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ABSTRACT

In 1937, the French Surrealist artists Claude Cahun and Marcel Moore moved from Paris to St. Brelade’s Bay on the Isle of Jersey in anticipation of Nazi occupation of Paris. By 1940, the Isle itself became an occupied territory, and as queer Jewish artists, Cahun and Moore found themselves in danger yet again. Despite having the option to flee, they decided to remain on the Isle. From 1940–1944 the artistic collaborators and romantic partners launched an anti-Nazi resistance campaign under the identity, “The Soldier without a Name.” Their acts of resistance took the form of a leafletting campaign, a satirical newspaper service that used surrealistic writing styles in an attempt to inspire an internal mutiny.

This thesis argues that Claude Cahun and Marcel Moore’s anti-Nazi resistance acts are a political performance that relies on multiple subject positions, invisibility, and absence as its dominant strategies. Cahun and Moore’s acts of anti-Nazi resistance were possible through a purposeful invisibility that allowed them to live a private life on the Isle as eccentric sisters at the same time that they dispersed anti-Nazi propaganda, which was attributed to “The Soldier without a Name,” an anonymous German soldier. Scholars such as Louise Downie and Gen Doy have written about Cahun and Moore’s work as anti-Nazi resisters, but their accounts are primarily historiographies. By analyzing Cahun and Moore’s early surrealistic photographs and later political acts as anti-Nazi propagandists through the frame of performance, a deeper understanding of Cahun and Moore’s artistic practice emerges, one that moves beyond the scope of the camera.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project would not have been possible without the support of many people. I would like to thank my adviser, Kristin Romberg, whose advice and encouragement have helped me grow as a scholar. Her feedback throughout the numerous revisions this paper went through have also been invaluable. In addition, many thanks to Terri Weissman, my second reader, whose encouragement throughout my Master’s helped me develop this thesis topic. I am also thankful to the School of Art and Design for awarding me a graduate fellowship during my study. Finally, I would like to thank my family, for all of the late night phone calls, and Lisa Thomas, Sarah Richter, Laura Shea, and Evan Nave for their humor, optimism, and support.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: PERFORMING EVERYDAY LIFE UNDER OCCUPATION .................................1

CHAPTER 2: CAHUN AND MOORE IN PARIS—PRIVATE PHOTOGRAPHS AND
PUBLIC PERSONAS .............................................................................................. 6

CHAPTER 3: FIGHTING FOR THE SURFACE—THE ISLE OF JERSEY AS A
PROPAGANDA WAR ............................................................................................15

CHAPTER 4: BODILY ABSENCE AND ENACTING “THE SOLDIER WITHOUT A
NAME” .................................................................................................................23

CHAPTER 5: PERFORMING POLITICAL FICTIONS—CAHUN’S THEORY OF INDIRECT
ACTION ..................................................................................................................32

CODA ....................................................................................................................41

FIGURES .............................................................................................................43

BIBLIOGRAPHY .................................................................................................55
CHAPTER 1: PERFORMING EVERYDAY LIFE UNDER OCCUPATION

A photograph taken in 1940 by French Surrealist artists Claude Cahun (1894–1954) and Marcel Moore (1892–1972) shows their cat in front of a second-story window at their home, La Rocquaise, on the Isle of Jersey (Fig. 1). Cahun and Moore purchased La Rocquaise in 1937 and moved there permanently in 1938 in anticipation of Nazi occupation of Paris, dubbing their home, “La Ferme sans Nom” (The Farm without a Name).1 While many French surrealists emigrated to New York at this time, Cahun and Moore moved instead to the Isle of Jersey, a British territory off the coast of France. As children, they vacationed at the St. Brelade’s Bay Hotel on the Isle, and their return provided some semblance of home under dire circumstances.2 Their restored sense of peace, however, was soon shaken as the Channel Islands themselves fell under Nazi occupation from June 1940–May 1945, bringing the encounter Cahun and Moore were trying to avoid to the forefront of their everyday life. Despite having the option to flee, they decided to remain. Of this decision, Cahun reflected, “To return to France would have brought a greater chance of detection, and the scattering of all previous friends would not have brought the compensation of much increase of opportunity.”3

The photograph of their cat (Fig. 1) is notable for many reasons. The year the image was taken, 1940, is the same year that photography was banned on the Isle, which makes the photograph not only an illicit image, but also one of the last taken by Cahun and Moore during

---

2. Ibid.
Nazi occupation.⁴ As this was one of the final photographs shot before occupying forces put the ban into effect, its banal subject matter, their cat, seems like an odd choice, but a closer look at this image suggests otherwise. In the distance, a line of figures are visible through the window of their apartment. These background figures are German soldiers walking along the shore of St. Brelade’s Bay, appearing as if they have emerged from the nearby water. Cahun and Moore’s move to the Isle of Jersey and its subsequent occupation produced many changes in their lives, and the presence of Nazi soldiers within this image reveals the proximity between their private life at home and the widespread effects of occupation. The distance of the camera lens to the window reinforces the secretive quality of this image, suggesting that Cahun did not want anyone to spot her taking it. As the cat is the focal point of the image, Cahun and Moore have rendered the illegal photograph innocuous. Ultimately, the presence of the soldiers complicates this image, elevating it from a casual snapshot to something more profound.

Upon their move to the Isle, Cahun and Moore dropped their pseudonyms and reverted to their birth names: Lucy Schwob and Suzanne Malherbe, respectively.⁵ With this new identity in place, and the closing of one chapter of their artistic practice, Cahun and Moore developed another. The two launched an anti-Nazi resistance campaign, disseminating propaganda leaflets under an anonymous, masculine identity called, “The Soldier without a Name.” The leaflets they distributed encouraged their imagined readers, predominantly German soldiers, to oppose the current war and engage in anti-Nazi subterfuge. Their messages were conveyed using a surrealistic writing style, attempting to breach the reader’s unconscious through propagandistic forms such as fictional dialogue, pervasive dark humor, and a call for unity in an attempt to

---

⁴ Valerie Nelson (registrar at the Jersey Heritage Trust), e-mail message to author, November 27, 2014.
inspire an internal mutiny. While their ostensible goal was to incite revolution, more reasonably, these actions simply enabled Cahun and Moore to demonstrate disobedience under occupation, which restored their political agency under occupation through the simultaneous dispersal of anti-Nazi leaflets, and the performance of an unassuming life on the Isle.

Claude Cahun was adopted into the art history canon in the late 1980s, beginning with her inclusion in the exhibition *L’Amour fou: Photography and Surrealism*, curated by Rosalind Krauss and Jane Livingston. Scholarship on Claude Cahun has focused predominantly on her early photographic practices and their connection to psychoanalysis and sexuality. Her early portraits are often read as an act of reclaiming female agency within the male-dominated movement of Surrealism. Many analyses, such as those by Katy Kline and Amelia Jones, position Cahun as a proto-Feminist artist, often comparing her work to Cindy Sherman’s photographs. Of this impulse, Abigail Solomon-Godeau has rightly noted:

Cahun’s oeuvre, with its consistent play with the instability of identity, its frequent deployment of masquerade, its penchant for masks and mirrors, is startlingly close to the terms of contemporary feminist thinking about identity, gender, and sexual difference. Consequently, it requires almost more of an effort to reposition Cahun in her actual time and milieu than it does to consider her work in the context of contemporary theoretical formulations about femininity, identity, and representation.

Framing Claude Cahun’s work within contemporary feminist understandings of gender, sexuality, and identity politics is productive as Cahun’s work is illustrative of these theories.

---

6. In particular, Rosalind Krauss has critiqued this scholarship for limiting analyses of Cahun’s photographs.
However, this scholarly approach is somewhat limiting, as it does not necessarily take into account Cahun and Moore’s communist ties, personal biography, or surrealist affiliations.

A more recent trend in scholarship on Claude Cahun takes Solomon-Godeau’s words as a call to action, attempting to expand knowledge about Cahun’s life and artistic practices by piecing together her personal archive: making use of her personal diaries, early political writing, and the surviving remnants of her and Moore’s later acts of anti-Nazi resistance on the Isle of Jersey. The exhibition catalog Don’t Kiss Me, edited by Louise Downie (2006), Gen Doy’s A Sensual Politics of Photography (2007), and Lizzie Thynne’s article, “Indirect Action: Politics and the Subversion of Identity in Claude Cahun and Marcel Moore’s Resistance to the Occupation of Jersey,” (2010) have deepened our understanding of Claude Cahun’s practice not only in terms of gender and sexuality, but more broadly as a communist artist and writer. Less considered, though, is how she and Marcel Moore’s campaign as anti-Nazi resisters works not only in terms of politics, but also within the framework of performance.

