

Glorious to Gruesome: Callot, Goya, and Picasso, and the Art of War

For centuries, art has glorified war. Ancient Greek statues of warrior heroes, portraits of great generals going off to battle, recreations of enemy surrender, paintings and drawings calling men to fight to protect their country, all represent war as glorious. Artists visually capturing war have used their talents to evoke a sense of patriotism as well as pride in soldiery, and to document historical events during conflict. Some of the more well-known instances of art relating to war and aiming to evoke patriotism are World War Two propaganda posters encouraging soldiers to arms and women to the factories. For the United States, Uncle Sam and Rosie the Riveter both looked directly at the viewer, calling them personally to the war effort, with Uncle Sam pointing to the men and Rosie telling the women they could take care of the home front. Such images stem from a long tradition of art motivating duty by glorifying heroic efforts. In 1851, the artist Emanuel Leutze portrayed George Washington—one of the most revered figures in United States history—as a mighty general standing tall and proud in a long boat crossing the icy Delaware River. Painted during the Revolutions of 1848, it was meant to encourage the liberators of Europe by representing the first great victory of the American Revolution.¹ Likewise, Hyacinthe Rigaud’s warrior-like portrait of King Louis XIV of France shows the absolute power and militaristic strengthen Louis held, and Eugene Delacroix’s *Liberty Leading the People* encourages her compatriots to move forward and fight for the liberation of the French. Art displaying hubris, or even aggression, has been used as a way of instilling war figures with honor, dignity, and pride. As Esther Averill declares, “[military] Art had usually stressed the glory of battle and the joy of conquest.”²

Whether creating propaganda posters or recreating iconic scenes in history, artists have always had a purpose including documenting the effects of war. Artists create to memorialize

events, express emotions, and tell stories. Prior to the invention of photography, paintings, drawings, and etchings were the only way to capture an image. For this reason, artists have as much power to represent reality visually, as authors have with the power of word choice. One can look at different paintings of George Washington and infer the artists' political feelings as Washington is variously portrayed as handsome and stately, or old and feeble. Like literature, art invites viewers to draw from their own experiences and perceptions when interpreting a work. Since art typically is a composition layering image and color, the viewer can find hidden meanings through analysis and close observation. Likewise, because art is so subjective, some critics believe that artists have a moral obligation to present images responsibly. These critics condemn artists for using their work frivolously as a way to mislead the public. As a New York journalist stated at the start of the American Civil War, “ARTISTS! ... remember that your elegant brushes are recording the history of a nation.”³ Although this concept of “recording” may be a noble goal, it is rarely applied in practice. Artists throughout history have used their work to persuade, influence, and even deceive the public, especially when depicting war. Patriotism, politics, and propaganda invade war art, and artists take advantage of their medium to push forward their own personal agendas.

Although the victories and heroism of war have been popular subjects of art, war obviously has a dark side. Joanna Bourke states in her introduction to *War and Art: A Visual History of Modern Conflict*, “War is the most destructive activity known to humanity. Its purpose is to use violence to compel opponents to submit and surrender.”⁴ In other words, war is only glorifying to the winner. Artists traditionally record the winning side, but what about the losing side; the side that has fallen? What about the dark, the cruel, and the ugly? William Astore, a retired Lieutenant Colonel of the United States Armed Forces, writes, “War is not glorious. It

may feature noble deeds and remarkable sacrifices, but it also features brutality and many other bloody realities. War breaks men (and women) down. It does so because war is unnatural.”⁵

Artists down the centuries have understood this reality, yet few have chosen to depict the brutality in overt ways. However, three artists—Jacques Callot, Francisco Goya, and Pablo Picasso—chose to explore the darker side of war. These men experienced war first-hand, witnessing the cruelty and atrocity of battle—war was in their backyards. Although none of these artists were soldiers, each of them by design or accident, viewed the bloodshed and experienced the repercussions of warfare. Profoundly affected by conflict, Callot, Goya, and Picasso became the chroniclers of combat for their audiences; they also have provided people with a way to see, even centuries later, the cruelties of conflict. These three artists recorded the violence of their times by depicting the horrors of war, demonizing their enemies, and making a great impact with their art by dramatizing war.

