"Cubism, Dadaism, Futurism, Impressionism, and the rest have nothing in common with our German people. For all these notions are rather old, one as they modern; they are simply the artistic expression of people whom God has denied the gift of genuine artistic talent and given instead the gift of praying and deception." — Adolf Hitler.

The first of these statements was made by Hitler on the opening of the Nazi exhibition of "Degenerate Art" (in reality, an exhibition containing the finest works of the last sixty years of German Democratic art), held at Munich in July, 1937. The second was made by Sir Lionel Lindsay in his recent book, "Addled Art."

Modern Art is not the only topic on which these two gentlemen think alike, as a further remark of Lindsay's will show: "Artists raged, protested, watched the spread of the epidemic (Modern Art) with dismay as they saw their legitimate market invaded by the charlatan sponsored by the Jew."

This statement reflects the main theme of the book; for the author would have us believe that all Modern Art is a gigantic hoax, unrelated to traditional European art; foisted on the unsuspecting public by the Jew. This cannot be taken seriously historically, but of the philosophy it betrays, I will have more to say.

Because Lindsay alleges that his book contains a criticism of Modern Art, let us first examine it from that aspect.
and unsuccessful. Quick to read the sign of the times, he quitted the hard road of good draughtsmanship for the easy down-hill track of novelty." Having set the tone, Lindsay soon demonstrates that, in addition to being a vague historian, he is also a very dishonorable and ignorant person of his own experience.

"...he started with a sound enough training, and his copy of the Old Masters in the Louvre; but he found himself nearing middle age and unsuccessful. Quick to read the signs of the time, he quitted the hard road of good draughtsmanship for the easy down-hill track of novelty." Having set the tone, Lindsay then criticizes his work in terms calculated to exploit this implied lack of integrity: "glamour of charming colour...childish and arbitrary." The truth is that Matisse began to paint the pictures which occasion Lindsay such discomfort when he was in his early twenties. "My Room in Aja e" was painted when he was twenty.

To Lindsay's accusation that Modern artists cannot "represent and draw well," the work of artists like Matisse, Picasso, Derain, Klimt, Stanley Spencer, Grosz, Segonzac and Gropper presents an adequate answer. We are reminded continually of the "distortion" practised by these modern painters. Is distortion new to art? What of the modern painters. Is distortion new to art? What of the truly new," the "salons" are filled with the work of painters like Matisse, Picasso, Derain, Kline, Stanley Spencer, Grosz, Segonzac, and Gropper? Our answer is "yes." The work of such masters as Goya, El Greco, Bosch, Grunewald, and Ingres is designed to imply that there were no Jewish artists before the 19th century. Before going further, I would like to point out that there are four Pissarros in the Louvre. The passage paraphrased above is unsparingly devoted to the "unjust" existence of Modigliani. When we learn that Modigliani was a Socialist, and anti-Imperialist, and although dying of consumption and in the direst need, consistently resisted attempts by rich collectors to popularize his work, we understand the basis of Lindsay's dislike for him. Augustus John and Epstein were both great painters when he was in his early twenties. "My Room in Ajaccio" was painted when he was twenty.
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representation. Before the 19th century, when the part played by Jews in Art and other social activities began to increase, two factors restricted the number of Jewish painters. Overshadowing all other reasons is the position of society which the Jewish people have been forced to occupy throughout the centuries, and still occupy in the fascist countries of the world. Confined to the ghettos, and forbidden to take part in the normal social life of the cities, the opportunity for Jewish painters to develop was limited. One other influence which played a large part in the lack of Jewish visual art, was the religious prohibition against the representation of the human figure or of religious subjects. This had the effect of confining Jewish artistic inspiration mainly to the art of the decorator, and Jewish artists have been famous as gem-setters, seal-cutters, etc. Some of the most beautiful jewellery of Europe has come from the hands of Jewish artisans. With the disintegration of the ghettos of Europe, beginning after the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars, and the gradual "official" emancipation of these people, there was a corresponding broadening of religious outlook, which has made it possible for Jewish artists to use their new freedom unhampere.d by religious restrictions. Jewish painters, musicians, and men of all arts and professions began to appear in greater numbers in the 19th century. Liebermann, Israels and Piazz are provide adequate proof of the artistic talent of the Jewish people. As the century proceeded, this band of artists increased, and we see Picasso, Chagall, Modigliani, Zadkin, Klee, Epstein, and many other Jewish painters and sculptors, all playing a leading part in European art. This is the true story of the sinister "invasion" of the arts which Lindsay so viciously misrepresents.

