

# LESSONS IN

THE ROOTS AND RAMIFICATIONS  
OF BOUNDARIES

# SURREAL-IST

LESSONS IN FREEDOM OF SPEECH



WORDS: MARTIN LANG

SPEECH  
FREEDOM OF



Stewart Atkins, *Exquisite Corpses Homage*, 2015.

In 2007, the Hayward Gallery hosted *The Monster in the Night of the Labyrinth*, a major contemporary live art event inspired by Georges Bataille's writing. For example, it featured Ron Athey's seminal performance *Solar Anus* and Lee Adams' *Language of Flowers* (both based on Bataille's essays of the same names). These contemporary surrealist performances featured live anal penetration, as artists attempted faithful renditions of Bataille's ideas. Such performances are now under attack.

The surrealists actively sought to engage with the unconscious, unleashing its contents unchecked by reason or morality, as the definition taken from the founding *Manifesto of Surrealism* makes clear.

**SURREALISM, n.** *Psychic automatism in its pure state, by which one proposes to express-verbally, by means of the written word, or in any other manner-the actual functioning*

*of thought. Dictated by thought, in the absence of any control exercised by reason, exempt from any aesthetic or moral concern. (Breton 1924)*

'Automatism' has the same root as 'automatic' or 'automaton'; it refers to something that functions of its own accord. Our bodies have many automatic functions, such as the beating of our heart, digestion and breathing. These are necessary functions, but sometimes we do unnecessary things unconsciously, such as sleepwalking, nervous twitches, tics, the infamous Freudian slip and so on. Surrealist leader André Breton would later declare that 'pure psychic automatism was the guiding principle of surrealism'. (Breton 1953). Freud argued that these are all manifestations of suppressed emotions and trauma, the implication being that you have to deal with these issues, because if suppressed they will only resurface without your consent or even knowledge.

The surrealists played a dangerous game by attempting to unleash such forces. This essay considers the most perverse suppressed desires, fears, sadism, masochism and other perversions that might surface when we open the door to the unconscious. It questions whether these would be best left alone, and whether art should remain unchecked by reason and morality, or whether it should be censored.

### The Roots of Automatism in Writing and Drawing

Breton was a pioneer of the earliest kinds of automatism in art. He developed automatic writing, a technique where you write as fast as possible without pausing to think. The idea is that unconscious thoughts come unexpectedly to the fore. Similarly, Max Ernst developed surrealist collage. He would assemble seemingly random newspaper and magazine clippings, adverts taken from catalogues and anything else he could get his hands on. Apparently random juxtapositions potentially reveal unconscious connections made in the mind. It could be argued that surrealist collage was the first example of automatism in visual art. Another André, André Masson, deserves a special mention for his contribution to automatic drawing. According to William Rubin (former director of Painting and Sculpture at the Museum of Modern Art) and Carolyn Lanchner (former research curator, also at MoMA), Masson virtually invented the surrealist technique and it was he who extended the automatist approach into painting. (Rubin & Lanchner 1976).

One example of surrealist automatic drawing is the *Exquisite Corpse*. In 1925, surrealists including Yves Tanguy and André Breton developed a collaborative drawing approach to create random and instinctual images. Surrealist *Exquisite Corpse* resembles the party game called Consequences, where players write a sentence on a sheet of paper, folding it over before they pass it on so that the next person cannot see what they have written.

## UNCONSCIOUS THOUGHTS COME UNEXPECTEDLY TO THE FORE

This results in often hilariously random short stories. The *Exquisite Corpse* is similar but involves the drawing of body parts, again folding the paper over as you go so that the next person cannot see what you have drawn. These techniques appear to generate random and funny outcomes. So far, not so controversial.

Hans Bellmer fled Nazi Germany for Paris in the years preceding the war. He was welcomed by the surrealist group who described him in their 1938 *Dictionnaire abrégé du surréalisme* as a 'surrealist writer, painter, and builder of large dolls'. (Webb & Short 1985). Indeed, Bellmer remains best known for the life-sized pubescent female dolls he produced in the 1930s, entitled *Poupée (Doll)*. Bellmer's doll sculptures were made out of wood, metal, papier mâché, straw and plaster. These unsettling sculptures contained several important

surrealist qualities: they were subversive, erotic, sadistic and fetishistic. They remind us of childhood and how cruel children can be. Many seem to express a fascination with ball joints, and several contain nuts and bolts. Indeed, one work was originally known as *Ball Joint*.

