment of rationality approaching the picture’s edge and fixing the viewer with its gaze seems to have been inspired by Edvard Munch’s Red Virginia Creeper (1898–1900; fig. 155) — not only the figure itself but also the spatial relations: the conception of perspective, the architectural view. Yet Munch painted in emotional fervor, giving his figure the expression of panic and horror — especially through the wide open eyes and the greenish color of the skin. Whereas fear of death here annexes the whole picture, Schlichter draws its threatening weight from the field of deadly reason. “O paralysis, stagnant death, fossilization and sleep, you set the limits of our lives,” Bebuquin said in his “Rede vom Tod im Leben” (Speech of Death in Life) of 1912.83 Death as the suddenly intervening power of horror, as the catastrophic ending — as Grosz still saw it in the apocalyptic vision of Widmung an Oskar Panizza (Dedication to Oskar Panizza) (1917–18; fig. 78) — was here replaced by the slow process of decay and gradual standstill — a constant menace of the people on the scene as well as of the viewers. This is an ending that does not close in from outside; this is an ending from inside through the steel rationality of mechanization.
Schlichter’s multifaceted allegory of the arts in the Roof Studio lends probability to the hypothesis that this work was based on Dürer’s engraving Melencolia I (1514). Dürer’s “Denkbild” (image for contemplation, Schuster) at this time had a great influence on art, especially on pittura metafisica. It was for this reason also that De Chirico’s The Seer (1914–15; fig. 146) was programmatically accepted for the Dadaco proofs (fig. 165.3). The highest goal of the humanists, the virtuous striving for knowledge, seemed to have turned fatal through the experiences of a self-destroying, completely rationalized society. The roof studio, like Dürer’s engraving, creates a “Denkraum” (realm for contemplation, Warburg) of the polar qualities of melancholy: lethargy and creativity. The picture is in the grasp of melancholy’s coldness and aridity. The black figure might appear as the facies nigra of melancholy. The great productive capability that is usually ascribed to black bile is here transformed into a passive apathy due to the overwhelming, chilling influence of the technologized rational world. Devoid of meaning, enthralled by an apparently limitless progress, acedia, the negative typhus of melancholy, triumphs as listlessness and passivity. The dominance of rationality reveals itself as disastrous for this society and its culture. Its mechano-cripples belong to the children of Saturn, the planet of misery, which indeed hovers above the metropolitan society in Schlichter’s Hausvogteiplatz of 1923 — the same year Panofsky and Saxl published their interpretation of Dürer’s Melencolia I, which saw in it a “Warnblatt”, an “image of warning,” a reading of cultural pessimism, which itself probably also was a symptom of its time.84

But, as we have seen, the old type of artist was still harboring other possibilities of interpretation also connected to the unique gifts of melancholy, which the Renaissance had rediscovered with reference to classical antiquity. In this paralyzed civilization marked by its decline, the artist remains, offering resistance in his passivity. His gas mask makes us realize that a different kind of art and culture is necessary after the horror of World War I. He survives because he reflects on art, on science, and on himself. The Dadaists themselves remained passive in dreary resignation, and yet they took an active stance of denial, exposing the world to its meaninglessness. Although they perceived modernity from the point of view of its potential ending, this happened with a kind of dandyist heroism, which did not itself succumb to the end but activated as a clean slate for a new creative challenge, both negative and affirmative.

In the roof studio we see the new artist seated in front of his utensils, passive yet ready to take them up. What he lacks, however, is the pair of circular compasses of Melencolia I; it is no longer in his hand; the ingenious capability of a global master builder is denied him. His instrument seems to be the triangle with which he can construct a new metamechanical beauty of the world, piece by piece, devoid of anthropocentric goals. As in Dürer’s copperplate engraving the instruments of astronomy and geometry, the Saturnine arts of measurement as two of the seven liberal arts, challenge Melencolia I; likewise in the Roof Studio they provoke a rethinking of their use in the context of art and an interpretation of the “meta” of mechanics as an intensification of life, not as metaphysical incapability. Creativity itself is the foundation of the metaphysical dimensions of art. Schlichter himself, using geometry, developed a new kind of beauty that transcends lethargy; it is not gloomy but bright and clear. The scene’s profound melancholy is captured by the “veil” of geometrical beauty, captured, not repressed: “If we could imagine dissonance become man — and what else is man? — this dissonance, to be able to live, would need a splendid illusion that would cover dissonance with a veil of beauty” (Nietzsche).85

The finality, which is resolutely connected to the black figure, will not attain such a dominant effect if we rethink the appeal of the Prussian Venus. She appears on her pedestal,
together with the child, showing its Dionysian origin as counterpart to the black figure. As yet she is capable, in union with the child, of relativizing the entry of death, even if the company seems to have become its prey. She attempts to balance the new demands of the time, rationality and discipline, with what remains of her Dionysian potential.

In metamechanics, the Apollinian enters a union with forces of melancholy ingenuity. The new aesthetics of discipline, coldness, simplicity, and regularity mark the constructor in Nietzsche’s sense: “Logical and geometrical simplification is a consequence of increased power: conversely, the perception of such simplification will increase the feeling of power . . . The height of development: grand style.” The artist appeared on the scene as one who created his own laws for himself: the New Man (Grosz, fig. 94) controlled the new set of instruments in order to construct his own world. The utopian conditions of this new creative constructor were a non-alienated relationship between man and technology and a classless society demanding a new type of collective man, a “bright healthy worker” (Grosz). Rationality was thus no longer separated from life but served to enhance the will to life. But if these conditions were not fulfilled and mechanization was not controlled by an artistic creative mind — if it did not unite with art but sacrificed life to the intellect of industrialization — then mechanization would appear as a repressive force perpetuating the rules of bourgeois society. It would even be a deadly force because it paralyzed man by turning him into a puppet, alienated from other people and the environment, without a space for agency.

Metamechanics uses the same set of instruments, matter-of-factness and precision to construct both a repressive, mechanized anthropology and a productive, serene one. The Apollinian dominance will only take full effect when it has completely “counterbalanced” the Dionysian forces — not having deadened them, but having maintained its rationality passionate, its emptiness alive, its tranquility vital, its precision activated, its indifference creative, and its silence audible. In this way metamechanics was not to form any unequivocal position but to remain tied to Dada’s concept of polarities. Consequently Dada’s metamechanics shows on the one hand liberating moments allowing a detachment from metaphysical residues, heading for a reorientation of culture in an artistic and poetic tension by integrating rational intellect as part of life; on the other hand, it presents the dangers of alienation by a life-denying rationality, a one-dimensional progress of civilization.

We could conclude with Nietzsche’s sense that the metamechanics of Dada contributes to a liberation of rationality towards its own existence — in order to contribute to a transvaluation of values. “Whoever has to some extent achieved the freedom of reason cannot feel but that he is a wanderer on earth — even if he is not a traveler toward an ultimate goal: for this does not exist. And yet will he watch, and keep his eyes open for whatever actually happens in the world; this is why he must not attach his heart too tightly to every single thing; there must be something wandering inside him enjoying change and transitoriness.”

Dada’s metamechanics presupposes first of all a bright self-reflecting transparency of reason. Strength and strictness of the intellect are the enabling forces for “Lust der Erkenntnis” (joy of knowledge) and an “erfinderisches glückliches Ich” (inventive happy ego). Dada then was working in a deconstructive way on the preconditions of a “great architecture of culture”: it tried to balance the contradictory, dissonant forces, scientific coldness and skepticism, with the Dionysian energetic and vital power of art and poetry. In this spirit Hausmann’s Mechanical Head demanded a new conception of culture.
The First International Dada-Fair developed the complexity of the oppositional Dionysian and Apollinian poles into an experiential realm, revealing the “terrible and dubious character of existence” (Nietzsche) as a social and cultural grotesque. With this fair, Berlin became the focal point of Dadaism from July 1 to August 25, 1920. In the announcements the vernissage was on June 30 (Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger, June 26, 1920). According to the entrance ticket of the critic E. F. in Deutsche Tageszeitung of August 4, 1920, it opened on July 1, 1920, for the public. The Dadaists had announced diverging dates; possibly the opening was postponed several times. From the sticker of the Dada-Fair, we can assume it closed on August 25; this date approximately coincides with the period of the last critique by Kurt Bosdorff in Ostpreussische Zeitung (August 18, 1920). As a “first” exhibition, one can assume that something new would be shown and that second and third events would follow: strength was demonstrated. “First” also means “best”: Berlin was supposed to become the center of international Dadaism, the fair its mirror and advertisement.

The term “international” showed Dada’s thrust against the patriotism of the European nations at war; in this realm Dada was provocative whenever possible. Thus the trilingual titles for the portfolio by Grosz God With Us (fig. 79.1-79.9), published in 1920 by Malik-Verlag and exhibited at the Dada-Fair, strongly contributed to the public outrage at Grosz’s defamation of the German Reichswehr, as the lawsuit on April 20, 1921, would show. Already in the plan of an international Dadaist Weltatlas (world atlas), the Dadaco, which Huelsenbeck pursued from June 1919 to February 1920, the movement was to get a first summarizing documentation (fig. 165.1–165.4). But from the mostly German contributions to the fair in Berlin, it can be seen that it was somewhat euphoric in its claims. Only six artists (7%) with seventeen works (10%) came from foreign countries: Picabia (6) (France), Arp (5) and Serner (1) (Switzerland), Schmalhausen (4) (Belgium/Berlin), Hecht (2) (U.S.), Hans Citroën (4) (The Netherlands/Berlin). The cosmopolitan element of Dada was contained both in its enthusiasm for the American lifestyle and in its demand for an “international, revolutionary unification of all creative and intellectual people of the whole world rooted in radical communism.”2 It can be traced back to an appeal made by the new Russian government printed in Die Pleite, no. 1 in January 1919, which suggested an assembly of German and Russian artists leading to a world-convention of all revolutionary artists. For Grosz, Heartfield, Herzfelde, and at times also Hausmann, international solidarity was an indispensable part of the Dada-Fair, even though the communist movement did not honor them as trusted combatants. They were judged to be bourgeois and decadent because of their nihilism, and the Dadaists themselves revolted against the communists’ dogmatic, punctilious concept of art.3

The term “Dada-Fair” associates the art exhibit with a trade show, the quotation coming from the montage Universal-City (fig. 117), the title illustration of the catalog: the trade with Dada-Erzeugnisse (products) was supposed to be transnational. Dada pointed ironically to the numerous trade shows starting up after the war (Leipzig, Frankfurt, Munich, Nuremberg, Offenbach, Dusseldorf, and others), entering the European net of Paris, London, Milan, Vienna, Basle, Gothenburg, and Moscow. The connection to trade show also critically pointed to the fact that capitalist interests did not stop before works of art. Dadaists offensively responded to this fact by having their Erzeugnisse refuse the criteria of the art market. “Dada will lead to the cancellation of the art trade,” the catalog of the Dada-Fair announced. Beyond that, it became an unmistakable characteristic of this fair to parody the rhetoric of advertisement.
The German word for fair, Messe, however, also associated this exhibit with the “Christian mass”: Dada Berlin was celebrating an “anti-mass,” “both buffoonery and requiem mass” (Totenmesse) in one. It took the fetishes of culture only to deconstruct them in the same breath. Once and for all it shattered the metaphysical demand of religion in the guise of theological nationalistic militarism as hypocritical and deceitful and made it unmistakably clear that Dada’s metaphysics of artistry was the last cultural force field. In a Nietzschean sense the Dadaists undertook the revaluation of values and defined “art as the highest exercise and the real metaphysical activity of life.” As “prophets” (Heartfield) and subversive “Satans” at the same time, they proved themselves as “divine” brothers of the suppressed: “Dada is fighting on the side of the proletariat,” was their creed. In the mask of the “Da-Dandy” (Höch), the artists took on contradictory roles between autonomous creation and committed fight, pursuing their own “Weltrevolution” (world revolution), fictitious and real. According to Huelsenbeck, the Dadaist “today was not the same as tomorrow . . . maybe ‘nothing’ the day after tomorrow in order to be ‘everything’ later on.” The artists experimented with their poetical and political identities and roles: often in one person they presented themselves as dancers, painters, graphic designers, photo-“monteurs,” sound-poets, philosophers, communists, “presidents,” Apaches, advertising experts, engineers, writers, impresarios, as much stimulating each other as they supplemented and contradicted each other.

The following artists took part in the Dada-Fair, organized by Marschall (Marshal) Grosz, Monteurdada (Dadamechanic) Heartfield, and Dadasoph Hausmann (numbers of their works in brackets): Johannes Alberts (1), Johannes Sokrates (Paul?) Albrecht (1), Hans Arp from Zurich (5), Johannes Baader (17), Johannes Theodor Baargeld from Cologne (4), Carl Boesner (2), Dr. Otto Burchard, the Dadageneral or -financier (2), Hans Citroën (4), Otto Dix from Dresden (4), Alois Erbach from Wiesbaden (2), Max Ernst from Cologne (9), George Grosz (28), Maud E. Grosz (2), Raoul Hausmann (17), John Heartfield (17), Ben Hecht from Chicago (2), Wieland Herzfelde (1), Hannah Höch (6), Georg Koch (1), Georg Kobbe (2), Sigmar Mehring (1), Francis Picabia from Paris (6), Max Schlichter (1), Rudolf Schlichter from Karlsruhe (7), Otto Schmalhausen from Antwerp (4), Georg Scholz from Grötzingen near Karlsruhe (2), Walter Serner from Geneva (1), and Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt called W[alter?] by mistake (5). Of joint works mentioned in the catalog ten were by Grosz and Heartfield, by Heartfield and Hausmann (5), by Heartfield and Schlichter (1), and by Max Ernst and J. T. Baargeld (1). Some co-productions were fictitious: Hannah Höch created her dolls alone (without Hausmann), and the works in the catalog by “Otto Else Lasker-Dix” (were created by Dix alone). Fitting with the Dada concept of a destruction of the traditional notion of art was the inclusion of young and unknown “artists,” such as the fourteen-year-old Hans Citroën from the “Dada youth group” and the nineteen-year-old high school student Stuckenschmidt, of anonymous (press) photographers, and workers of a Berlin stencil factory. The high number of works by Grosz, Baader, Hausmann and Heartfield is noteworthy.

The exhibition took place in two rooms of the art dealer Dr. Otto Burchard on the ground floor of a five-story apartment house at Lützow Ufer 13, which as of 2003 no longer exists (fig. 2 cat. of Dada-Fair). How many rooms were rented by the art gallery that had opened its avant-garde program just before with an exhibition of Rudolf Schlichter’s works (May 20 to June 15, 1920) could not be ascertained; the two rooms of the Dada-Fair in the left wing, however, can be recognized in the blueprints of the house, built by the architect Carl Schön in 1888. The basic structure of the rooms for the Dada-Fair was due to a renovation in 1903, done by the architect S. Zadek. (fig. 3 cat. of Dada-Fair). The blueprints indicate that the architect wanted to enlarge and
adapt the former apartment for a post-office; he changed the size of windows, took out walls, and put in thinner walls instead of the thicker ones. At that time, a small outside stair was added, which allowed for direct entry to the ground floor rooms from the courtyard. Besides that, the facade of the house, in keeping with the prosperous Wilhelmian times, had received an upper middle class look with new elements such as pediments and balconies, and by centering parts of the facade (fig. 2 cat. of Dada-Fair). But the ground plans are only partly valid, since between 1903 and 1920 other changes were made to the rooms and the dividing walls taken down. If photographs of the first exhibition-room of the Dada-Fair did not permit a good way of orienting ourselves, according to the plans, we would still be confronted with a thin wall put up in the middle of the first room. Thus it is possible that remodeling was done also for the second “hall” of the exhibition, as it is called in the catalog. The question arises whether a dark connecting hallway led to it or whether the entrance was directly through a door. The plans from 1903 show a hallway, but it is also possible that the wall had been taken down, as in the remodeling in the first hall. This arrangement would have allowed a better use of the room. Since none of the reviews from the press or the catalog talks about such a hallway— the Rheinisch-Westfälische Zeitung of July 11, 1920, talks of “two back rooms” — it may be assumed that the two rooms were linked only by an open door (fig. 4 cat. of Dada-Fair). Nevertheless, how big the second room was remains unclear. Was it combined with a third room, still present in the ground plans, or were they separated by a thin wall and a door? Looking at the number and size of the works listed in the catalog for the second room, the latter can be presupposed; the third room probably was used otherwise by the gallery.

For the exhibition in the first room, we can assume that the Dadaists had at their disposal a length of wall of twenty-six meters, using the full height of 3.90 meters, and in the second room a wall of 19.4 meters, including windows and some doors, which also had some works on them. The entrance full of nooks and crannies with walls of 0.5 meters to 1.5 meters fit in just as well with the Dadaist ideas as the large wall surfaces of three and nine meters (plus a ledge of 0.5 x 1.20 meters). With the help of twelve photographs (view I–XI of Dada-Fair) at least the first room of the Dada-Fair can be reconstructed fairly well. One can also identify the order of works from their numbering in the catalog (fig. 1.1–1.4 cat. of Dada-Fair) with the help of these photographs. On this basis the reconstruction of the first room of the Dada-Fair was done by Helen Adkins within the exhibition Stationen der Moderne (1988). The works of the second room are known from the catalog; however, it is much more difficult to imagine their placing, since only two photographs exist (cat. view X and XI), focusing mainly on Das große Plasto-Dio-Dada-Drama: Deutschlands Größen und Untergang (Great Plasto-Dio-Dada-Drama: Germany’s Greatness and Decline) by Johannes Baader. The room probably had a size of 6.2 by 3.7 meters.

With the Dada-Fair the art gallery had its most spectacular exhibition. The Dadafinancier Burchard invested one thousand marks in this Dada exhibition. He also owned the very important work of the Dada-Fair Deutschland, ein Wintemärchen (Germany, A Winter’s Tale, 1917–18, by George Grosz; fig. 76; cat. no. 70). After 1920 he sold it to the gallery von Garvens in Hanover. It seems that after the end of the Dada-Fair in August 1920 no more exhibitions took place, for in the relevant art-periodicals of the time this gallery advertised no other avant-garde programs. The same rooms were already taken over in 1921 by the art dealer and antiquarian Fraenkel & Co, directed by Josef Altmann, who exhibited artists of the November Group there. Possibly the gallery had been an experiment of Otto Burchard; his official livelihood remained dealing in East Asian art, French furniture, arts and crafts, and archaeological objects, “old and
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new art.” An auction catalog from the year 1935, ending simultaneously the art trade of Otto Burchard under the national-socialist dictatorship, shows how closely he must have worked together with the gallery van Diemen in the 1920s.

The Dada-Fair by far surpassed the first exhibition of the Berlin Dadaists of April 28 to probably May 10, 1919 in the rooms of the Graphische Kabinett of I. B. Neumann. While the satirical and abstract works predominated over material “products,” the Dada-Fair was mostly characterized by its montage realism and meta-mechanical tendencies.

It is surprising that the Berlin Dadaists produced only two exhibitions, for there had been many plans after Huelsenbeck came from Zurich to Berlin. In August 1917 he wrote to Tzara about planning a big exhibition, and on August 29, 1919, he again made plans for a “huge Dada exhibition.” These plans overlapped with his international project Dadaco, from which the Dada-Fair still profited: several times the Dadaco is pointed to, and several proofs could be seen at the fair. All in all about thirty-four Dadaco-proofs existed in Berlin (see fig. 165.1–165.4). Presumably, Huelsenbeck was not present at the fair because of quarrels and vanities in connection with the project. The project, directed by him, with Tzara as collaborator, and designed by Heartfield, probably failed because of organizational and financial difficulties in February 1920. At that time, the publisher Kurt Wolff canceled his contract with Huelsenbeck and Heartfield, which he had made in June 1919; the project was continued by Tzara with the title Dadaglobe until March 1921 but was never published. Meanwhile, the Cologne Dadaists Max Ernst and Theodor Baargeld made two provocative exhibitions: in November 1919 with the Gesellschaft der Künste (Society of the Arts) in the Cologne Arts Club, publishing Bulletin D as a manifesto that distanced themselves from the official exhibition, and in April 1920 with the title Dada–Vorfrühling (Dada–Early spring) at the Brewery Winter. These exhibitions had an essential influence on the norm-breaking concept of the Dada-Fair, the choice of works by Dada Cologne, and foreign works, using diverging materials and mixed styles (apart from Dada works also children’s drawings, technical plans, “negro”-sculptures, polarization curves, works of unknown artists from the beginning of the twentieth century, “vulgar and dilettante” works).

As the twelve photographs of the Dada-Fair show (see cat. views of Dada-Fair), the works were hung closely together on the gallery walls. The Dadaists chose this arrangement for the presentation not only for lack of space; it corresponded to their simultaneous urban perception as well as to their programmatic attitude to center themselves in the polarities and contradictions of the times. On the one hand, they reminded one of the effective mix of the agitational material of the Russian agitprop trains, on the other of staged parodies of art galleries, suggested especially by some kitschy frames [for example, visible in catalog no. 4: Vierundzwanzig Dada-Spiesser besteigen einen Pudding (Twenty-four Dada-Philistines Climbing a Pudding)]. The works were locked into a dynamic net of connections that resulted from the Dionysian–Apollinian dramaturgy of the rooms. Thus in endless movements and unlimited combinations one thing led to another, complemented another, relativized another, rubbed on another, or contradicted it. Each wall was a calculated montage, corresponding to other wall-montages and to the “Plastiken” (sculptures).

The simultaneous abundance of products, the differing materials and their contrasts, their various techniques, sizes, framings, and executions, all produced an effect of confusing diversity. There was no evaluation between reproductions and originals, finished and unfinished results. The Dada works presented themselves consciously as non-artistic “products,” not differentiating between simulated dilettantism (artists’ works) and vulgar dilettantism (amateurs’ works); sometimes one could not even keep them apart. The Dadaist was not afraid to repeat some of his
reproduced works in different contexts. Thus the sound poem *kp’erioum* (1919; fig. 98) by Hausmann and the portrait photographs of the Dadaists appeared in various sizes. They were distributed on the walls and in the works and made for an omnipresence of the Dadaists.

In such a way, printed sheets, book covers, watercolors, drawings, montages with text and photograph, newspapers, title pages, big photographs, posters, drafts for advertisements, assemblages (“Konkretisations-Skulptur-Assemblagen,” Hausmann), flyers, Dada pillows, “Plastiken” (sculptures), dolls, a “dessert”-drawing, a gastronomic prize, and different documents of ‘*Lebenskunst*’ (life art) filled the rooms of the exhibition and changed it into a dynamic and heterogeneous production, demonstrating the Dadaist break-up of traditional art concepts. Even the ceiling was used: the scandalous sculpture *Preußischer Erzengel* (Prussian Archangel) by Heartfield and Schlichter (cat. no. 91, view VI and VII 1.2) hung overhead. Sculptures and assemblages also conquered the room between the walls: the *Elektromech. Tatlin-Plastik* (cat. view VIII) with the self-ironical title *Der wildgewordene Spießer Heartfield* (The Philistine Heartfield Run Wild, cat. no. 90), probably a smaller assemblage *Dada-Plastik* (1920; fig. 127) by Hannah Höch, along with two now unknown sculptures by Schlichter: *Der Tod der Anna Blume* (The Death of Anna Blume, cat. no. 84), and *Der Oberdada* (according to Hausmann, not in the catalog). Probably also Max Ernst exhibited a sculpture (on the pedestal between the four armchairs) made for the most part from the limbs of a puppet with the title *Falustrata* (1920, cat. no. 89). Johannes Baader with his *Großes Plasto-Dio-Dada-Drama: Deutschlands Größe und Untergang durch Lehrer Hagendorf oder Die phantastische Lebensgeschichte des Oberdada* (Great Plasto-Dio-Dada-Drama: Germany’s Greatness and Decline at the Hands of Schoolmaster Hagendorf, or The Fantastic Life Story of the Superdada) (cat. no. 174; fig. 47, view X and XI) in the second room broke all hitherto known dimensions of Dada assemblages.