Here, I consider Claude Cahun and Marcel Moore’s anti-Nazi resistance acts as a performance that embodies multiple subject positions as a political tactic. Specifically, I argue that while Cahun and Moore’s acts of resistance were political endeavors, they also function in a different register, as a performative gesture of absence. In this framework, their own marginalized positions on the Isle are sometimes inverted into positions of power. Ultimately, analyzing their acts as anti-Nazi propagandists through notions of performance, absence, and invisibility provide a deeper understanding of Cahun and Moore’s artistic practice that moves beyond the scope of the camera. Their artistic mediums changed depending on their message, and they took on an interdisciplinary practice that ranged from poetry and prose, fiction and nonfiction, to photography and photomontage. Viewing their diverse practices not as separate
explorations, but as interconnected projects reconfigures Cahun and Moore’s life on the Isle into a larger performance of everyday life in which their appearances fluctuated as their circumstances did.
CHAPTER 2: CAHUN AND MOORE IN PARIS—PRIVATE PHOTOGRAPHS AND PUBLIC PERSONAS

Even before Claude Cahun and Marcel Moore moved to the Isle of Jersey, invisibility, privacy, and opacity were important elements of Claude Cahun and Marcel Moore’s political and artistic practice in Paris. Cahun changed her name from Lucy Schwob in 1918, when she was just twenty-four years old. This decisively rendered her relationship with her immediate family obscure, as she adopted the last name of her great uncle, Léon Cahun. Additionally, Cahun and Moore’s own personal relationship was complex; they negotiated roles as stepsisters, romantic partners, and artistic collaborators, all of which became further veiled upon their move to Jersey. In Paris, while they were considered Surrealists, Cahun and Moore were at the same time somewhat removed from the core of this movement because prominent Surrealist artists discriminated against them because of their androgyny and homosexuality. Themes of opacity, absence, and tensions between “normative” and “transgressive” behaviors extended beyond their daily lives and were made visible within both the photographs and photomontages they produced in Paris during the twenties and thirties, and in Cahun’s own passport photographs.

A prominent example of this is within Cahun’s published manuscript, Disavowals: Cancelled Confessions. In Disavowals, ten photomontages divide the text, which culminate into an innovative union of automatic writing and photomontage, two practices that develop from similar mental processes of intuitive making. One image from this book, a photomontage titled I.O.U., literally, although haphazardly, reveals the breadth of Cahun’s personas (Fig. 2). I.O.U. is comprised of close-up cutouts of Cahun’s face, pasted one atop another, which creates a deep layering of masks upon the page: an image of Cahun wearing goggles, another with

exaggeratedly large eyes, and another with elaborate makeup, built up into eleven layers of images in all. In a cursive script on the montage, a declaration reads, “Beneath this mask is another mask. I will never finish taking off all of these faces.” This caption, paired with the kaleidoscopic range of images calls attention to the opacity of each seemingly expressive identity. Cahun and Moore’s use of photography to portray these identities, none of which is more “real” than any other, capitalizes on photography’s truth claim in order to distort reality, a project that makes photography’s inherent opacity visible.

In “The Photographic Condition of Surrealism,” Rosalind Krauss writes, “Vision’s primacy results from the way its objects are present to it, through an immediacy and transparency that compels belief.”¹⁰ The fact that Cahun’s image only exists as a photographic record, however, undermines this sense of belief. Although the images appear real, they are also artifices. Thus, Cahun’s performative presence within the photograph indexes her absence as such in reality. Alternatively, as Shawn Michelle Smith explains in At the Edge of Sight, Cahun’s absence in reality calls attention to the “that-has-been” quality of photography, in which the only truth a photograph reveals is that its subject once existed, however momentarily.¹¹

Cahun and Moore’s portrait photographs, which never publicly circulated during the artist’s lifetimes, are source material for their published photomontages. One portrait, made years earlier in 1927 and included in the bottom right corner of I.O.U., is a good example of the compositional tropes that Cahun and Moore employ throughout their portraits made in Paris (Fig. 3). In this image, dressed as a dandy-esque version of a twentieth-century strongman, Cahun sits with her legs crossed. A large decorated barbell rests casually across her lap. Cahun gazes into

---

the camera, her eyes mirrored by the hearts donned on her cheeks and curls gelled onto her forehead. Looking doll-like, with drawn-on eyebrows, heavy shadow, and dramatic lipstick, she wears a long sleeve shirt with two circles embroidered on it, suggesting exposed nipples. Between these circles, a sort of mantra is written across her chest: “I am in training/Don’t kiss me.” This costuming, coupled with her determined gaze creates the effect that she is undergoing some sort of labor that outright rejects any notions of sex or intimacy. This image, and many others by Cahun and Moore at this time (for example, Fig. 4), are shot in front of a makeshift black backdrop, like a homemade commercial portrait studio. The use of the backdrop rejects the outside world and obscures the domestic setting that Cahun and Moore worked within; the fantastical quality of these images largely emanates from this lack of context. The black backdrop, an aesthetic choice that rejects the acknowledgement of any outside reality, heightens the sense of interiority within the images.

Looking at one more image of Cahun and Moore from their time in Paris further demonstrates the sense of opacity created by using a backdrop (Fig. 5). In this exceptional image, Moore is both present and partially invisible within the frame. This double portrait reveals the nature of Cahun and Moore’s collaborative practice that often goes unmentioned in contemporary exhibitions of their work. While Moore’s presence is rarely visible within the images, she emits a spectral presence from behind the camera, which creates a doubling effect within their collaborative photographs: Cahun’s presence in front of the camera indexes Moore’s shadow behind it.

This image (Fig. 5) from 1925 depicts Cahun with an oversized Star of David tied around her neck. The star is missing its bottom point; its imperfection has a bricolage quality, giving the feeling that Cahun and Moore pieced together costumes from whatever happened to be around.
Cahun’s face is flanked by two streaks of light, which appear more purposeful than light leaks and give the photograph a haunted quality. Her costuming depicts her as a stereotypical representation of a vampirish Jew. The image is a flagrant response to, or a subversive embodiment of, rising anti-Semitism in Paris at the time. Cahun repurposes the symbol of the Star of David as a means of stirring controversy, leaning back with a cautious gaze.\(^\text{12}\) The chameleon-like shifting of identities within these photographs, made explicit within *I.O.U.* (Fig. 2), suggests that Cahun sought ways to move beyond the limit of her singular body.

What sets this image apart from others, however, is the inclusion of the top half of Marcel Moore’s face, visible in the upper left-hand corner of the image. She rises slightly above the backdrop, revealing the constructed nature of the image. The only defining characteristic of Moore’s presence is her ungroomed eyebrows, which starkly contrast to Cahun’s thinly drawn arches, paired with lipstick and bare shoulders. Moore’s exceptional presence within this image demonstrates the optical unconscious at work. There are dozens of photographs of Cahun in this set-up where Moore does not appear, erased by the black backdrop that typically bleeds to the edge of the frame. Within this photograph, however, the camera’s maladjusted view captures an uncoordinated moment, revealing Moore’s attempt to remain invisible behind the studio backdrop—a type of costuming in its own right. Her presence within this image reinforces the idea of multiplicity that runs through their work, makes explicit their collaborative process, and demonstrates invisibility as an aesthetic choice. During their era of anti-Nazi resistance, the creation of the character “The Soldier without a Name” would serve as another method of invisible costuming that challenged binaries between reality and artifice.

\(^\text{12}\) The political nature of this image raises a question about the status of these images. Because Cahun and Moore’s photographs were private images, kept within a personal archive, it is uncertain if these portraits functioned as anything other than source material for their published photomontages.
While their portraits from this period were never exhibited publicly in their lifetime, familiarity with these images today has largely shaped how audiences conceive of Cahun and Moore as visual artists. Yet, at the same time that Cahun and Moore were making such experimental images, Cahun was more famous as a writer. She had a small share of fame, as she was known within the artistic circles of her wealthy Jewish intellectual family. Her father was Maurice Schwob, the director of the regional newspaper *Le Phare de la Loire*, and her uncle, Marcel Schwob, was a symbolist author. In 1929, Cahun was featured in a *Chicago Tribune* column titled, “Who’s Who Abroad,” written by Golda M. Goldman (Fig. 6). Despite her and Marcel Moore’s photographic practice that was contemporaneous to this article, the short piece focused solely on her pursuits as an author, and briefly mentions Marcel Moore as her half-sister and the illustrator of Cahun’s work. The failure to mention Cahun’s interest in photography is remarkable, as even the image used to illustrate the column is a cropped version of one of Cahun and Moore’s own photographs (Fig. 7). Goldman’s article provides another example of their ability to hide in plain sight, where their photographic practice remained private even during those rare occasions that their images circulated publicly.