This paper will examine the effects of war and how they are interpreted by Callot, Goya, and Picasso. How each of these artists used their work to portray the brutalities of combat to influence public opinion will be evident through the examination of the works presented here. The circumstances of their times, the effects war had on the artists themselves, and the various fashions in art will be discussed in relation to illuminating the trauma of battle as opposed to glorifying heroes. Firstly, this paper examines how the artists depict war and its horrors through color, style, context, and symbolism. Secondly, the dark side of war is discussed as these artist demonize their enemies, either making them neutral to both parties, faceless, or removed completely from the image. Likewise, the use of vulnerable victims, such as the clergy, women, and children are exploited in order to manipulate the viewers’ emotions. Finally, dramatization was used by each artist to present the images as a grand statement and add to the repugnance of

the situation. Through depiction, demonization, and dramatization, Callot, Goya, and Picasso all reveal a clear hatred for war and the effects it had on not only the military, but society as well.

Today, soldiers and generals are typically no longer immortalized by etchings and paintings. With the advent of photography and film, the soldier is made real through the image rather than the imagination. Television and computer screens bring war in real-time to anyone interested in watching. However, during the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648), The Napoleonic Wars (1803-1815), and The Spanish Civil War (1936-1939), unless one was an eyewitness on the scene the horrors of the event were experienced only through report. Often receiving news by word of mouth or through newspaper articles, people did not have the luxury of instant news or vivid images of war. Critics today say that Picasso's *Guernica* is an "important artistic and social document," and Callot is described as an early documenter of the violent Thirty Years' War because of his *Les Misères et les Mal-Heures de Guerre*.⁶ Artists like Callot, Goya, and Picasso brought the devastation to life through paintings so people could understand the reality and remember the costs of war.

The way that a scene is depicted is crucial to the intent of the artist. Setting a mood establishes whether an image will be viewed as uplifting or disturbing. The methods of depiction are important to the antiwar messages these artists present by allowing them to use their craft to impact the public mind. Depiction is defined as "representation in image form, as in a painting or illustration."⁷ The way something is illustrated, including the media used, produces a specific effect and determines how a message is received. Style, color, and light are essential components needed to bring to life the times and emotions of the artist. A painting done in an Abstract style gives a different impression than one painted in the Baroque, and with changing styles come changing ideas and ideals. "[A]rtists have blended colours, textures and patterns to depict

wartime ideologies, practices, values and symbols” to express their views on war.⁸ By studying the grotesque horrors of combat and focusing on the gruesome instead of the glorious, artists depict and enhance the violence of war and allow those who have not been exposed to conflict to be enlightened. The artist’s work “investigates not only artistic responses to war, but the meaning of violence itself.”⁹

Picasso is a prime example of how the evolving style of art can impact the way war is perceived. Picasso lived when Europe was being pulled apart. During the three year Spanish Civil War, the fight for the Republic against Spanish nationalists was in full swing, with Francisco Franco at the helm of the Nationalist movement. A leader in Cubism style nearing the beginning of the Second World War, Picasso lived in Paris when he painted one of his best-known pieces, *Guernica*. This painting was inspired by the small town of the same name in northern Spain that was known for its Basque culture and industry. On April 26, 1937, a year into the Spanish Civil War, German air raids relentlessly bombed Guernica, destroying most of the town. As one eyewitness states, “Guernica, city with 5,000 residents, has been literally razed to the ground.”¹⁰ The number of casualties are unknown, estimates recorded around 1600 victims. In a time of artistic freedom, the style of Cubism allowed artists to experiment with shapes in a way that had not been explored before. Defined features and authentic colors disappeared in paintings of this style, which liberated the artist to express him- or herself in a new way. By using various shapes rather than realism, Picasso was able to illustrate the ensuing chaos within the image. The style intensifies the scene of war presented, giving it an unrealistic yet haunting presence. During an interview, Picasso stated, “Cubism is not either a seed or a fetus, but an art dealing primarily with forms, and when a form is realized it is there to live its own life... Cubism has kept itself within the limits and limitations of painting, never pretending

to go beyond it.”¹¹ Not only does he use shapes to defy the definitions of painting, but he also utilizes a monochromatic setting in varying shades of gray. Removing any color gives the scene a clear and direct presence with no distractions or second guesses; what one sees is what is there.