The hierarchy between high art and low art was invalidated. The spectrum of the exhibition ranged from oil paintings to products of everyday life. The effect was one of a great, disclosed interactive process, inviting at all times one to add here and there, to re-hang, to make new combinations, to invent other types of text and montage. In contrast to the previous exhibition concepts, the visitor was challenged and provoked. What the montage demanded as one object, the exhibition demanded in a complex way. It was provoked first by the text-posters and by the products giving structure to the walls. The text-posters turned out to be coequal to the works and seemed to compete with them, to even sometimes invade them and to re-emerge. They constituted significant signs, which were distributed throughout the display; the term “Dada” became the verbal signifier of the exhibition. The same easily readable roman type of wooden letters was used for the slogans. With this uniform typeface the Dada maxims made the walls more rhythmical. Thus the visitors could read these sentences: “Dilettantes revolt against art!”; “Anybody can Dada,” “Take DADA seriously; it is worthwhile!”, “Dada is political,” “Dada is the conscious subversion of the bourgeois system of concepts,” “Dada is against the art fib of the Expressionists” (fig. 1.4). They could read Marshal Grosz’s comment, “I can live without eating or drinking, but not without DADA”; John Heartfield’s “Me neither”; and Raoul Hausmann’s “And me neither.” This way of multileveled presentation activated perception: vision was obliged to differentiate continuously, to jump, to come closer and to distance, to set off intellectual processes and to track down tactile experiences at the same time. In the catalog, Herzfelde programmatically said the following about the concept of the exhibition:

Properly speaking, any product is Dadaist that is made without influence, unconcerned about public authorities and values as long as the representing object
operates against illusions, from its own compulsion to propel forward the disintegration of the present world, obviously in a state of dissolution and metamorphosis, in order to topple the last hierarchical residues of thought and perception. The past is important and authoritative only insofar as its cult has to be fought against.\textsuperscript{13}

The First International Dada-Fair as a whole was a “directly negative \textit{Gesamtkunstwerk} (total work of art)” (Odo Marquardt)\textsuperscript{14} shaking up the established society in one big retaliation, destroying all its art forms in order to grasp “the motor of things” (Huelsenbeck): in its political, revolutionary reality, in its tragic Dionysian abyss, in its dynamics destroying traditions, in its Dadaist function as an antimetaphysical “Last Judgment” (Baader). Here, according to Nietzsche, culture, education, and civilization had to appear before the “unerring judge Dionysus,” to penetrate the appearances of the surface down to underlying truths.

\textbf{“Down with Art!”: Dada’s Iconoclasm}

The opening situation of the Dada-Fair was programmatically characterized by the photo-portraits of its organizers: Grosz, Hausmann, and Heartfield (cat. no. 1–3; view I). The large-format photographs effectively staged the actors of the Dada-Fair and created a visual and acoustic dialogue across the nooks and crannies in the walls. The most modern possibilities of the enlarged photographs corresponded to the vision of their continuous presence. They hoped to thereby jointly emphasize their revolt. Already in \textit{Der Dada} (no. 3) in April 1920 they appeared as “Psychofakte” (psychofacts, Ball): “groszfield, hearthaus, georgemann.” Also the works hanging beneath were portrait-photographs and portrait-montages: for example the Hausmann-Baader montage (1919, cat. no. 5), which was glued into the treatise \textit{Synthetisches Cino der Malerei} (1920) or the self-portrait of the screaming John Heartfield (fig. 11), next to the aphorism by the Belgian painter Antoine Wiertz (1806–1865): “\textit{Dereinst wird die Photographie die gesamte Malkunst verdrängen und ersetzen}” (One day photography will drive out all of painting and replace it). This maxim also served as one of the mottoes for the introductory essay by Herzfelde written for the catalog of the Dada-Fair. The photograph of Heartfield appears once more on a proof of \textit{Dadaco} (to the left behind the \textit{Big Plasto-Dio-Dada-Drama} by Baader in the second room of the Dada-Fair [view X]). Here he is ironically responding to his own portrait fragment (on the opposite printed sheet), which had challenged him with the exclamation “\textit{Steckt die Maler ins Irrenhaus!}” (Put the painters into the nuthouse) and with “\textit{Seid trunken vor Schönheit}” (Be drunk with beauty). To the right below the large portrait of Heartfield appears once again Heartfield at the entrance, screaming into the ear of Hausmann (fig. 23, cat. no. 9).

The large portrait acquired an aggressive acoustic intensity in conjunction with the Dada declarations “Down with art!” exclaimed by Hausmann, “Finally open your mind!” and “Free it for the demands of the times!” (cat. no. 1). It was comparable to the effect of the photo-portrait of Heartfield (cat. no. 2), emphasizing his outcry by putting his hands to his mouth: “Dada is great and John Heartfield is its prophet.” With solidarity he repeats the “Down with art” above the photo-portrait and the programmatic demand, “Down with bourgeois spirituality!”
These shattering sentences originated in the position of the *Unzeitgemäßen Betrachtungen* (Nietzsche), which were castigating a bourgeoisie prone to ideology, and at the same time referred to the bloody crushing of the Spartacus revolt of March 1919.

Visiting Harry Graf Kessler on March 23, 1919, John Heartfield quite clearly spelled out that he and his friends were opposed to art more and more antagonistically. What George Grosz and Wieland were doing was indeed art, but only as a side effect. The main thing was the pulse of the times, the great fellowship in which it resonated. This is why he also disapproved of any older art, even if during its time it had had just this quality of modernism. They didn’t want to create documents, nothing that would prevail and get in the way of posterity.”

Thus Heartfield’s words at the Dada-Fair still contained this hatred of the traditional bourgeois function of culture. Just like in the manifesto of spring 1920, *Der Kunstlump* (The Art Rogue), the Dadaists equated leftist radical criticism of bourgeois art with the tabula rasa of art as such. What twenty-first century viewers might conceive of as an expansion of the concept of art was for the Dadaists in reality an execution of art, having a much more blasphemous effect because it was carried out in an art salon into which one entered with the expectations of bourgeois ideas of art. One also cannot overlook the topicality of these declarations, since only on June 9, 1920, Gertrud Alexander in *Die Rote Fahne* (The Red Flag) had turned against the “vandalism” of Grosz’s and Heartfield’s pamphlet *Der Kunstlump* (The Art Rogue) referring to the eternal values of art. Thus the Dadaists used their iconoclasm against the bourgeois conceptions of culture and against the unfailing communist ones, and in the end also against their own — since of course they made fun of themselves in *Vierundzwanzig Dada-Spiesser besteigen einen Pudding* (Twenty-four Dada Philistines Climbing a Pudding, cat. no. 4) between the large portraits of Hausmann and Heartfield. One can also see it as a gesture of self-derision that they exhibited Walter Petry’s criticism of Dada, *Die Dadaistische Korruption. Klarstellung eines erledigten Philosophieversuches* (1920; The Dadaist Corruption: Clarification of a Dead Philosophical Attempt, Cover by Georg Kobbe, cat. no. 145) in the second room of the fair. Petry criticized Dada as a “made up, done up, playing up show.” Directly under the large portrait of Heartfield one could see *Dadaco*-sheets (view II) — on one of them an ironical article on Heartfield (“Our John”; cat. no. 7), to its right an attack of expressionism and next to it, “Dada in den Schulen” (Dada at the schools) with a photograph of a “Dada performance on ‘Petra Tageslichtapparat’ for schools” (cat. no. 8), which shows part of the montage *Dada-merika* (1919, fig. 162, cat. no. 113): Grosz on the blade of a knife. Other graphical prints were taken from the brochure for *Kleine Grosz-Mappe* (1917; The Small Grosz Portfolio), “the first Dadaist attempts at printing in Germany” (fig. 115.1 and 115.2, cat. no. 10–12).

A new element was brought in with the two Dada dolls by Hannah Höch (cat. no. 15), sitting on a narrow pedestal at eye-level, centered in front of a wall measuring half a meter. They seemed light and playful in view of the theatrically noisy staging of the large photographs. Next to them, Baader’s *Bekanntmachungen* (Announcements, cat. no. 173) were placed on an easel in front of a closed door, 1.6 meter wide:

Take the book on display, open it, and put the covers into the two iron holders: the book is ready for use. (The book on display is the handbook of Islam with the
The photo portrait of Grosz (cat. no. 3, view I) on the adjoining wall is of a certain classical gravity, presenting him with combative profile and hair combed straight back. This profile appears, as a drawing, on many of his works, for example, on the *Self-portrait for Charlie Chaplin* (1919), which appeared in the Dadaco-sheets under the title *45 volt, 3 ampère*. Heartfield also used the silhouette of Grosz’s profile for Wieland Herzfelde’s publication *Gesellschaft, Künstler und Kommunismus* (Society, Artist, and Communism, Berlin: Malik 1921; fig. 121). To Grosz’s photo-portrait, two programmatic mottoes were added: “*DADA ist die willentliche Zersetzung der bürgerlichen Begriffswelt*” (DADA is the willful destruction of bourgeois terminology) and “*DADA steht auf Seiten des revolutionären Proletariats!*” (DADA is on the side of the revolutionary proletariat!). Thus, the photographs of the leaders of the Dada movement, together with their militant slogans, invoked a new alliance between art and revolution and art and aesthetic revolt.

The critical exhortations of the Dadaists, despite their radical impetus, were not always directed against the works of art themselves, but against the dogmatic claim for possession of culture by bourgeois and communist ideologies. Grosz especially was the iconoclastic leader: *Das Mittelalter stinkt bis ins 20. Jahrhundert* (The Stench of the Middle Ages Reeks into the Twentieth Century, cat. no. 50), *Mißachtung eines Meisterwerkes von Botticelli* (Contempt of a Masterwork by Botticelli, cat. no. 51), a reproduction of *Primavera* by Botticelli, crossed out by Grosz, *Weg mit dem alten Mist* (Away with the Old Crap!; cat. no. 53), and *Singe mit! Ich glaube an den heiligen Goethe* (Sing with Us! I believe in St. Goethe; cat. no. 54). The latter work was included in the Dadaco-sheets. In this context also belongs the *Beethoven-death-mask* (cat. no. 98), disfigured by Otto Schmalhausen, which Huelsenbeck used for the cover of the Dada Almanach (1920; fig. 124.2): the face mask had glass eyes inserted, whiskers were glued onto it, and “Oz-Dada-Works” was stamped on its forehead. Its contours can be seen on the wall leading to the second room (view VII). According to Adkins, Hausmann obviously “corrected” Rubens’s Bacchanal (cat. no. 33), and Rudolf Schlichter disfigured Leonardo da Vinci: Heiland der Welt (Leonardo da Vinci, Savior of the World; cat. no. 116, missing).

In Korrigierte Meisterbilder (Corrected Masterworks; cat. no. 73, 74), a grotesque alienation of famous artworks was accomplished mainly with photomontages by Grosz and Heartfield and in Verbesserte Bildwerke der Antike (Improved Masterworks of Classical Antiquity) by Schlichter (cat. no. 116–121). In the first group are Henri Rousseau, *Self-portrait* (1920, cat. no. 73), which was shown in the Dada catalog, and Pablo Picasso, *La Vie Heureuse (Dr. Carl Einstein gewidmet)* (Pablo Picasso, The Happy Life, dedicated to Dr. Carl Einstein; fig. 164, cat. no. 74). The Tableau Dada by Picabia, after a Ready-made by Marcel Duchamp, a postcard dated and signed 1919, on which he disfigured Mona Lisa with a goatee and a moustache for the four hundredth anniversary of Leonardo da Vinci’s death also belonged in this context. Picabia quoted this iconoclastic gesture of his friend, who had left for New York in 1920, for the title cover of *391* (vol. 4, no. 12, March 1920) but forgot to add the goatee to Mona Lisa (see cat. no. 102). *Die Rote Fahne* (The Red Flag, July 25, 1920) took an indignant stand against this. The second group altered classical antique works with photo-portraits and
photographic quotes. *Pompeian Apollo* (cat. no. 117), *Venus de Milo* (cat. no. 118, 119), *Jünglingsfigur von Tenea* (cat. no. 120), and *Ringer* (Wrestler, cat. no. 121) constituted part of the grotesque Dada-renaissance. These now missing works were on display in the second room of the Dada-Fair. Baargeld probably was inspired by Schlichter’s alterations to actualize reproductions of antique statues with portrait photographs. His montage *Typische Vertikalverklitterung als Darstellung des Dada Baargeld* (Typical Vertical Distortion as Representation of the Dada Baargeld) was created in 1920, showing his portrait photograph on the bust of *Venus de Milo* wearing a topless cap (fig. 51).

The Dadaist opposition was sparked by the bourgeois cultural assertion of a classical, idealized unity of beauty and good, of sensuality and ethics. Dada’s iconoclasm contained hatred of and the fight against the deformation of antique culture by its narrow-minded reception, against the philistine enthronement of Apollo as a god of bourgeoisie. For the Dadaists life as a revolutionary, Dionysian motor had been excluded for the sake of beauty and truth much too long already. For this reason, these iconoclastic works were present throughout the exhibition. Apollo had paled under the influence of the bourgeoisie to a nice deceiving appearance and was supposed to distract from the abyss of life. With this iconoclasm the Dada-Apollo acquired a new, vital relationship to itself and to reality. “Products” replaced “masterworks.”

**“Dictatorship of the Dadaists”: Typography on Stage**

The part of the Dada-Fair showing the works of Raoul Hausmann and Hannah Höch (view IV) — somewhat more than one-third of the large long side of the wall opposite the entrance (9 meters plus an edge of 0.5 x 1.20 meters) — presents above all the different ways of working with text, photography, and other material of every day life. The new stylization changed text into an icon. The alarming Dada slogans on the wall competed with the figurative material and with the words and letters within the works. On the whole montage of the wall, text seemed to float, to lose itself in sound poetry and individual letters, to consolidate again in complete maxims. Especially the text montage on top of the wall, *Plakat Dada* (Dada Poster, cat. no. 26) by Hausmann counter-accentuated *Art is Dead. Long Live the New Machine Art of Tatlin* at the bottom. It was clearly calculated that his optophonetic poem *kp`erioum* (fig. 98) from the opposite wall here as well appeared twice: once in the montage *Plakat Dada*, the second time to the right next to *Die Kunst ist tot* (as a text-construction from *Dadaco*, cat. no. 32). Thus the wall appeared erratic and arrhythmic. It was part of the Dadaist processual concept to present the works as products in changing contexts and to show them in different stages of work. The various connections in which the sound poem appeared, for example, demanded of the viewer to read it anew every time. *kp`erioum* already appeared beneath the large photograph of Hausmann next to *Synthetisches Cino der Malerei* on the entrance wall (view I). On the other hand, the screaming Hausmann now appeared as a smaller photograph, placed directly onto the sound poem in *Plakat Dada* (cat. no. 26). The other textual quotes in this montage profited from this arrangement: “Dada Aumü” and “Huelsenbeck-Hausman[ñ],” which were also meant to be read aloud.

It was hard for the smaller experimental montages of graphics like the sound poem to stand up against typographically larger structuring effects of statements: “Art is Dead!” Hausmann’s montages *Tatlin lebt zu Hause* (Tatlin Lives at Home, 1920; fig. 109, cat. no. 28),
Ein bürgerliches Präcisionsgehirn ruft eine Weltbewegung hervor (A Bourgeois Precision-brain Brings forth a World Movement, 1920; cat. no. 29), Selbstporträt des Dadasophen (Self-portrait of the Dadasoph, 1920; cat. no. 27). Even the relief-assemblage Industrieller Umsturz im Jahre 1919 (Industrial revolution in 1919; cat. no. 30; fig. 102) could match the striking effect of the invocations and appeals only with difficulty, therefore necessitating a different reading distance than the large letters, which already could be deciphered from a distance. This wall brought about polar tensions by presenting the different perceptual conditions of the works. Dada siegt! (Dada Triumphs!), which surfaced on the wall three times: on the assemblage Dada Toilette (fig. 101, cat. no. 144), Industrieller Umsturz . . . (Industrial Revolution) (fig. 102, cat. no. 30), in Dada im gewöhnlichen Leben (Dada Cino) (Dada in Everyday Life [Dada Cinema], fig. 107, cat. no. 24), and in Ein bürgerliches Präcisionsgehirn ruft eine Weltbewegung hervor (A Bourgeois Precision-brain Brings forth a World Movement, 1920; cat. no. 29), which during the Dada-Fair appeared as a Dada propaganda sticker everywhere in Berlin. From this slogan, parodying also the revolutionary pathos of other groups, Höch put together the relief Diktatur der Dadaisten (Dictatorship of the Dadaists; cat. no. 21) hanging on the preceding part of the wall (next to Schnitt mit dem Küchenmesser (fig. 130, cat. no. 20). The portrait-photographs of Mehring and Grosz from Der Dada (no. 3) were inserted into the montage of words now lost. The motor “Dada” was associated through the wheel that was fastened to the frame of this montage and which was also pasted over.

While the wall showing the works of Hausmann presented tensions between montages of text and image, between the material of the photo-montages and the assemblages, the opposition between the abstract and the figurative characterized the wall of 1.20 meters length, on which the two relatively large works of Hannah Höch were presented: Schnitt mit dem Küchenmesser Dada durch die letzte weimarer Bierbauchkulturepoche Deutschlands (Cut with the Kitchen Knife Dada through the Last Weimar Beer-Belly Cultural Epoch of Germany; 114 x 90 cm.; fig. 130, cat. no. 20), and Plakat Ali Baba-Diele, Berlin (Poster Ali Baba-Diele, Berlin; cat. no. 19, now lost). The small figurative parts of the photomontage and the large abstract parts of the poster contrast with each other. Only the typographical elements present a relational net between the two works. Comparable to the Plakat Ali Baba-Diele, Berlin could be the Plakat “Der Malik-Verlag” (Poster “Malik-Verlag”; cat. no. 17) by Raoul Hausmann (view III): large abstract parts constitute a neutral background for the newspaper-heads of Der Gegner (The Opponent), Die Pleite (The Bankruptcy), Jedermann sein eigner Fussball (Everyone His Own Football), Der Dada (no. 3). The work was hung, together with pages from Neue Jugend (June 1917, fig. 40), in front of the light-shaft window connecting the entrance with the Dada “prophet” on it to the wall of Höch and Hausmann.

With this montage-technique of rhythmical and mobile fluctuation between text and image a fascinating experience of space, visual and acoustic, was presented. No matter where one looked, the suggestiveness of the ever-present text-posters also pounded the Dada messages and their representatives into the heads of the viewers through repetition and variation.

“dadafex maximus”:
Max Ernst and the International Participation

Apart from the “products” of their friends from Karlsruhe (Rudolf Schlichter, Georg Scholz), Dresden (Otto Dix), Cologne (Max Ernst, Johannes Theodor Baargeld), Wiesbaden (Alois Erbach), and Magdeburg (Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt), the Berlin Dadaists also exhibited works
of those from Zurich (Hans Arp), from Genova (Walter Serner), Paris (Francis Picabia), Antwerp (Otto Schmalhausen), and Chicago (Ben Hecht).

The contributions by Arp and Picabia most likely were shown thanks to Max Ernst. On July 5, 1920, Ernst brought some works for the Dada-Fair to Dr. Burchard in Berlin that had been shown at the Dada exhibitions in November 1919 (catalog in Bulletin D), and in April–May 1920 (Dada Vorfrühling, [Early Spring of Dada]) in Cologne.

From his own store for exhibitions Ernst contributed the sculpture *falustrata* (cat. no. 89, now lost), which had been already shown in April 1920 at the Cologne exhibition Dada Vorfrühling (no. 14) under the same title, which at the Dada-Fair was placed on a pedestal in the center of the first exhibition room. According to Max Ernst’s memory the now lost sculpture was mostly made from doll’s limbs. The second assemblage, exhibited with the title *Schalttafel für Gummifrucht* (Switchboard for Rubber Fruit; cat. no. 44), may have been that now lost relief above 45% Erwerbsfähig! (45% Fit for Work!). It is not, however, mentioned in the catalog of Dada Vorfrühling, nor is the work *Dadafex maximus* (cat. no. 14); in all probability it is the collage on photograph and gouache, showing the Dadaist as *Punching Ball ou l’immortalité de buonarotti* [sic] (Punching Ball or the Immortality of Buonarotti; fig. 67), demonstratively exhibiting a narcissist imperturbability of the Da-Dandy by ironically making use of the papal dignity of the *pontifex maximus* and the immortal fame of Michelangelo Buonarroti. According to the principle of the catalog, however, which was designed by the order of works on the walls, it must have been that montage of cliché-prints that can be seen above the dolls by Höch at the entrance of the exhibition (view I).

Experimenting with prefabricated materials in 1919 led Max Ernst to montages of cliché-prints. Line etchings of complicated technical apparatuses and machines, with cylinders, pistons, sprocket-wheels, and drive-belts from scientific catalogs and compendia of the times were used, for instance, from the *Buch der Erfindungen* (Book of Inventions), edited by F. Reuleaux, which already had been of interest to little Max. In the advertisement of his Paris exhibition (1921) at the gallery Au Sans Pareil, Max Ernst called the montages *dessins mécano-plastiques* (Mecano-plastic Drawings). For the Dada-Fair he chose some of these works: *Staubgefäße und Marseillaise des Dada Arp* (Stamens and Marseillaise of Dada Arp; fig. no. 65, cat. no. 82), and *Erectio sine qua non* (Indispensable Erection;) fig. no. 65, cat. no. 83). These works are the two only directly verifiable ones of the fair that were known to exist. However, they are not identical with the cliché-prints, which can be seen on the photographs of the fair (view I, VIII). The other works by Ernst cannot be verified any more: *Nationalcodex und Delicateß-Index des Dada Baargeld* (National Codex and Index of Delicacies of Dada Baargeld, cat. no. 147), *Zum 2. Lehrratz vom Genuß* (On the Second Maxim of Pleasure, cat. no. 105), and *Die verschiedenen Wirkungsradien des Damadamaxernst bei hoch und niedrig* (The Various Spheres of Activity of Dadamaxernst at High and Low, cat. no. 115), or also Baargeld’s works *Vergebliche Verleumdung des Dada Baargeld* (Futile Slander of Dada Baargeld, cat. no. 122) [in the catalog Dada Vorfrühling beneath the title Vergebliche Verleumdung und Inthronisierung des Dada Baargeld (Futile Calumny and Enthronement of Dada Baargeld), no. 8], and *Bild für aufgeregte Expressionisten* (Painting for Excited Expressionists, cat. no. 134), [at Brauhaus Winter beneath Ausgießung des Urohämatins auf aufgeregte Expressionisten (Emptying of Urohamatin onto Excited Expressionists, no. 7).

At the Dada-Fair there were also cooperative works by Ernst and Baargeld. Taking Tristan Tzara’s honorary plaque *Quelques Présidents et Présidentes* (Some Presidents, Male and Female), which was published for the matinée “Mouvement Dada” (February 5, 1920) in no. 6 of
the Bulletin Dada, the two artists created a simultantriptychon: die Dadaisten und Dadaistinnen Dr. Aisen . . . (namen) . . . verwandeln sich in Blumen (simultaneous triptych: the Dadaists, male and female, Dr. Aisen . . . (names) . . . turn into flowers, cat. no. 76), which already had been printed in the catalog for the Cologne exhibition as “Dada Vorfrühling” (Early Spring of Dada). The names of Archipenko – because of the exclusion of Ernst from the exhibition at the Closerie des Lilas (February 25, 1920) – Hans Richter, Christian Schad, Kurt Schwitters who seemed to Max Ernst to be one of the “majority Dadaists” like the “majority socialists,” who had betrayed the revolution, and also Arthur Segal and Alfred Vagts were taken off the list. The names of Baargeld and Lulu Ernst, wife of Max Ernst, were added. Hannah Höch was missing from both lists.

Probably Baargeld’s work Vive le sport! (Long Live Sports!) listed in the catalog was mistaken for a photomontage by Ernst (cat. no. 135). He had shown Vive le sport! in 1921 during his first exhibition at the gallery Au Sans Pareil in Paris. The original title is found in the heading of André Breton’s foreword for the catalog of this Max Ernst exhibition: La mise sous whisky marin se fait en crème kaki & en cinq anatomies. Vive le sport. Max Ernst (To get under the influence of marine whisky is achieved by crème kaki and in five anatomies. Long live sports. Max Ernst). With a tendency towards surrealism this message can be clearly distinguished from the politicized engagement of the Berlin Dadaists. The naked male body, parodying free leg and support leg of antique statues, presents as its head the photograph of a crochet work depicting a butterfly. It rests on a golf club in its left hand. This montage, which also had a female counterpart (Au dessus des nuages marche la minuit, 1920 [Above the Clouds Marches Midnight]), was determined by iconoclastic elements, mixed with ironical allusions of the relation between body and spirit. Baargeld ironized sports only in the now lost work Der sportsmann max ernst beim training am 100 m Ständer (The sportsman max ernst training at the 100 meter stand, cat. Dada Vorfrühling, no. 6).

Francis Picabia was represented by four of his machinerotic and machinomorphous works: Æil rond, Buschmannzeichnung (Round Eye, Bushman Drawing, 1919–29; cat. no. 47; shown at Brauhaus Winter, no. 35). Can(n)ibalisme (ca. 1918; cat. no. 48), which also was shown on a Dadaco sheet, Tamis du Vent (ca. 1918; fig. in 391, no. 8, February 1919; fig. 142, cat. no. 103), and Muscles brillants (ca. 1918; cat. no. 49). Their sectional view, their elevations, and alienated diagrams complement the ambivalence of Dada Berlin’s metamechanics with their grotesque machines of desire. One can also read in the press reactions (see for example Neue Berliner [12 Uhr mittags], July 6, 1920) that the “Vorderblatt zu 391” (Front page of 391; vol. 4, no. 12, Paris 1920), mentioned as a Picabia work in the catalog, showed Duchamp’s Mona Lisa LHOOQ with a moustache (cat. no. 102). Also under Picabia’s name the program for the Festival Dada of the third Dada-Soiree of May 26, 1920, in Paris (cat. no. 101) was announced; the French Dadaists all took part: Paul Dermée, Philippe Soupault, Paul Eluard, Georges Ribemont-Dessaignes, Marguerite Buffet, Francis Picabia, Paul Draule, André Breton, Walter Serner, Tristan Tzara, Theodre Fraenkel, Louis Aragon, and Céline Arnauld. Even the Nationale Zeitung of June 4, 1920, in Berlin reported on this Dada-event. The evening’s draw was the announcement that all Dadaists would have their hair and beards cut on stage! Hausmann also put the program beneath his montage Self-portrait of the “Dadasoph” (cat. no. 27).