With these examples from their life in Paris, it becomes clear that even before their later anti-Nazi resistance acts, Cahun and Moore engaged in paradoxical artistic practices. The contrast between Cahun’s elaborate costuming, which makes visible her multiple selves, contrasts with their opacity, revealing nothing more about Cahun than the surface of her image.

13. While outside the scope of this paper, this also raises larger questions about the ethics of viewing and circulating private photographs.
Cahun’s image is only an artifice; there is no “authentic” identity to discover. Alternatively, to put it another way: her inner-self is non-representable. Their use of masks and doubling suggests a multiplicity of persons within one body, and the simultaneity of an artistic and authorial practice destabilizes how they are positioned in canons of art and literature. While Marcel Moore’s role as a collaborator is largely hidden within their photographs, her presence is revealed at times. Her appearance exposes the optical unconscious at play within their images, as well as the duality between hypervisibility and invisibility within their practice. Ultimately, we can understand their photographs not only as interior explorations of the unconscious, but also active attempts to distort outer perceptions of reality.

The play of visibility and opacity through performative identities also comprise photographs of Cahun that circulate in public spheres: namely, within her passport photograph. This may seem counterintuitive, since passport photographs are meant to render their subjects clearly, demonstrate authenticity, and function as evidence of the truth. For Cahun, her “official” representation allowed her to hide in plain sight, creating an image that is no more real than photographs of her in character. An analysis of her passport image also identifies how Cahun and Moore used fashion to construct a visual appearance of innocence, constituting another mode of erasure.16

A 1936 passport photograph of Claude Cahun identifies her instead by her birth name, Lucy Schwob (Fig. 8). While Cahun had the agency to costume herself for the image, taking passport photographs is a job ultimately placed into the hands of the state. Taken one year before Cahun and Moore fled Paris, presumably this photograph enabled Cahun to leave the country.

Images of Cahun display a range of self-fashioning and costuming: sometimes a dandy, a vampire, hyper-masculine and feminine, androgynous, and even non-human, posing as Buddha (Fig. 9). This rendering of Cahun (Fig. 8), however, is markedly different as here she is represented in more normative terms. The photograph shows an early prototype of the bourgeois persona that Cahun and Moore adopted upon arriving to the Isle of Jersey in 1937, which I will return to later. As with other examples of seemingly innocuous images of Cahun, this photograph is not without its subversive elements.

Cahun is dressed austerely in a heather grey jacket. A gold, star-shaped brooch is pinned to her jacket, competing with her gaze as the focal point of the photograph. While accessories feminize Cahun’s image, this particular brooch also clearly references the Communist red star. Her pulled back hair is set in pin waves, and her blouse is modest with a high neckline. Her pragmatic, utilitarian styling within this image heightens the connection between Cahun and communism. Her non-expressive gaze pushes these sartorial indexes into reality, representing her not merely as a citizen of the state, or particular nationalistic agenda, but as a member of the International Communist Party. Her self-fashioning as such effectively undermines the purpose of the document. As a French passport photo, it is ironic insofar as it is of a vehemently non-nationalistic subject.

The surface of this image depicts Claude Cahun as Lucy Schwob, which protects her identity as a political activist. It disconnects Schwob from the acts of radicalism completed under

the name and image of Claude Cahun, another form of erasure. In addition to a change in name and image, her clothing within the photograph can also be understood as a political choice.\textsuperscript{18} Many communist circles saw an interest in fashion to be anti-revolutionary and bourgeois. Cahun’s own lavish and eccentric tastes, however, occupy an indeterminate space, one that manages to reject classist notions of being \textit{en vogue} and allows her still to present herself as a dedicated socialist. For example, the designer Charlotte Perriand intentionally sought out a particular style that would be suitable for political activism, which unsurprisingly involved her dressing in black and forgoing the adornment of jewelry.\textsuperscript{19} While her portraits in Paris stray far from this sort of visual rhetoric, Cahun’s outfit of choice within this passport photograph is closer to Perriand’s preferred communist style.

Cahun’s gaze within her passport photo is in tension with her sartorial choices, and this overall fashioning complicates the purpose of this identification photograph. Identification photographs record citizenship by depicting a neutral subject: an ambivalent face that lacks a definable expression or clear emotion. Passports are a tool that ensures fidelity between a traveler and her documents, as a means of both avoiding misidentification and proving authenticity.\textsuperscript{20} Lily Cho has written about the lack of affect in passport photography in relation to citizenship. In “Citizenship, Diaspora and the Bonds of Affect: the Passport Photograph,” Cho notes that neutral expressions are enforced because “emotion obscures the identity of the citizen.”\textsuperscript{21} However, in terms of lived experience, emotion and engagement are crucial aspects of modern citizenship. An overt display of emotion or dissent within an image renders a subject

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{19} Ibid., 104.
\bibitem{21} Ibid., 275.
\end{thebibliography}
illegible to the state. Cho writes, “To become a citizen, one must let go of one’s particularity, suspend it, so as to become part of something more general, more universal.”

Cahun’s reversion to the identity of Lucy Schwob upon her return to Jersey relies on this misidentification of her as a neutral, universal subject. Claude Cahun, in her grotesque and vulgar appearances in daily life would not be recognizable to the French state, whereas Lucy Schwob’s neutral affect is. It is clear that Cahun made use of her passport photograph as a political strategy to present herself as a neutral, non-threatening citizen. But even this neutral image is layered. While Schwob’s gaze may be direct, her androgynous clothing and gold star brooch indirectly point to her political resistance activities as a communist and her non-normative lifestyle. Upon their arrival to the Isle of Jersey, the strategic self-fashioning displayed within this passport photograph would carry over into their everyday life.

22. Ibid., 282.
CHAPTER 3: FIGHTING FOR THE SURFACE—THE ISLE OF JERSEY AS A PROPAGANDA WAR

The larger context of the Isle of Jersey during World War II has a precarious place in military history, as the lack of full-fledged battles and large-scale forms of resistance have led historians to disqualify or ignore its impact on the war overall. The Nazi army captured the Isle of Jersey mainly for propagandistic purposes, enabling the Germans to claim that they annexed a piece of British territory.\(^\text{23}\) Paul Sanders, Gilly Carr, and Louise Willmot, authors of *Protest, Defiance and Resistance in the Channel Islands*, posit that the importance of the Channel Islands as an occupied territory has not been thoroughly recognized because of the lack of visible public resistance, leading many to believe that most of the resident population was complicit with the Nazi regime.\(^\text{24}\) This dominant narrative effectively erases small-scale resisters like Cahun and Moore, whose anti-Nazi propaganda campaign represents one of many independent attempts at intervening in the hegemonic occupation of the Isle.\(^\text{25}\) Within the context of this paper, however, the role the Isle played as a site of war propaganda is precisely what makes it an interesting case study for better understanding the relationship between performance, visibility, and political action under authority.

In June 1940, twenty-three thousand residents of the Isle were registered to flee to England in expectation of imminent occupation, but in actuality, only sixty-six hundred evacuated.\(^\text{26}\) Hazel R. Knowles Smith, in *The Changing Face of the Channel Islands Occupation*.

---

24. Ibid., 2.
25. Ibid., 4.
has noted that in an unexpected response to Germany’s invasion, the British government demilitarized the Isle, and even discouraged citizens from resisting occupation. This governmental decision points to why histories of the Isle under occupation depict residents as collaborators rather than dissenters. Independent channels of communication, however, such as the BBC radio host Colonel Britton, encouraged citizens to, “try to do something anti-Nazi every day.” In fact, Cahun and Moore were inspired by these newscasts, conceiving of their resistance acts as their own avant-garde news service to counter German propaganda.

By the end of the war, roughly thirteen hundred people were listed as political prisoners for violating various Nazi laws on the Isle. Common forms of resistance by those who stayed took the form of personal displays of symbolic patriotism, also known as V-sign protests, which included displaying British flags and wearing patriotic brooches. Other forms of resistance included aiding the Isle’s Jewish residents and members of the Organization Todt (OT), the Third Reich’s civil engineers, who were sent to Jersey to construct fortifications around the Isle. While a small number of OT workers were volunteer employees, the majority were forced laborers, brought to the Channel Islands after internment in France.