### Pre-Emptive Exposure Therapy

Following Bellmer's warm reception and subsequent rise to fame for his macabre mannequins he made a series of photographs titled *Jeux de la Poupée (Doll Games)*, that were published in the surrealist journal *Minotaure* in the 1930s. In these photographs, Bellmer sited his dolls in various different locations and situations. The photographs are clearly more than documentation of a sculpture; they are artworks in their own right and assume an equal if not greater importance to the sculptures. Bellmer delicately hand-tinted each one. The chosen hues recall early twentieth century erotic postcards. The colours are not accidental. The pinks are sexual, the red suggests violence, and the yellow evokes sickness. The title perhaps indicates links to childhood (dolls are toys after all).



However, they might also remind us of the recent developments in adult sex robots. Indeed, Bellmer took inspiration from Jacques Offenbach's opera, *Tales of Hoffmann* (1881), in which the main character falls in love with a mechanical doll that comes to life. One of Bellmer's sculptures makes the element of sexual fantasy explicit by reducing the subject to two sets of hips. Is the doll perhaps a willing playmate? The images indicate anything but the case. They are more reminiscent of an abduction or some kind of S&M sexual fetish. Or maybe an even more grisly fantasy: tied up, dismembered torsos hang from trees or sit on staircases.

The doll could be read as a metaphor for the dehumanising effects of industrialisation (which the ball joints point to) and the devaluing of human life following two world wars. Seen in this way, they operate within an artistic tradition that includes paintings and prints of the dismembered and contorted veterans returning from war by Otto Dix and George Grosz. This reminds us that, no matter how disturbing artworks such as Bellmer's dolls are, they are only echoes of the worst atrocities committed in the real world. With this in mind, it is noteworthy that although the dolls are of an ambiguous age, the white socks and dainty shoes indicate they might be young, confronting the viewer with possible paedophilic connotations. Indeed, the inspiration for Bellmer's doll works came from unfulfilled sexual desire for his underage cousin Ursula Naguschewski, who was living with him and his wife at the time.

After realising that Bellmer might be revealing a sinister side to his character (and by extension, of society's character), the viewer becomes aware that they might be the voyeur, observing from the shadows. While the sculptures do have a certain connection to theatrical props, this sense of theatricality is fully realised in the photographs, which seem to be reminding the audience that they are representations rather than documentation of actual sexual fantasies and fetishes. Rosalind Krauss described Bellmer's use of the doll as a tactic to 'produce the image of what one fears, in order to protect oneself from what one fears—this is the strategic achievement of anxiety, which arms the subject, in advance, against the onslaught of trauma, the blow that takes one by surprise'. (Bois & Krauss 1997). This reminds us that Freud developed and used psychoanalysis

Left: image courtesy of the artist © Stewart Atkins. Right: Trebuchet Magazine 2020.



Above: Doll, 2020  
Left: Stewart Atkins, *Broken Dreams*, 2015.

as a therapy to heal trauma. Could it be that Bellmer's practice has a similarly therapeutic quality? Are we to consider Bellmer's work as a pre-emptive, cautionary hardening against mental damage?

Today, the jury is out regarding the effectiveness of Freud's methods. There are serious accusations that psychoanalysis is merely a pseudoscience. The philosopher Karl Popper led the assault, with philosopher of mathematics Imre Lakatos noting that psychoanalysts have no answer to Popper's criticisms and that they refuse to 'specify experimental conditions under which they would give up their basic assumptions'. (Lakatos 1980). Philippa Perry, presenter of the BBC programme *How to be a Surrealist* (2017), has noted how the widespread opinion that it is better to open up about your problems has been challenged in recent times. Perry, herself a psychotherapist who stands to gain by promoting psychoanalysis, acknowledges that the psychologist Walter Mischel 'discovered that talking about your trauma doesn't, as is often advised, necessarily diminish the ill effects, but can make them worse'. (Perry 2014).