The drawings by Hans Arp exhibited at the Dada-Fair certainly came from the collection that was also shown in Cologne: primarily the drawings (cat. no. 87–88) from Bulletin D (no. 1–6) and Dada-Vorfrühling: (no. 2–3). The untitled works printed all around the outside and on the inside cover of Die Schammade (April 1920) already give an impression of them. These works of
Arp are products of an artistic phase that had begun in 1917 in Ascona, where he started to make abstract drawings of dead twigs, roots, herbs and stones that the Lago Maggiore had washed ashore. The new biomorphic “earthen forms” which Arp also created with his woodcuttings and reliefs invoked the elementary processes of growth and decay. These organic forms and flowing bodies of most of these drawings, which were first outlined with pencil and then filled with black ink, applied metamorphosis as a Dadaist principle of creativity, as did the wood relief Der Arp ist da! (The Arp is Here! cat. no. 58) from Brauhaus Winter, which was exhibited in the first room of the Dada-Fair (view VI, VII). It had been published in Die Schammade (p. 8) and was subsequently lost. Arp’s Dadbilder aus dem Dadaco (Dada Pictures from the Dadaco; cat. no. 94–95) can be verified on the printed sheets I and VI; possibly they are also joint works by Sophie Taeuber and him. After 1916 Huelsenbeck examined Arp’s works and wrote an essay “Die Arbeiten von Hans Arp” (The Works of Hans Arp), which he published in Dada (no. 3) in December 1918 and in Deutsche Tageszeitung on February 21, 1919. Since the beginning of 1920 Arp was in contact with Huelsenbeck and with the Malik-Verlag, which planned to publish the collection of poems Die Schwalbenhode.

Within the group of the Berlin Dadaists, mainly Hausmann, Huelsenbeck, and Baader had somewhat intensive international contacts, and those only with Tristan Tzara and Hans Arp. While Arp was strengthening his contacts with the Berliners and in 1921 signed, together with Hausmann, Puni, and Moholy-Nagy, the “Aufruf zur elementaren Kunst” (Call for Elementary Art), striking up a friendship with Hannah Höch, Picabia, and Ernst were distancing themselves more and more from Dada Berlin. In a letter to Tzara, Ernst had criticized on February 17, 1920: “En Allemagne il y a déjà les contrefaçons de Dada (à Berlin). Ils s’appellent ‘Neo-expressionistes Dada.’ C’est vraiment allemand. Les intellectuels allemands ne peuvent pas faire caca ni pipi sans des idéologies.” (In Germany there are already counter-movements of Dada (in Berlin). They call themselves ‘Neo-expressionist Dada.’ This is really German. The German intellectuals cannot do poo-poo or wee-wee without an ideology). Since his Dada-time in Zurich, Huelsenbeck kept the connection to Tzara, and in the beginning of 1919, Hausmann and Baader began writing to him. In a certain respect, Tzara became the “First State Attorney in dada” (Baader). It was to him that the Dadaists Hausmann, Baader, and Huelsenbeck wrote about their tensions within the Berlin group, and to him they also reported about the Dada plans and Dada successes (fig. 22). In the first issue of Der Dada (June 1919), Tzara was introduced with the poem “Ange” (Angel). Through him they received information about the publications 391, Proverbe, Dadaphone, Cannibale (all Paris), Der Zeltweg, Dada (both Zurich), which they then distributed through Malik-Verlag. While the Berlin Dadaists published the original French version of the “Manifeste Cannibale Dada” by Picabia in Der Dada, no. 3 (April 1920), in French Dada-publications, apart from the names in Quelques Présidents et Présidentes, all mention of German Dadaists was missing; there was not even a reference to events like the First International Dada-Fair. At the Salon Dada in 1921 at the Galerie Montaigne, only Walter Mehring who was staying in Paris represented Dada Berlin. Not even once the project of Dadaco was mentioned in the French Dada publications, even though it was announced for January 1920 in Der Dada (no. 2), Bulletin D, and Der Zeltweg. There was no meeting between the Berlin Dadaists and Tzara, neither during the Dadaist and Constructivist Congress in Weimar from September 25–27, 1922, nor at the following Dada-matiniée “Dadarevon” at the gallery von Garvens (Hanover) on September 30, 1922, because no proof exists that Tzara actually took part in it at all.
Deutschland, ein Wintermärchen (Germany, A Winter’s Tale):

Grotesque Eschatology of the Fair

At the very entrance, the exhibition presented itself as anti-fair, as parody and travesty of the Christian world view and its forms and contents, beginning with the three “prophets” Grosz, Hausmann, and Heartfield (view I), the satirical voices in the wilderness forecasting a new era with their Dadaist, ironically twisted doctrines of salvation and continuing in the right half of the first exhibition room (view VI and VII) with 45% Erwerbsfähig (45% Fit for Work! cat. no. 43), Deutschland, ein Wintermärchen (Germany, A Winter’s Tale, cat. no. 70) and on the ceiling with Preußischer Erzengel (Prussian Archangel, cat. no. 91).

In Deutschland, ein Wintermärchen (1917–18; fig. 76) George Grosz satirizes the traditional representation of the Last Judgment, the model of which for the whole occident is the old fresco at St. Angelo in Formis near Capua (around 1072),


showing, on the entire western wall, Christ as Judge of the World at the center (Matthew 25: 31ff.), in an almond-shaped gloriole, flanked by the archangels and the twelve apostles, beneath him three figures of angels (with banners) with archangel Michael in the middle, to the left and right of them the damned and the righteous. Grosz created a travesty of this hierarchy: at the place of the Supreme Judge he placed the fat and timid arch-bourgeois in soldier’s uniform. The general (beneath him) was given the role of the Prussian archangel, armed with épée and monocle; to its right the “Bildungsbürger” (educated bourgeois) with blinders, a volume of Goethe, black, white, and red flag of the monarchy in his hand appeared in the role of the devil; the care-worn Protestant minister (lower left), who shows his bad conscience is simulating the role of the savior angel with a blessing sign of the cross. This unholy trinity of figures with their black clothing puts them so near to the lower edge of the painting that they are cut-off in the middle and look like characters of a Punch and Judy Show; at the same time, however, they take the viewer into their middle. In their strict composition the pyramid of church, world-judge, and these three apocalyptic figures creates a tension in the dynamic chaos of the city on Doomsday bursting into all directions: to the left (seen from the bourgeois world-judge) the “damned,” to the right the “righteous.”

Grosz, at the time, had good reasons to satirically attack the Last Judgment as a propagandist trap of the Wilhelmian war-theology. The ideological pseudo-religious militarism misused it for its imperialist goals. “Eyes open! Head held high! Looking upward, knees bent before the great Ally, who has never forsaken the Germans.” This worldly interpretation of history’s apocalypse culminated in the claim that the salvation of the world could come about through the German character alone. The “crusade in the service of the world spirit” elevated the German army and navy to “powers of the spirit,” as “embodiment of the people’s spirit.” World spirit and nationalist people’s spirit in the German soldier became one. These were the messages drummed into the small subject depicted as a soldier in the center of the painting by the military, by the Protestant church, and by the traditionally educated Prussian middle class. He found himself elevated pseudo-religiously as a Supreme Judge and could justify the war atrocities ideologically in the maxim Gott mit uns! (God With Us, fig. 76.3).

Grosz, on the other hand, already during the war furiously realized:

Disgusting and hypocritical like everything human (yes, indeed!) these creatures today are praying to the same Christ; only he is now specifically German – no, I would say, out of the international preacher of disarmament emerges a Prussian
Christ, one, however, who is now ready for use (maybe we should give him a uniform, etc.)

And in the satirical representation of the petit bourgeois soldier in *Deutschland, ein Wintermärchen*, he sits before us in his profane “Judgment Seat,” the representative of a “Dopehood’s Religion.” In the 1920s Grosz more often took up the theologian justification of war and the hypocritical propaganda as a subject of satirical social criticism. Its culmination came in 1928 with the representation of Christ on the cross with a gas mask as a victim crucified by the militaries. Erwin Blumenfeld, under the influence of Grosz, had the reality of the war collide with a hypocritical and ideological mentality appearing as an allegory of a “Nun” (fig. 52).

We can read Raoul Hausmann’s cut through *August Leist’s Seele* (August Leist’s Soul) in his satire *Ja, so sind die Deutschen nun mal* (Well, That’s the Way the Germans Are, 1920) as an ironical confirmation of *Deutschland, ein Wintermärchen*:

The German idea in the world — that is the soul, and this is why the world will be saved through the German character. August’s soul contained everything . . . it contained the shining beauty of the covers of Goethe’s and Schiller’s works; it contained the joy of noble singing and golden beer, and it contained the unshakable certainty that God only loves the Germans, and among these of course, next to the reserve NCO August Leist also the German emperor, and then, of course, the authorities, the police, and the church. In his German soul the spirit of unshakable order was anchored, continuing its whole caboodle, whether grenades were bursting, whether people were dying, or whether the end of the world was near. Yes, stop — and of course the hatred against everything alien, foreign, against everything that might disturb the blissful true German soul . . . Truth, honesty, tidiness, and faith in authorities live in the soul of a German . . .

The German wants his order, his emperor, his Sunday sermon, and his easy chair! . . . Citizens, protect your home, your emperor, and your soul — God with you !!!

Hausmann illustrated his satires *Hurrah! Hurrah! Hurrah!* (1921) with metamechanically functioning political idols like Hindenburg (cat. no. 31, 34–36), embodying the old nationalistic spirit of monarchy, Junkerdom, and the military.

Grosz and Hausmann revealed that the everlasting citizen was to be blamed for the war because of his subservience, his mechanical obedience, and because his political mentality was a continuing threat for the democracy of the Weimar Republic, for even after the war he fantasized of salvation and renewal of a German vision of the world, which in the end prepared the ground for German National Socialism. One notices in the caricature of the eternal bourgeois that Grosz gave him the characteristics that appear in descriptions of the typical Berliner of the Wilhelminian time:

Formed like a block, hewn in straight lines, with wide shoulders, his limbs and joints well-built, with large hands and feet . . . He is a NCO of a regiment of the Infantry of the Guards, and in memory of this keeps his mustache brushed
upwards, and the parting of his hair will continue to shine, and be accurate for the rest of his days. . . . His head is round and regular . . . the obesity distributed so evenly, particularly among the lower classes, that foreigners, describing today’s capital of the Reich, usually name it first. The round cheeks are shaved.\textsuperscript{36}

It could not be overlooked in Berlin that the military formed the “heart of German culture.” Grosz recognized that this monopoly of violence in the military was dangerous, that the military was dangerous for the establishment of the young republic, and also that the willingness of a large part of its bourgeois and petit bourgeois population to support it ideologically was dangerous. In the portfolio \textit{Gott mit uns} (God With Us; fig. 79.1–79.9; cat. no. 40) Grosz disclosed these connections by satirically attacking the military. This necessary contribution for the oppositional strategy of the Dada-Fair strengthened the impact of \textit{Deutschland, ein Wintermärchen}. To an extent, it also provoked the trial for slandering the Reichswehr in April 1921.

This subject for Grosz did not belong to the revolutionary soldiers, who towards the end of the war declared their solidarity with the sailors. Rather, he was anxiously ogling the hastily approaching sailor directly at his eye level, seeing him as a social threat. His rigid posture simulates law and order, even though everything around him is shaky. Even his parlor is shaken by chaos: the chair next to him, the grandfather clock, and the vase on the small table above it. But the eternal citizen’s world would persist as long as the things on his table, on this private altar, still stood — the idols of bourgeoisie: good food, beer, newspaper, and cigar. Even though a pamphlet “Workers! Soldiers!” calls to mind the revolutionary turmoil of November 1918 and the food stamp reminds us of the great famine of that time, this bourgeois has enough to eat. He is also the type of black marketer who was to be found frequently after the war. The beer on the table for Grosz associated the German beer-belly, which for him embodied the reactionary, nationalist German character: “You believe whatever you may be able to believe with a belly pregnant with beer and sauerkraut.”\textsuperscript{37} This kind of thinking went along well with the \textit{Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger} of 21 December 1918 whose headline “A republic of Upper Silesia?” created a surge of nationalist waves because Upper Silesia, full of mineral resources, threatened to be lost to Germany by a referendum.

The same daily appears on the \textit{Tatlinist Blueprint: Chamber of Horrors} (fig. 86.1; cat. no. 60). Here, it is lying on the table of the bourgeois clenching his hands into a fist on the table, even though behind him the world is being “de-mounted.” This type of “Untertan” (subject) characterizes other Dada works as well, for example \textit{Tatlinistische mech. Konstruktion. Den sozialistischen Reichstagsabgeordneten, die für den Krieg gestimmt haben, gewidmet} (Tatlinist Mech. Construction. Dedicated to the Socialist Members of Parliament Who Voted in favor of the war; fig. 86.4, cat. no. 71). George Scholz as well felt prompted by this topic to caricature the \textit{Industriebauern} (Industrial Peasants; fig. 158, cat. no. 93) or \textit{Kriegerverein} (War Veteran’s Club, 1921) in this typifying way: the satirical deformation of bodies and faces allows the drawing of critical conclusions about their anachronistic mentality, for their thoughts are “symptoms” of their sated and self-satisfied affluence.

Adjacent to the eternal bourgeois as a profane Supreme Judge, to his right and left, run whore and sailor — she the instinctual, he the revolutionary force of life. They take up the place in the composition, which traditionally is occupied by archangels as intercessors or by Mary and John. Analogous to the traditional representations of the Last Judgment, the right side — seen from the soldier — (here nature in moonlight) shows the celestial one, the left side (here the city
in electric light) the satanic one. There also the cowering dog is sleeping, who, as a melancholy manifestation, brings disaster and madness. This is where the revolutionary sailor belongs, as well as the man bent over, pushing a wheel-barrow with a coffin — possibly a reference to the people killed during the political street fights in Berlin in November 1918, while on the other side the capitalists pompously drive into the hereafter in a funeral carriage. Next to the hurtling city railway and some ant-like passersby, in opposition to the view of nature, gloomily rise courtyard and prison. The office buildings, factory chimneys, and the silhouette of a spiked helmet as a caricature of the ostentatious buildings of monarchy like the Berlin cathedral (1894–1905), main church of Prussian Protestantism, are gathered towards the upper edge of the painting. In front of it “Kaiser” (Emperor) is ambiguously floating on a briquette. This way of mixing things, people, and hidden associations are characterized by the grotesque principle of montage in Dadaism, even if Grosz here still mainly prefers oil painting, and only glued things from the table onto the work, like newspaper and food stamps as real materials. We realize how Dionysian foundation and Apollinian structure conflict.

The simultané of Grosz was grotesque . . . throwing together contradictory elements with passionate coolness. This simultané was the result of an enormous sensitivity gathering with one swift grip painful multiplicity. Disgust, fear, and strangeness threatening to overwhelm the artist, force him into cool observation. 38

In his exhibition at the gallery von Garvens in Hanover (1922), Grosz dated the painting between August and November 1918. The Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger though showed the date December 21, 1918. This discrepancy points to the fact that Grosz with this work wanted to denote the end of the war and the beginning of the Weimar Republic, in which monarchist forces were continuing to be at work, supported by subjects of the described kind. In the same month the representatives of the people (Ebert, Scheidemann) and the Supreme Command (Hindenburg, Groener) entered into an alliance to prevent the spreading of bolshevism in Germany. As it did for many left intellectuals, this alliance for Grosz and the Berliner Dadaists meant the bankruptcy of the first democratic attempts of the new republic. Grosz’s martial profile with “galligen Mienen” (caustic facial expressions)39 appears as a silhouette at that place in the painting, in which in the religious representations of the Last Judgment the donors of the painting can be found.

Grosz at the time would have been most interested to see Deutschland, ein Winternächte as an enlightening work of admonishment in schools,40 for his battle was directed against the continuing political danger from the reactionary opponent. The defeat of the revolution was to be overcome in a class struggle with all cultural means. As Carl Einstein wrote in February 1919 in the satirical periodical Die Pleite (The Bankruptcy), in which many of the Berlin Dadaists were collaborating: “Bankruptcy stares into your eyes. Utterly: The revolution was embezzled. Defrauders of the revolutionary idea rule and pursue the redevelopment of the petit bourgeois.”41 Thus the priest, the general, and the educated bourgeois continue to appear in January 1920 as Stützen von Altar, Thron und Vaterland (Pillars of Altar, Throne, and Fatherland; fig. 76.2)42 in form of quotations in Die Pleite with the satirical commentary: “We jointly traffic! We jointly feast! We all have only one enemy: Russia!” The general stands as a bastion of monarchy against communism on the cover of Deutschland muß untergehen! Erinnerungen eines alten Dadaistischen Revolutionärs (Germany must Fall! Memoirs of an Old Dadaist Revolutionary, 1920; fig. 120, cat. no. 100) in which Huelsenbeck got even with the hypocrisy of Weimarian culture. And in the portfolio Gott mit uns (God With Us; fig. 79.1–
Grosz once more has the physiognomy of the military, its obtuseness and brutality, emerge from the chaos of the city, illustrating it in his satirical, typifying caricatures, laying open the barbarism of German nationalism. Similarly, *Deutschland, ein Wintermärchen* refers to the winter of 1916–17 when the population had only rutabaga to eat, to the events of the winter of 1918–19 (the beginning of the Weimar Republic, the elimination of the Workers’ and Soldiers’ Councils, and the suppression of the Spartacist street battles in Berlin), and to the title of Heine’s satire in verse (1844) referring to his social and cultural criticism on his journey through a backward anachronistic Germany. As Heine had been sharply denouncing restoration, militant nationalism, and intellectual narrow-mindedness, Grosz consciously took up the combative spirit, which even at that time was directed against German nationalist and monarchist thought. Already Heine’s social criticism condemned the superior strength of the Prussian state, the suppression of human, individual, and spiritual rights of freedom, as well as the “wooden pedantic people” of subjects. Simultaneously, Grosz’ painting hints at the hidden message of Heine, who at the time said to his Prussian customs agents:

```
You fools who are searching in my sack!
You'll find nothing in there!
The contraband that travels with me
Is hidden in my head!
```

“The contraband,” that was for Heine and Grosz the hope for “a new generation, entirely without make-up and sin, with free thoughts, with free pleasures,”

```
The old generation of hypocrisy
thank God is disappearing
it sinks to its grave now, bit by bit, it dies
from its long disease of lies.
```

The parade of cripples 45% Erwerbsfähig! (45% Fit for Work! 1920; fig. 59, cat. no. 43) by Otto Dix (now lost) like a march of the damned was the largest work of the fair (according to Löffler ca. 150 x 200 cm; according to Adkins, ca. 165 x 245 cm). The figures appear with artificial limbs, reichs-patented, clad in parts of uniforms, with occasional medals as ranks of the lost war. The pointed finger of a big hand denounces the politically responsible on a poster (as a montage) on the wall of a house with a (fictitious) competition: *Who is the Most Beautiful?* — the montage by Grosz from the cover of the illustrated bimonthly *Jedermann sein eigner Fussball* (fig. 80, cat. no. 41; view VI and VII).

While the first cripple, whose head in the fair was covered by *Ein Opfer der Gesellschaft* (A Victim of Society, 1919; fig. 85, cat. no. 40), a work by Grosz emphasizing the title and underlining with the montage within the montage even more the cutting-up of human beings, still has the sharp glance of an inspector. The second one closes his eyes, shaken by trembling neurosis, and is blindly joining the parade. The third one wears a black eye-patch; he crouches on a cart, without arms or legs, pushed by the fourth one, who with a glass eye stares out from the painting at the viewer. The two first ones stalk across the pavement on stumps and crutches; the last one has artificial limbs and is trying to give his parade the necessary determined appearance. Artificial extremities are supposed to render back to him the correctness affirming strict obedience. The cripples, at the same time victims and offenders, embody the disaster of the war’s
reality; obviously intractable they march into the Weimar Republic. In association with the reigning Weimar politicians and their entry into the National Assembly, the parade of cripples is shown as a satirical parodistic reversal of a triumphal procession into a procession of shame, which traditionally, and especially during the time of the Reformation, had publicly presented lawbreakers of all kinds on their way to the pillory. The disastrous world after the war for the Dadaists often took on the topical characteristics of a *Civitas diaboli*. The horrors of the war were lurking behind this metamechanical slapstick of artificial limbs, shadowing the beginnings of the Weimar Republic, still ideologically undigested.

The fair as travesty and parody of Christian representations of salvation staged heterochrony in simultaneity as a grotesque political spectacle of death in life. In the vain ship of fools of this bourgeois society the “Princes of Darkness and Devils” sit, following their interests of power-politics by intertwining military, church, education, and money. The Dadaist declaration of war was directed against the spirit of the times, assembled from the artificial limbs of ideological nationalistic militarism: beneath *Deutschland, ein Wintemärchen* was clearly placed the sentence: “Dada is political.” At the same level in the lower third of the wall an election poster of the *Deutsche Volkspartei* (cat. no. 77) was fixed, distorted by workers of a cliché-factory with pieces of glued-on paper: a lighthouse projects the big letters of the party over all of Germany, signalizing its claim to power. Rightwing liberal, founded by Gustav Stresemann in 1918, it was oriented monarchistically and invoked the old Prussian spirit, these great enemy powers of Dadaism. Directly above the poster hung Grosz’s montage *Das Geheimnisvollste und Unerklärliehteste, was je gezeigt wurde* (The Most Mysterious and Inexplicable that was Ever Shown; cat. no. 69), which he had made for *Der Blutige Ernst* (The Bloody Earnest, vol. 1, no. 6, 1919; fig. 42). The montages on the wall next to the war cripples by Dix also refer to the political subjects of Dada. The “pedantic automaton George” in the montage-watercolor *Daum* (1920; fig. 86.3, cat. no. 52) represents a synthesis of cripple, petit bourgeois, automaton, functional soldier, and subject. Above it, *Herr Krause* (Mister Krause, 1919; cat. no. 45), who had also been originally planned for the Dadaco, turns his monarchist heart inside out, which Grosz showed greedily beating for the millions of the inflation. The *Hohenzollern-Renaissance* (1920; fig. 81; cat. no. 57), that photo-montage of the heads of no longer trustworthy members of the Weimar government on the bodies of the old emperor’s family (fig. 81.1), unmasked the new democracy as “negative Monarchie” (negative monarchy, Tucholsky), among whose ranks were also counted Kapp, Lüttwitz, and Ehrhardt, the putchists of March 1920. They belonged to that circle, as did the politicians of the Weimar Republic — Bauer, Müller, Ebert, Gessler, Watter, and Severing. During the fair its title probably was “Entwicklung” (Development; cat. no. 57), for Wieland Herzfelde commented on it cynically in his text for the catalog: “A conclusive and unmatched refutation of the widely spread opinion that nothing has changed in Germany and that the monarchy still is deeply rooted in the people’s marrow.”

This political and satirical panorama was interspersed with elements characterizing the modern lifestyle after the war, for example the boxing match (cat. no. 65) recognizable faintly above *Daum*. The boxing match was a distinct and clear image of the times, literally and metaphorically. Thus it had induced Tucholsky to the following demand in the *Berliner Tageblatt* (July 20, 1920): “But you should not miss a look at the boxing match between Grosz and the soldier’s century.” Beneath the work we recognize the metamechanical *Tatlinistischer Plan* (Tatlinist Blueprint; 1920; cat. no. 56) by Grosz, subsequently titled *Nude* (fig. 86.5) as well as advertisement slogans like “Nehmen Sie Dada ernst, es lohnt sich!” (Take Dada seriously; it is
worthwhile) and “Jeder kann Dada” (Anybody Can Dada), pointing out the present awareness of the Dadaist spirit and strategies. Here, in this lowest area of the wall montage, we can read a Dada slogan which is directly related to the Dadaist way of dealing with photography and which became the motto that Wieland Herzfelde used for his introduction to the Dada catalog, a (slightly changed) quotation by Delacroix, who, as a founding member of the Société Héliographique (1850) had spoken for the artistic work with photography, which had not been recognized as art at the time: “Truly, if an artist should use photography as it ought to be used, he will raise himself to heights unknown to us.” To the different levels of meaning that were overall characterizing this wall montage corresponded the different materials: apart from photomontages and watercolors the wood-relief Der Arp ist da! (The Arp Is Here; cat. no. 58) — his Dadaist self-portrait, and among the fragments and details of the montages Picabia’s contribution Œil rond, Buschmanzeichnung (Round eye, Bushman’s Drawing; cat. no. 47). As an ironic crowning of these combinations appeared a laurel wreath, possibly hinting at the fact that only the healthy sports-type was honored after the war, while the soldier, who had been promised the highest esteem, ended up with nothing and the man crippled by war did not receive any recognition whatsoever.