Gilly Carr, and Louise Willmot (London: Bloomsbury Academic 2014), 253. The total population of the Isle was fifty thousand.
28. Ibid., 25.
30. Gilly Carr, Paul Sanders, and Louise Willmot, “Conclusion,” in *Protest, Defiance, and Resistance in the Channel Islands*, ed. Paul Sanders, Gilly Carr, and Louise Willmot (London: Bloomsbury Academic 2014), 348. There are two records of political prisoners on the Isle of Jersey. One log lists 506 people between August 18, 1940 and July 27, 1944, while another log lists 856 sentences and prosecutions. Based on these logs and other accounts, the authors estimate that Nazi officials tried roughly thirteen hundred people for various acts of political resistance.
The main form of public (and private) protest, however, was the continued use of radios after their ban in June 1942, two years after the ban on photography.\textsuperscript{31} The ban on radios was part of an effort to prevent rival narratives, such as those by Colonel Britton, which could counter German propaganda. The German military collected over ten thousand radios in 1942, making their ownership the most common channel of resistance during occupation.\textsuperscript{32} While radios were confiscated from islanders, their presence remained due to bait-and-switch tactics. Households, including Cahun and Moore’s, would turn in one radio to authorities while concealing another.\textsuperscript{33} Although possessing a radio during occupation was an illegal offense, a hierarchy of infraction emerged depending on whether a person was merely listening to the radio, or disseminating the news.\textsuperscript{34}

Cahun and Moore’s prime mode of resistance came in the form of a fictitious newspaper that they dispersed for German soldiers, called “Unsere Zeitung,” or “Our Newspaper.”\textsuperscript{35} Although they did have a radio and could have transmitted actual news, the majority of their distributed tracts did not directly relay any specific news headlines to the public. Instead, their radio was used to boost personal morale, allowing Cahun and Moore to remain informed throughout the war. Other independent resisters either listened to the BBC news privately or dared to spread it in verbal and written forms. Cahun and Moore’s leaflets differed in that they were not literal translations of news headlines. They were more theatrical and poetic, having less

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{33} Considering that Cahun and Moore disobeyed this ban on radios, it is surprising that archival evidence suggests that they obeyed the island-wide ban on photography.  
\textsuperscript{34} Sanders, “Radio Days,” 72.  
\textsuperscript{35} Follain, “Lucy Schwob and Suzanne Malherbe—Résistantes,” 85.
to do with the news and more to do with undermining ideologies embedded within German propaganda.

Historians have critiqued these small-scale forms of resistance as “petty” because ultimately, they did little to change the structural power system in place. While not specifically mentioned, Cahun and Moore’s acts of resistance can be included in such arguments. Alan Milward has challenged the critique of the “pettiness” of these forms of defiance, arguing that gestures of resistance, regardless of size, are important not because they attempted to affect the outcome of occupation, but because they boosted individual morale and created sense of validation within the minds of the resisters. Simply put, with Milward’s argument in mind, Cahun and Moore’s resistance acts are not necessarily important because of their impact on creating an anti-Nazi revolt, but instead because they gave the artists a space to perform a position of authority in a situation where they severely lacked it. At the same time, scholars and historians should not discount the real world ramifications of their resistance, as Nazi soldiers arrested and imprisoned Cahun and Moore for these acts in 1944, four years after the start of their leafletting campaign. The longevity of their campaign was possible due to the creation of two personas that protected their layered identities as Lucy Schwob and Suzanne Malherbe, and “The Soldier without a Name.” These identities allowed Cahun and Moore to move between registers of political resistance and innocence by transgressing public and private borders, a boundary often crossed by the state.

The reversion to their birth names was not in name only, but was also demonstrated by a complete shift in their appearances, embodying the persona of upper-middle-class women.

37. Ibid.
intermediary image that Cahun fashioned within her 1936 passport photograph (Fig. 10) was put into practice during her and Moore’s everyday life on the Isle. This guise not only rendered the sexual nature of their relationship invisible, but also erased their Jewish identity and their history of previous affiliations with communist groups, such as the Association of Revolutionary Writers and Artists (AEAR) and Counter Attack. In Paris, Cahun was known for her shaved head, drawn-on eyebrows, and androgynous clothing. This public persona is apparent in a snapshot from 1930 of Cahun and Moore in front of a window display at the launch of her then recently published book, *Disavowals: Cancelled Confessions* (Fig. 11). In this public appearance, Cahun wears a skullcap and cardigan with a long scarf tied around her neck like a men’s cravat. Marcel Moore sports modern clothing, wearing a dress with a square neckline, accessorized with a belt and bold necklace. Upon the Isle of Jersey, as a means of concealing her identity as a revolutionary and her Jewishness in anticipation of Nazi occupation, Cahun’s persona became decidedly more feminine, even wearing velvet evening gowns (Fig. 11). In addition to a change in wardrobe, Cahun and Moore also largely kept to themselves, gaining a reputation as highly private, eccentric sisters.

The photographs made on the Isle of Jersey by Cahun and Moore prior to the 1940 ban on photography capture this shift in appearances. On the surface, these images are seemingly oppositional to their earlier portraits of Cahun: taken outdoors instead of within a makeshift interior studio, shot from a medium distance rather than close-up, and feature her in modern, womanly clothing as opposed to extra-terrestrial costuming. However, reading these images as an extension of Cahun and Moore’s earlier photographic practice demonstrates the relationship between their visual identity and the acts of subversion that would follow. The visual disconnect

---

between their embodied personas and their anti-Nazi resistance acts contributed to the longevity of their campaign and provides another example of hiding in plain sight as a strategy within their artistic practice.

A particularly striking image of Cahun in this guise shows her hanging by her fingertips from a wooden outdoor awning that serves as an entrance to a local café (Fig. 12). Cahun dons a floral bikini, and with her toes pointed, she turns her head to the left towards the camera. This image has all the hallmarks of a snapshot from a relaxing day at the beach, but Cahun’s expression undoes the sense of ease that we can infer from her bikini-clad body. Her choice of accessories heightens the sense of uncertainty within the image, sporting a pair of heavy black welder’s gloves and one white buckled shoe on her right foot. The missing shoe does not seem to appear anywhere in the frame. The gloves and her serious facial expression appear to be purposefully eccentric, and suggest a sense of labor or training similar to the image of Cahun dressed as a strongman (Fig. 3). While Cahun and Moore clearly shot this scene in public, there are no indications of any spectators or other beachgoers, which maintains the quality of seclusion and privacy created within their earlier interior photographs.

Similar to her passport photograph, even when embodying a feminine bourgeois persona, details within the image undermine its construction. The overt escapism and Cahun’s deliberate non-smiling gaze towards the camera disrupt the persona that Cahun and Moore chose to adopt on the Isle as a means of safety. These moments suggest that while Cahun and Moore were trying to “pass” as non-threatening citizens, the exploration of various identities through fashion remained an important part of their being. The odd moments within these portraits are subtle allusions to Cahun and Moore’s earlier, more explicit, identity-challenging portraits. This

photograph, and others like it, is part of a larger strategy of resistance, and an extension of the artist’s earlier practice based on their embodiment of multiple subject positions.

The photographs made from 1937–1940 utilize space differently than their earlier images, and heighten the emphasis on the surface of appearances. While a sense of interiority and privacy characterize Cahun’s earlier portraits, their later images are set in outdoor contexts that are only semi-private, places like secluded gardens and empty beaches. The apparent increase in the distance from the camera to its subject de-emphasizes the role of photography as a tool to explore Cahun’s psychic being. The majority of portraits of Cahun made in Paris are close-up photographs, calling attention to her affronting gaze. In the portraits made upon their move to the Isle of Jersey, however, the camera presents Cahun from a longer distance, changing the photograph to be more about how she relates to her exterior surroundings rather than her inner being. The distance makes these images initially seem like innocuous snapshots made by amateur photographers, if it were not for those details (the welder’s gloves and the missing shoe, for example) that are just a little bit “off.”