Could it be that, instead of being an act of therapy, Bellmer is opening up old wounds with no promise of healing? Hal Foster (2001) seems to suggest that Bellmer's practice could indeed be considered as an act of self-harm when he writes that:

*In his sadistic scenes Bellmer leaves behind masochistic traces; in his erotic manipulation of the dolls he explores a sadistic impulse that is also self-destructive. In this way the dolls may go inside sadistic mastery to the point where the subject confronts its greatest fear: its own fragmentation and disintegration.*

Bellmer's impact on surrealist art was evidenced in the *Exposition Internationale du Surréalisme* (Paris 1938). Mannequins became de rigueur.

## IN HIS EROTIC MANIPULATION OF THE DOLLS HE EXPLORES A SADISTIC IMPULSE

André Masson exhibited a female mannequin with a bird cage over its head, simply titled *Mannequin*. The wicker birdcage opened to reveal that the 'mouth was gagged by a strip of green velvet; in place of the mouth was a pansy'. (Rubin & Lanchner 1976). The mannequin was naked except for some tiny stuffed birds nesting in the armpits and 'below the belt, a red cord that simulated a bloody gash, there was in place of the sex an oval mirror surrounded by tiger eyes and topped by a plume'. (Rubin & Lanchner 1976). This was one of about 20 mannequins that formed a group installation called *The Most Beautiful Streets of Paris*. Behind each mannequin was a Paris street sign.

The aforementioned Max Ernst along with Marcel Duchamp, Man Ray, Jean (Hans) Arp, Joan Miró and even Salvador Dalí contributed mannequins. (Rubin & Lanchner 1976). Dalí's effort, entitled *Rainy Taxi*, rained water onto mannequins sitting inside a taxi as their skin crawled with live snails. Dolls and mannequins had become important surrealist motifs. They appeared to be simultaneously alive and inhuman. Links to Freud's uncanny are clear to see and given Freud's major influence on the movement it is inconceivable that these artists were not aware of Freud's essay, "The Uncanny" (first published in 1919). While these motifs were clearly important to the surrealists, the concepts behind the dolls and mannequins pre-dated Bellmer.

### Sliced Women: The Recurring Allure of the Blade

Man Ray's *Anatomies* (1929) is a series of photographs of nude torsos. Sometimes bodies are cropped to appear headless. At other times the viewer's attention is drawn to other fragmented body parts, which require the viewer to consider them as detached from the whole. An exhibition at the Tate (2001-2002) called *Surrealism: Desire Unbound* posited that:



Image courtesy of Modern Panic.

Hans Bellmer, *Les Crimes de l'Amour*, 1968.



H. R. Giger, *Biomechanical Landscape IIa*, 1976.

Unlike conventional images of the female body, the use of unusual lighting and darkroom techniques emphasises their artificiality. The figure is often distorted and in several photographs [...] the head has been cropped out [while in another] the angle of the model's tilted head and neck makes her flesh resemble an erect penis.

Alberto Giacometti is best known for his elongated bronzes that resemble Tim Burton's *Nightmare Before Christmas* (1993). However, between 1930 and 1933 he made a series of works that used displaced body parts. *Woman with Her Throat Cut* (1932) is one of these works and the title makes the latent misogyny, that has only been hinted at so far in this essay, explicit. This time body parts, rather than being fragmented, are displaced. Giacometti turns the body inside out. These sculptures resemble insects, with their exoskeletons, but also one might imagine spinal cords, a chicken being prepared for Sunday lunch, or images from Ridley Scott's *Alien* (1979). The woman may have had her throat cut, and she may appear disembowelled, but she is also conceptualised as a threat: a praying mantis or a black widow ready to consume her mate... or the viewer, perhaps.

Themes of violence and domination, mingled with fear of a devouring female, are also present in the sculpture and installations of Louise Bourgeois. Bourgeois' work is well known to reflect the psychological trauma of her father's affair with her English governess, and other events in her childhood. These traumatic experiences emerged in the form of spiders, cages, medical tools, and 'sewn appendages to symbolize the feminine psyche, beauty, and psychological pain' in her sculptures and installations. (Martinique 2019). The trope continues age-old themes of woman as devourer or castration anxiety. With it, comes the inevitable reaction; man-on-woman violent retribution, from Jack the Ripper to revenge porn is a recurring counterstroke, although it more commonly breaks out of the depictive realm and into real life. Although Hans Bellmer and Louise Bourgeois were both in touch with the surrealists in the 1930s, the two artists never met. Nonetheless, there are commonalities between their work as highlighted in the exhibition entitled *Double Sexus* (The Hague, 2011). Dismembered androgynous bodies play a major role in both artists' practices, whose legacy can be seen in the work of Sarah Lucas (think of Bellmer's legs on chairs and Bourgeois' stuffed tights).