The Preußischer Erzengel (Prussian Archangel, 1920; cat. no. 91; view VI and VII), a life-sized soldier’s-puppet put together by Heartfield and Schlichter from “real materials” (Hausmann), floated threateningly as a Deckenplastik (ceiling sculpture) above that part of the room, in which the eschatological meaning of the fair began concentrating — between 45% Erwerbsfähig! and Deutschland, ein Wintermärchen. The simple field-gray of the uniform belonged to a soldier who had worn it in the war, the cockades were from a cap, the epaulets had been taken off an officer’s uniform and then applied here, the spit-shined boots reminded viewers of drill and drill-step. Around the body was (doubly) wound a bodybelt with the text of a Protestant choral by Martin Luther: “Vom Himmel hoch, da komm ich her” (From Heaven High I Come Down Here), and a plate was hanging: “In order to understand this work of art completely, one should drill daily for twelve hours with heavily packed knapsack in full marching order in the Tempelhof Field [military training ground in Berlin].” The authentic materials were alienated provocingly with a pig’s mask taken from Grosz’s repertory of caricatures, a reflection of his pessimist anthropology. The barbaric nature of humanity, cloaking itself ideologically with nationalistic war theology, was exposed most urgently by these humanoid animal caricatures. On March 3, 1918, Grosz wrote to Otto Schmalhausen: “Dear Oz! Nail a maxim above your swinish bed, once and for all — from Confirmation to being gunned down into the paradisiacal antics hereafter: ‘People are Pigs.’ Fleischerladen (Butcher-Shop, 1920; cat. no. 104) by Dix, Musketier Helmhacke auf dem Felde der Ehre gefallen (Musketeer Helmhatchet Fallen in the Field of Honor) by the unknown artist Johannes Sokrates Albrecht (cat. no. 108), and Grosz’s portfolio Gott mit uns (God With Us, 1920; fig. 79.1–79.9, cat. no. 140), in these images of man the true face of the epoch is revealed: bestial sadism. Dix tattooed the arm of the pig-faced butcher with the emblem of the field-artillery regiment no. 48, in which he once had served.

Calling the peculiar hanging montage of a soldier Preußischer Erzengel (Prussian Archangel) shows how seriously the Dadaists took the political danger of a disproportionate nationalist Christian ideology of militarism, since as an ideology it endangered the Weimar Republic. The Deckenplastik is a grotesque variation of the version of the archangel in Deutschland, ein Wintermärchen — not the general appeared in this new version, however, but the soldier. Here the Dada-Fair is parodying pivotal Christian types of imagery and the moral
function of the archangel that had been given to him since the Middle Ages from church fathers and biblical legends. The figure of Michael in particular had more and more come to the forefront in this process. Besides his fight with the dragon as an image of the cleansing of heaven from evil and the devil (Revelations 12:7–9; 20:1ff.), in the course of time more and more offices had been entrusted to him: as a fighter in coat of mail and suit of armor he now became the carrier of Christ’s banner, patron saint of Christian armies and peoples, guardian of the Kingdom of Heaven. As mediator he now brought the prayers of humanity to God (Origines), became the escort of souls (Gregor of Tours) and carried cross, nails, crown of thorns, and lance at the Last Judgment.

These traditional meanings can be associated in this dangling sculpture, in this desolate archangel in a soldier’s uniform deriding cynically the role of Supreme Judge that Germany in its war theology had taken on within the world craving power. The eschatology of heaven has broken into pieces, even if the abdominal belt of the soldier still invokes the Protestant choral by Martin Luther — twice for the visitor: to be read going in and again leaving. The two components of the grotesque, cruelty and irony, rob the Christian paragon of its character of salvation and reduces the worldview of war theology and its political morals to absurdity. Dionysus, contrary to this image, is Dada’s “judge,” returning life to its rights, simultaneously mobilizing disruptive and revolutionary forces.

“Dada Youth Group”:
Young Artists and Students

In the second room (6.2 meters x 3.3 meters) in accordance with its Dionysian intent the Dada-Fair included works by young students: Hans Citroën\(^{47}\) (cat. no. 123–126) and Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt\(^{48}\) (cat. no. 109–112, 133). Paul Citroën’s brother as a member of the Jugendgruppe dada (Dada Youth Group) made his debut at age fourteen. Wieland Herzfelde praised *Das Netz* (The Net; cat. no. 126, now lost) in his introduction to the Dada catalog:

A collection of different odds and ends as they fill a young man’s brain; unburdened by problems, his attitude to the world is perceptive, collecting, hardly registering. Among these odds and ends are concepts playing a great role for perception but which essentially have not yet formed ideas; these are, therefore, represented in the way they were first picked up, for example, as newspaper headlines. The whole is spanned by a net, symbolizing the passion with which all these impressions were collected. At its center hangs a coral, which might be looked at as the brain that, like a spider, wishes to wrap the world in its threads.\(^{49}\)

The montage *Wilsons 14 Punkte* (Wilson’s 14 Points, 1920; fig. 54; cat. no. 124) presented the abundance of citations as a cross-section of his world of ideas in which political slogans, Dadaist works, names and material yield a productive chaos of contemporary events.

The second young Dadaist, Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt, was enthusiastic about Dada as a nineteen-year-old student at Magdeburg and showed his work to George Grosz in Berlin. Stuckenschmidt produced a pauperist collage of material that was presented at the fair. Wieland Herzfelde wrote about this work, which he entitled *Die Produktionskrise* (The Crisis of Production; cat. no. 111, now lost):
Most obtrusively, you see the sad state of German textiles. But this is not enough for the artist, who also indicates what he regards as the cause of the production crisis. First you see S. M. [His Majesty] and entourage in gala attire. Of course, don’t you also sometimes painfully remember the good old times where everything was just shining and where at every occasion one’s attire was changed? You also see an advertisement for soldier’s toilet paper, as a symptom of wartime speculation; furthermore a button, a stamp, a ten Pfennig voucher, etc., all things which used to be worthless but which today all have become the subject matter of innumerable worries.

In his montage Die Impotenz des Herrn Dr. Pfitzner (The Impotence of Dr. Pfitzner, Esq., cat. no. 110, now lost), Stuckenschmidt polemically attacked Pfitzner’s Neue Ästhetik der musikalischen Impotenz (New Aesthetic of Musical Impotence), published in 1920. In this work Pfitzner violently disparaged the influential music critic Paul Becker of the Frankfurter Zeitung who had slandered the composer, musicologist, and pianist Ferruccio Busoni. It was the latter’s Outline of a New Aesthetics of Music (first edition, 1907; second edition, 1916) that had already challenged Pfitzner to write his polemic treatise Futuristengefahr (The Danger of the Futurists) in 1907. Stuckenschmidt, an enthusiastic adept of avant-garde music, sided with Busoni.

I do not think, that any treatise on music, Schönberg’s theory of harmony perhaps excepted, had a more disquieting and exciting effect upon me . . . The outline’s utopian character with its presage of new keys, the twelve-tone kaleidoscope, the third- and sixth-tones, even electric instruments, which have now become an everyday experience for us — with all these, Busoni anticipates a crisis to which his music follows suit.

Stuckenschmidt therefore regarded Pfitzner’s reaction as “disgustingly nationalist.” Stuckenschmidt’s decided confession clearly showed his interest in the “mechanization” of music, which would also characterize the concept of the revue Schlechter und Besser (Worse and Better) he wanted to develop together with Höch and Schwitters in 1924 and 1925.

In another contribution to the exhibition, he rather emphasized Dada’s anti-authoritarian vigor. Stuckenschmidt’s Sie kennen mich nicht? (You Don’t Know Me? cat. no. 112, now lost) mirrored the Dadaists’ dandyist game with the public: with the intimidating words, “You don’t know me? I’m Stuckenschmidt!” the young student managed to pass the doorman of Hamburg’s Curio House without a ticket, so that he could witness Hausmann’s and Baader’s Dada soiree of February 18, 1920. This was Stuckenschmidt’s subsequent explanation of his work’s title.

The contribution of the Dada Youth Group supported Dada’s anarchist and immoralist dilettantism. This factor triggered a creative process because “anyone” could make art, a process that admitted the immediate, the lawless, and the playful.

“Vulgar Dilettantism”:
Everyday Products

The exhibition organizers expanded the principle of dilettantism by elevating trivial objects of the art of living as Erzeugnisse (products). These were casual works, now lost, such as Dr. Otto
Burchard’s *Nachtischzeichnung* (Dessert Drawing; cat. no. 85), or so far excluded from high art, such as the *Kochkunst-Preisarbeit* (Prize Work in the Art of Cooking; cat. no. 66) by Max Schlichter, Rudolf’s brother, an excellent cook who owned a restaurant in Ansbacher Straße, a regular meeting place of the Berlin bohemia. The portrait photographs which showed, or were meant to show, *Serner* (cat. no. 81) and *Burchard* (cat. no. 86), also belonged to this more private sphere, as did the cushions by Maud/Daum E. Grosz⁵² (cat. no. 155, 156).

Even greetings were extended as part of the fair — by Ben Hecht,⁵³ for example, the American journalist reporting about postwar events in Berlin, to George Grosz (cat. no. 128), or by Alois Erbach, Heartfield’s friend from Munich student days: *Ich grüße dada (Dadaisten in der Werkstatt)* (My Greetings to Dada [Dadaists in the Workshop]; cat. no. 106). The artist, who was also part of the *Rote Gruppe* (Red Group) in 1924, communicated *Sehnsucht nach dada* (Longing for Dada).

Sigmar Mehring’s contribution was included in the exhibition as *Historisches Dadabild aus der Zeit um 1850* (Historical Dada Picture from ca. 1850; cat. no. 97). Looking back, Walter Mehring described it as that of his grandfather Siegfried Mehring, a Silesian painter:

Two of his large size quodlibets — one with a fly on Friedrich-Wilhelm III’s “Address to My Silesians,” which every viewer tried to chase away — alchemistic compositions (according to Max Ernst’s definition) of scorched gazettes, ink-stained accounts, grease-spotted assignations, cabinet photographs of illustrious generals and poets, daguerreotypes from our family album betrayed, in the apparently accidental disorder of a writing desk, an irony so subtle that they were selected by the Dada jury.⁵⁴

Dix, with his *Bewegliches Figurenbild* (Montage of Mobile Figures) in the style of folk art typology, ironically joined the ranks of the dilettanti, giving a concrete translation of the combination of the names “Otto Lasker-Dix” [Otto Dix – Else Lasker-Schüler, the expressionist writer and poet] into an erotic activity in the mechanical manner of a jumping jack (cat. no. 80 with Herzfelde *in actu*).

Many of the dilettante works are obscure: *Transformation* (cat. no. 154) by Georg Koch (called “Der Maskenkoch,” the masked cook) or the *Amerikanisches Dadareklameblatt* (American Promotional Leaflet for Dada; cat. no. 79) by Chicago journalist Ben Hecht. Unpretentious utterances and messages are communicated in these trivial “productions.” Full of the joy of spontaneous manufacturing, Dada’s dilettantism had its roots in an unbiased, unprejudiced creation, opposed to specialization and the myth of the genius. *Dilettanten erhebt Euch gegen die Kunst!* (Dilettantes, Stand up against Art!) was the great message and practice of the exhibition. This slogan was inspired by the Cologne Dadaists who had demanded the uprising of the dilettantes in *Die Schammade* (from April 1920 on).

With dilettantism, the Dadaists attempted to incorporate the general producibility of art into their conceptions. As a result, Herzfelde wrote in his introduction to the Dada-Fair: “The Dadaists consider it their merit to be champions of dilettantism, for the dilettante in art is nothing but the victim of a biased, pretentious, aristocratic worldview.”⁵⁵ Therefore they ironized their own breakout from art as the dilettantism of the “miracle,” as the continuous search for a creativity without preconditions — alluding to Carl Einstein’s work *Bebuquin oder die Dilettanten des Wunders* (Bebuquin or the Dilettantes of the Miracle, 1912). Their search for point zero combined the strict “no” to previous artistic work with an affirmation of creative
activity itself. Making art political in this way was as important to the Dadaists in Berlin as was the political polemics of their montages. The artistic play with dilettantism opened up a liminal realm in which new creations could emerge, vibrant with immediacy and authenticity, without even the slightest trace of commercialism or of bourgeois pretensions of “culture.” The positive freedom harbored in these small works, dispersed all over the exhibition, announced that life itself was being “produced” here. They showed both Dada’s freedom from constraints and its freedom for “life.” The communication beginning between art and life thus received its own dynamics, its self-creating dimension.

**The Great Plasto-Dio-Dada-Drama:**

**Baader’s Dionysian Last Judgment**

In view of the “death” of God, the Superdada constructed his own fictional realities and declared himself — in resistance to all authorities a global prophet, simultaneously ironic and serious. Within and against the world, he built up his communicative network of protest, mobilizing any medium at his disposal. He needed those media, which he simultaneously negated; he needed them in order to be able to present his messages and, together with these, his artistic self-image as a combination of “admonisher” and “fool.” The montage principle enabled him to cumulate as many traces of his activities as possible and to pile them up into a large, spatial assemblage, one of the first great assemblages in art history. Consistent with and matching his megalomania, this biggest work at the Dada-Fair — regarding height and width — spread throughout the second room. The visitor, on entering the room, suddenly faced *Das Große Plasto-Dio-Dada-Drama: Deutschlands Größe und Untergang* (The Great Plasto-Dio-Dada-Drama: Germany’s Greatness and Decline, 1920; fig. 47; cat. no. 174) by Johannes Baader, “Oberdada, Präsident des Erd- und Weltballs, Leiter des Weltgerichts” (Super-Dada, President of the Earth and the Globe, Chair of the Last Judgment). This “Dadaist Monumental Architecture in Five Floors, three Facilities, one Tunnel, two Elevators and one Cylindrical Top” dominated the second (smaller) exhibition room (6.2 x 3.3 meters) and captured the visitor’s complete attention: the pugnacious Superdada’s assemblage brought the fair’s direct, negative revolt of *Gesamtkunst* (total art) to a Dionysian culmination.

Reading *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* around 1905 made Baader experience the divine apotheosis of his own person as the new redeemer of mankind. From this height of intoxication it was difficult to come down to earth at all. By his own vital energy, he had become *Jesus redivivus*, succeeding the historical Jesus:

> All things began to speak and became parables. And the divine consciousness arose within me again, ecstatic . . . And I was Christ again, walking in exhilaration all night through the streets of Berlin, traversing in my mind all countries and all times, and neither past nor future existed for me anymore.56

It was this state of consciousness that initially intensified Baader’s architectural ideas into monumental dimensions. His reading of *Zarathustra* occurred at a point in time, after the turn of the century, when Nietzsche had begun to be widely read and studied. This was a symptom of a deepening cultural crisis of the educated middle class, accompanied by an experience of political and social deficiency triggered by the rise of the affluent bourgeoisie, the rapid growth of the white collar classes, and the formation of the working class. This loss of social and political
importance pushed the cultivated bourgeois into the position of a counterculture, into the realms of irrational worldviews, and messianic prophesies that were to show a political “Third Way” deriving from the claim toward a “Supremacy of the mind,” a postulate for renewal of all humankind. These reform movements condemned the increase of the nonculture (Unkultur) of industrialization, the pernicious spirit (Ungeist) of Western civilization, castigating such products of the Industrial Revolution as science and technology, materialism and positivism that clearly renounced concepts that were beneficial for society as a whole. In Baader’s megalomaniac self-image, the influence of Zarathustra mixed with a messianic reforming zeal in the effort to procure for himself again a new political and cultural significance, and to compensate for his own isolation. According to his thinking and that of many middle-class apostles of cultural critique, the renewal of civilized society was tied to a “great, artistic individual.” This was the spirit of reading Zarathustra. In 1906, Baader had designed a utopian Cosmic-Temple Pyramid (fig. 48) with an imperatorial gesture of creation. He himself presided over this temple as the self-appointed redeemer of an “international and inter-religious league of humanity.” All religions, arts, reformed lifestyles, and festival cultures could be placed around him as their center: “great universities enjoying complete freedom, libraries and archives, modern world museums or world collections, arenas and plazas for Völkerspiele (international competitions), music and drama festivals, public parks, pilgrimage centers, spring lodgings, and villas and gardens and forests and fields and mountains and meadows and creeks and lakes and rivers and the sea.” This unity of all life and culture in the spirit of Gesamtkunstwerk (total work of art) found expression in the massive compactness of the monument. It was supposed to take humanity a thousand years to build the world pyramid. Its program grew out of ideas of a “New Jerusalem,” which comprised the qualities of all previous monumental buildings of all cultures in world history from the pyramids, the temple of Solomon, the palace of the Dalai Lama in Lhasa, to the Acropolis and the Capitol, “vaulted by the eternal dome of the infinity of suns burning in the distance.”

After World War I, the relationship of art and life was reversed: it was no longer the creative domination of art over life that directed Baader’s work, but the Dionysian will to life that now determined his architecture: in this deconstruction the change from the directly positive to the directly negative Gesamtkunstwerk can be immediately recognized. While the Temple and the Tombs or Hall of Urns (see fig. 49) attempted to connect all the arts in order to become reality themselves, the arts now were destroyed in the anti-artwork in order to acquire the forces of life. Baader was to construct the new Dada-architecture out of real-life materials, out of shards and fragments. After the war he destroyed and disfigured the architecture of his pre-war utopia with permanent reference to its grotesqueness. Baader’s assemblage gives a concrete Dadaist transformation of Hugo Ball’s vision of a disintegrating Occidental world-building. It points further toward Schwitters’ Merzbau, which he began in 1923: architecture itself became the actualization of the imponderable. The forever static space was destroyed by the dynamism of the life-will. The Vitruvian virtues of construction, utility (utilitas), stability (firmitas), and grace (venustas), were abandoned. Architecture transformed into a deconstructive process balancing the instability of the real and gaining its shape from chaos.

For the architect, Dada’s cultural de- construction opened new possibilities of “Superdadaism” in the form of means and devices of transvaluation; no longer an architectural Macht-Beredsamkeit in Formen (power-eloquence in forms) (Nietzsche), was created, but the Dionysian multiplicity of Dada’s montage process. The five-floor structure of the Great Plasto-Dio-Dada-Drama recalls notions of intensification, transformation, and transcendence, recalls
“The Steps of the Overman,” “The Preparation of the Superdada,” “The Metaphysical Examination,” “The Initiation,” “The World War,” and “World Revolution.” These steps lead upward to the *Ueberstock* (Superior Floor) from which he announced, “the ultimate redemption from the body and from death.” The floors were arranged to represent different steps of the intensification of life, thus more or less in Nietzsche’s sense overcoming the “Spirit of Gravity.” From the topmost fifth floor “the cylinder [i.e. Baader] spirals upward into heaven” and sends his message “by radio into the ether.” Into the successive levels of his ascent, the architect also integrates theosophical and political elements, also communism. Finally, everything is related in a solipsistic, fictional, and self-ironic manner to himself, the Superdada who “will gladly unhinge the world, the whole world with its race of dwarfs.”

The transvaluation of architecture from a total work of art to one of total destruction takes place in the course of the assemblage-process: as the comment on the first floor has it, the “original idea of architecture was brought to incineration.” Baader is here destroying traces of his own work in the Dresden Vereinigung Bildender Künstler für monumentalen Grabmalsbau (Association of Artists of Monumental Sepulchres, 1903) in which he worked together with the sculptor Metzner and the architects Rößler and Hempel (fig. 49). On the third floor, “the last remnants of architecture are packed up in a broken basket . . . Paul Scheerbart, too, arrives in a coach of crystal glass, placing himself as a bomb next to the dust-covered basket of architecture.” Here the Superdada buries his past as architect and master builder, so as to share in the beginning of a new epoch by way of an intensification of life — turned against himself. For him, the “moments of destruction” and “dissolution” are “the preconditions for the formation of a completely new age, which will grow out of the clear, science-based consciousness of the unutterable greatness and force, which every single human being represents in reality.” Out of this vision the Superdada wanted to draw the conclusions of which, in his opinion, Christianity was incapable.

Baader transformed architecture into an “Oberdadaist” play of media, materials, sound poems, linking their combination in grotesque constellations with the last days of the world and with redemption: on the first floor, the express train “Kaiser Wilhelms des Großartigen” (of Emperor William the Splendid) is blown up. In addition, the broken steeple of Dresden’s *Kreuzkirche* (as spiritual power) is to be seen in contrast to the recently erected Dresden City Hall (as worldly power); they are blended with Dada traces like *Dada siegt!* (Dada Triumphs!) and Baader’s *Vierzehn Briefe Christi* (Fourteen Letters of Christ, 1914). Schoolmaster Hagendorf’s bookstand on the second floor symbolizes the “tunnel of the doomed Empire”: here one can see the “wheel of events” and “the phantom and result of the World War” appears here, too. On the third floor, Baader connects the constellation of the heaven’s W with the W of Kaiser Wilhelm, and the “sum of all W(oe)s,” the crucifixion of Christ (John 19:17ff.). On the fourth floor, the reality of World War I is dissolved in a clear-sighted manner, as a media-induced virtuality: “The World War is a newspaper war. In reality it never existed”; “The press has created the World War. The Superdada will terminate it.” At the same time, “Spa” hints at the location of the Great Headquarters from which Emperor Wilhelm went into exile. The fifth floor is where “the final redemption” is being announced: with the broomstick of communism, the Superdada wants to clean up the world!

In this work, the political and eschatological character of the Dada-Fair found its grotesque ending. Both spatially and by way of content, it forms its culmination. The prophetic callers of the entrance, the apocalyptic works hinting at the Last Judgment, like *Deutschland, ein Wintermärchen* (Germany, A Winter’s Tale) and *45% Erwerbsfähig!* (45% Fit for Work!), the
archangel in the first room who points the way — only here and now, in the second room, the Dionysian Judgment Day is present, proving Christian nationalistic cultures a farce.

The Great Plasto-Dio-Dada-Drama seems to be part of the scenery described some two months previously by Huelsenbeck in a weird, (self-)ironic vision of a “Besuch im Cabaret Dada” (Visit to the Cabaret Dada; Der Dada no. 3, April 1920):

it was then that the Dadaist Judgment Day made its entry in grand style. It was as if the building ought to be brought down on our heads. Underneath a mighty baldachin they carried the so-called President of the Earth and the Globe, Johannes Baader, a former journeyman tailor, equipped with all the legitimations of madness and Dionysian obtuseness . . . The Dadasoph was riding an owl, the animal of wisdom, holding the symbols of Zarathustra, a serpent and an eagle, in his hands . . . The marshal of propaganda, Grosz, came along with the kettledrum, the sign of Dadaist world-domination. Right behind him came the well-known Dadaist minister of transport and Dada-mechanic, Heartfield. It was an illustrious company. An infinite entourage followed suit. Mounted on cows and horses or walking on foot with children’s trumpets and guns, the Dadaists from all countries of the world entered the stage, all marked by the same Dadaist expression on their faces . . . The noise increased so much that our eardrums whined like infants. The great osteomalacia fell from the roofs. Nobody knew what it was supposed to be good for. Then the journeyman tailor Baader cried out: “Dada is the victory of cosmic reason over the demiurge. Dada is the cabaret of the world as much as the world is the cabaret of Dada. Dada is God, spirit, matter, and roast veal at the same time.”

This impression is intensified by the works surrounding the scaffold of the Last Judgment (starting approximately with cat. no. 129). First are the relics of the Superdadaist World-Judge: his visiting card, business card (cat. no. 167, 168), his death on the cross for the sake of humankind (cat. no. 170), the eight pages from his Doomsday Book (HADO; fig. 45; cat. no. 159–166), the Habitations of the Blessed (cat. no. 171), and the beginning of his new chronology (fig. 160; cat. no. 172).

Placed in close proximity to this assemblage was Leben und Treiben in Universal-City, 12 Uhr 5 mittags (Life and Bustle in Universal City, 12:05 Noon; cat. no. 152, fig. 117). Heartfield condensed the Superdada’s Dionysian Judgment Day to a metropolitan melting pot of mass culture into whose media spectacle both life and death were dragged. In the nearest vicinity, Rudolf Schlichter’s Verbesserte Bildwerke der Antike (Improved Art Works of Classical Antiquity; cat. nos. 116–121, now lost) speeded up the decline of bourgeois culture, while the satirical political contributions and montages by Grosz and Heartfield (cat. no. 129–132, 140) were working toward the downfall of the anachronistic Pappkameraden (cardboard figures) of the Weimar Republic. In this effort, the fair’s protagonists seemed to be supported by the Dada Youth Group and by eighteen-year-old Georg Kobbe (1902–1934) with his two works Schall und Rauch—Fantasie (Sound and Smoke — Phantasy, 1919; cat. no. 146) and a portrait of Baader illustrating the cover of Die Dadaistische Korruption (The Dadaist Corruption) by Walter Petry (cat. no. 145). Kobbe, an admirer of Grosz, and “a small master in the best sense,” as Alfred Richard Meyer called him, belonged to the circle of the cabaret Schall und Rauch to whose program leaflets he frequently contributed.
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Other works in the room look like a detective’s work at securing of evidence of the great war crimes: next to the knife, a newspaper is presented as body of evidence in Scholz’s contribution *Hindenburgsülze. Ein duftendes Geburtstagsgeschenk für den Feldmarschall* (Hindenburg Apic: A Fragrant Birthday Present for the Field Marshal; cat. no. 92). Cynically, Scholz aimed to uncover the relationship between victim and criminal. A commentary on the lost work in the *Ostpreußische Zeitung* of August 8, 1920, reads:

On a large plate underneath a glass cover lies a soldier’s head, deadly pale, crushed and bloody; next to it a long knife and an edition of *Deutsche Zeitung*.