The shift in setting from interior to exterior space and the use of medium distance affect how the images produce meaning. The distance that Cahun and Moore shot these images demonstrates attention to the surface of the image, pulling the lens back far enough to obscure its constructed nature. Cahun and Moore perform a normative identity through modern fashion in order to separate themselves from their past existence as political resisters and surrealist artists. Although Claire Follain and Gen Doy have written about Cahun’s identity on the Isle as bourgeois based on her clothing choices, a closer look at these images reveals an identity that was still more eccentric than wholly normative.41 When contextualized with the resistance tracts

they distributed as “The Soldier without a Name,” the images made on the Isle constitute an extension of their past, not fully erasing it as they may have intended to, but instead blurring it into a harmless eccentricity.
CHAPTER 4: BODILY ABSENCE AND ENACTING “THE SOLDIER WITHOUT A NAME”

During their time in Paris and the Isle of Jersey, Cahun and Moore’s artistic practice both challenged and capitalized on photography’s truth claims. At first, in Paris, the pair pushed the limits of photography’s mimetic truth claims through the embodiment and performance of different characters in front of their camera. Once on the Isle of Jersey, they conversely relied on the truth claim of the image to erase their political past. Their propaganda and performative actions relied on invisibility as its long-term strategy. Their sublimation into the identity of “The Soldier without a Name,” a fictitious German soldier, gave their anti-Nazi leaflets an air of authenticity and provided a truth claim for their imagined audience.

Cahun and Moore’s identities as “The Soldier without a Name” culminated in the dispersal of their newspaper, “Unsere Zeitung,” in St. Brelade’s Bay and St. Helier, the capital of Jersey. The tracts they initially dispersed were so obscure that it is likely they did not register to passers-by as acts of protest. Their first disseminated leaflet featured a photomontage of Oscar Wilde, Lord Alfred Douglas, and an image of German soldiers. The phrase “Ohne Ende” (without end, short for horror without end) was written on it, and it was placed inside a cigarette packet. Their use of photomontage as resistance recalls the work of John Heartfield, whose anti-German collages greatly influenced Cahun and Moore’s artistic practice.

As their four-year campaign of political resistance went on their efforts became less obscure, but no less abstract. They began to distribute written anti-Nazi propaganda, as opposed

42. Willmot, “Women and Resistance,” 187. While none of these photomontage tracts appeared to have survived, there is a written record of these early efforts.
43. Ibid.
to photomontages, on cigarette papers. To make the leaflets, Cahun wrote the majority of the anti-propaganda text, while Moore translated it into German. Moore withheld her fluency in German from military authorities, despite requirements to report such information. The tracts were placed in locations where German soldiers could easily pick them up: inside cigarette boxes and posted on telephone poles. The leaflets were even left upon graves of German soldiers, as the artist’s home was located across from a military graveyard. In one example, a resistance leaflet addressed to “Those who are not afraid of the right to freedom,” attempts to agitate readers through a performance of nationalism, a strategy that runs throughout Cahun and Moore’s writings as “The Soldier without a Name.” The full text reads:

In addition to our weekly labor, we have to do subsequent work for this newspaper, about ordinary hazards. We give our time and our effort in an emergency. We give our lives for freedom, peace and our home country! For the True Germany! For the great Germany of Goethe, which Hitler’s Nazi Germany would like to sully in vain. Comrades! Are you with us? The Soldier without a Name

In this leaflet, Cahun and Moore make a distinction between Hitler’s Germany and the real Germany, arguing that their displays of resistance are actually an act of nationalistic pride for the “true” Germany. This sense of nationalism is further complicated by the use of the word “comrade” within the leaflet, giving the text communist underpinnings.

Attributing the leaflet to “The Soldier without a Name” demonstrates the way in which Cahun and Moore sought to occupy a subject position other than their own—without relying on the truth claim of photography to do so. Instead, this tract demonstrates authority by bolstering its inside credibility, attributing their “newspaper” to an anonymous soldier, rather than a pair of

45. Thynne, “Indirect Action,” 10–11. This process offers yet another example of misdirection used in their campaign, similar to the bait-and-switch tactic used when they hid their second radio set. The most high-risk example of this, however, was Cahun and Moore’s failure to report their Jewish identity to the Nazi army.
46. Doy, Claude Cahun, 115.
communist radicals. The conception of “The Soldier without a Name” also evokes the monumental tombs of The Unknown Soldier, a national symbol of collective memory that commemorates those unidentified soldiers killed in war. Of the figure of the Unknown Soldier, Benedict Anderson has argued: “No more arresting emblems of the modern culture of nationalism exist… Void as these tombs are of identifiable mortal remains or immortal souls, they are nonetheless saturated with ghostly national imaginings.”47 The persona of the “The Soldier without a Name” connotes a collective, anonymous body similar to that of “The Unknown Soldier.”

In adopting the identity of the nameless soldier, Cahun and Moore enliven this absent victim by taking on his German identity and enduring sense of nationalism. Cahun and Moore, however, frame their nationalism differently than that of the Nazi party. As seen within this propaganda leaflet (Fig. 13), they position their resistance optimistically out of love for “our home country,” for the “True Germany,” despite the fact that neither Cahun nor Moore was German. Their strategy was to fight fascist propaganda with the suggestion of an authentic nationalism for Germany, a nationalism rooted in freedom and peace. Within this leaflet, the call to action is posed as a simple question, “Are you with us?” which signifies an embodied performance of this character who attempted to redefine German nationalism.

Cahun and Moore’s shift to writing from photography inherently privileges invisibility as a position of power. Peggy Phelan has written about invisibility as a mode of performance in Unmarked. Phelan’s project “[locates] a subject that cannot be reproduced within the ideology of the visible… [and is an attempt] to revalue a belief in subjectivity and identity which is not

visibly representable.” Unmarked develops a strategy that empowers invisible, marginalized subjects and is overall distrustful of the power of representation. Cahun and Moore’s project similarly avoids visibility as its ultimate goal. Instead, Cahun and Moore recognized the absence of a counternarrative from the perspective of Nazi soldiers, and constructed a new identity to spread their leaflets, avoiding self-representation in the process. Developing this narrative evolved into a strategy that relied on Cahun and Moore’s active invisibility, subsuming their identities into that of an anonymous, male German soldier. This new identity constitutes a performative absence, in which the ultimate goal is not to render one’s self more visible, but instead intentionally denies traditional modes of visibility in order to produce a noticeable absence. Phelan notes, “Active disappearance usually requires at least some recognition of what and who is not there to be effective.” The framework of performance is suitable for this active vanishing, as Phelan defines performance as “representation without reproduction,” and notes that its temporal quality is an alternate “representational economy” in its own right.

The bodily absence of the character “The Soldier without a Name” is also important in terms of the inherent vulnerability that comes with performances of political protest. In the case of Cahun and Moore explicitly, public forms of dissent might have presented a temporary payoff that made immediate, outright disobedience visible to onlookers. At the same time, public protests would have also brought a much greater risk to their lives, countering perceptions that heightened visibility equates to an automatic increase in power. Judith Butler’s recent book, Towards a Performative Theory of Assemblage, discusses the concept of “bodily vulnerability,” raising questions about how best to protest without placing one’s body in explicit danger. Of
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public protest, Butler writes, “Not everyone can appear in a bodily form, and many of those who cannot appear...are also part of ‘the people,’ defined precisely by being constrained from making a specific bodily appearance in public space.” Within Cahun and Moore’s project, the notion of bodily exposure in unsafe spaces is complicated: one the one hand, they avoided public protest and were able to remain invisible by operating under the character, “The Soldier without a Name.” On the other, they still entered the public sphere to disseminate their leaflets, which placed them, at least momentarily, in danger if caught. The two were aware of the risk and prepared for the worst; they kept an overdose of barbiturates in their pockets in case of arrest.

In regards to this risk, Butler writes, “Sometimes overcoming unwilled conditions of bodily exposure is precisely the aim of a political struggle. And sometimes deliberately exposing the body to possible harm is part of the very meaning of political resistance.” This sentiment resonates with Milward’s understanding of independent forms of resistance on the Isle, which as previously noted, were in some ways simply about demonstrating resistance as a form of personal empowerment. While Butler champions visibility as a display of democracy, in contrast, Peggy Phelan notes, “There is real power in remaining unmarked; and there are serious limitations to visual representation as a political goal.” Cahun and Moore’s acts as anti-Nazi resisters oscillate between these two extremes.

For Cahun and Moore, distributing their leaflets was a compromise to remain invisible in name, but be physically present in the streets. The notion of being present in the streets began with their past involvement with Counter Attack, a revolutionary group of anti-fascist

intellectuals founded by André Breton and Georges Bataille in 1935, who thought of visibility in the streets as a political act that would combat “[French] nationalism’s ideology of the home.”