Image courtesy of Modern Panic.



**” THE UNINTENDED AROUSAL REDUCES THEM TO THE SAME LEVEL... AS THE MOB THEY SO DESPISE ”**

**Fellated Priests and Other Taboos**

Georges Bataille was a French essayist, philosophical theorist and novelist. He was the thinker of the unthinkable; in his work, it *all* came out. He exhibited an almost Sadean interest in sex, death and the potential of the obscene. Bataille’s book *Histoire de l’oeil (The Story of the Eye)* chronicles the sexual escapades and misbehaviour of an anonymous adolescent narrator and his lover Simone. It was wisely published under a pseudonym, as it was subsequently condemned by the Criminal Court of the Seine, France, in 1951. The book, first published in 1928, contained eight lithograph illustrations by André Masson. It was reissued twice in Bataille’s lifetime, but not published under his real name until 1967–40 years after the original publication and five years after his death. (Surya 2010). This version, and the previous one from around 1952, was published by Jean-Jacques Pauvert, notable for also publishing the works of the Marquis de Sade.

Bataille shared Bellmer’s fascination with dismembered bodies. For example, he became captivated by a photograph of Fu Chou Li, a tortured Chinese assassin who was slowly executed by being cut up into 100 pieces. Fu was plied with opium to prolong the agony, but as such, he can be seen smiling as if in ecstasy. (Surya 2010). Later issues of *Histoire de l’oeil* include 12 aquatint engravings by Bellmer, who made a series of scandalous photographs as studies for the set of aquatints. Pornographic in nature, the photographs are nonetheless artistically composed. They feature cropped female bodies that you would expect from

Bellmer (the heads usually not visible) often fingering themselves. The engravings illustrate some of the most disturbing scenes from the book, including its ending.

The story ends with the murder of a Spanish priest called Don Aminado. Simone goes to a church to confess her sins, but she starts masturbating in the confessional. She informs the priest of what she is doing before opening the door and seducing him, while the narrator and Sir Edmund look on. The three degenerates spontaneously take Aminado to the vestry where he is stripped and fellated by Simone. Sir Edmund explains to Aminado that hanged men get erections and ejaculate as their respiration is cut off. This will be the priest’s fate. Simone strangles the priest while riding him. Then the murderous scene takes a bizarre twist. Simone declares that the priest’s eye is an egg that she wants to play with and demands that Sir Edmund cut it out. Simone takes the eye and inserts it into her vagina and the narrator sees the eye gazing at him from its new socket. The vagina is a surrealist motif for the eye and Bellmer would later restate this connection when he made a drawing of his lover and muse Unica Zürn, titled *Eye Vulva* (1964).

Although this, in common with much of de Sade’s work, has deep artistic significance and motive, it is disingenuous to pretend that there’s no deliberate intent to arouse. This is not accident; the aim is to make the viewer or reader *complicit*. Smut disturbs the conservative viewer not because their morals are higher, but because the

unintended arousal reduces them to the same level, with the same body responses, as the mob they so despise.

So far, this essay has framed the unfettered engagement with the unconscious as a dangerous endeavour that might invoke sadistic, masochistic and even misogynistic tendencies. Against Freud, the case has been made that this might not be therapeutic and that ‘bottling it up’ might not be so bad after all. This position is akin to the Three Wise Monkeys or Christian positions of only thinking pure thoughts... lest they become reality. The opposite position will now be considered, that despite these potential dangers it is better to acknowledge your fears and desires and that, so long as they remain fantasies, this is preferable to suppressing them.