The entire work is painted in a kind of realism seeming to mock the Dadaist stammer of the remaining works in this exhibition.

A crass, sadistic realism is mixed with Dada’s Dionysian Judgment Day in other large-sized works in this room: *Fleischerladen* (Butcher’s Shop) by Otto Dix (cat. no. 104), *Musketier Helmhache auf dem Feld der Ehre gefallen* (Muskeeteer Helmethatchet Fallen in the Field of Honor, 1920) by Johannes Sokrates (Paul?) Albrecht (cat. no. 108), and *Industriebauern* (Industrial Peasants) or *Bauernbild* (Picture of Peasants), also by Georg Scholz (fig. 158, cat. no. 93). Whereas in Dix’s and Albrecht’s works brutality is obvious on the surface and is satirically caricatured in the pigs’ faces, Scholz’s family picture uncovers contexts and discrepancies regarding Christian hypocrisy, avarice, and sadism as they are transferred from father to son through the generations. *Musketier Helmhache, Fleischerladen, and Industriebauern* most likely dominated the walls of the second hall, being the largest works exhibited there.

The fair as a grotesque Dadaist Judgment Day, the tragic-Dionysian dimension of contemporary events demanded a working out in the manner of Apollinian irony, in a conception of movement, a conception that was itself in motion and stayed close to the “underground of suffering.”67 It was designed in relation to the viewer, activating him, composed, not static, as a work-by-work presentation in the manner of a museum or archive, but in a dynamic, arrhythmic flow directed toward the viewer’s progression to Baader’s Last Judgment. Dada thereby created an artistic work of total destruction: *Gesamtzerstörwerk* in contrast to *Gesamtkunstwerk*. A walk through the exhibition develops into a dramatic grotesque progression: increasingly the viewer enters into a process of enlightenment, excitement, irritation, valuation, and transvaluation.

On the way out, back at the entrance, the visitor passes the *Elektromech. Tatlin-Plastik Der wildgewordene Spießer Heartfield* (The Philistine Heartfield Run Wild, 1920; cat. no. 90, view VIII). Parody and travesty of theological images are transformed into an acoustic and visual spectacle for the senses: the light bulb as head that can be turned on and off, the bell system on the left shoulder, the revolver on the right, then the knife, the fork on the lapel, a letter C, a number 27 made of cardboard, the Black Eagle medal (a high decoration in Prussia), finally a gaslight as artificial leg, an Iron Cross on the posterior, and a set of teeth as a metaphor of castration. The mutilation, the numerical, the sublime, the trivial, the prosthetic, cocooned, mechanical, the comic are colliding, relativizing, and at the same time intensifying the signs’ effects toward the grotesque: the soldier, decorated with honors, is placed upon a pedestal as the figure of a saint, a fetish of cult only so that he can better be dismantled. Mirrored in the mechano-automaton, the visitor recognizes the allegory of his cynical epoch. It recalls once more the tragic Dionysian initial catastrophe of man’s dismemberment and deformation, bringing Dada’s ironic, grotesque, cynical, satirical, scenic choreography back to the earthly facts of (cultural and political) passion. The prosthetic, the cripple was the loser of the “greater” history
of heroes. The Dadaist became his transvaluator, not in a moral respect but within the process of creation overcoming itself — by way of opposition. As monteurs and constructors, the Dadaists set in motion means and powers that were artistically adequate to their times, in order to liberate poetically universal forces out of the balance of the reciprocal drives of the Dionysian and Apollinian toward an “anthropogenesis of dissonance” (Menschwerdung der Dissonanz).

“The Play”:
Catalog and Plans
The four-page catalog of the Dada-Fair (fig. 1.1–1.4), typographically designed by John Heartfield, was published three weeks after the opening (ca. July 20, 1920) by Malik-Verlag. Its oblong format (31.5 x 39.5 cm) may have been unusual for the time. Over the city chaos of the montage Leben und Treiben in Universal-City, 12 Uhr 5 mittags (Life and Bustle in Universal City, 12:05 Noon, 1920; fig. 117), which appears like an inferno due to the reddish coloring of the print, he placed, at an oblique angle across the picture’s middle and in emphatic red roman type, the writing Erste Internationale Dada-Messe (First International Dada-Fair), printing “Dada-Messe” in bolder upper-cases.

Twice the title page contains information on prices: in big black italics, bottom right: “Catalog/Price 1.70 Marks.” And if we turn the page by ninety degrees, to the right, at the top: “Tickets 3 Marks,” a fairly large sum at the time. In fact the charge was 3.30 marks. This led the critic Adolf Behne to note, in Die Freiheit of July 9, 1920: “Therefore, even though a poster in the exhibition assures us that Dada is on the side of the revolutionary proletariat, the exhibition in fact amounts to the presentation of the spiritual dictatorship of the proletariat in front of a well-off number of philistines who pay for a ticket. So it is ‘art’ after all.” Viewed in this light he will have found even more contradictory the programmatic text on the cover, if only upside-down: “The Dadaist person is the radical opponent of exploitation, the meaning of exploitation creates nothing but stupid people, and Dadaist man hates stupidity and loves nonsense! Therefore, the Dadaist person proves himself to be truly real as opposed to the stinking mendacity of the patriarch and capitalist rotting away in his easy chair. (R. Hausmann)” Only its subversive game appeared to save Dada from the inextricable tangles of commerce. Was Dada’s “exploitation” an ironic gesture in view of life being increasingly invaded by the exploitative laws of the capital, which became more and more inflationary?

The montage Universal-City underlying the title page was shining forth everywhere from beneath the writing: The Play entered in between the letters of “Dada-Messe” from out of the urban jungle, recalling its multifaceted meaning for Dada. FOX could be read as a signal on the right. The loudspeaker, top left, connoted urban noise — with which the First International Dada-Fair was also met. Thus underneath these letters there culminated a metropolitan chaos from which strangely blinded and muted persons were washed up to the surface. An apocalyptic sense of being and a modern pace underlie Dada’s concept of “affirming the gigantic global nonsense” (Grosz). In this manner the cover of the four-page catalog contained programmatic elements and condensed the concept of the exhibition: Totenmesse (requiem) and chambers of black humor.

The inside pages of the catalog showed two Korrigierte Meisterbilder (Corrected Master-Works) assembled by Heartfield and Grosz, inserted into pieces of text: Henri Rousseau. Selbstbildnis (Henri Rousseau: Selfportrait) and Pablo Picasso. La Vie Heureuse (Dr. Carl Einstein gewidmet) (Pablo Picasso: La Vie Heureuse (Dedicated to Dr. Carl Einstein).
Herzfelde’s “Introduction” is an important source for the concept of Dadaism, its relationship to other avant-garde conceptions and media (such as photography), the interpretation of single works in the exhibition, in particular also of works that have been lost. A parody by Hausmann beats the reaction of the conservative press by preempting their critique: “What the Art Critics Will Have to Say About the Dada Exhibition, According to the ‘Dadasoph.’” Interspersed are challenging hints: “Max Liebermann Illustrates the Bible!”, “Please Note Our Book Table With Numerous Dada Publications from Malik-Verlag”, or “Have You Already Asked For George Grosz’s New Portfolio ‘God With Us’?” On the book table, Der Gegner (The Opponent), Die Pleite (The Bankruptcy), and the portfolio were presented for all to see.

The catalog of the Dada-Fair contains 174 numbered items (nos. and items 148 and 149 are left out; no. 4a was added). The interspersed Dada-propagandist exclamations and slogans are not listed specially. Besides, reports by visitors and artists prove that works were exhibited at the fair, which were not mentioned in the catalog. Named, but not numbered, are Grosz’s portfolio Gott mit uns! — but only the cover, by “Grosz-Heartfield” (cat. no. 140) — and the second edition of HADO. Therefore the exact number of “productions” actually presented cannot be stated with certainty.

The listing of single works by Dadaists begins on the third page and continues on the fourth, taking up all of it. The photograph of “Obermusikdada Preiss” with the ironic commentary above his right shoulder: “Forever Live Sports Near Potsdam” dominates the left-hand half of the reverse; “Victory Triumph Tobacco with Beans,” the title of an essay by Hausmann, which he published in 1921, is inserted on the right between the columns.

On the whole, the catalog and in particular the listing of artists and their works strive toward exactness and a meticulous attention to detail. This does not exclude ironic asides (“Hannchen Höch,” “Otto Else Lasker-Dix”). But the definite attribution of work to artist is strictly adhered to at all times, both with regard to the person of the individual artist and to collaborative works. It was, therefore, never sacrificed to a general anonymity or even to the group. Thus the catalog listings supply a reasonably reliable basis for the explorations of the authors and the context of the exhibition. The numbering of items, as mentioned above, is according to the arrangement of the works in the rooms. Therefore, they are not listed according to the artists but follow the plan of the exhibition.

At the end of the catalog, there is the following notice of a planned exhibition in the United States: “After the exhibition ends, the works marked with an asterisk (*) in the catalog will be exhibited at the Société Anonyme, Inc.,” continuing in English: “open its First Exhibition of Modern Art, 19 East 47th Street, New York” and again in German “These are the first German Dada works to be shown in America.” Whether this exhibition ever took place, we will use the selection in order to test the contents and goals of the Berlin Dada-Fair itself: an investigation of the fifty marked titles show that mainly works by Heartfield (9 of 17 included in the fair), Grosz (6 of 28) and Hausmann (5 of 17) are still predominant. The isolated large-size photograph of Heartfield also serves to personify his presence and make it clearly noticeable. The selection, certainly far from easy, otherwise obviously seeks to reproduce the artists’ share in the fair on a small scale: Schlichter, Ernst, Baader, Dix, then Erbach, Maud E. Grosz, Schmalhausen, Hecht, Citroën, and Stuckenschmidt; thus even friends of Dada, young and minor artists were still included, as were the workers of the Berlin cliché factory (Berliner Clichéfabrik). Excluded (for reasons of rights and the theme “German Dadaism”?) were the foreigners Picabia, (Hecht as an exception because of America), Schmalhausen was suddenly a citizen of Berlin again!, and the string of minor contributors: Baargeld (3), Boesner (2), Kobbe...
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(2), Scholz (2), Alberts, and Albrecht, Burchard, Herzfelde, Koch, S. Mehring, M. Schlichter; Ernst/Baargeld, Heartfield/Schlichter (1 each). The only unjust exception, Hannah Höch, who was represented in the fair with six works, was completely ignored – not even her dolls were deemed worthy of the trip. Among her male colleagues in the Dada-Fair, she was merely tolerated anyway; from the beginning Heartfield and Grosz had not wanted to include her in Berlin. It was only when Hausmann threatened to withdraw his works that she was allowed to participate.

Yet — despite Höch’s exclusion — there was an obvious desire to preserve the complexity of the Berlin fair: the conception of crossing the boundaries between art and life was mirrored in the selected montages, prints (from Dadaco, Neue Jugend), advertisements, cliché prints, drawings (pen, ink), oil paintings, oil prints, cushions even. Especially the montages in all variations determined the selection: in combination with text and photographs (from contemporary and historical newspaper material), gouaches, watercolors, and drawings. Missing (perhaps because they were difficult to transport) were all the important Dada-“Plastiken” (sculptures): Ernst’s falustrata (cat. no. 89) and Grosz/Heartfield’s Reklameplastik (Advertisement Sculpture), Der deutsche Dummkopf in der Welt voran (The German Fool [Gets] on in the World; cat. no. 143), and especially their Elektromech. Tatlin-Plastik (cat. no. 90), the Preußische Erzengel (Prussian Archangel; cat. no. 91), and Das Große Plasto-Dio-Dada-Drama (cat. no. 174) by Baader, as well as the reliefs by Höch (cat. no. 21, 22), Ernst (cat. no. 44), and Arp (cat. no. 58). Regrettably, too, (because of their size?) Dix’s 45% Erwerbsfähig! (45% Fit for Work!; 165 x 245 cm; cat. no. 43) as a significant companion piece to Grosz’s Deutschland, ein Wintermärchen (Germany, A Winter’s Tale) (215 x 132 cm; cat. no. 70), but also the latter’s Daum (cat. no. 52), and his portfolio Gott mit uns (God With Us), were not selected.

The coherence of the whole was strongly affected by the presumable lack of the political and artistic slogans that, in the Berlin exhibition, had set in motion visually provocative scenery from wall to wall, together with the large and small-scale portraits. The reasons for this may be found in problems of language but also in the different political climate in the United States as compared to postwar Germany.

If this selection had been shown in America, it would still have presented a good cross-section of Berlin Dada’s production: experimental multiplicity, close attention to contemporary events, the avant-garde role of a general artistic dilettantism, all this could still be clearly recognized in the small selection. But the political character, the historical component underlying Berlin Dadaism, had been pushed into the background. It was further impossible to create the grotesque Judgment Day atmosphere of the Berlin Dada-Fair.

Much has been speculated about the realization of an exhibition in the States. A central role in these considerations was played by Katherine S. Dreier (1877–1952), a well-to-do artist of German descent, arts patron and gallery owner from New Haven, who was most interested in the European and American avant-garde. Already in October 1919, on a trip to Germany, Dreier contacted Max Ernst whom she subsequently met in Cologne while he was preparing his works for the Gruppe D (Group D) exhibition. Together with Marcel Duchamp as president and Man Ray as secretary, she founded the Société Anonyme, Inc. in New Haven, a gallery of contemporary art, which held its first exhibition in April 1920. She stayed in Germany from late June to August 21, 1920, to make further contacts, and to prepare a Dada exhibition for America. Max Ernst recommended the First International Dada-Fair in Berlin to her and gave her the addresses of the Herzfelde brothers. She must have visited the Dada-Fair because she informed Max Ernst in a letter of August 16, 1920, that she had begged Grosz to send “your [Ernst’s]
things and the relief by Baargeld with the Berlin things to New York.” Supposedly she was referring to productions of the Dada-Fair (although Baargeld, according to the catalog, had not exhibited any relief there). Unfortunately, the contact to Grosz broke off at this point; her mail returned “with the note that he was unknown.” “We would be only too happy to show your [the Dadaists’] things,” she wrote to Ernst on November 6, 1920, “and [therefore] I was infinitely sorry when I received this letter. I have never heard from Herr Gross [sic!] since, and [now] I would much like to know whether the things are on their way, and who is the responsible person for the shipping agent. Also I request documentary evidence concerning the pictures’ originality so that I can import them here duty-free.”

In view of the fact that the catalog only appeared around July 20, the works marked with a cross may indeed have been intended for New York. Were they ever sent? Why did Katherine S. Dreier not approach other Berlin Dadaists, the Herzfeldes for example, whose address she had? Why did Max Ernst not do anything about it, although his intervention was expressly requested? Can it be that the shipping was prevented by the veto of the occupying forces, as Max Ernst claimed from Cologne? However that may be, although only a small part (nineteen items) of the fifty selected works have survived, they have not disappeared in the sea – as Wieland Herzfelde ironically relates:

A fat old lady, a museum director and patron of the arts from Boston, Massachusetts, was so impressed by, even shrilly enthusiastic about, the exhibits she saw in the arts salon of Dr. Otto Burchard on Lützowufer, that she insisted on showing the “Dada-Fair” in Boston. Well could we understand her wish, the more so as we had already anticipated it in an utterly fictitious final note in the catalog. It read: . . . The lady from America agreed to all our demands: from one day to the next, gigantic boxes made sea-proof with zinc plate were delivered to us, and the exhibition material was packed up. The above-mentioned paintings by Grosz and Dix, also the stuffed officer’s uniform with angel wings made of papier mâché and the mask of a pig’s head, which was hanging from the chandelier like a large fish, together with a number of other bulky objects, proved to be too large for the boxes. The contents of the boxes were insured for the sum of seven thousand dollars, if I am not mistaken. At the time that was an almost astronomical amount. We received the money – together with news that the ship with the boxes had run on a floating mine, and sunk in the Atlantic Ocean. We were proud. Had Dada not found on the bottom of the sea the most dignified grave – not to say museum?

“Dada Triumphs!”: Public, Censorship, Trial

The Dadaists attached as much importance to the immediate number of visitors as they did to the reactions of the press. Before the opening of the exhibition there were announcements in the following Berlin newspapers: Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger (June 26, 1920), Börsen-Courier (June 27, 1920), Vorwärts (June 29, 1920) and Frankfurter Oderzeitung (July 1, 1920). The Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger printed an advance notice of the opening for June 30 with the following text (by Hausmann):
Dadaist Exhibition in Berlin. We have received this invitation: “Opening of the great Dada exhibition. All threads of the international Dada movement are intersecting in the Monster-Dada-Exhibition to be opened at the gallery of Dr. Otto Burchard on Wednesday, 30 June at 13 Lützowufer. Medially, all Dadaists of the world have transferred their psycho-technical elasticity upon the Berlin representatives of the immortal Dada. Everyone must have seen the wonders of this psycho-metalogic. Dada outdoes any kind of occultism. Dada is the clairvoyance of the insight into the outlook of any view [“die Hellsicht der Einsicht in die Aussicht jeder Ansicht”] on politics, economy, the arts, medicine, sexuality, erotics, perversion, and anesthetics. The works by George Groß, John Heartfield, Baargeld, Max Ernst, Hanna Hoch, Raoul Hausmann, Baader are better than anything one has ever seen. The General Dada: Dr. Otto Burchard.” After the shy attempts of Dadaist imitators within the November Group in Moabit’s Glass Palace, here are the “real” Dadaist artists marching into the capital of the Reich with blaring fanfares. (Anon., “Dadaist Exhibition in Berlin,” using Raoul Hausmann’s announcement, in Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger, June 26, 1920).

Furthermore, two kinds of posters must have advertised the exhibition in the streets: the motto of the first was Dada siegt! (Dada Triumphs!), prompting the Neue Preussische (Kreuz-)Zeitung (morning edition) of July 3, 1920, to write: “Large posters everywhere are announcing in a boastful manner ‘Dada Triumphs!’” The other one rather speculated on the people’s desire for sensations: “Athlete with professional attire wanted for one month to guard the Dada exhibition. Applicants please register with Dr. Otto Burchard Gallery Berlin W. 10, Lützow Ufer 13.”

Although the Dadaists generated quite a lot of publicity, the number of visitors was not high, probably because of the above-average ticket price (3.30 marks). On July 16, 1920, Baader mentioned in a letter to Hausmann and Höch, who were staying on the island of Rügen, that sales had only just reached “ticket no. 310”: “The exhibition keeps dragging on; we have somewhat managed to increase the number of visitors through the poster, but after all it is not very great either.”

It can no longer be ascertained to which poster he is referring. Perhaps it is the Athlete Wanted poster. In order to make the exhibition more attractive, Baader launched a press notice in Vorwärts of July 27, 1920: “The Oberdada and the Empress Dada are inviting the public of Berlin to come to the Dada exhibition at 13 Lützow-Ufer on July 29. All day long, from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. and from 3 to 6:30 p.m., one attraction will follow the next. At 4 p.m. the Oberdada will give a lecture on the theory of Dadaism. The Empress Dada will do the honors. There will be no additional charge.” It is not known what ideas the Oberdada came up with, but it is quite revealing that he already announced early elements of performance art to make the exhibition more interesting. This may not have sufficed, however, to raise the number of visitors: on August 4, 1920, the critic of Deutsche Tageszeitung writes that he is the 389th visitor — according to the number on his ticket. Despite this low attendance rate, the Dada-Fair did receive numerous press reactions revealing the criteria of art criticism at that time.

On the whole, one can recognize three different reactions in the press: a reactionary-conservative one, a communist one, and a more open-minded perspective. The liberal press took a welcoming stance toward Dada, especially the review by Ernst Cohn-Wiener in Neue Berliner (12 Uhr mittags) of July 6, 1920, by Adolf Behne in Die Freiheit of July 9, 1920, by “P.W.” (Paul Westheim) in Frankfurter Zeitung of July 17, 1920, and also by Max Osborn in Vossische Zeitung of July 17, 1920; according to Kurt Tucholsky in Berliner Tageblatt of July 20, 1920,
referring mostly to Grosz: “The others scratch. He kills.” The Italian journals *La Domenica Illustrata* (July 25, 1920) and *Noi & Il Mondo* (October 1, 1920) were also interested. Ernst Cohn-Wiener ironized Dada’s entertainment aspects using its own means:

If I had had to arrange this exhibition, I would not have opted for the Burchard Gallery and its idyllic surroundings under the chestnut trees on Schöneberger Ufer. I would have chosen a fairground, as noisy as possible. I would have opened the most colorful stall among merry-go-rounds, slides, boxers, orchesttrions (barrel organs) and hurdy-gurdies; I would have placed both Herzfeldes on the right with bass drum and triangle, George Groß with a long trombone on the left, and I would have shouted, “Come in, dear un-respected audience, come in if you please! You won’t see any boxing-wrestling-racecourse thrashings of reviewers (*Box-Ring-Rennbahn-Rezensenten-Hauereien*). Here you’ll see genuine art, an anatomical museum in which you can see yourself dissected, not only arms and legs, but also heads and hearts.

The best-informed and most unerring review was written by Adolf Behne:

Dada wants to liberate us from all bourgeois humbug. It wants to undermine the phrases, the conventions and hypocrisies of the bourgeois frame of mind, and it has achieved extraordinary feats in the sure-footed detection of concealed bourgeois attitudes . . . “Know thyself” is the wisdom of Dadaism. Let go of the past, let go of the future; know thyself . . . today!

Behne also understood the Dadaists’ decision for material art because “Only a fool today can paint the ‘Elysian Fields.’” What he did criticize was the abundance of material, which was brimming out of the exhibition. He also found fault with the selection of artists: “After completing the exhibition the Dadaists should have thrown out half of it. Annoying the philistine citizen, annoying the philistine artist – that alone is somewhat too little for Dada. Kurt Schwitters and Golyscheff would indeed be better here than many ‘real’ Dadaists.” Behne wished for them to overcome their moralizing and scolding, and he desired a real “World-Dada-Exhibition.”

In *Frankfurter Zeitung*, Paul Westheim presented Dada as “reaction,” namely as a “reaction to the Zeitgeist that is out of all bounds, to this culture of catchphrases, pretense, exploitation, and oppression,” concluding that “perhaps Dada is the very great sentimentality of childlike idealists who are shocked by the heaped-up ruins of our chaos that they have to face, and who — as great unbelievers — live in the firm belief that salvation can only lie in the complete disintegration of this world compiled of catchphrases and pretense.”

The norms of traditional aesthetics and their pretension to “eternal” values were adduced both by the conservative and the communist press. Both attacked Dada’s iconoclastic intention. As she had already done in the *Kunstlump* controversy, Gertrud Alexander of *Rote Fahne* (July 25, 1920) again spoke out for the preservation of cultural heritage:

A conscious fighting man, he [the revolutionary worker] does not need, like Dada, to destroy works of art in order to get rid of being “bourgeois”; for he is not a bourgeois. But who, like Dada, can do no more than paste up silly kitsch should
keep his hands away from art. . . . Because by pasting side by side such objects of bourgeois origin in the manner of a mosaic as newspaper clippings, tramway tickets, picture postcards, little parts of toys; by framing and signing them as a “Painting,” hanging them next to madly distasteful new barbaric “Paintings”; by placing near them or hanging from the ceiling, next to colored Dada dolls and jumping jacks, stuffed soldiers’ uniforms labeled “Plastik” (Sculpture); by distributing all this monkeyshine on walls and in space he believes “to crush bourgeois society” . . . Such “sculptures” would only be justified in an anti-militarist waxworks, to which there could be no objection. But to exhibit a collection of perversities as a cultural or even an artistic achievement, that is no longer a joke but impertinence.

While Gertrud Alexander, apart from her indignation, tried to tell the Dadaists that they were overestimating the political effects of their left-wing iconoclasm, the shocked reaction of the conservative bourgeois press rather reveals that it saw itself as threatened by left-wing anarchists: “Das Gift des Dadaismus” (The Poison of Dadaism) was the title of the review by E. F. in the Deutsche Tageszeitung of August 4, 1920. The Rostocker Anzeiger of July 25, 1920, were offended by the “impudence” of the Berlin Dadaists and, applying the bourgeois yardstick of normality, denounced them as “Poor Lunatics”:

The Dadaists have now organized a regular “art exhibition.” A visit cannot be recommended highly enough to German psychiatrists. For there can only be one question: are these people poor lunatics who think that these excrements of polluted brains are the revelation of some strange but sacred art, or are they impudent jesters who wish to fool people, and who want to fill their pockets by appealing to stupidity.

A comparable tone was struck by Kölnische Zeitung (evening edition, August 6, 1920), with the headline “The Biggest Bedlam in Berlin.”