Similar to the portraits of Cahun in Paris, which indexed the absence of her characters in reality, Cahun and Moore’s leaflets, left without a trace of who disseminated them, indexed a physical absence. Through this purposeful invisibility, Cahun and Moore were able to reclaim a sense of power at the same time that their everyday life as private women on the Isle allowed them to hide in plain sight.

In one noteworthy resistance tract, Moore added an illustration to Cahun’s text. This political cartoon features a Nazi soldier with his hands up in defeat on a small, sinking boat (Fig. 14). The intentionally crude nature of this drawing obscures Moore’s previous training as an illustrator and designer. One of her earlier illustrations from 1915 features a woman modeling androgynous clothing for wartime, featuring slouchy trousers with clean lines and a wide-armed trench coat (Fig. 15). Comparatively, the illustrated leaflet’s lack of detail and simplistic rendering reads hyperbolically childlike. Underneath this hasty rendering, a cryptic caption reads, “I think the waves will devour the boatman and small boat at the end of the war, and the roar of Adolf Hitler will quiet.” The caption paired with the drawing creates a clear metaphor of the Third Reich as a literal sinking ship. This is an example of their anti-propagandistic efforts, which did not depend on clear directives for action, but instead tried to create doubt within their readers by expressing a contrarian opinion.

58. Ibid., 52. Her designs are androgynous, and are notable for the design of trousers for a female model in 1916. Specifically, the piping on the pants and jacket are suggestive of military garb, and suggest an interest in collapsing masculine military garb with feminine details like a wide pant leg and tied belt, foreshadowing their acts as “The Soldier without a Name.”
The intentionally low quality of this drawing is also evidence of the dark humor that Lizzie Thynne has identified as a political strategy in Cahun and Moore’s leaflets. Thynne notes, “Cahun and Moore realized that disrespect for Nazi authority could be very effectively evoked through laughter; irony and humor were anathema to the literalism and rule-bound thinking of their oppressors.”\(^{59}\) One leaflet (Fig. 16) calls for an international dissemination of propaganda, calling soldiers to “take it with you on vacation,” a dark suggestion as the Isle was going through fortification at that time, making it nearly impossible for one to leave.\(^{60}\) Parody runs deep within this particular tract, further demonstrated by the repetition of the word *kampf* (fight) repeated endlessly at the bottom of the leaflet. The use of all capital letters suggests urgency and aggression. The repetitions, overlapping keystrokes, and eventual gradation of the word *kampf* into the letters “ppff, ppff, ppff…” emasculate the military rhetoric by hollowing it out phonetically, into the sound of an exhale or even flatulence. In such examples, it is clear that these leaflets were not “the news,” factual, or even always clear statements, but instead were drafted as a particular type of literary rhetoric that relates to Cahun’s previous written work. Indeed, the tracts resemble Cahun’s methods of assemblage writing seen in *Disavowals: Cancelled Confessions*, which consists of prose, poems, letters, photomontages and imagined dialogues.\(^{61}\)

One tract, noteworthy for its design, as it features collaged elements and red and black ink, reads, “Our revolution is to be made by all. Our revolution is by all, not one!” (Fig. 17). The use of the collective voice created an illusion that the scale of their operation extended well
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60. This exaggeration also calls attention to the shortcomings of the project, as it was unlikely that the project would ever reach an international scope.
61. For a more in depth discussion of this work, see: Jennifer Shaw, *Reading Claude Cahun’s Disavowals* (Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2013).
beyond Cahun and Moore. The last line of this leaflet, “This writing is a prophecy,” suggests a surrealist premonition that incites a spiritual look toward the future, and demonstrates the sense of optimism that underscored their tracts. Cahun and Moore believed that this call for camaraderie could eventually overtake Nazi forces. Military heads on the Isle regarded the sense of universalism and spirituality within their writing as dangerous. According to Willmot, Cahun and Moore “were sentenced to death for inciting the troops through propaganda…and to six years’ penal servitude for illegal possession of a radio, arms, and a camera.” This sentence is telling, as it establishes equivalencies between the power of radios and cameras, technologies that mobilize propaganda, with weapons, demonstrating that German authorities believed in the potential of Cahun and Moore’s campaign to have long-lasting effects, despite the lack of visible protesters.

By inhabiting these two identities at once: that of the anonymous German soldier and eccentric sisters, Cahun and Moore capitalized on their own marginalization to both express personal discontent and attempt to psychologically affect occupying forces. Phelan’s understanding of invisibility as one of power is one way of situating their performative acts under an anonymous identity. While no large-scale public revolts occurred because of their leaflets, the military’s belief in their potential power as counter-propaganda demonstrates the
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62. According to Claire Follain, “They fervently believed that not all of the German soldiers stationed in Jersey were Nazis and, with some inspiration, these Germans could be encouraged to overthrow the Nazi regime within the island.” Follain, “Lucy Schwob and Suzanne Malherbe—Résistantes,” 84.
64. One of the judges of their trial, Oberst Sarmsen, is recorded as saying, “With firearms, one knows at once what damage has been done, but with spiritual arms, one cannot tell how far-reaching it may be.” Follain, “Lucy Schwob and Suzanne Malherbe—Résistantes,” 89.
65. This is not to say that positions of marginalization, or closetedness, should be encouraged. Rather, Cahun and Moore’s use of invisibility as a tactic suggests that fighting for greater visibility is not the only approach to political resistance. In a position where one is inherently marginalized and oppressed, Cahun and Moore’s actions constitute a method of subversion.
surface-level politics that played out on the Isle, of which Cahun and Moore recognized and capitalized upon.
CHAPTER 5: PERFORMING POLITICAL FICTIONS—CAHUN’S THEORY OF INDIRECT ACTION

Cahun and Moore’s artistic and political practices continually return to the tensions between surface appearances and inner psyches through the performance of multiple identities. Their embodiment of different personas, their manipulation of the truth claims of photography, and the framework of “the news,” followed the ideas that Cahun outlined in a 1934 essay for the communist party-sponsored literary group, the Association of Revolutionary Writers and Artists (AEAR). The essay, titled “Les Paris Sont Ouverts,” commonly translated as “Place Your Bets,” defined Cahun’s concept of “indirect action,” which offers a historical framework for her and Marcel Moore’s later attempts to create successful propaganda. I contextualize their acts of anti-Nazi propaganda within the notion of “dissensus,” developed by Jacques Rancière as an analysis of contemporary politically engaged art. While seemingly disparate in both period and context, these two strategies are similar in that both frameworks seek out successful methods of art making that will agitate viewers into action. Rancière’s lens of “dissensus” is productive for understanding Cahun and Moore’s acts of resistance as examples of political performances of dissent.

In 1932, Cahun and Moore began working with the AEAR, for which Cahun published a number of essays. In 1934, Cahun wrote “Place Your Bets,” now considered one of her most famous essays, for the literary section of an AEAR report. Within the essay, Cahun outlines a classification system for successful types of propaganda and defends the practice of producing avant-garde poetry and art not as a bourgeois endeavor, but one with revolutionary potential.66

66. Claude Cahun, “Poetry Keeps its Secret,” in Surrealist Women: An International Anthology, ed. Penelope Rosemont (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998), 53. While Cahun’s essay is an in-depth analysis of the revolutionary potential of poetry, this argument stems from Breton’s
Like Cahun’s belief in fashion as a communist endeavor, her position towards poetry demonstrates a similar line of thinking, which set Cahun apart from other members of the AEAR who saw poetry as a solely formalist, capitalist enterprise.⁶⁷ For Cahun, humanity’s essential need for poetry makes it a prime medium for political expression. Cahun writes:

In attempts at poetry, even those of the proletariat, they will see only vestiges of capitalist society and will decree that we must guide those confused comrades toward the more precise tasks of Marxist propaganda. To this I answer, that poetry, having existed historically in all epochs and places, seems undeniably an inherent need of human, and even of animal, nature, a need undoubtedly linked to the sex instinct.⁶⁸

In this excerpt, Cahun is directly responding to the AEAR’s disbelief in the medium of poetry as a communist art form. She discounts arguments that poetry is a capitalist endeavor and even suggests that it moves beyond political and economic structures, fulfilling an inherent human need. Cahun concludes by making a connection between poetry and the sex instinct, a Freudian concept.