Picasso’s painting transcends time and inspired others to express political dissatisfaction through art. This fact can be seen in the South African recreation of *Guernica*. In 2010, a community in South Africa recreated parts of *Guernica* with textiles, mainly blankets from health clinics that were closed.¹² People in the area were dying of AIDs as there were no clinics within walking distance and transportation was either too expensive or non-existent. By using blankets from the clinics as their medium, this small village was able to depict their loss reimagining parts of *Guernica*, much like Picasso was able to depict how he felt about the loss of that Basque town, the bombing of which had the support of Spanish Nationalist Leader, Francisco Franco, who experimented with the effects of civilian bombings. Making a case for the painting’s timelessness, Ishaan Tharoor from *The Independent* quoted a witness to the bombing, “The raid on Guernica is unparalleled in military history... Guernica was not a military objective. A factory producing war material lay outside the town and was untouched. The object of the bombardment was seemingly the demoralization of the civil population and the destruction of the cradle of the Basque race.”¹³ Just as those in South Africa were raising awareness for HIV and AIDs patients, Picasso was using *Guernica* to express his outrage against civilian attacks and the brutality for military experimentation.

As an unexpected, and in many peoples’ view, an unnecessary part of the war, the bombing left an incredible impact not only on Spain, but on the artist himself. Already commissioned to present a painting at the Paris 1937 Exhibition in July, Picasso painted his reaction to the bombing within a month. The abstract portrait of confusion and disaster presents

images of a bull, an injured horse, a wailing mother caressing her dead child, a fallen soldier, and others that give the impression of chaos. Novelist and biographer Patrick O'Brian mentions how this painting is viewed by some to simply be propaganda, but he believes this conclusion is a mistake.¹⁴ Though there can be no doubt that *Guernica* holds elements of propaganda, O'Brian also sees it in Picasso's contempt and outrage against the Spanish Nationalists, particularly Franco, though there is no indication of Picasso naming either the Nationalists or the Republic. Those who have studied *Guernica* believe that the characters of this tragedy are more than they appear and are more likely to be symbols of the artist's point of view.

Goya's depiction of war is very different, but also very powerful. It is not chaos of war the artist wishes to convey, but its brutality. Known in his time as a court painter for King Charles IV of Spain, he painted the royal family and other aristocrats. The elegance of the people he painted earned him national recognition due to his Baroque and natural style.¹⁵ Goya's paintings give the impression of light and color, showing emotion and character. *The Parasol*, painted in 1777, is just such a painting layered in color and realistic simplicity, showing his art as a mixture of "high Renaissance and Baroque with an amazing realism of his own."¹⁶ However, two major events happened in Goya's life that defined him as a man and as an artist. First, in 1793 Goya was ill and bedridden for several months. Although not diagnosed in his lifetime, doctors today believe he may have suffered from an autoimmune disease called Susac's syndrome.¹⁷ Rachael Rettner notes that, according to the Cleveland Clinic, "In this rare condition, a person's immune system attacks small blood vessels in the brain, retina and inner ear... Symptoms can include severe headaches, difficulties thinking, psychiatric problems and loss of vision, balance and hearing."¹⁸ Goya suffered from many of these symptoms during his illness. Even though he eventually recovered, he was left permanently deaf. A second life

altering event was the invasion of the French into Spain, particularly the execution of Spanish patriots. Even though Goya made an alliance to Joseph Bonaparte who was placed on the Spanish throne by his brother-in-law and received the Napoleonic Royal Order of Spain, Goya was still appalled by the cruel and unjust actions of the French army.¹⁹ As part of the even greater Napoleonic Wars, the Peninsular Wars suffered from the terroristic invasions of Napoleon and his armies.²⁰