Next to denouncing the Dadaists as lunatics, the conservative press also had another strategy: ranking them with the Bolshevists. This line was pursued by Ostpreussische Zeitung (Königsberg, August 18, 1920) and Rheinisch-Westfälische Zeitung (July 11, 1920): Dada was viewed as “the symptom of the sickness of a whole generation of artists” and “just like Bolshevism in the realm of politics.”

The nationalist Neue Preussische (Kreuz-)Zeitung (morning edition) of July 3, 1920, also aimed in this direction, giving its review of the Dada-Fair the headline “Dada Bolshevism.” The critic “P. F.” saw it as “a writing on the wall and a chronometer of our times showing the incredible confusion of all moral and spiritual ideas.” In its final section the journalist wrought himself up to a crushing verdict on the Dada-Fair by pretending to quote from a devastating self-review by the Dadaists themselves. This badly disguised trick was ironically taken up by Hausmann, who passed the ball of outraged criticism back: three weeks later, and with only minor changes, he exposed this same text to ridicule in the catalog of the Dada-Fair: “What art critics will have to say about the Dada exhibition, according to the ‘Dadasoph.’” This is the text in the Neue Preussische (Kreuz-)Zeitung, with Hausmann’s changes added in parentheses:
Let it be said right from the beginning that this Dada exhibition is simply another common bluff and not worth visiting [Hausmann: is a lowly speculation on the curiosity of the public — a visit is not worthwhile]. While Germany is shaken by a government crisis . . . [Hausmann: While Germany is shaking and twitching in a government crisis such as has never been seen, of a duration such as has never been known, while the meeting at Spa removes our future fate ever further into uncertainty] — these characters produce trivial jokes out of old rags, kitsch, and photographs [Hausmann: these characters come along and produce dreary trivialities out of rags, waste, and garbage]. Rarely has a company so decadent as this one, lacking any and every spirit, appeared before the public in such insolence as the Dadaists are doing here [Hausmann: Rarely ever has a company so decadent as this one, lacking any and every skill and serious intention, appeared before the public in such insolence as the Dadaists here dare to do]. There can be no more surprises here [Hausmann: There can be no more surprises with them]; everything is submerged in the convulsions of a rage for originality, which, because it is empty of all creativity, spends itself in fatuous antics [Hausmann’s text has only slight stylistic deviations in this sentence]. “Mechanical work of art” may be a type passable in Russia [Hausmann: type tolerable] — here it is cheap copy without artistic talent or merit, the extreme of snobbery and impudence toward serious criticism. Even the only moderate talent of the horde, the draftsman Grosz, is disappointing; it is he who shows most clearly where weakness of character and inability to resist the addiction to the “newest, latest” [Hausmann: to resist the constraint of fashion and the addiction to the “newest, latest”] can lead a talent — straight into the swamp of boredom, of aberrance, and the stale public-house prank. [Hausmann: O Grünewald, Dürer and ye other great Germans, what would you say to that!?]. What is being shown in this exhibition is of such a low standard throughout that one is forced to wonder how a gallery can have the courage to show these lousy works, and charge a high entrance fee [Hausmann: after all a high entrance fee]. Let the owner, who may have been duped (and who, by the way, has been appointed “General-Dada” by the Dada windbags), [this parenthesis is omitted in Hausmann’s text] be warned — , but let eternal silence be spread over the Dadaists [Hausmann: but let merciful silence be spread over the Dadaists!].

At this point Hausmann’s paraphrase breaks off, whereas the newspaper article ends in exaggerated conclusions: “One sees what is in store for us and the thousand-year-old German art should Bolshevism force its way over here. (The danger is very great!) In any case: where is art’s censorship?”

Repeatedly, many Dadaist works had been forbidden: Huelsenbeck’s Phantastische Gebete (Fantastic Prayers) was confiscated by the commander’s office in May 1917 without reasons given. The Neue Jugend. Wochenausgabe, Club Dada, Jedermann sein eigner Fussball, Die Pleite, were all prohibited, and had to be distributed undercover. In September 1920, Baader’s flat was searched because of his involvement in the Dada-Fair, as were the rooms of the Malik-Verlag; editions of the portfolio Gott mit uns (God With Us) were confiscated, and a month later seven original drawings by Grosz met the same fate. High-ranking military officers took offense with the works at the Dada-Fair: with the ceiling sculpture Preußischer Erzengel
(Prussian Archangel; fig. 1), the field-gray soldier with officer’s epaulets and the mask of a pig’s head who wore a field cap with cockade; then with the Tatlin sculpture Der wildgewordene Spießer Heartfield (view VIII), and above all with the portfolio Gott mit uns (fig. 79.1–79.9) containing caricatures said to slander soldiers and officers both by the satirical presentation and the accompanying text (in three languages) — as reported in Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung (Vienna, Prague, April 21, 1921).

A trial was initiated by the Reichswehrministerium (Ministry of the German Military): on April 20, 1921, Baader as Superdada, the gallery owner Dr. Otto Burchard, Grosz as draftsman, Herzfelde as publisher, and Schlichter (not Heartfield as creator of the sculpture) had to appear before the First Criminal Division of District Court II, Berlin. Because the files for the trial are lost, the proceedings can only be reconstructed from press reactions, an exchange of letters between Fritz Grünschach, Grosz’s defense lawyer, and Reichskunstwart (arts counselor of the Reich) Edwin Redslob, as well as between the lawyer Udo Rukser and Adolf Behne, and from the satirical reactions of Herzfelde and Mehring. The prosecution accused them of “severe defamation of the ‘Reichsheer’ (army)”; the Dadaists’ defense lawyers Fritz Grünsbach and Martin Beradt pleaded against an insult to the Reichswehr and asserted that this was a form of satire directed against “the excesses of militarism” not only in Germany but also in all countries (Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger, April 21, 1921).

The main witness for the prosecution was Hauptmann (Captain) Matthäi who vented his outrage at the “detestable” smear campaign against officers and ranks of the army; the heads of the military, according to him, were distorted, and he especially loathed the foreign titles in the portfolio Gott mit uns (God With Us; fig. 79.1–79.9), as they did provide a platform to the enemy from within and without. The portfolio contained nine lithographs with titles in three languages from the year 1919: 1. Gott mit uns — Dieu pour nous — God for [sic] Us; 2. Für deutsches Recht und deutsche Sitte — Les boches sont vaincu — The Germans to the Front; 3. Feierabend — L’angelus à Munich — „Ich dien”“; 4. Licht und Luft dem Proletariat — Liberté, égalité, fraternité — The Workman’s Holiday; 5. Le triomphe des sciences exactes — Die Gesundbeter — German Doctors Fighting the Blockade; 6. Zuhälter des Todes — Les maqueraux de la mort — The Pimps of Death; 7. Die vollendete Demokratie — L’état c’est moi — „The World Made Safe for Democracy”; 8. Die Kommunisten fallen – und die Devisen steigen — Écrasez la famine — Blood Is the Best Sauce; and 9. Den macht uns keiner nach — Honni soit qui mal y pense — „Made in Germany“. Titles and content of the satirical drawings were placed in a contradictory tension, clearly revealing the contrast between fact and fiction, propaganda and political violence. In the hollow physiognomies of the soldiers and officers themselves, brutality moreover was meant to attain unmistakable traits.

The defense witness was writer Stefan Grossmann. He played the Dada-Fair down: “when he visited the exhibition, [he had] expected an atmosphere of fun and neither felt nor noticed any outrage” (Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung, Prague, April 22, 1921). Several expert opinions had been commissioned: one in written form by Reichskunstwart Edwin Redslob and one which was orally presented by art expert Dr. Paul Ferdinand Schmidt, director of the Dresden City Collections. Both opinions mainly discussed the portfolio Gott mit uns, which both regarded as “a satire on military excesses, executed in genuine artistic form” (Der Ararat, vol. 2, 1921, p. 180). Schmidt added that it was “among the most valuable of our days.” It can no longer be ascertained whether Adolf Behne also appeared as a Dada expert. Udo Rukser, a lawyer at the District Court and a Dada sympathizer who had written an extensive review on the productive nonsense of the first Dada exhibition in April 1919, had encouraged Behne to intervene in the
trial for the sake of Dada “as a philos[!]ophical matter to be taken seriously” as well as for “Schlichter’s work” as “the first attempt at a Dadaist sculpture in the artistic sense.” It probably was to be significant for the course of the trial that Reichskunstwart Edwin Redslob’s attitude took the edge off the prosecution’s arguments.

How did the Dadaists themselves behave in court? After all, this was one of their last public appearances together, disregarding the Offene Brief an die Novembergruppe (Open Letter to the November Group; 1921), which some of them (Grosz, Höch, Hausmann, Schlichter, Scholz, and Dix) signed against its conservative cultural and exhibition politics. This was a public trial, and the Dada friends, among whom Hausmann and Höch were missing, used the occasion to stage a little spectacle. To start with, they attempted to dodge the court’s orders by letting a guard, a “Cerberus in uniform” (Herzfelde), throw them out at one door of the courtroom, only to enter again through the other until finally all the benches were “filled tightly” and “people were laughing and grinning.”

Baader’s appearance was strategically effective. He had probably been summoned because his title Oberdada identified him as the main intellectual perpetrator and author. But he quickly revealed the bluff himself; the title, he said, had merely been chosen for its advertising value. And he elaborated that if “we Germans” had a better sense of humor we would have a completely different status in the world; the foundations of Dada being “humor,” “highest elasticity” in order to “counteract culturally detrimental sediment formations” (Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung, Prague, April 21, 1921). With this speech Baader seemed to have eloquently secured his acquittal. Dr. Otto Burchard, the owner of the gallery where the Dada-Fair had taken place, declared his sympathy for the Dadaists and gained compassion at the same time because he had not profited by the exhibition but had incurred a deficit of 1,000 marks (Kölnische Zeitung, April 23, 1921).

The prosecution probably focused on Grosz and Herzfelde, in particular because of the portfolio God With Us. The district attorney had proposed six weeks imprisonment for both, while he demanded a fine of 600 marks from Burchard and Schlichter. Eventually, there were mitigating circumstances; the court acquitted Burchard and Schlichter, while Grosz as the portfolio’s author was sentenced to pay a fine of 300 marks for Entgleisung (moral derailment), and Herzfelde as the publisher was sentenced and fined 600 marks for “insulting the Reichswehr” (Der Ararat vol. 2, 1921, p. 180 f.). The prosecution finally concentrated on the portfolio because it was one of the few exhibits giving the impression of having possible long-term effects. The “reconstruction” of other parts of the exhibition “failed,” although Schlichter had been called upon to reassemble the remaining fragments of the Prussian Archangel (cat. no. 91) in court. The district attorney thought of them as evidence; the Dadaists took this as a welcome occasion for mocking the court.

Dada was “difficult to see through” — a point made several times during the trial, once by Baader, then by Schmidt — also the Dadaist’s strategy was confusing for many of the persons present. These political artists who produced razor-sharp caricatures of the military and basically “thought of the whole militarism as the outgrowth of a false social order that had to be fought” (Herzfelde), these artists applied Dadaist strategies of bluffing and deception not in order to give themselves away but rather to expose their prosecutors. With “all manner of evasions” and “interpretations” they wanted to “make the court’s work miserable.” The aim was not to confirm the connection of judiciary and military power by confessions to the contrary, but to ironically question their function and thereby the judicial system’s concept of truth. Grosz deceived them by using the cultural level of the judicial officers themselves in his argument,
pretending to draw like Meggendorfer, a popular Bavarian painter at the time who had edited an illustrated humorist journal in Munich in 1889. He also ironically adduced the bourgeois “essence of representational art” for the sake of understanding, when called upon to answer the question why, in his portfolio, only German military personnel were chosen to represent international militarism. His answer was: “if for example an artist wanted to represent the spring, this cosmic and international occurrence, then the German should stick to the flowering trees of Germany, the Brazilian to those of Brazil — and in just the same way this should hold for soldiers.” And to the question why the soldiers were wearing Reichswehr insignia, he responded that he was not a “tailor of uniforms.” This was not only an ironic evasion, but Grosz made it also clear that Reichswehr insignia belonged to wartime routine and occurred “everywhere,” just like the types of “Hindenburg” and “Ludendorff.”

However, the Dadaists’ maneuvers of bluff, deception, and evasion challenged Tucholsky to write an outraged commentary in the Weltbühne: “Grosz’s plea saved his neck and was crushing for himself and his friends. Is this the way your defense looks? You did not really mean it? . . . If Grosz did not really mean it — we did.” Tucholsky, because of his “melancholy gravity,” misread the ironic artistry and elasticity of the Dadaists. Had they gotten involved with the prosecution’s allegation they would have taken their opponent’s strength much too seriously. Deception was to be answered by deception.

Thus, instead of fulfilling the expectations that lay behind such a verdict — which were, as Herzfelde satirically wrote, “for the draftsman, out of grief at the punishment, to douse his oeuvre with petroleum and burn it — for the publisher to address Herrn Professor Kampf with the request to illustrate the Nibelungenlied for the Malik-Verlag” — these expectations were subversively evaded. Some of the lithographs from the portfolio were mixed in Grosz’s new publication, his fifty-five political drawings for Das Gesicht der herrschenden Klasse (The Face of the Ruling Class) appearing in 1921 also with Malik-Verlag. It did not take long for the conservative newspapers to react. By intending to show “Dadas wahres Gesicht” (the true face of Dada), they already demonstrated the radical right-wing defamation policy toward the arts, which was only waiting to be confirmed and executed in Hitler’s Mein Kampf (1925), in Wolfgang Willrich’s National-Socialist Säuberung des Kunsttempels (Cleansing the Temple of Art, 1937), and in the exhibition Entartete Kunst (Degenerate Art, Munich, 1937; fig. 166.1 and 166.2).

After the Dada exhibition, it [the portfolio Das Gesicht der herrschenden Klasse] is perhaps the most shameless thing to have emerged from this circle . . . The vileness and lack of principle speaking from these works are so revolting and repulsive, so cynical and brutal that everything produced against us in the way of satire and pictorial smear-propaganda by foreign enemies during the War here is by far surpassed . . . The Face of the Ruling Class never bears Jewish traits. Not one single caricature is directed against Semitic capitalism and Semitic racketeering. Well, Groß [!], after all, has to obey his instructions. Connections could not become any clearer.

In this article by Borsdorff about Grosz and the Dada-Fair in Deutsche Zeitung (June 26, 1921), all those goals attacked by Dada in its calculated criticism of politics, culture, and media once more gave rise to conservative/nationalist outrage:
The intellect of these people who duped citizens with the Dada-humbug has its foundation in the most boundless cynicism toward anything and everything that is held high and sacred by the German—even if he were a Social Democrat! A cynicism, which does not stop at tradition, history, culture, folk, fatherland, or God, which does not shrink from any vilenes, any crudeness of feeling; a cynicism put on display so diabolically and with such satanic pleasure that it makes one’s cheeks red with anger. One is disinclined to believe it . . . and yet it is compatriots who are doing this.

“Dada ist politisch” (Dada is political) was a programmatic slogan at the Dada-Fair. Dada had a political impact through its provocative topics, its attack against fatherland and nation, military and tradition, against the cult of genius and messianism, as well as through its strategies and materials, its ironic transgression of boundaries and attempts at destabilization and dissolution. Dada’s activities and their multiple meanings served to undermine the rigid, monolithic cultural, and political patterns of interpretation and action. Dada’s laughter, its “laughing true” (Nietzsche), was more difficult to bear the more it acquired a warning function and intervened wherever the living individual was in danger of giving itself up to the manipulations of the mechanical. “Laughter” was consciously politicized by Dada. Dada’s politics pointedly developed all the provocations feared by the established authorities. In this cultural revolt, solidarity among the excluded and the outcasts grew into such a Dionysian revolutionary force that it became too strong for those in power. That is why even in 1937 Dada was still judged as dangerous by the National Socialists—at a time when their revolt no longer had any visible significance in cultural life. But Dada’s impact seemed to persist. The artists in Berlin had oriented their revolt completely toward the nationalist enemy of war theology and militaristic ideology. They also had already discovered the swastika (fig. 56.1) as a dangerous symptom of this ideology of subordination.

In the exhibition Entartete Kunst (Degenerate Art, 1937; fig. 166.1 and 166.2), Dada’s concept was cynically inverted. Now the grotesque works of the fair were themselves turned against the Dadaists. Likewise, the slogan “Nehmen Sie Dada ernst! es lohnt sich! George Groß [!]” (Take Dada seriously! it’s worth it! George Grosz) was meant to appear ridiculous in this context, because—as criticism of 1921 had already shown—Grosz’s acerbic caricatures particularly provoked the “enemy.” Moreover, with the critique of decadence, racial discrimination, and anti-Semitism as denigrating leitmotifs, Grosz’s anti-nationalist and pro-American work Der Abenteurer (The Adventurer, 1917–18), the metamechanical construction New Man (1920; fig. 94), was branded as “degenerate” next to some pages from Der Dada (no. 2), the Merzbild (1919) by Schwitters, along with expressionist works by Kirchner, Klee, Feininger, Voll, and Moll. Dix’s war cripples, 45% Erwerbsfähig! (45% Fit for Work! 1920) together with Schützengraben (Trench, ca. 1923) were labeled “Painted Act of Sabotage against the Armed Forces. An insult to the German heroes of the World War I” (fig. 166.2). This defamation was mainly supposed to deprive Dada’s laughter of its provocative point, its view and promise of a different future. Dada was a thorn in the rulers’ flesh because it knew how to hit the mark of its enemy with precision.

During national-socialist rule, the Berlin Dadaists either went into hiding—like Hannah Höch, whose exhibition in the Dessau Bauhaus was forbidden as early as 1932—or emigrated like Grosz, Heartfield, Herzfelde, Hausmann, and Mehring. Only Baader tried, as it seemed, to adapt to the new situation, working—according to his own report—in the office of architect...
Konstanty Gutschow in Hamburg. In his application, however, he had excised any mention of his Superdadaist activities from his curriculum vitae. A letter to Hitler of September 15, 1943, which was probably never sent, shows once again his Dadaist missionary principles, dealing in a fictional and ironic way with authorities, now also with Hitler: “Your verdict against my Dadaism is unjust. You cannot prove the opposite because you never took the trouble of hearing also the other party, myself.”94
DADA’S ARTISTRY—PLAY OF POLARITIES

The spiritual, aesthetic, and political revolt of Dada Berlin’s artistry expanded into a creative freedom that shook off dogmatic ideologies, Christian morality, traditional ethical ideals, nationalist and militarist convictions, and their claims to power. Nietzsche motivated the Dadaists: “To transform the world in order to withstand it — this is the driving force: consequently the precondition is an enormous feeling of contradiction.”¹ The artistry of polarities actively created self-surpassing structures of modification, growth, and transvaluation — just as much in the ironic play of Dada as in “bloody earnest” life, as much in the simultaneity of the montages as in the metamechanics of the constructions. Dada was bound to a constant movement of destruction and creation,² trying to place “will and . . . values . . . onto the flow of becoming.”³ Continuously attempting to conceive of “life” as a process of possibilities, modifications, and transformations, thereby activating an “anthropogenesis of dissonance” (Nietzsche), Dada’s art turned back more pointedly toward the human, to its social and cultural experiences and conditions than the other avant-garde movements of the time. Unlike Dada, expressionism, for example, generally underestimated the contradictoriness of reality, stressing a religious transcendence of vital elementary forces.

Within the field of tension of “its own counter-force,” Dada through its artistry of polarities attempted to give culture back its power and its authority of experience and knowledge. The Dadaist approached “creative indifference” by bringing himself into a “balance of contradictions” and by seeing the world “as the product of its own ridiculous earnestness.”⁴ It therefore was important to Dadaists that in their works they brought this contradictory potential to a “decisive mixture.” Underlying the Dadaist concept was, according to Hausmann, the “perfect well-meaning maliciousness”⁵ as an immaterialist attitude. It can be related to the influence of Nietzsche, who drew from Heraclitus’s “foaming phial of condiments and mixtures.” Dada seemed like a “grain . . . of that delivering salt which brings forth a good mix of things in the phial . . . since there is a salt that binds the good and the evil together; and even the worst has its dignity for seasoning and for the last froth of fermentation.” The destruction of all values as the “highest evil” belonged to the “highest good”: creativity. This coincidentia oppositorum characterized “Dionysian nature,” which did not separate “doing No” and “saying Yes.”⁶

Thus the Dadaists made Anti-Dada into their simultaneous, polarizing principle, bringing themselves into a constant conflict of antinomies. In the simultaneous Yes and No they grounded a freedom of and for things, dissolving certainties, bringing into play relativities and ambiguities, leaving open questions of meaning: “You say yes to a life that strives upward by negation” (Huelsenbeck). “Dada no longer subtly grades red against green; it no longer plays off good against bad with the mien of an educator; Dada knows life more fundamentally, permitting the parallel existence of double realities” (Hausmann).⁷ The interplay of contradictions between sense and senselessness, chance and plan, consciousness and unconsciousness, meditative and spontaneous elements also characterized the concept of this movement as explained in Hans Richter’s treatise Dada — Kunst und Antikunst (Dada — Art and Anti-art, 1964). Dada perceived concepts and things as “mutually-oppositional-conditioning” similes of themselves and in this way attempted to establish its spiritual attitude in the identity of non-identity.
The New Material

Dada’s self-surpassing creations, its impulsive aesthetics of creativity that actively wanted to close the gap between art and life demanded the “introduction of new material” thereby replacing the aesthetic truth of the good and beautiful with a hylomorphic process. Not any higher meaning, no hermeneutic context brought forth creativity, but a new directness of Dionysian materiality: “Beauty is something created during the process of production.”

In Dada’s artistry the process of creation is its own goal; it has precedence over the result, bringing chance and temporality into play. However, it is also concerned, and especially in these rebellious works, with new “laws” that originate from working with the material: “Dada . . . again approaches the world in a primitive way,” Hausmann announced in his manifesto. “Dada ist mehr als Dada” (Dada is more than Dada). This is “expressed, for example, in pure sounds, imitation of noises, in the direct use of existing material like wood, iron, glass, fabric, paper. It is neither realism nor abstraction, but arises from striving for identity, receiving its regulating and numerical function from the individual act of creation.”

Hence, the introduction of the new material is a process participating in the Dionysian basis of life, forming it with new Apollinian aesthetic laws. Hylomorphism brings forth automatic regularities located in the material itself that had completely vanished from high culture. The artistry emerged from matter itself, from material, by doing. The act of montage began with the choice of the material; it lay in this discovery, not in the invention. The introduction of the new material had a method: it was the result of a process made transparent. The montage pointed to the productive act, permitting new laws of chance to take over. Consequently, the artistry widened the aesthetic of the material by integrating ugliness, trivial matters, the unexpected, the cruel, and the deformed, declaring “everything” and “nothing” in art. It drew from contradictions, began to confront different materials from different areas, bringing the collision of oppositions in the work into balance. Thereby, destruction and creation in montage were closely related: disorganization, deregulation, and a new function emerged during the process of production. The same was true for sound poetry as a montage of vowels and consonants. Without being conceptual or fictitious, it approached the Dionysian musical origin in an elementary process. The deregulation of the linguistic material corresponded to typographical experimentation, which was also used for publicity effects in Dada’s own media. On account of this connection, the montage principle can be called the origin of both Dada’s medial construction of itself and its ironical destruction.

Simultaneous Montage

The simultaneous concept of the coincidence of contradictions helped to introduce the new material, expanding it into a limitless complex event, so that the montage could spill over from image to assemblage into the rooms of the Dada-Fair. The time-conception of simultaneous montage, on the one hand, required a pictorial simulation of the highest kinetic energy of the individual elements; on the other, it was made rhythmic by the flow of the universal Dionysian movement of life — a dynamic merging of an autonomous process revealing itself in developments and effects but not in causality. In this simultaneity Nietzsche’s postulate of equivalent values at every moment of becoming can be perceived. Montages bound to individual movements mixed with the big wheels as the catalytic agents of the works. These represented a
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continuous process, which at the same time pointed to the total: “From the things of everyday life that surround me simultaneously — the city, the circus Dada, rumbling, screaming, steam sirens, house-fronts, and smell of roasted veal — I get the impulse that points and pushes me to direct action, to Becoming, to the great X.” The probe of this urban montage drove deeply down, beyond the fluctuating surface of media into the tragic Dionysian strata of postwar society. For Dada, no politics, no theory, no ideology was able to indicate this complex out-of-joint world in a more differentiated way than the montage-principle. Its multi-layered, heterogeneous structure alone, its arrangement of various materials, levels of meanings, and degrees of reality revealed absurdities, conflicts, and contradictions; disclosed unsettled matters of the past; and showed the heterochrony in simultaneity. An enlightening skepticism, illuminating the chaos with an Apollinian will to cognition, was interwoven in the simultaneous montages. The object of perception and the perceptive process itself were both called into question. The Dadaists consistently stressed that the montages themselves belonged to a fluctuating whole.