Importantly, however, Cahun notes that not all poetry is revolutionary. For her, poems that are interested in formalism, language play, or seemingly unaware of their own revolutionary potential are counterrevolutionary. To determine whether a poem is revolutionary or not, Cahun suggests assessing the manifest and latent content of the poems. The Freudian terms stem from her investment in psychoanalysis and refer to the surface meaning of language (manifest) and how it functions in the unconscious (latent). It is noteworthy that this exploration also seems to take place within her photographs, as she utilized the camera in an effort to make aspects of the unconscious visible.
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Whereas some members of the AEAR believed that Soviet socialist realism was the only adequate form of communist artwork, Cahun’s essay was less black-and-white, arguing that certain types of poetry are as effective, if not more so, than some forms of communist propaganda were in encouraging psychological agitation in readers. The AEAR ultimately disbanded in 1936 due to dissent of the members and, “isolation from the workers it claimed to support.”\(^69\)

While some members of this group went on to support Soviet socialist realism, negating all avant-garde art practices as bourgeois, Cahun did not follow, and on the Isle of Jersey even found an occasion in which wearing bourgeois fashion took on a subversive political meaning.

As Thynne has noted, the ideas within “Place Your Bets” became the basis for Cahun and Moore’s anti-Nazi resistance on the Isle of Jersey later in their lives.\(^70\) From her initial defense of poetry, Cahun attempts to develop a deeper understanding of the “propaganda value” of poetry as a way to determine a poem’s potential for inciting a revolution.\(^71\) She measures propaganda value by breaking down the type of action a piece of poetry or art can produce into three categories: direct action, forcible direct action, and indirect action.\(^72\) Direct action, Cahun writes, is comprised of:

> Great moralizing and usually rhythmical poetry…The kind of poetry one learns by heart…It is the effect of commercials or the ideological publicity of catchwords like, “All elegant women are customers of Printemps…” or “Your country is the USSR, a sixth of the globe….” This sort of propaganda benefits from the use of repetition, and it is not unusual to find repetition, puns, rhymes, and all the mnemonic techniques that are at the

\(^70\). Thynne, “Indirect Action,” 4. Claire Follain and Kristine von Oehsen have also made similar observations.
\(^71\). Cahun, “Poetry Keeps its Secret,” 53.
\(^72\). Doy, *Claude Cahun*, 114. Only direct and indirect action will be discussed here. It is also worth mentioning that direct forcible action is a facet of direct action, using counterrevolutionary propaganda as a means to generate the opposite response in audiences.
Cahun describes direct action in a manner similar to that of formalist poetry; the writing is catchy but empty, operating only on the surface. Cahun surmises that this type of writing is akin to “revolutionary masturbation,” ultimately exhausting the masses it aims to agitate. Direct action has all the appearances of action without a specific gesture to correspond to it, as if repeating a slogan is enough to generate structural change through affirmation.

Most relevant for Cahun and Moore’s anti-Nazi resistance pursuits is the concept of indirect action, a practice that attempts to make visible the unconscious of both the maker and their audience. Of this, she writes:

[Indirect action] is a question of starting people off and leaving them in the lurch. This obliges the reader to go one-step further than he would like. All the ways out have been carefully blocked, but [he] is left in charge of opening the way in. “Let them wish,” Breton said…I think indirect action is the only one that works from both a propagandistic and poetic viewpoint.

In this passage, Cahun describes indirect action as a means of generating a dialogue with the audience by refusing to complete an idea, or by being purposefully absurd, vague, or contradictory. The ultimate goal of indirect action is to move the audience from passive roles into active ones, which require deeper intellectual engagement and inspire making a visible gesture of dissent. Through their performative and lyrical nature, Cahun and Moore’s resistance tracts are an attempt to create propaganda that meets the criteria of indirect action. It is a tactic that can be understood as a “dialectical” poetry, as Gen Doy has termed it, beginning a conversation for its audience to finish.
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as Cahun sees it, requires an active participation on the part of the reader in divining the subtext of what is being said, and thus pushing them to advance to a higher level of comprehension, or rather questioning of the status quo.”

Indirect action inherently relies on a tension between surface-level and deeper meanings to push audiences to seek new understandings. This tension was put into practice in Cahun and Moore’s dual-personas as eccentric sisters, and as the more political persona of “The Soldier without a Name.”

Cahun continues her line of thinking about propaganda values by suggesting that the ultimate efficacy of a propagandistic poem could be determined by quantifying the amount of action that it stirs up in its viewer. Put another way, propaganda’s value can be measured by assessing the cause-effect relationship between viewing art (and propaganda) and a viewer’s particular actions in response. However, Cahun concedes that taking this sort of measurement is actually impossible, suggesting instead that it would only be possible to measure the depth of emotion a piece of propaganda stirs up in a viewer. For Cahun, attempts to measure action are futile, as the reasons a person ultimately takes action are too ambiguous to ascertain; there are too many factors within an individual’s psyche to consider.

This reinforces the point that Cahun makes when contrasting direct action and indirect action: inciting an audience to feel deeply, but in a passive mode, is ineffective because it creates the illusion of action, moving audience emotionally, but does not cause them to act or alter larger structural imbalances of power.

In *Dissensus: On Politics and Art*, Jacques Rancière introduces a similar concept of “dissensus,” which provides a productive framework to unpack Cahun’s concept of indirect
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action. Like Cahun, Rancière is similarly critical of art movements that claim to catalyze action through the production of emotion, specifically shock. He writes, “There is no straight path from the viewing of a spectacle to an understanding of the state of the world, and none why understanding the latter ought to produce a decision to change it.” In addition to this, he rejects the notion that traditional forms of mimetic representation and models of participatory art can incite audiences to action. Rather than establish a hierarchy of the most productive art forms, for Rancière, the terms “dissensus,” “politics,” and “fiction” productively culminate into an artistic framework that can mobilize political action in audiences who encounter it.

Before contextualizing Rancière within Cahun and Moore’s acts of anti-Nazi resistance, it is first necessary to define Rancière’s terms. He defines dissensus as, “A conflict between sensory presentation and a way of making sense of it, or between several sensory regimes and/or ‘bodies.’” Generating dissensus within a viewer offers the potential for action by producing agency within subjects that rewrite prescribed divisions of people based on power structures. It is similar to the concept of indirect action insofar as it creates a disconnect between visual appearances and how those appearances are then interpreted. Dissensus is a facet of politics that actively negotiates the space between powers. As he writes:

[Politics] invents new forms of collective enunciation; it re-frames the given by inventing new ways of making sense of the sensible, new configurations between the visible and the invisible, and between the audible and inaudible, new distributions of space and time—in short, new bodily capacities.

Within this definition, politics refers to an active contestation of power through the body. Cahun
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and Moore’s resistance campaign enacts politics through reconfigurations of visibility and invisibility, through the creation and embodiment of multiple subject positions that rupture bodily and circumstantial limits.

The creation of “The Soldier without a Name” allowed them to breach spaces and audiences that they otherwise would not have been able to access. Their actions constitute the creation of political and artistic fictions, which:

[Introduce] dissensus by hollowing out the “real” and [multiplying them] in a polemical way. Fiction is not so much a binary between real and imaginary, fact and falsity, or observable truth and speculation, but a more ambiguous place where multiple narratives distort the way we encounter the everyday. The practice of fiction undoes and then re-articulates connections between signs and images, images and times, and signs and spaces, framing a given sense of reality, a given “commonsense.” It is a practice that invents new trajectories between what can be seen, what can be said and what can be done.\(^\text{84}\)

As a space defined by propaganda, it is productive to think of the Isle of Jersey under German occupation as a site of multiple fictions. Similar to Peggy Phelan’s observations in *Unmarked*, the ultimate goal of inciting dissensus and creating fictions is to challenge ideological structures of authority by fundamentally altering one’s perception of such institutions, which redraws boundaries between public and private, transparency and opacity, and visibility and invisibility. A similar idea is raised on André Breton’s *Manifesto of Surrealism* (1924), where he suggests that altering perception through automatic writing is favorable to illusionistic representations, a notion that Cahun and Moore put into practice.\(^\text{85}\) By creating the character of “The Soldier without a Name,” a Nazi soldier that was vehemently against German occupation, Cahun and Moore dissented against occupation not through visible public protest, but by introducing an artistic fiction onto the Isle, one that complicated the beliefs one would expect Nazi soldiers to

\(^{84}\) Ibid., 148–149.
hold. Fiction as a strategy undoes divisions set between everyday life, aesthetic, and political regimes by pushing against the boundaries that divide them. When these realms intersect, a new understanding of reality emerges, ultimately exposing systems of power that were previously rendered invisible.