**The Political Ramifications of Artistic Censorship**

Surrealist art might be challenging, and it might contain disturbing attitudes towards women, but this reflects society as much as the individual artist (because what they depict, even if shocking, really exists). Allowing artists to offend is a positive sign of a healthy society. It demonstrates tolerance of difference without knee-jerk bans or censorship. The point of free speech is that we allow people to say and express things that we disagree with, even if it offends. We know from Freud that suppressing issues only results in their resurfacing later on (often with a vengeance, sometimes having already caused harm). It is conceivable that the rise of populism is a symptom of such a repression. The election of Trump and the Brexit referendum result could be conceptualised, in part, as the product of frustrated voters who felt they had suppressed their beliefs because they were perceived to be politically incorrect. Political correctness has resulted in self-censorship in the arts, too. Let us consider examples from comedy and music before turning to art.

Tom Walker (aka Jonathan Pie) was interviewed by Krishnan Guru-Murthy for Channel 4 News about satire and freedom of speech. He rails against ‘woke comedy’ where jokes about

race, sexuality and gender have become no-go areas. The rise of ‘snowflake’ venues and programmers that he refers to apparently cannot tell the difference between a joke and the literal truth (i.e. the subject of the joke). The irony is that so-called ‘liberal’ and ‘progressive’ concerns about normalising discriminatory language and attitudes are manifested as intolerance to jokes. This righteous attitude embodies a deep condescending distrust of the general public, who are seen as being only one joke away from becoming fascists, when perhaps they are perfectly capable of understanding the joke, and even acknowledging its humour.

While stand-up comedy is largely self-censored (perhaps the price for venturing into no-go areas is too dangerous to contemplate), in music the censorship comes in legal form. Form 696 was used to censor grime, garage and drum ‘n’ bass music by requesting that venues provide advanced information such as the names of DJs, the genre of music and even ethnicity of the audience. London mayor Sadiq Khan banned its use, but since then the censorship of drill music has been a hot topic. An injunction banned drill artists from using certain words, irrespective of their context. (Bernard 2019; Thapar 2019). In early 2019 two drill artists, Skengdo and AM, made legal history when they were given suspended prison sentences for performing their song “Attempted 1.0”. (Hancox 2019).

Attempts to censor drill fail to recognise that it is a symptom of gang culture. Censoring young black people talking about the violence they live under seems wrong. The effect of such music is often overrated. Eminem’s lyrics are impressively angry and violent. They also contain homophobic and misogynistic references. Listening to Eminem did not turn me into a ‘gangsta’, homophobe or misogynist. The corrupting effects of music have been debated at least as far back as 1950s rock ‘n’ roll. In the 1960s Kris Kristofferson sang “Blame it on the Stones”, referring to the scapegoating of the Rolling Stones for perceived moral decline, rise in drug-taking,

sexual promiscuity and anything else on offer. This position was echoed by Eminem when he sang 'And they blame it on Marilyn and the heroin; [but] Where were the parents at?' ('The Way I Am' 2000) in reference to the Columbine High School Massacre (1999) and subsequent accusations levied at Marilyn Manson.

What is the price of *not* censoring music and comedy? Tasteless jokes about taboo topics and lyrics glorifying violence and gang culture. Dehumanising and othering of the ridiculed groups. Stereotyping and normalisation of discrimination. Or none of the above. Whilst it's arguable that the term 'it's just a joke' is the vanguard statement of ever more racist and discriminatory narratives, we must also be careful of allowing mob rule from self-appointed guardians of public morality, too. The renowned gay rights activist Peter Tatchell argues that freedom of speech should be allowed, no matter how distasteful, with only three exceptions. The first, incitement to violence, is already prohibited by law, but even this should be context-based. For example, a joke about blowing up Robin Hood Airport because of a delayed flight should not have resulted in prosecution. (Rawlinson 2012). The second is defamation: the spreading of malicious lies. In the United Kingdom, this is prohibited under the libel law. Again, this must be context-based, as it is possible to use irony and satire. The last is harassment. Posting threatening messages to people (or graffitiing them on their property) is unacceptable. It is logically necessary to prohibit these three exceptions, because they restrict free speech themselves.

Let us examine the surrealist examples against these three criteria. Did any of the artworks incite violence? It would be difficult to make a case that featuring violence, or even the glorification of

violent acts is incitement, unless you want to ban most horror films. There are no explicit calls to enact violence. Did any of the works defame anybody? No. Surrealist art is fictional, imaginary, and if anything, reflects on the artists themselves; none of the examples here even refer to real people. Do they harass anybody? Presumably, an artwork that harasses would be pretty obvious. According to the Smithsonian 'at least 110 Confederate monuments and symbols have been removed since 2015'. (Katz 2018). Icons to slavery looming over your house, place of work or school could be read as threatening, but they do not target individuals and statues are not

considered to 'harass' anybody. Surrealist art might make women uncomfortable, even offended, but it does not amount to harassment, defamation or incitement to violence.