The effects of these experiences resulted in Goya's paintings and prints growing darker, often showing a world of nightmares and horrors. An example is *The Colossus* completed in 1812, which shows a giant walking over a stampede of wandering animals and people, his fist clenched, eyes shut and back turned towards the audience. The painting is chaotic and dark, only having splashes of color and light. This painting and others like it give the impression that the darker his paintings get the more complex they are as if he is trying to convey to the audience what is going on inside his head. One of his most powerful paintings in this category is *Third of May, 1808*. "The victims, whose faces are vividly etched, display the full range of human emotions at the moment of death. Some are terrified, some are prayerful, some are stoic—all are transcendent in their humanity."²¹ While these subjects are cloaked in darkness, the illuminated figure stands out. "The main figure, a man dressed in a white shirt, kneels before his executioners with his arms upraised in a final gesture of defiance or supplication, almost Christ-like in his suffering (he even has a pierced palm). He represents all the helpless victims of war—his fate is literally out of his hands"²² Goya uses his experiences and his troubled imagination to express his abhorrence of the French brutality over the Spanish people through his artwork as he demonizes the French army.

Focusing on an execution in *Third of May 1808*, Goya paints a complete picture, not leaving out any details. However, he also uses artistic techniques to convey a message of urgency in this painting. Goya uses an impressionistic style—seventy years before the movement began. The Impressionists of the late nineteenth century used light brush strokes and airy movements to give a different life to paintings beyond merely a realistic portrayal of a scene, while allowing color and light to influence the movement of the picture. Goya uses these techniques to give a sense of being in the moment, while also presenting a realistic image of the figures in his work. It is recorded that Goya did in fact watch the execution of Spanish patriots by the French army, and with feathery brush strokes, the artist gives the viewer a sense of immediacy. Witnessed outside his home in Madrid, Goya went into the streets to see the execution, sketching the sight and memories of the event. His gardener, Isidro, is said to have gone with his master to the site. A biographer of the event writes:

The artist approached the dead bodies, sat down on a ridge just above them, and “calmly” looked for his sketchbook and pencil while his gardener shook with terror at the sight of the dead bodies, pools of blood, and dogs preying on the corpses. Goya sketched everything, Isidro recalled, and the following morning showed him the first print of “The War,” which the gardener viewed with terror: “Sir,” I asked him, “why is it that you depict such human barbarities?” And he responded, “To have the satisfaction of saying to men, forevermore, that they should not be savages.”²³

Later, in 1814 after Napoleon lost control over Spain, Goya presented his depiction of the execution through his painting. Goya also created a piece, *Second of May, 1808*, depicting the battle that occurred the day before the execution. Unlike *Third of May, 1808*, *Second of May, 1808* is busy, filled with people and actions. Set in the daytime, men on horseback battle with those below them and unknowingly are about to be ambushed as the horses rear in fear. Goya’s depiction of *Third of May, 1808* highlights the scene with scarcity rather than with details. In opposition to *Second of May, 1808*, he presents an uncomplicated scene, the victims, the

executioners, and the faint view of the town in the background. This simplicity brings to light the importance of the main figures of the scene; the Spanish patriots, the French Infantry, and a central character awaiting execution.

In *Third of May, 1808*, colors are used to highlight the action. Despite the impressionistic style overall, Goya uses his colors in a Baroque fashion where the lightest colors are centered on the main figure and the world around him is dark. His central figure dons a bright white shirt and bright yellow breeches that make the figure illuminated in the scene as his clothes reflect the only light source within the piece. His fellow compatriots and the soldiers before them all wear neutral colors and are not as bright as the central figure. Like the foreground the setting of the painting is dark and shadowy. With the faint image of a steeple and town faded into the background, the artist, “[w]ithout painting ruins... evoked ghosts of [the town].”²⁴ Leaving only the central character illuminated, even the surroundings are merely a silhouette.