The montages as Dadaist parables showed a movement of life without goal and freed of purposes as seen by Nietzsche: “The work of art and the individual are a return of the primeval process from which the world has emerged, a ring of the wave in the wave, as it were.” The wheel pointed to the power underlying the reality of creativity, to the “inexhaustibly generative will to live,” of becoming and passing away. It also was an element in the second nature of technology, running from nothing through an infinity of simultaneous phenomena into heteromobile incompleteness, without meaning or purpose, as if the simultaneous event were a symptom of an inner-worldly energy.

But the Dadaists perceived this complexity ambivalently. Simultaneity motivated them to contradictory views as well: under the pressure of “racing time,” reality was vanishing. “Everything” took place, but “nothing” really changed. As Grosz noted with strained attention: “Catch racing time, before the devil gets you! and before the rotary presses sing your funeral song.” With their mobile abundance of media, the montages visualized the broken social bond of the people who were floating, isolated and disoriented. It also visualized that the public system of media communication had taken the place of social coherence. As political allegory, simultaneous montage reflected a reality broken up into disconnected fragments as it was seized by medial and mechanical processuality.

Emptiness in abundance, the tension between “everything” and “nothing” was immanent to the simultaneous montages of the Dadaists. They were totally wrapped up in the prodigality of appearances, and with their activities they also de-constructingly interfered with them. Thus in the works elements of playfulness and aggressive involvement, cheerfulness and skepticism, melancholy and irony were mutually conditional.

The montages were only alive insofar as they were processing these contrary positions in a tension between the Dionysian and the Apollinian — on the one hand close to chaos, on the other to structured method, here the infinity of Dionysian de-limitation, there the “decisive mixture”; here an abundance of images, there a calculated disclosure. Deregulation and “dissolution” (Hausmann) characterized the montage method, letting the “freed intellect” (Nietzsche) become the motor of the montage as a culture-critical power, questioning ready-made contexts of thought, habitualized concepts of words and images with satirical and grotesque methods:

These immense beams and clapboards of terms saving needy humanity throughout its lifetime for the freed intellect are only a scaffold, a plaything for its
most daring artistry: and if the intellect shatters them, jumbles them up, reassembles them ironically, pairing the most alien principles and dividing the closest ones, it reveals that it doesn’t need these stopgaps of destitution and that it is now guided not by terminology but by intuitions.

The “freed intellect” and the intuitions of the Dadaists used the operative method of cuts. The concrete interface also was the spiritual one. “Everything” was assembled toward possibility and an act of surpassing.

The montages of photographs and textual quotations of the Berlin Dadaists were attempts to show the destructive cut visibly, letting the viewer take part in the destruction of fictivity. The two parts of the activities of montages, mutually requiring each other — de-composition, taking apart the pre-set material, and its re-composition according to Dadaist intentions — became visible in this process. The surgeon’s work of the artist on the body of society — the cut through the beer-belly, the brains, the abdominal area — all that was clearly performed as an operation. The artist, dissecting the body with his scissors, obtained cut-up elements that he, with an alienating effect, combined according to a new law that spoke in the result of the work — ironically, paradoxically, and sarcastically.

The Dadaists metaphorically equated the cutting-up of the montage and that of the bodies quoted, thereby submitting both to dissolution of their identities. With the ecstatic Dionysian techniques of montage, the image as a symbolic form was fundamentally called into question; the individual learned of its “death” and was reborn as a “multiplicity.” Time and again the Dadaists brought themselves into the play of montage in this interweaving destructive process of interference with image and individuality as the most accessible models of revaluation.

The Dadaist was no longer interested in artwork as accomplished, meaningful “organic” configuration. In the method of montage the process of disintegration of meaning and values was supposed to be “subversively pushed forward” (Herzfelde). This open process of montage also made team-works possible, each created by the Dada friends Hausmann and Baader, Grosz and Heartfield, Schlichter and Heartfield, and Höch and Hausmann.

The individual activities of montage — de-composition and re-composition — invoked the creative rituals of a new art. In each montage the rebirth of the torn-up Dionysus-Zagreus seemed to be celebrated. The power that put back together the dismembered limbs was the creative Apollinian power of the artist. This assembling of the pieces was executed first and foremost in a dissonant principle of alienation in which the veil of irony permitted the existential abyss to shine through; the contradictoriness of culture and civilization critically disclosed the joining of heterogeneous parts (human, medial, mechanical).

It remained important for Dada Berlin that the cutout particle was recognizable in the end and that it allowed, with the ironic constellation, unexpected perceptions and insights. Here sometimes the satirical intention (which was supposed to be socio-critical and critical of reality and ideology) and the grotesque intention (whose combinations reached into the fantastic and fictitious) intersected. The satirical intention was more prevalent in Grosz and Heartfield, the grotesque more in Hannah Höch, Raoul Hausmann, and Johannes Baader.

With the grotesque and satirical montages, a Dadaist anti-world opposed the rational and alienated conditions of the society of war and industry in the Weimar Republic, making clear the loss of meaning and orientation on the one hand, on the other the departure into a new world at times marked by communist utopias. It offered a wide scale of disillusionment, enlightenment,
skepticism, irritation, amusement, alarm, which were supposed to augment each other but when merged could also restrict their individual effects to the point of leveling them.

Simultaneous montage can be specified as follows: it is characterized by two different forms: first by portrait-montage, crossing a dominant physiognomy with intersecting quotations, thereby deciphering the represented person or type to the point of breaking up individuality; second by the simultaneous, cumulative and hybrid montage of text and photograph in which the abundance of the world is interpreted by a method of equivalence.

By incorporating elements of language — letters, syllables, words, sentences, texts — in their different realizations, sizes, and items like advertisement, headlines, signets, inscriptions, and even whole newspaper articles, the montages acquired, apart from the figural quotations, a second sign system stimulating the viewer to read. In this way visual perception and verbal processes were linked and provokingly unlinked since there was often a rift between signifier and signified characterized mainly by the oppositional argumentation or its radical separation. In the montages, language as an iconoclastic element discredited the purist genre “image” and changed it into a verbalizing “static film” (Hausmann). The simultaneous montage with its quotations of text and image took part in a progressing lingualization of post-1910 art, running parallel to an increasing iconization of language: images turned into characters and these similarly turned into configurations of images.

In the montages the tendency was to dismember the bodies and faces analogous as language divided into its components. Bodily fragments were combined to make a new construct of signs like morphemes. Their dissonant refabrication created an optional play of dissolutions of selves, widening into combinations of human organs and limbs with mechanical elements. In contradistinction to the “anagrammatics” (Bellmer) of bodies in surrealism, the Berlin Dadaists chiefly employed physiognomic classification, primarily using the principle of transposition.

In the montage works citations of photographs and characters form an exciting net of references along with the linear structure of coherence and the abundance of quotations. Mostly put together as narrow textual fragments, the linear elements proceed asymmetrically, cut off courses of movement, take them up again, focus them, and break them up, thus setting off a dissonant world of events with the arrhythmically distributed surfaces and quotations.

Beyond that, processes of dissociation are created by preventing space from expanding, as the flow of time is also irritatingly broken up. Space tilts into plane; time splinters into moments. The fragmented character of the montage therefore is also an admission of the imperfection of any simultaneous perception of reality. In the artistic creation of montage the break, the interval itself turns into the sense-giving structure. “Racing time” can also give rise to an evaporation of reality into nothingness. Therefore, simultaneous montage reflects “everything” and “nothing,” multiplicity of connections and unconnectedness of current events.

The montage as an allegorical model explodes the medial constructions of reality, trying to produce the multiplicities and relativities and their soaring and swaying components. There are no plain facts of perception, of consciousness, or of world.

The simultaneity of Dada’s montages has at its base the Nietzschean dynamic interpretation of the world of independent forces, working “all” directions. The recipient is thereby confronted with the “tragic Dionysian” truth of montage, testifying to “the complete instability of all reality, continually only working and becoming but not being” (Nietzsche) — a world of inconsistency, of cruelty and sensuality, of surfaces and depths alike.

Therefore the simultaneous arrangement demands many activities of perception: dynamized vision, to interpret the dissonant constellation of the whole; recognizing vision for
quotations, to set associations in motion; combinatorial vision resulting in a movement of thought and perception; constant alertness in diversion; both distinguishing and intuitive perception; artistic ability urging on, flexible, and turning “upside down.”

Beyond Dada’s demand to offer a contradictory and complex cross-section of life through simultaneous montage, the connection to simultaneity also demonstrated an approach to the theory of relativity and its revolutionary insights. The Dadaists were influenced by the discovery that the universe was by no means a static and noncommittal structure in which matter existed by itself and was held as in a container; rather it was an amorphous continuum without any stable frame, spatially variable and continually undergoing a process of reorganization. The simultaneous montage attempted to create a convergence between scientific and aesthetic perception, filtering the processual and continually relativizing dynamics of the “whole.” The atomizing, particularizing, and relativizing process of the individual elements of the montage made the recipient aware of the fact that any measuring, spatial, or visual perception of time was a shortened and simplistic one and that things were exposed to an invisible, energetic, constantly varying process. They were defined historically, and they were defined within a constantly moving field of “events:” the world to Hausmann seemed an “energetic ocean.”

The simultaneous photomontage, therefore, was understood as an optical pamphlet against Newton’s perception of space. The Newtonian world picture was soundly anchored in space and time: it functioned like a comprehensibly constructed machine; there existed an “absolute space” and an “absolute time.” For Dada, on the other hand, time and space were variable quantities in continually fluctuating simultaneous “referential systems.”

Simultaneity meant supreme temporalization of the chaos of time as well as a timeless, objective, orderly structure of an energetic, constantly varying, universal process. In its simultaneous equivalence, the montage attempted to present an aesthetic analogy to the progress in the sciences: the idea of transformation of matter into energy and the negation of absolute quantities by the theory of relativity. Nuclear fission seemed to confirm Dada’s realization that the world is unstable and cannot refer back to any primeval cause. “Life” for the Dadaists asserted itself in a continuous process of actions alone.

**Hausmann**

In Hausmann’s concept of montage the “organization of his body” took the place of the “aesthetics of the good and beautiful.” The artistry of his montages acted as a dynamic deconstruction: as scream, as the modulation of a sound poem or as the energetic and hovering structure of a picture-text montage, as “static film” where the sounds, as stochastic elements of autonomous emergence, encounter citations of image-material and photographs of various levels of meaning and reality taken from personal, scientific, geographical, urban, and media realms. Their formal and semantic tensions in their simultaneous density initiated a creative process of increased sensitivity, which attempted to rise to the “real experience of all relationships.”

As no other Berlin Dadaist, Hausmann grappled with the deregulation of language. In optophonetic poetry he created a new musicality of language as well as a new iconicity of montage. The dynamic movement of life was to become identical with the *Seelen-Automobil* (soul automobile). Thus, he never simplistically connected the kinetic movement of his montages with the “tempo” of the times, but could always see it as a bridge to the “primeval forces of life.” He was filled with the utopian wish to see bodily and to feel intelligently. He continually fought against the spiritual, cultural, and social encrustations. Hausmann asserted:
“One may well accuse the Dadaist of bourgeois nihilism: Dadaism is the pivotal attack on the culture of the bourgeois!”

In his works Hausmann created an aesthetic analogy between body and machine. Both function with their own inner laws, without metaphysical support, without sentiment. The machine as a hermetic-mechanical organization presented an Apollinian equivalent to the physical language of the Dionysian. By the end of 1919, the systematics of the Apollinian constructions was emerging next to the accidentality and randomness of the heterogeneous montages. The Dadaist Satyr was counterbalanced more and more by the disciplined Apollo, constructing his ambivalent metamechanical Plastik (sculpture) Mechanischer Kopf (Geist unserer Zeit) (Mechanical Head [The Spirit of Our Age], fig. 113). In the role of Engineer of World Emanations Hausmann in 1922 widened the Dionysian-Apollinian drives into a biodynamical view of nature with “universal functionality.” He wrote: “Logic, rationality, and intuition are human disciplines and can be used for an approach to the highest incarnations of creativity only in an approximating manner.”

Höch

In the dissonant dynamics of Höch’s simultaneous Dada montages the “nothing” and the “everything” of Dada were related to each other, both pessimistically and in a utopian manner. The montages revealed a grotesque “Cabaret Mankind” that in its finality corresponded to an “idle nonsense” and which in its endlessness could be interpreted as part of seismic processes. In the new consciousness-industry of the media where everything seemed readable, attainable, and feasible, but where the meaning of the appearances was out of reach, Höch’s simultaneous montages reflected the activities of their protagonists as artistry without safe grounds. The new power of the media imparted itself in the violence of a seemingly unsystematic entertainment, driven only by interests of exploitation and marketability. With her photomontages Hannah Höch attempted to undermine the powerful interplay between media and politics as one of the significant phenomena of this time of upheaval. Their grotesque techniques opened a fearless view into contemporary events as a provisional process, in which the chaos meant also departure. On the level of form and content the fragmented materials of text and photograph remained recognizable: the source context served as a contrasting foil for the new grotesque links of the montage. Spatial multiperspectivity and temporal simultaneity created a confusing, spiraling, never-ending play of meanings. The female dancers and athletes seemed to say yes to the course of the world into which they were drawn, while they were also staging the “lightness, the carelessness in the greatest weightiness” in the “accessibility to the oppositional” (Nietzsche).

In a modern age of the thin substance of fashionable coverings and “costumes,” like “moralties, articles of faith, tastes in the arts, and religions,” Hannah Höch became the “parodist of world-history” (Nietzsche), in which her laughter was to have a future. In the series Schöne Mädchen (The Pretty Woman, 1920; fig. 131) she imparted an effect of alienation to the medially predefined image of the New Woman, consistently questioning her awakening by distorting and contradicting it and particularly by confronting it with the world of machines. Thus she ventured into possibilities, which otherwise would have been closed off by role allocations.
**Baader**

As the self-appointed redeemer of “the Earth and the Globe,” Baader, in a megalomaniac gesture, cast a wide, hermetic net of coordinates of infinitely small and infinitely large world-references. Nietzsche’s postulate of “self-creator” affected Baader’s self-image as architect who imagined a total rehabilitation of the world. He was both the “hard admonisher” and the “world’s clown,” intending to reduce the metaphysical heritage of the Middle Ages to absurdity — Hausmann’s idea that, however, often failed because of Baader’s obstinate role-image as Jesus redivivus. Baader staged his role as Oberdada out of the grotesque tension between the sublime and the profane.

Baader had been influenced by the post-1906 reception of Nietzsche and by the reform-movement as much as by the post-1918 Dada revolt. The vision of creating a World-Temple for the turn of the century (fig. 48), in which he still was trying to put Nietzsche’s “Grand Style” monumentally into practice, after the war changed into the deconstructive “play” of the assemblage Deutschlands Größe und Untergang (1920; fig. 47). Baader widened the principle of montage into assemblage. Dada was at the same time “the creator of all things and God and global revolution and judgment day all rolled into one. It is not a fiction but can be grasped by humanity. And the game played in heaven between the stars is the game of Dada, and all living and dead beings are the players.”

All quotations that Baader took up in the assemblage were “secret” signs that referred to him and beyond him to the order of his fictitious cosmos of the superdadaist world-revolution with a calendar of its own. In the accumulation of simultaneous utterances, also in the different editions of HADO, the “Superdadaist’s Handbook,” Baader attempted to read his own cosmology from the layers of media — they did not clear up objective world history but alone served the Superdada as multimedial components of his solipsist Dada-game in which he felt appointed as judge of the world. He was to be a judge, however, who was wise enough not to divide the world into good and evil, but to sentence all from his own perspective grotesquely and associatively in the Dionysian events of his assemblage, for it was Dionysus and not so much “Christ crucified” who inspired him.

**Grosz**

Even before Dada, Grosz was able to arrange his works, his graphics, and his paintings both analytically and as Dionysian, cruel visions of decline characterized by a vitally grotesque deadliness. His paintings’ simultaneous, layered visions of urban experiences merged the selective and anatomical gaze of the hastily drawing draftsman with the oil-painter’s synthetic power of color (fig. 78). Individual things in these complex visions began to float in isolation and announce the montage as a method of quoting even before he used materials in his works.

The things he included in his paintings and watercolors, Grosz first put on the table of the philistine, of the capitalist, and war profiteer in order to reveal more pointedly and more tangibly their greedy materialism (fig. 76). They appeared to be concrete clues that he had discovered like a detective in the possession of the “culprits.” The table became the alienated altar on which the things lay like cult-objects and corpi delicti.

If these belongings as quotations were classified with caricatures of the bourgeois type-portraits, then Grosz, unlike Hausmann or Höch, in the simultaneous montage often strikingly opposed and alienated political textual quotations, like in Germania ohne Hemd (Germania
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Shirtless, fig. 84) in order to give an associative sectional view of the monarchist, nationalist ideology that threatened the democracy of the Weimar Republic.

His concern was to expose the heterochrony in simultaneity. Urban modernity was not able to dissolve the anachronistic jingoism of the Weimar Republic. In his drawings Grosz sifted out the deformed physiognomies of those militant nationalists so that they would not be lost in the eccentricity of things and the urban chaos. Consequently, Grosz’s statement was fundamentally different than Höch’s. While in her montage mostly the mediated system of communication and its principle of dissociation were grotesquely alienated, Grosz’s works, influenced more by communism, exposed the ideology of a class or social status, especially the opposition between proletarian and bourgeois classes. While Grosz, mostly in painting and drawing, caricatured the perpetuated power of the capitalists in their deforming greed with satirical social criticism, Hannah Höch took her point of critical awakening from the appetite of the eyes, the power of the new media society that she let speak for itself as a symptom of the young democracy. While she, in the montage of media, questioned medial perception and the process of perception itself, Grosz remained more in the tradition of caricature.

Only the myth of America seems to have freed Grosz into the simultaneity of montage. For example in Dada-merika (fig. 162) he activated a vigorous explosive force against the anachronisms of bourgeois culture. The montage in its simultaneity brought forth the immediacy of exhilarated American urbanity, a Dionysian de-limitation that immediately seemed crystallized in the effects of light. These urban montages and representations by Grosz were characterized both by a high level of abstraction and an unrestrained demand for thrills.

Heartfield

Heartfield developed the montage with material from graphic design. In 1916 and 1917 he created text- and cliché-montages from the type-case; he was interested in the effects of the visual and the verbal and also in the topicality of the medium photography. In 1917, as an isolated quotation of the “Flat Iron Building,” it was first taken up programmatically in the layout of the magazine Neue Jugend (fig. 40). In his montages he reorganized the photographic and pictorial material and the plane and line in a new manner. At the same time, the dynamics of the graphic acquired clear structures.

The simultaneity of the citational method was foreseeable as early as 1917 in the introduction of the Kleine Grosz Mappe (Small Grosz Portfolio, fig. 115). The suggestive iconography of the dance macabre was replaced by the Dionysian symbol of the wheel in the Dada-montages. The hustle and bustle of the urban dynamo opened up an unsecured space and broke boundaries — “totally” — as Das Pneuma umreist die Welt (The Pneuma Travels around the World) quotes (fig. 116). In Universal-City (fig. 117) the violent, indifferent medial and urban machinery dissociated people and revealed the contradictoriness between their reality and the new media, pushing from America into postwar society.

Dada gave Heartfield the impulse to do work with montages, developing from the “idle nonsense” during the course of the twenties into a moralizing-satirical, socially involved criticism. Death continued to mark the montages. In his political montages Heartfield pointed out the forces of death of the times, which had allied themselves to the powers of politics and capital. The montages were produced in a contradictory construction, leaving the photograph-quotations clearly visible.

With their threatening tension of terror and laughter the grotesque manifestations of death had an especially strong effect, because the contemporary world’s reliability seemed fabricated
of lies and deception. The montages in all consequence operated to break up illusions. Heartfield’s enlightening laughter was to open up insights regarding the dark politics of power and at the same time free the forces of resistance. Social change for him could only be brought about through the proletarian revolution.

The Monteur Heartfield in the Malik-Verlag created a sphere of active involvement — from advertisement to leaflets, from magazine to book cover and political posters — thus opening up his artistic work into everyday life.

**Huelsenbeck**

Simultaneity was a concern of the arts and of literature. In the coherence of impressions and the abruptness of imagery and metaphors the experience of an increased temporal compression imparted itself. Huelsenbeck, for example, underlined that his collection of poetry *Die phantastischen Gebete* (The Fantastic Prayers, first published in Zurich in 1917, reissued by Malik-Verlag in 1920) “for the first time in the German language” seize upon “the unrestrained colorfulness,” upon life as an “insane simultaneous concert,” dissolving it “into laughter.”

He intermingled his grotesque and fantastic images with parodistic forms of Psalms, other Bible passages, elements of Protestant and Catholic liturgy, and jingoistic phrases.

“In his novel *Dr. Billig am Ende* (Dr. Billig Ruined), published with Erich Reiss Verlag in 1921, but already announced in a short excerpt in *Club Dada* in 1918, Huelsenbeck narrated a plot with urban atmosphere, in its simultaneity resembling an urban witch’s cauldron. Like his “philistine run wild” protagonist, bewitched by the erotic magnetism of a whore, the writer succumbs to the Dionysian frenzy of impressions, letting the “fantastic sensation of things” speak for themselves. “The cities are tipped and the clouds wander above the roofs like green devils. All this Billig feels, hearing the thundering noise of the subway under his feet, which seems to announce a tempest . . . Hats are drifting through the pub alone, ordering food . . . Billig has the ability for enthusiasm: He says: “Turn! — Bang! Explode!”

In *Deutschland muß untergehen! Erinnerungen eines alten Dadaistischen Revolutionärs* (Germany Must Fall! Memoirs of an Old Dadaist Revolutionary) published by Malik-Verlag in 1920, Huelsenbeck projected a simultaneous Dionysian experience of urbanity onto the Berlin of the revolutionary fights. Like all the Dadaists, he vehemently criticized the Weimar Republic for their bloody
suppression. The Dandy as a social and behavioral model, however, remained characteristic for the Dada attitude of Huelsenbeck’s writing. It mirrored just as much the Dandy’s deep reflection of the metaphysical uprooting as it did the danger of a spiritual deprivation in the modern age. Like no other Berlin Dadaist, Huelsenbeck revealed that he was influenced by Nietzsche’s diagnosis of an emerging nihilism that demanded a Dadaistic new form of poetry.

**Mehring**

“*Berlin simultan*” (Berlin, simultaneous), the “first original Dada-Couplet” was written by Walter Mehring, composed by Friedrich Hollaender, and dedicated to Richard Huelsenbeck. Its tone and form took up some of Berlin’s cocky jargon, capitalist hardness, and unconcern. The poem at its beginning depicts Ebert, the President of the new Republic, as a “self-made gent,” as an upstart:

- Dressed for driving a self-made gent!
- Make way! The President!
- The Salvation Army
- Storms the Café!
- A “jeist”(mind)-prole checks out in the dirt
- A girl waves her plaid ribbon
- A guy haggles at the trollop’s post
- Give me the check!
- Racketeering with bacon fat
- Forget it all!
- Come sweet doll!
- Having a brawl
- Or necking
- One two three
- Get off my back
- The Berolina
- Carriage on the jolting track
- Great “Ballina”
- Berlin Berlin.

In his chansons Mehring intended a “ragtime of language,” an “international literary artwork,” whose rhythms were inspired by the “syncopated music” of jazz. Furthermore, short lines, exclamations, dashes, and breaks characterized the abbreviated associations of the staccato of imagery recognized by Karl Riha as a new form of “report ballad.” Striking are the different levels of these chansons published by Mehring in *Das Politische Cabaret* (1920). In a simultaneous poetic panoply, they attempted in a critical way to sketch the machinery of the metropolis, of the revolution, and the counter-revolution, of the pop-songs, newsreels, and the Kapp-Putsch. The multiplicity of imagery corresponded to an enormous linguistic variability, bound together in paratactic series. Tucholsky commented that Mehring “masters all Berlin dialects, that of the pimp, the whore, the racketeer, the civilized manufacturer, the cabdriver, and mostly the dialect of the readers of papers, who don’t even feel that they are speaking dialect, and who believe that this is their beloved German. An effect of this amazing knowledge is Mehring’s songs, which are eerily genuine.” This “genuineness” was intensified by the fact that
Mehring picked up the thread from ballads, folk songs, popular tunes, and couplets, working out its vital substance to use it dadaistically against the high culture of literature and poetry.

The Dada Friends

The war as the catastrophe initiating Dada demanded the modern “pessimism of strength” of Dix as a reader of Nietzsche: “the courage . . . to say Yes,” this does not mean Yes to imperialist wars, but to a fate, which under the circumstances approaches him and in which he has to prove himself. The extraordinary situations present man at his best and also in his depravity; in such moments man shows himself in all his possibilities. This Yes demanded of Dix an aesthetic of horror going far beyond his expressionist beginnings, taking up Dada’s artistry of montages. In 1919, he inscribed onto his skull the symbol of the life wheel inspired by Dada around which circulated quotations drawn from the realms of Eros and death (fig. 63) along with the montages of bodies and artificial limbs of his cripples. These montages were a tragic Dionysian avowal of the ugliness of life and mirrored at the same time, the interaction of the contradictory forces of the grotesque — of fear and irony, sublime and comic. In the diametric execution of the works themselves — in the materials that were reproduced and in the topics that were painted, in which the artist now was acting as an engineer, now as a traditional painter — these montages (fig. 60) were characterized by the polar tension between an increasingly mechanized humanity and the resistance of organic life to this mechanization. Dix thus produced the illusion that the artificial limbs were alive, and, as their inventor, he gave them a carnivalesque choreography while he also dissected the remains of the organic body as a painting artist. In both roles he blended the polar forces into a shocking work of hybridity. Behind the grotesque staging of the artificial limbs lurked the horror of the war.