Jewish participation in the life and culture of society has increased, but this increase in not confined to art. nor did it begin in the 20th century. Lindsay and Vanderpyl dishonestly give this date, as it dovetails their racial prejudice with their respective ideas on art. Both, incapable of an objective attack on Modern Art, look for scenarios on whom they may place the blame; and like that other "eminent" painter and "leader" of culture—Hitler, they blame it on the Jews.

In an attempt to bolster his theory he has put forward. Vanderpyl again, dissect history; there can be no Jewish participation "since it postdates primitiveness." As so much of the primitive art of Europe is unsymmetrical, how can Vanderpyl be sure that because of the work of Jesus. In any case, this statement is not correct, as there are Jewish primitives. In many of the cities of Europe, e.g., Leiden, and the catacombs of Rome, have been found the remains of primitive Jewish religious art. In the city of the Escurial, Dura-Europos, there has been, found a well-preserved Jewish Synagogue rich in ornamentations and frescoes. Apart from this, there is little validity in Vanderpyl's argument. Why should there be a school of Jewish painting? The Jews of Europe were spread over every border and, despite their segregation, they have been influenced by the countries in which they lived, and their art has naturally been expressed in the terms of the art of their environment. Picasso has his roots in Spanish culture, Modigliani is considered an Italian artist, Israels is undoubtedly a product of Dutch life and paintings. To expose the extent of Lindsay's anti-Semitism and reaction, and to provide an answer to this type of charge against Modern Art, was my main reason for writing this article. However, I think that this is a convenient time to examine the position which the Lindsay tradition occupies in Australian art.

The role of the Lindseys has been that of the provincial anarchist and exhibitionist; disseminating social restrictions. The decadence of Petronius, and the reactionary Aryan-myth, "Superman," aspects of Nietzsche and Wagner provided their philisophic background. They quickly became a "fashion," and, in time, the spearhead of chauvinism and cultural reaction in Australia. Their association with the "Bulletin," and Norman's derisive attacks on those who sought to intervene in the first fascist ventures in Spain and Abyssinia, indicates their position. Sir Lionel continually deplores the fact that art is getting beyond the control of the cultured few; that artists are enlisted "from the gutter," and not "from the artisan and middle classes."

Sir Lionel accuses Modern artists (we note that he is careful not to name any Australian artists) of flight from reality. Where in the works of the Lindseys do we find...
any attempt to equate with the life and buildings of their own country? Not in Norman's pornographic procession of monstrous blondes, or his cut-throat pirates and brigands. Not in Lindsay's watercolors, or water colors of Venice. In their settings they see only their sinister thin and warped conception of 'Medievalism.' They cannot see or depict its life and cost, but conceive it only in terms of vice, decadence and the exploitation of women—a trait entirely consistent with their petty anarchism. The artistic bankruptcy of the Lindsay family cannot be better demonstrated than by the fact that, after a lifetime of work, they leave no important pupils. I suggest that Sir Lionel has no right to raise his voice to save Australia, "in its cultural backwater," from the invasion of "foreign" art.

It is from this position of reaction that Lindsay attacks Modern Art. One thing that has characterised all the schools of Modern painting has been the spirit of examination and criticism with which the artists have worked. Men like Courbet, Daumier, Van Gogh, Modigliani, Picasso, Gropper and Grosz have not confined their criticism to the realms of art. It is not for their "distortion," that Modigliani is hated and vilified by the reactionaries, or that Grosz is the artist most hated by the Nazis.

It is not coincidence that the fascist propaganda dodge of "blaming it on the Jews" is employed by Lindsay, and that to support his contentions he quotes such people as Renan, or the French fascist, Camille Mauclair. While mentioning Mauclair, it is important to observe the similarity of Lindsay's book to a pamphlet from which he quotes—"Painting Gone Mad," written by Mauclair and translated into English in 1931. After reading this pamphlet, it is apparent that Lindsay, unable to formulate even an abusive attack on Modern Art, has simply rewritten Mauclair's pamphlet.

At a time when complete unity is absolutely essential to Australia, the appearance of Lindsay's book, echoing as it does, not only the whole vile Nazi outlook on art expressed by Hitler and Goebbels themselves, but also their views on racial discrimination, performs no service to Australian art, to the unity of our cultural workers, or to Australia's war effort as a whole.

Fred Pilgrim