Of the three artists, Callot’s depiction stands out because of his use of detail in his etchings. During the Thirty Years’ War, he created a collection of engraved prints that show the horrors of war on the common people, as well as the life of a soldier following war.²⁵ Though it is not as pronounced as the French infantry in Goya’s piece, Callot’s art also degrades the enemy in the act of war. In speaking of Callot, Susan Sontag writes, “The practice of representing atrocious suffering as something to be deplored, and, if possible, stopped, enters the history of images with a specific subject: the sufferings endured by a civilian population at the hands of a victorious army on the rampage. It is a quintessentially secular subject, which emerges in the seventeenth century, when contemporary realignments of power become material for artists.”²⁶ Considered mostly a religious war between Catholics and Protestants, the backdrop of the Thirty Years’ War was the world in which Callot lived. Lorraine (eventually siding against the French)

was a continuous battlefield. Callot was born in Nancy which was, “a flourishing cosmopolitan town” in the Duchy of Lorraine, and “was... a crossroad of typhus, smallpox, syphilis, and plague as French, German, Italian, and Spanish Netherland (*sic*) troops marched across the city *en route* to their next battle.”²⁷ Eventually, he became a renowned engraver and is known today, particularly for his *Miseries of War* etchings. By examining three of these engravings—*Destruction of a Convent*, *Pillage of a Farmhouse*, and *The Hanging*—one can see the attack on a religious house and order, the rape and murder of a farmer’s family, and the demise of fallen soldiers. Callot’s prints, unlike the other pieces examined here, have one unique feature: Callot never states, with the image or by textual comment, which side he favors in the war. In the collection of prints, he presents horrific scenes and lets the viewer make a judgement.

Callot’s lines are fine and the black ink against the parchment is markedly different from the boldness of color painting. His etchings were an inspiration to artists that followed. His pieces give the impression of a quick, light hand that leads one to believe that he was a witness to the event. A fellow engraver, Romeyn de Hooghe, was an artist from the Netherlands, a generation younger than Callot and served under the patronage of King William III of England.²⁸ De Hooghe’s piece *Pillage of a House* shows a similar scene to Callot’s *Pillage of a Farmhouse*; murder, rape, the home burning as the soldiers attack. However, the key difference in these scenes are the lack of extreme detail on Callot’s part. Even though this could be viewed in many different ways—laziness, or lack of care—Callot actually seems very purposeful in his style. Callot adds just enough detail to give character and understanding to the image, showing the horror on the women’s faces, the horrible attacks on defenseless men, and the slaughtered, discarded animals. He does so as if he is sketching quickly, catching as many details as possible before the scene ends. De Hooghe shows the scene with great detail, catching everything there is

to be seen and more; each line shows the folds of the bed curtains, the devilish smirk on the man's face as he sets fire to the bed with two victims tied to it, the look of horror on the severed head rolled across the floor. He gives the scene an animated and detailed sense of urgency, giving the appearance of showing the horror after the fact, rather than Callot who gives the impression of being in the moment. Though these two artists use the same scene and the same medium to portray it, Callot's swiftness actually adds to the impact of his prints, bringing the reality of the war to the viewer.

Women play a large role within the three etchings discussed here, because they bring into specific relief the emphasis on weakness and those in need of protection. In *Pillage of a Farmhouse*, three women are being attacked in the two lower corners of the print and in the center of the piece. While using the angle of perspective, Callot makes it impossible for the viewer to escape the violation of women. He uses this technique as an example of how innocent subjects are compromised and injured. Those in the country and in towns, even within the confines of holy places are victimized. *Destruction of a Convent* shows the plundering of a holy order as nuns are carried off by the soldiers, holy relics and money are stolen, and what appears to be a holy priest is about to be murdered from behind without warning. This scene shows how dangerous life was during the Thirty Years' War for civilians, especially women. Many of the soldiers attacking these convents and farmhouses were military men relieved of duty and had no money. Therefore, these mercenaries would attack any place they believed they could find money or food. Gregory Hanlon, a behavioral historian, writes about how poor priests and convents such as the one etched by Callot were easy targets and often stripped of everything they had.²⁹ By depicting these scenes with swiftness, he gives an impression of action, and like Goya and Picasso, he uses his style to bring the matter of unjust war forward.