However, the art world is becoming more 'woke' and as such censorship (or self-censorship) is on the rise. Calls for art to be censored on moral or ethical grounds used to be the domain of the conservative, religious right. These motivations differ from Communist censorship in the Soviet Union and China, where morals and ethics played a secondary role (if they played a role at all) to political ideology. Conservatives, on the other hand, have a history of calling for artworks to be banned on the grounds of 'decency'. For example, in the United States two Republican Senators, Jesse Helms and Alfonse D'Amato, took legal action to censor a retrospective of Robert Mapplethorpe's work (*A Perfect Moment*, Contemporary Arts Center Cincinnati, 1990). This was the first time that a museum director in the United States had faced criminal charges because of an art exhibition. The *Sensation* exhibition (Royal Academy of Arts, London 1997) caused a stir because of Marcus Harvey's portrait of child murderer Myra Hindley.

” THE ART WORLD IS BECOMING MORE 'WOKE' AND AS SUCH (SELF) CENSORSHIP IS ON THE RISE

Image courtesy of the artist © Stewart Atkins.



When *Sensation* toured to the Brooklyn Museum of Art in 1999, Mayor Rudy Giuliani and others were offended by Chris Ofili's *Holy Virgin Mary* (1996). The image featured a black Madonna adorned with Ofili's trademark elephant dung. This demonstrates that what is deemed offensive varies from person to person and culture to culture. The controversy surrounding *The Holy Virgin Mary* is reminiscent of Andre Serrano's infamous photograph commonly referred to as *Piss Christ* (1987), which features a crucifix submerged in a vat of urine. Both these artworks elicited calls for censorship on the grounds of blasphemy. The church might be the ultimate arbiter of what is and what is not profane regarding religious matters, but who decides when sex and violence become gratuitous? Where is the red line? Perhaps conservative calls for censorship on these matters reveal something about the complainant's unconscious. Perhaps they fear that if such things are let out of Pandora's box they won't be able to control themselves (or that the leaden proles won't be so easily co-opted to their crusades).

In place of decency and blasphemy, self-appointed virtue-signalling arbiters of the morally dubious call for art to be censored on the grounds of patriarchy and cultural appropriation. Three recent examples include: Sonia Boyce's evening takeover at Manchester Art Gallery in 2018, where she infamously removed Waterhouse's *Hylas and the Nymphs* (1896) to raise a debate about depictions of women in art history in the wake of #MeToo (Eden 2018); accusations of cultural appropriation levied at Luke Willis Thompson during the 2018 Turner Prize; and calls for a painting by Dana Schutz to be removed from the Whitney Biennial 2017 and destroyed (also for cultural appropriation).

Lois Keidan, co-founder and director of the Live Art Development Agency (LADA), has reported an increase in complaints about LADA events such as *The Monster*

*in the Night of the Labyrinth* mentioned at the start of this essay, but especially so with events at more underground and intimate spaces that people have 'unwittingly' attended, having seen the event advertised on social media, but being unaware of the content. Keidan (2015) notes that all the events for which she has received complaints were in 'under the radar, artist-run, and aimed at specific "communities of interest"'. According to Keidan, people enter underground events hosted by subcultures, in spaces where they have no history of attending or understanding of context, and then demand censorship. For J. J. Charlesworth, however, art should never be boxed off for special interest communities so that it doesn't offend the outside world. For Charlesworth (2015), the danger is that all artworks will end up being shut off in sealed boxes (whether it's to protect the public from the degeneracy of the artists, or to protect the cognoscenti from the grubby mores of the masses is irrelevant) with signs saying 'by appointment only to the appropriate community of interest'.

If artists, musicians and comedians feel they cannot make work about certain topics then, by definition, art itself will become diminished. The furore around *Sensation* reminds us that morality is not fixed. Part of the role of art is to challenge the parameters of morality, not merely accept them. The surrealists certainly pushed these boundaries, asking questions of their audience as they did so. This is artistic freedom: long may it continue.