In the works by Schlichter, Hubbuch, and Scholz the principle of simultaneity was almost exclusively reserved for drawings, watercolors, and oil paintings. While Schlichter compiled scenes of excessive intoxication, in which the subject was murder and manslaughter, revolution and revenge, and while only in some of the montages — as in Phänomen-Werke (Phenomenon-Works; fig. 152) and Tumult in Filmstadt (Riot in Film City, fig. 153) — he was showing the beginnings of simultaneous quotations, Hubbuch took up the simultaneous principle as a stimulation for his graphic works in which he combined emotionally charged urban and interior scenes (fig. 140). Scholz, still bound to the prismatic deregulation of expressionism, was only stimulated by the metamechanical phase of Dada. He placed his satirically caricatured social specimens of the Weimar Republic into metamechanical scenes — capitalists, whores, politicians, clergymen, farmers — assigning to them material quotations in the style of Grosz (fig. 158). Only Griebel created simultaneous montages with Dadaist material quotations (fig. 73).

In this scenic, simultaneous procedure aggression and matter-of-factness, emotion and resistance were overlapping. In the polar oppositions of the simultaneous experience of their works and montages, these artists from smaller cities like Karlsruhe, Dresden, and Dusseldorf saw the mutual conditioning of the impersonality of urban life and the eccentricity of the senses.

Metamechanics

Dada’s metamechanic turn was embedded in the disintegrating process of the montage itself. The destructive process of the montage as symbolic form ultimately shifted into action, seemingly fulfilling the Dadaist conception of seeing art anew “in the perspective of life”; however, the
destruction of the traditional “masterwork” did not result in its end. On the contrary, the outcome was a new conception, which by its greatest reduction countered the chaotic complexity of the actionist element in the montage. This conception was characterized entirely by the diagrammatic mode, by drafts and schematizations, exclusively taking representations of functionality as a starting point but fully objecting to any functionalistic dogmatism. As a last consequence, the “metamechanic construction” was a heuristic means of the Dadaist play, indicating an open generative process in planning, favoring a concept that now saw science “in the perspective of art.” It introduced a process of revaluation, confronting the Monteur (artist of ecstatic montages) with the new work of the Konstrukteur (constructor). He was the enlightened specimen, representing “American brightness” (Hausmann), freed of the “dark” internalizations of Christian beliefs and expressionist tragedy: he was sachlich (functional), impersonal, skeptical, and severe. As Tatlin (fig. 109), as Neuer Mensch (New Man, fig. 94), as Ingenieure (Engineers, fig. 110), he claimed a collective spirit, emancipating himself from capitalist limitations to the utopian visions of a communist society while at the same time wanting to use technology for a new creative American way of life, which would have freed itself from the political-destructive utilization of technology. The stereometrically abstract regularity of metamechanics was characterized by the Manichino, by the automaton, by geometry, the technically exact construction, the architectonic principle. The Dadaist constructor with his sharp intellect was able to recognize and visualize the never changing rules within the chaotic external forms. He revealed functional connections and disclosed mechanisms surrendering life to the repressive culture of the rationality of capital, economy, politics, technology, to militarist drill, and subservient spirit.

He was able to interpret the simultaneous appearances negatively and positively, on the one hand rendering them as blown-up nothings or as vain abundance, on the other as the most condensing “experience of all relations” resulting in a new abstract concentration, in vital simplicity and lively elementary ideas. With the great ambition to “master chaos” the new Dada Apollo launched into forming an alliance with the rigor and strength of rationality, which was to lead to a new relation between the nature and the appearance of things, contrary to the misusing one-sidedness of the mind. According to Nietzsche, “the logical and geometrical simplification [is] a result of an increased strength” — is the highest “concentration” of vital forces into a new style. The development of Greek culture from the Dionysian to the Apollinian and the transition into a scientific, technological era in the nineteenth century gave Nietzsche reason to remark that so far the “seriousness of inventing symbols and forms” had changed to include the “appeal of simpler form,” even if it at first seemed “uglier” because of its “spirituality.”

The metamechanical constructions have to be seen in the context of a contemporary process of revaluation, taking place in the avant-garde movements of the time under the influence of a mechanization affecting all areas of life. In Holland after 1920 van Doesburg promoted his “will to style” of the machine as a “phenomenon of exemplary spiritual discipline.” The influence of pittura metafisica was just as strong. Carlo Carrà had also made a sudden break with the principle of simultaneity in collage-representation. With these influences and from their specifically Dadaist concept of polarity, the Dadaists developed their metamechanical aesthetic. The exploding eccentricity of the montages transformed into a concentration of forces which as abstraction revealed a new qualitative aesthetic leap. Not the action-orientedness of the cut but the rigid line of rationality characterized the new metamechanical constructions. The simultaneity of the quotations was pushed aside by clearly
positioned images. In the place of simultaneous infinity the narrowness of space and immeasurable, multifocal depth emerged. Contrary to the exploding perspectives of the quotations, cubic, lucid, architectural spaces structured the pictorial works. The functioning automaton and the senseless *manichino* took the place of satirical caricatures, grotesque fragmentation, and individual distorted physiognomy of the photographic citations of people. The ugly beer-bellied German became a functionary of the system and was stylized into a mechanic subject of a rationalized and bureaucratized society. The reproductive ability of the photographs corresponded to the standardization of the figures and to the utmost reduction and economy of the stereometrical forms. The geometrical tools of the spatial constructions were put in the place of the real-material of the montages. While the montages of photographs and text, like the real-materials, as a rule simultaneously and loudly presented themselves as actionism, a contemplative silence emerged from the metamechanical constructions. The open structure of expression and the processual character of the montages changed into structural and abstract standardization. Emptiness, that in the beginning of Dada had demanded an abundance of material, again gained acceptance in the compositions and now attained poetic validity. The space-orientedness of the metamechanical constructions at the same time engendered a new *Denkraum* (realm for contemplation, Warburg), changing the *vita activa* of the montages into a *vita contemplativa*. Here, in these new realms, the “architecture for the perceptive” in Nietzsche’s sense was created as a counter-image to urban dissipation.

There is and probably will be a need to perceive what our great cities lack above all: still, wide, extensive places of reflection . . . buildings and locations that express as a whole the sublimity of stepping aside to take thought for oneself. The time is past when the Church possessed the monopoly of contemplation . . . We want to have ourselves translated into stones and plants; we want to have ourselves to stroll in, when we take a turn in those porticoes and gardens.43

In this new interpretation, influenced by Nietzsche, we can find the fundamental proximity between Dada and *pittura metafisica*. But despite these influences, the difference also has to be mentioned. Its rational constructs were brightening up the “glowing sunset of culture” (Nietzsche) once more, allowing in the uncanny sublimity of its *manichini* and architectures to penetrate melancholically the longing for the myth of antiquity. They showed a pessimistically rigid perspective that, according to Spengler’s morphology of culture, emerges when civilization has completely taken over culture. The Dadaists, however, did not succumb melancholically to this myth of decline; they distanced themselves from it with strength and ironical matter-offactness.

*The Mechanical Head (The Spirit of Our Age)* (fig. 113) of Hausmann gives a Dadaist answer, neither melancholic, like the *pittura metafisica*, nor abstractly functioning like the constructivist works. Its skepticism saves it from being too obvious; its spirit resembles the “meta irony” of Duchamp vis-à-vis too great a belief in science and rationality. The instruments, artifacts, and means of the *Mechanical Head* may remind us of the demand for a “dry,” aesthetically indifferent production, only to be found in an alliance between art and science — Dadaist as it were — like a mechano-player without goal or purpose, like, for example, the *Diabolospieler* (fig. 95). For him circumstances keep moving, and his room to maneuver has to be balanced out time and time again. The new “classicism” of the metamechanical constructions does not appear rigidly, following a set pattern. The diagrams and cuts allow function to be
conceived anew without giving it a final form. In 1913 Duchamp was questioning the original platinum chronometer, which was kept in the Bureau International pour Mésurage et Poids (International Office for Measurement and Weights) in Sèvres near Paris, with the ready-made Trois Stoppages Étalon and introduced chance as a new standard.⁴⁴

Typical as well for Dada became mixed forms, tensions between the figure-elements of caricatures and the abstractions of the environment, between materials and schematizations, photographic quotations and the architectonic principle, mimetic representation and cut. Dada in these medially and semantically hybrid collisions balanced a process of Dionysian-Apollinian tension: “This means: to break the will to the enormous, multiplicity, unknown, horrible with a will to measurement, simplicity, fitting into rules, and terminology.”⁴⁵

The Apollinian element in the metamechanical constructions is infiltrated by the Dionysian; the ground is trembling, a threatening uneasiness remains. The spirit of the constructor invents machines with which he can speed up the decline of culture — for example the “big mousetrap,” into which “he wants to direct the Occident very quietly and unnoticed, only waiting for the door to slam shut.”⁴⁶

In “Cabaret Mankind” Hausmann shows the senseless “mechanism of the soul” with the help of a machine:

You get a short, convincing example of your own inner expenditures, your fight. Then a whistle sounds, and with huge thumps, crackling, and moaning, sending out sparks the motorcyclist zooms off, the punching-machine pounds, the main newel-lathe buzzes and crunches as the two mechanics are working on them fiercely. The audience has to see clearly that this whole mess is for nothing, that all of this rattling and all the whole bustling around are completely meaningless!! — After three minutes a signaling whistle sounds, everything stops; the hairdryer starts its activity and blows the ten thousand little notes with the text “Soul!” into the audience. Those who still have not grasped that humanity is really like this, nothing, an idle nonsense.⁴⁷

Hulsenbeck’s children’s ratchet produced a provokingly mechanical sound on stage, which drowned out everything. For the World-Dada’s activity in the role as nihilist Hausmann also invented a mechanic metaphor: “Like a big electric steam-roller the movement Dada he created laid itself down on the protruding gothic, onto the painful Dark Ages of the German soul.”⁴⁸

The metamechanical constructions in their ironic ambivalence did not leave Dada’s terrain, even though they were already pointing ahead into developments of Neue Sachlichkeit (New Objectivity), surrealism, and constructivism.

The Dada-Fair — The Occident in the “Mousetrap”

The Dada-Fair as a complex total work of destruction and as a revolt of the “self-creators” and “self-lawgivers” (Nietzsche) was characterized by the attempt to bring about an abysmal downfall of the Christian heritage, to celebrate America as the vital future, to speed up the revolution of the proletariat, to implement the social-erotic revolt as an anti-authoritarian experience in order to destroy the cultural superstructure of metaphysics, idealism, and ethics, to reduce the militarist and monarchist subjected spirit to absurdity, and to realize the new “anthropogenesis of dissonance.” The facies hippocratica of a society in decline was seized by the various new techno-political dimensions: by the revolutionary change in the perception of
time; by the increasing interconnectedness of space via the speed of the new means of transport; by the hectic circulation of goods, workforce, and money; by urbanity as a large, heterogeneously mixed fabric; and by the new realities of media and electrically charged energies. These phenomena created the unstable simultaneity of the rooms of the Dada-Fair, the mobility, breaks, and shocks of this production. The principle of montage took hold of the smallest detail of quotation and language, took apart its elements and put them back together according to new rules, and took hold of the big projects like 

Deutschlands Größe und Untergang (Germany’s Greatness and Decline) by Baader (fig. 47). The skeptical “Yes to the Gigantic Nonsense of the World” (Grosz) drove the rebellious motor of the fair onward.

The exhibition shook up all established forms of art and constructively destroyed them in order to justify life in its tragic-Dionysian reality: cruel, brutal, deforming, revolutionary, dance-like, contradictory. The visitor to the fair was challenged by destruction and invention of images, the activating method was provoking, working just as much with transitions as with collisions. With the help of the media equivalence used — finished and unfinished works, originals and reproductions, low and high art — perception was constantly kept alert for further horizons of association.

The Dada-Fair attempted to break up the class of the bourgeois visitors and to win a new audience. Its open concept was to move the young democracy to self-criticism. Their responsibility, their curiosity, their interest, their pain, and their feelings were not to be taken away from the people by an imperative and self-elevating art.

Dada was politicizing the Dionysian world judgment; the contemporary citizen, modeled as the capitalist, the educated bourgeois, the general, and the nationalist soldier, was just as short-lived as he was in the model of the priest, the philistine, the artist who was still basing his aesthetic on ideals, morality, or metaphysics. Dada implemented a new relationship of humanity and world in this all-encompassing event of the fair by viewing art “in the perspective of life” and science “in the perspective of art.” Playing, the Dionysian and Apollinian elements of the tragic world-interpretation were removed from pathos and the contradictoriness of being; ugliness, dissonances, and pain were counterbalanced with an artistic dance above the abyss. In the concept of this fair, lightness, the fleeting moment, and irony were at the same time bound to the heaviness of the “bloody earnest.” The specific concern was to find a counter-position to traditional art and a new art, a new synthesis of creative possibilities that would overcome the split from “life,” politics, science, and technology.

Dada destructively-creatively invoked the total artistic spirit of European cultural history, which was more and more weakened through the individual developments of the arts. In the experiential spaces since the Renaissance — the “Kunst-” and “Wunderkammern” as collections of rare specimens of art and nature — genre specific differences were overcome and a correspondence and combination of cultural, scientific, technological, and traditional relations became possible, displaying the world as a large cosmic total artwork. In the abundance of these “chambers” the universe unfolded before the visitor’s eyes: natural produce, artifacts, antiques, coins, cameos, precious objects, mirabilia (wonders), abnormalities, scientific displays, exotic specimens, watches, and automata. The horizons of this epoch were more and more broadened with the help of the intelligence of visual perception, opening up new cultural possibilities through the power of intellect and its associations. The ruler as collector and patron of research stood at the center of this infinite net of relations of art, nature, mechanics, and antiquity. The automaton was the virtually ideal image of a human being, who could be constructed godlike by the artist. The Dada-Fair as a contemporary “art-chamber” designed a grotesque and satirical
counter-image of the development of culture after the Renaissance by revealing the powers of death that had degraded beautiful, ideal humanity into a dismantled cripple. The exhibition demonstrated how the progress of humanity was destructively turning against itself. The abundance of objects uncovered not the wealth of the universe, but the poverty of the abyss.

Even though modernity was perceived by its possible end, it was an ironic perception that did not succumb to the end but went beyond it. The Dada-Fair confirmed a potential of freedom, which the Weimar Republic denied to reality. The Dadaist manichino was also a figure of transition, bearing witness to a world from which a Dionysian Apollo and an Apollinian Dionysus were to emerge. The Dadaist went back to the role of the artist as a finder and collector, as researcher and creator. He proceeded into the intersections of his times, of the socio-cultural, economical, political, scientific, and medial upheavals, and included the entanglements of society, culture, everyday, and private life in his art. The eye was directed especially toward the extra-artistic media becoming sensitized to a more optical era and specifically to communication-through-media, which more and more replaced the direct perception of the world. Along with photography and the image set in motion by film, the media of reproduction — newspapers, the serial artifacts of everyday life, and the new signs on urban streets — and cartography, x-ray, anatomical and mechanical cuts, diagrams and blueprints increasingly became the focus of the Dadaist’s critical attention. Contrary to the Renaissance artist, the Dadaist had lost his anthropocentrism; he rather continued the mannerism that had developed out of and against the Renaissance, radicalizing dadaistically its fusions, its polyvalence, entanglements, and distortions of shape, its multi-materialities and differences of realities, its different aesthetic possibilities, and variations in keeping with the times. The multi-perspective explosions of the Dadaist processes of perception had their unstable vanishing points in the tragic Dionysian imponderability of the real chaos of its times.

Dada without End

The paradoxical and emphatic quality of Dada, reverting to a point zero, the super-individual and ecstatic character of the extremes between “everything” and “nothing,” between crash and “more life” after 1922 and 1923 lost its catastrophic dimensions in the apparently stabilizing conditions of the Weimar Republic.

If we look back once again, World War I and its existential and cultural failure of world-orientation had triggered the deep crisis in perception for Dada. The new techno-political dimensions of an unleashed course of the world overruled the traditional ideas of power and powerlessness. The Dadaists saw themselves involved in a historical and cultural breakdown, just as much as in a raging progress. They expressed this negative dialectics of the current events formally and semantically in the polarizing methods of montage and metamechanics. On the one hand they exposed their imagination with a tragic Dionysian desire for cultural extinction; on the other, they attempted to ward it off.

In the conflict of the polarizing camps of modernity Dada’s colliding procedures continued in a modified way in the avant-garde of the twenties. These intentions manifested that modernity was not a unified phenomenon, but that it was divided by just this polarity — between autonomy and social involvement, abstractions and symbioses of art and life, utopias and absurdities.

Subsequently the principle of montage developed into an avant-garde method, connecting rapt attention with a wandering joy of seeing to “perceive simultaneously, or to conceptualize
DADA’S ARTISTRY—PLAY OF POLARITIES

boldly, or to deduce quickly” (Brecht). The montage, with its inhomogeneous and discontinuous structures was suitable both to aestheticize the urban “cult of diversion” or to argue critically with regard to epistemology and perception, and to play off reality against appearance, according to different artistic intentions. Contrary to this, it could also provoke a surreal picture puzzle playing between reality and virtuality. The montage could express the mental and political trouble spots of the era in a complex way, stimulating all the arts and characterizing in particular the new media of advertisement and film.

In the International Exhibition of the German Werkbund: Film and Photography (Stuttgart 1929) and the exhibition Fotomontage (Berlin 1931) these new medial possibilities were summarized. In 1928 Ernst Bloch even assigned the term “photomontage” to the Denkbilder (contemplative images), which Walter Benjamin had created in his short prose pieces in Einbahnstrasse (One-way Street, 1928). In 1935, in Erbschaft dieser Zeit (Heritage of this Age), Bloch set off the procedure of montage as an important gain for art, literature, and film — now from the perspective of Weimar’s ending in Nazi Germany. But also in theory of art the principle of montage in connection with Aby Warburg’s Mnemosyne Atlas (1926–29) gained importance. By taking the functional changes of the image into consideration, he delineated their modification, their character, and articulatory creations since antiquity in comparative expositions of photographed artworks, objects, and trivial pictures. Like a researcher, he operated on the heterogeneous material, exposing polar conflicts of historical experience that anticipated modernity, for example the clash of Dionysian pagan forms in the early Renaissance with the subdued medieval ones of devout piety.

Contrary to the method of montage, the metamechanics strengthened the Apollinian concentration on forms of representation with a calm, matter-of-fact pictorial language. This view of society focused its physiognomies socio-critically within Neue Sachlichkeit (New Objectivity). But it also went inward and opened fictional realms in Magischer Realismus (Magic Realism), consenting to the rootlessness of the era, apparently connecting absurdity with plausibility, the tragic with everyday events. The big exhibition of New Objectivity (Mannheim 1925) showed that this movement comprised quite diverging pictorial conceptions but that the tendency of banishing was prevalent, mastering the antagonism more by warding off conflicts than by exposing their tensions. The “lines of passion and mathematics” (Jünger), crossing in the new matter-of-fact model of the times, were not so much ironically broken. Instead, they often demonstrated a new strength, heroically asserting itself in the chaos of modernity.Contours became important again.

By contrast, surrealism worked both with the principles of montage and with those of metamechanics. On the one hand, the outside was able to penetrate into the interior of inspiration; on the other the creative process was hermetically restricted in favor of “profane illumination” (Benjamin). By obliterating the cuts of the montages, the transitions between reality and surreality obscured their clear borderlines. The realms inspired by pittura metafisica widened their horizons into hallucinations of “cold ecstasy” (Breton), leaving the metamechanical city-representations of Dada.

Dada’s tendency to emptiness and its ambivalent interpretation acquired a more unequivocal liberating function in the context of the Bauhaus. This connection between art and technology entered into a dynamic balance without calling it into question. Rather, the constructivist concept underlined that an adaptation of the senses to the new dimensions of technological development could bring forth a hitherto unknown weightlessness. The Bauhaus-exhibition (Weimar 1923), like the exhibition of Russian constructivist art in 1922 in Berlin and
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the movement of *De Stijl* in Holland, demonstrated a balanced *Stilwollen der Maschine* (will to style of the machine; van Doesburg).

By opening up for the first time in the twenties to the incalculable principle of chance and to ambivalent and ambiguous meanings, daring “everything” and “nothing,” the Dadaists found a new relation to balance. This brought with it similar creative work. Moholy-Nagy’s bottomless acts of balance in his *Fotoplastiken* (Photo-sculptures), Klee’s tightrope walkers, Schlemmer’s dancing figurines, Ernst’s *Femme chancelante* (Swaying Woman) even Beckmann’s tumbling, floating acrobats experience balance as an artistic challenge to be won time and again in and over chaos. All of them still seem to be neighbors of the *tollen Menschen* (raving person) as Nietzsche depicted him in *Fröhliche Wissenschaft*, searching for a myth of modernity.

For the first time in the century Dada made art “free for the demands of the times” (Hausmann), defining it as *Erzeugnis* (product), as created interactively, social-politically constituted, as a field of effects, resonances, and virtualities, developing complex deconstructive strategies to undermine power with the method of provoking irony, so that after the end of the 1960s it could again become a model for countercultural movements.

Using the upgrading of production and material, the principles of montage, action, and performance, Fluxus, Neo-Dada, Nouveau Réalisme, and Pop Art were influenced by Dada in the 1960s. Contradictions, multivalences, relativities, radical plurality, provoking mixtures of style, a multitude of materials, and the actionist concept of Dada inspired these artists to develop the principle of montage into intermedial projects of music, theater, poetry, art, video, and film.

Even the kinetic concept of Jean Tinguely was characterized by Dadaist metamechanics, while the space-orientation reached out to the sound concepts of John Cage, reducing it to absolute silence and void. By attempting to grasp functionality for its own sake, acknowledging to the diagram and the *Planriß* (blueprint) a semantics of its own, Dadaist metamechanics laid the foundations for an experimental conceptual culture.

The courage to make the breaks visible, to keep things unfinished and apparently disordered, to let things collide and polarized, this is what connects Dada also with the multi-layered skepticism of contemporary tendencies of postmodernism. Both Dada and postmodern tendencies are rooted in the experimental line of Nietzsche’s philosophy. It is the conscious acceptance of conflict, of change, of “complexity and contradictoriness,” and of multiplicity that characterize these movements of transition and crisis.

With its early upgrading and revaluation of art into a method that opened up to chaos, deciphering its signs, accepting an undirected energy without goals, Dada is influencing present-day art. While this new intellectual attitude rejected one-dimensional progress orientation, countering medial constructions with their own means, it developed new possibilities of irony, contingency, intuition, memory, and playing, accepted errors as challenges, demanded movement and lightness in difficulties, suggesting time and again that processual contradictoriness could not be terminated. It created the sophisticated type of cosmopolitan, who in the future could take on a reality showing itself increasingly as a labyrinthine riddle, especially in its systems of order, one who counters the randomness brought about by the processes of de-limitation with the method of polarity, always consciously keeping a balance on “light ropes,” still dancing at the edge of the abyss.

As *microbe vierge* (virginal microbe, Tzara), Dada was implanted in international art, keeping its subversive and resistant appeal well, ready to spread irritatingly at any time. For “Dada can be applied to everything, and still it is nothing; it is the point at which the Yes and the
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No meet, not solemnly in the castles of man’s philosophies, but simply on the corner of streets like dogs or grasshoppers. Dada is useless like everything in life” (Tzara).
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Jedermann,
der lesen kann,  
ist meinem Reiz verfallen.  
Jedermann, der auf sich hält, er stellt mir nach.  
Über jeden führt ich Buch, wenn etwas vorgefallen,  
ob der Unmensch einen Mord, ob ein Gedicht verbrach.  
Der Provinzler lernt das Gruseln vor der Sünde,  
Und der Künstler schlottert bleich vor der Kritik,  
Auch der Staatsmann, daß ich seine Schwächen finde,  
Denn ich lüfte die Dessous der Politik.  
Das Histörchen und Skandälchen suchtt Verbreitung,  
Bis die Neuigkeit die ganze Welt durchdringt!  
So erscheint an jedem Tag mein Kind, die Zeitung,  
Schwarz auf weiß geschmückt und unschuldsvoll geschminkt.  
Durch die Straßen ein Getümmel.  
Und dann bricht es  
Wie aus heitem Himmel  
Des Gerüchtes Donnerwetter:  
EXTRABLÄTTER! EXTRABLÄTTER!  
Und es wächst die Zeitungsletter  
Aus der Rotationsmaschine  
Zur Lawine aus Papier!  
Und ein Flüstern  
Neugierlüstern:  
Was ich wohl verbergen mag!  
Von der Sensationenfülle  
Löst sich Blatt für Blatt die Hülle—  
Ich, Frau Presse, bring es an den Tag!
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