One of the ways these artists expressed the effects of war was through the demonization of the enemy in images. Demonization is defined: “to portray (someone or something) as evil or worthy of contempt or blame.”³⁰ Regarding art, demonization can be seen in symbolism as well as inflammatory portrayals of the enemy. As they capture scenes of war, each of these artists in some shape or form demonize enemies within their pieces by showing attacks upon the weak—women, children, the poor, the defenseless, and the religious. Each piece connects with at least one of these elements and is the product of the artists’ encounters with violence. An example of demonization, Picasso’s *Guernica* displays a wailing mother holding her dead child. He used the newly formed style of Cubism to show the effects of a community torn from its foundations and its people blown apart. This image shows the audience the barbarity of the German bombers as they killed innocent women and children who more than likely had no warning of what was to happen. “A witness to Guernica and not a participant,” the woman appears in pain more from the effects of the conflict and the death of her child rather than from the injury.³¹ Another victim in *Guernica*, is the speared horse bucking in agony. The horse is a wounded animal being hunted for sport and is sometimes believed to be a representative for the people of the town; unjustifiably hunted and killed.

Often, artists use animals to add an element of symbolism to their work. In Picasso’s painting alongside the horse, a bull is also visible serving as a powerful representation. A traditionally viewed symbol of Spain and an image often used by Picasso in his works, the bull in the case of this painting is believed by some to be a symbol of fascism. As Charlotte Doyle of Sarah Lawrence College states, “The bull in Picasso’s art... [holds] many meanings: the lusty animal, Spain, the noble bull fight opponent, and various incarnations of the Minotaur: erotic, destructive, wounded, blind. But the bull, sometimes in these guises, was also frequently a

personal symbol for Picasso, the artist.”³² The bull could also be a symbol for Franco, and this is not the first time Picasso associated the animal with the Nationalist leader. Picasso was an avowed “anti-Francoist artist” with anti-Francoism as a “personal engagement” against the evils taking over Spain.³³ In his series titled, *The Dream and Lie of Franco*, Picasso’s propagandist sketches represent the villainies of the leader, and in this instance Franco is being confronted by a bull meant to represent Spain.³⁴ Similarly, the bull in the painting *Guernica* can be perceived as being either Fascist, due to its ability to survive the bombing, “as the brutish Fascist state,” or as a representative of the Republic and Spain, as a symbol and a force that Picasso shows as being unstoppable.³⁵

In the painting, because it is the only figure in the image still standing tall and uninjured, interpreters have had difficulties determining which image the bull represents, Fascism, the Republic, or Spain. However, O’Brian references an interview with an American soldier where Picasso states how the bull represents brutality against the people, who are represented by the horse.³⁶ The bull stands proud, almost nobly over the woman and child and taller than any other character in the painting. This image thus acts as Franco’s domination and power over Spain and how his actions tower over the innocent. In this manner, Picasso demonizes the enemies by inserting them into the painting symbolically. Aside from this symbolism, there is no sign of a plane or bomber present nor any real sign of Nationalists or Nazi Germans. This omission is significant because it degrades the enemy by ignoring them completely. He gives them no credit or recognition but is letting the actions speak for themselves. He lets the piece stand on its own in time as there is nothing in the painting to specifically connected it with anything but war—not Franco, Spain, even the twentieth Century.

Likewise, Goya learned to visually demonize his enemies through his presentations of the trauma of war. Painting *Third of May, 1808* allowed Goya a cathartic relief, a way to exorcise his demons by revealing the brutalities of war. There are two main ways Goya demonizes the enemy in his painting: his main figure and the faceless infantry. The most eye-catching image in the scene is Goya's main character; the Spanish patriot garbed in bright white shirtsleeves and yellow breeches as he kneels before the gun men, staring down the barrel of the muskets. Described as "one of the most vivid human 'presences' in all art," this figure looks terrified at his fate, his outstretched arms and proud stance show that he is willing to die for his country as it is overtaken by the French.³⁷ As previously noted, with his arms held high over his head, he gives the presence of a Christ-like figure. As a representation of the Savior, this figure gives rise to multiple meanings regarding why he was placed in this position and how it may affect the viewer. As Reva Wolf of Boston College, states, "Goya's association of the prisoner of war with Christ... echoes the rhetoric of the endless stream of propagandistic texts that characterized the struggle against the French... in the face of brutal torture and death, not to give up the fight."³⁸ He kneels willingly in the face of the enemy as a possible representation of sacrificed, and one interpretation of Goya's meaning is that with the murderous attack of these men will come the resurrection of Spanish patriotism.