## CENSORED ON THE " GROUND OF PATRIARCHY AND CULTURAL APPROPRIATION

### References

- Bernard, J 2019, 'Censoring drill artists is an attack on Black self-expression', *Metro*, 25 October, <<https://metro.co.uk/2019/10/25/censoring-drill-artists-is-an-attack-on-black-self-expression-10970971>>.
- Bois, Y-A & Krauss, R 1997, *Formless: A User's Guide*, Zone Books, USA
- Breton, A 1924, 'Manifesto of Surrealism', in R Seaver & H R Lane (trans.), *Manifestoes of Surrealism*, University of Michigan Press, USA.
- Breton, A 1953, 'On Surrealism in Its Living Works', in R Seaver & H R Lane (trans.), *Manifestoes of Surrealism*, University of Michigan Press, USA.
- Charlesworth, JJ 2015, 'Why Self-Censorship of Controversial Artwork is Wrong', *Artnet News*, 28 January, <<https://news.artnet.com/art-world/why-self-censorship-of-controversial-artwork-is-wrong-234778>>.
- Eden, M 2018, 'Sonia Boyce and a Meta Criticism of the Critics', *Trebuchet*, 6 February, <<https://www.trebuchet-magazine.com/sonia-boyce-meta-criticism-critics>>.
- Foster, H 2001, 'Violation and Veiling in Surrealist photography: Woman as Fetish, as Shattered Object, as Phallus', in J Mundy (ed.), *Surrealism: Desire Unbound*, Princeton University Press, USA.
- Hancox, D 2019, 'Skengdo and AM: the drilla rappers sentenced for playing their song', *The Guardian*, 31 January, <<https://www.theguardian.com/music/2019/jan/31/skengdo-and-am-the-drill-rappers-sentenced-for-playing-their-song>>.
- Katz, B 2018, 'At least 110 Confederate Monuments and Symbols Have Been Removed Since 2015', *Smithsonian Magazine*, 8 June, <<https://www.smithsonianmag.com/smart-news/least-110-confederate-monuments-and-symbols-have-been-removed-2015-180969254>>.
- Keidan, L 2015, 'The "underground" arts scene is now just a click away from the easily offended', *The Guardian*, 17 January, <<https://www.theguardian.com/stage/theatreblog/2015/jan/17/underground-art-mainstream-culture-outrage-sex-morality>>.
- Lakatos, I 1980, *The methodology of scientific research programmes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martiniq, E 2019, 'Julie Mehretu and Louise Bourgeois In The Spotlight at Kettle's Yard', *Widewalls*, 23 January, <<https://www.widewalls.ch/julie-mehretu-louise-bourgeois-kettles-yard>>.
- Surya, M, Fijalkowski K & Richardson M 2010, *Georges Bataille: An Intellectual Biography*, Verso Books, UK & USA.
- Thapar, C 2019, 'Don't censor drill music, listen to what it's trying to tell us', *The Guardian*, 6 February, <<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/feb/06/dont-censor-drill-music-listen-skengdo-am>>.
- Tinto, M 2017, *How to be a Surrealist with Philippa Perry*, BBC Four, <<https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b08l6qd8>>.
- Webb, P & Short, R 1985, *Hans Bellmer*. Quartet Books, UK.
- Perry, P 2014, 'When talking about your problems actually makes them worse', *The Guardian*, 25 September, <<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/sep/25/talking-about-problems-makes-them-worse-walter-mischel>>.
- Rawlinson, K 2012, 'Twitter joke trial man Paul Chambers wins appeal victory', *The Independent*, 27 July, <<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/crime/twitter-joke-trial-man-paul-chambers-wins-appeal-victory-7981742.html>>.
- Rubin, W & Lanchner, C 1976, *Andre Masson, The Museum of Modern Art*, <[https://www.moma.org/documents/moma\\_catalogue\\_2000\\_300297560.pdf](https://www.moma.org/documents/moma_catalogue_2000_300297560.pdf)>.
- Surrealism: Desire unbound: Room 5: Anatomies*, Tate, <<https://www.tate.org.uk/whats-on/tate-modern/exhibition/surrealism-desire-unbound/surrealism-desire-unbound-room-5-anatomies>>.