Although the larger goal of their campaign, inciting soldiers to mutiny, was ultimately unsuccessful, the dissemination of their leaflets did represent an attempt at solidarity by presenting soldiers with an open-ended offer to join their resistance. Operating under the belief that not all Nazi soldiers actually believed in Nazism, the leaflets were an effort to inspire action by making counternarratives visible, fostering an imagined community for those soldiers who held similar sentiments, and creating a sense of distrust within those who did not. This is an important part of politics for Rancière, which, “Consists above all in the framing of a we, a collective demonstration whose emergence is the element that disrupts the social parts, an element that I call...the anonymous.”86 Rather than merely giving a collective voice to an anonymous population, collective identity in this sense works to create shared experiences, ideally leading to a proliferation of displays of dissensus.87

Of their leaflets generally, Cahun felt, “The most effective were perhaps the most subjective, the most sincere, the most romantic, the most ‘disengaged’ [from political positions].”88 Cahun and Moore’s leaflets did not resolve to one particular outcome, but rather made thoughts of dissent both visible and tactile through the materiality of the tracts themselves. The dispersal of the tracts index Cahun and Moore’s presence at the same time they are rendered absent, functioning similarly to the portrait photographs made of Cahun in Paris. Ultimately,

---

87. Ibid.
their acts of dissensus were an attempt to generate a perceptual difference that puts conceptions of reality and authority that often go unchallenged into question, through the performance and parody of an authoritative voice.89

Within the context of this paper, Claude Cahun and Marcel Moore’s acts of resistance can be read not only as practices of indirect action, but also as attempts to introduce fictions on the Isle in hopes of producing dissensus. Cahun and Moore’s theatrical, surrealist leaflets operate in the realm of fiction, as manipulations of reality that create new connections while obscuring others. By exercising politics in a performative register, they are able to create new bodily capacities despite their position as invisible, marginalized subjects through “The Soldier without a Name.” Cahun and Moore’s dissemination of resistance tracts to German soldiers attempted to change the distribution of space, render invisible ideologies visible, or at least make them conceivable when they seemed otherwise under occupation.

CODA

After four years of campaigning, Cahun and Moore were arrested for their acts as anti-Nazi propagandists. As they distributed their leaflets on cigarette paper, German authorities began checking purchases of large quantities of rolling papers, suspicious, as tobacco on the Isle at this time was limited. On July 25, 1944, after making such a purchase, Cahun and Moore rode the bus back to La Rocquaise when a soldier travelling with them requested that passengers show identification, a common practice. A few months prior, in March, Cahun was summoned for an interview by the Feldpolizei, as her name Schwob had led to inquiries that she might be Jewish. Although Cahun walked away from this interrogation with her freedom intact, Lucy Schwob was on the radar of Nazi authorities after this encounter.

When her identification papers were checked, the boxes of cigarette papers she and Moore carried in tow became evidence of their actions. Cahun suspected that the woman who had sold them to her was a Nazi informant. According to Cahun’s diaries, she was spotted on the bus the day of their arrest. Military authorities sentenced Cahun and Moore to death for their political activities, but they were not immediately sent to concentration camps, as it was believed that they had to be working under a German soldier. This misinformation on the part of the Germans sheds light on their ingenuity. Capitalizing on the sexist expectations of the average soldier, the discordance between the persona of “The Soldier without a Name” and their visual appearances as innocent sisters kept Claude Cahun and Marcel Moore alive, but unwell and imprisoned until liberation came to the Isle on May 9, 1945.  

91. Ibid., 21.  
92. Follain, “Lucy Schwob and Suzanne Malherbe—Résistantes,” 87. Cahun’s poor health conditions also made the option of deporting them off the Isle difficult.  
93. Ibid., 92.
Upon liberation, Cahun and Moore resumed their photographic practice. In an image taken in 1947, Cahun stands in the graveyard on St. Brelade’s Bay across from their home (Fig. 18). Cahun stands tall, holding a cigarette and wearing trousers, black military style boots, and a long scarf and jacket. She stands upon a patch of cement with the word “private” etched into it. Between her legs is a large cat that also looks directly at the camera. In the lower right hand corner is a small skull, giving this image the quality of a *vanitas*. This photograph is also a double exposure; while the overlaying image is unclear, we might imagine that this portrait depicts Cahun as embodying the invisible figure of “The Soldier without a Name.” The overt masculinity, coupled with the military details of her sartorial choice and the fact that she is standing tall in a military graveyard, suggest this is the manifestation of his haunting presence.

This photograph also represents another renegotiation of space, illustrating the shift in power from this military cemetery under Nazi control, to being part of Cahun and Moore’s scopic field. Despite the public nature of the photograph, a sense of opacity persists, foregrounded within this image by the presence of the word “private,” which recalls both their personal lives, and the anonymity of “The Soldier without a Name.” While this may have been a matter of happenstance, an earlier image of Cahun standing next to another sign reading “private” demonstrates their penchant for this word, where privacy can be understood to be a type of freedom (Fig. 19). The latter image (Fig. 18) functions as an all-encompassing depiction of the various identity narratives created by Cahun and Moore. The surrogate figure of the cat at Cahun’s feet suggests that Moore is also represented in this image, not only through her spectral presence, or through the sublimation of their identities within “The Soldier without a Name,” but also through the feline figure, a surrogacy similarly to that of the portrait of their cat from 1940 (Fig. 1).
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Figure 1. Claude Cahun and Marcel Moore, *View of Soldiers at La Rocquaise*, 1940. Jersey Archives.

Figure 2. Claude Cahun and Marcel Moore, *I.O.U*, 1929. From *Disavowals: Cancelled Confessions*, 1930. Jersey Archives.
Figure 3. Claude Cahun and Marcel Moore, *Portrait*, 1927. Jersey Archives.

Figure 4. Claude Cahun and Marcel Moore, *Portrait*, 1920. Jersey Archives.
Figure 5. Claude Cahun and Marcel Moore, *Portrait*, 1925. Jersey Archives.

Figure 7. Claude Cahun and Marcel Moore, Portrait, 1928. Jersey Archives.
Figure 8. Passport Photo of Lucy Schwob, 1936. Private collection, UK.
Figure 9. Claude Cahun and Marcel Moore, *Portrait*, 1927. Jersey Archives.

Figure 10. Claude Cahun and Marcel Moore in front of the window display that is a part of the book launch of *Aveux non Avenus*, 1930. Jersey Archives.
Figure 11. Claude Cahun and Marcel Moore, *Portrait*, 1939. Jersey Archives.
Figure 12. Claude Cahun and Marcel Moore, *Portrait*, 1937. Jersey Archives.
“For who is not afraid of the right to freedom:

In addition to our weekly labor, we have to do subsequent work for this newspaper, about ordinary hazards. We give our time and our effort in an emergency. We give our lives for freedom, peace and our home country!

For the True Germany! For the great Goethe's Germany, Hitler's Nazi Germany would like to sully vain.

Kamraden!
Are you with us?

The Soldier without a Name.”

Figure 13. Claude Cahun and Marcel Moore, Propaganda Tracts, 1940–1944. Jersey Archives.

“I think the waves will devour the boatman and small boat at the end of the war and the roar of Adolf Hitler will quiet. Sir (colonel?)”

Figure 14. Claude Cahun and Marcel Moore, Propaganda Tracts, 1940–1944. Jersey Archives.
Figure 15. Marcel Moore, *Fashion Illustrations*, 1915–16. Jersey Archives.

“Comrades of the Navy!
Soldiers and Workers!
Spread our newspaper in the harbor!
Widespread in France
Widespread in Belgium
Widespread in Holland
Widespread in Denmark
Widespread in Norway
Widespread in Germany!
Take it on vacation with you!

Recognize: Win and fight, fight, fight,
etc....ight, ight, ight FIGHTTTTT.....
Fate and Fight!

Struggle without end, or horror and death.
Defeat? Freedom!”

Figure 16. Claude Cahun and Marcel Moore, *Propaganda Tracts*, 1940–1944. Jersey Archives.
“Freedom from Conscience
The Soldier without a Name works daily
sovereign and in the light-hearted way plots
on.

We observe this commonality and try to
understand and so minimize the differences
that are among people.
Our revolution should be for everyone, not
one.

Our revolution is to be taken by all.
Our revolution is by all not one.

This writing is a prophecy.”

Figure 17. Claude Cahun and Marcel Moore, *Propaganda Tracts*, 1940–1944. Jersey Archives.
Figure 18. Claude Cahun and Marcel Moore, *Portrait (Cat, Cigarette, and Skull)*, 1947. Jersey Archives.

Figure 19. Claude Cahun and Marcel Moore, *Portrait*, 1945. Jersey Archives.
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