By attacking a rebel who has the demeanor of the Christian Savior, Goya is presenting the French army as murderers of Christ, much like the Roman soldiers at the Crucifixion. In a country which is predominantly Catholic, the implication would be a great insult to Christianity. Along with the main character, Goya also utilizes a monk, kneeling in prayer in preparation for his death as well as an unknown figure looming in the background. Goya's intentions are unknown, yet some art historians believe the shadowy figure in the lower left-hand corner of the

painting is an angel, or a representation of the Virgin Mary, possibly holding Christ Child.³⁹ In any case, it raises the question: Why put the blessed Virgin there amongst the men being shot? “Here, Goya imparts that, despite the tenacity of the human spirit, acts of heroism and sacrifice can end up futile under the grander schemes of war.”⁴⁰ The attack on women and children, or even the mere representation of them, is a recurring theme in each of these pieces.

Goya’s second way of demonizing his enemy is by presenting them as faceless, in effect detaching the enemy from the audience. Representing them as unworthy of being seen, much as the enemy is viewed (or not viewed) in *Guernica*, eight men stand firing upon the rebels with their backs turned to the audience. Not one of their faces is seen. Mary Connell writes, “The work was not meant to be beautiful, but is instead supposed to be horrible in order to shock the viewer. Goya’s purpose within the painting is less to blame the French, but instead to point out to the people the ‘faceless and mechanical forces of war itself, blindly killing a representative of humanity.’”⁴¹ Remorselessly killing humanity enhances the violent effects of war—how the innocent or the worthy die needlessly. Not only are they “blindly” killing the victims, but they are also packed and prepared with their rucksacks strapped to their backs and their swords by their sides. They are not reluctant conscripts. These figures are professional soldiers, prepared to attack and kill when needed. Since Goya painted this piece in 1814, he has inspired countless other artists including Auguste Renoir and Claude Manet.⁴² Manet’s *Execution of Emperor Maximilian* reveals a great deal of Goya’s influence. For example, Manet’s piece has a victim facing the audience and faceless executioners, save one who does not even look in the direction of the killing. This reflection shows how influential Goya’s work was to the artistic world.

Like Picasso and Goya, Callot also uses elements of demonization in his art. His goal with these prints is not to vindicate but to draw in the viewer deeper as each plate presents a

darker, more sinister image than the previous one. “In each instance, the gruesome invites [the viewer] to be either spectators or cowards, unable to look.”⁴³ In each of the three pieces the lack of designation of a certain side makes them all the more powerful. Both the Catholics and the Protestants had wayward soldiers who took either matters or pleasures into their own hands. In each piece, the soldiers are dressed in full, clean uniforms while they attack those who look ragged and are oftentimes unarmed, “revealing the unheroic miseries which befell both soldier and civilian behind the actual line of battle.”⁴⁴ The assault of the vulnerable is a consistent feature of demonization in Callot’s work. Averill affirmed that “These steady tracks of violence, experienced as regular conditions and sights throughout Lorraine, surely left an impression on Callot that served as a prominent inspiration for the *Misères* series.”⁴⁵ Although he does not express a political side, Callot’s Catholic leanings are evident in his works. *Destruction of a Convent* shows a wretched scene of soldiers raiding a nunnery, pillaging holy items, and the bodily injuries of holy persons. Attacking a convent brings to light not only the attack of women, but also the defenseless and the religious, as churches were prime targets. Like Goya, this shows a blatant attack on Christianity and its community. Even today is it considered sacrilegious to deface a church and people consider it a violation of sanctuary when a church is bombed, or a crime is committed in a worship center. During Callot’s time—when there was a heightened sense of religious conflict—these actions were considered particularly heinous.

By not conveying a particular side in his prints, Callot is stating that all sides are guilty of the practices of war. The French, the Italians, the Germans; each one has the potential to commit the crimes portrayed in Callot’s works and are equally responsible. However, in his etching, *The Hanging*, the demons meet with a just end as soldiers who committed war crimes such as the ones described in *Destruction of a Convent*. Forgiven by the ones whom they attacked as the

priests and monks pray for their souls, the men almost seem to reverently go to their deaths as if they have acknowledged their own demons. Their comrades in arms look on as the executed serve as examples of what end results from committing foul war crimes. Callot, like Picasso and Goya, presented his demons through the persecution of women, the poor, and the religious, as well as the victimization of the defenseless, and in images of punished soldiers.

Perhaps the element of war art that has the most impact is the way the artist dramatizes events. The emotion a piece evokes and the movement it implies create a distinct drama. Picasso, Goya, and Callot all seek to emphasize deeper meanings through dramatization. Dramatization is defined as a way “to express or represent vividly, emotionally, or strikingly.”⁴⁶ Though commonly used to describe theater or sometimes film, it can be used to evaluate visual art and the artist’s intent. By adding the elements of a stage production, each artist shows his work in a greater light, bringing the piece forward into the viewers’ space rather than allowing it to remain remote. Like breaking the fourth wall in a Shakespearean play, these artists pull the viewer into the immediate dangers and horrors of their battles. “Drama, as Aristotle long ago described it, is the presentation of heightened action within a well-structured formal frame of ‘a certain, definite magnitude,’ ‘a well-constructed plot’ with a clear ‘beginning, middle and end.’”⁴⁷ By painting or etching, the artist becomes a storyteller and the images the story, giving the viewer the idea of a beginning, middle, and end. As Sontag states, the artist does not have to be a direct witness, he or she is saying ‘it was like *this*, and it was horrific.’⁴⁸ Dramatization uses both symbolism and style to create a theatrical setting that humanizes the story taking place.

In war art, though the scene(s) captured are only one moment in the story, the viewer can see the anger that started the conflict, and they can infer how it will end in misery and suffering. Richard Shusterman writes that there are two ways of understanding art within the aspects of

drama: naturalism and historicism. “Naturalism see art’s most valuable essence in the vivid intensity of its lived experience of beauty and meaning, in how it directly affects and stimulates by engaging themes that appeal most deeply to our human nature and interests.”⁴⁹ By connecting with the viewer, the artist is able to give them a sense of human nature buried within the picture as Goya’s men are seconds from death, and the mother in *Guernica* cradles her dead child. It brings out the natural human instinct within people giving a work of art a sense of reality. The reverse, however, historicism gives not only historical contexts, but also the history of the physical artwork and offers viewers a wider perspective of when the painting was created. “On the other hand there is the historicist’s insistence that art’s crucially defining feature has nothing at all to do with the vital nature of its experience, but rather resides in the historically constructed social framework that constitutes an object as art by presenting it as such and institutionally determining how it should be treated or experienced.”⁵⁰ This aspect allows the viewer to experience the artwork itself through its wear and tear (damage), the elements it has been in (environments where it has been displayed), and the styles popular for the day; very similar to the difference between a silent film of the early twentieth century and computer generated imagery (CGI) in today’s films. It gives a unique character to each piece of art and reflects the times not only in which it was created, but also the decades or centuries through which it lived.

One of the more dramatic depictions is the central woman in Picasso’s painting. She is a representative—an actress—to the viewers of the fate she suffered. Having to bear the weight of her dead child, she almost seems to scream to the Heavens begging for mercy on her child’s soul. Much like a wailing Lady Macbeth or a distressed Gertrude, her movements and expressions exemplify the horrors around her. “She responds in imagination with inconsolable grief to the terrible acts of the drama.”⁵¹ The other women presented in the scene—the woman carrying a

candle, the woman running away, and the woman wailing at the burning flames—also give a sense of insecurity and confusion. Paired with the imbalance of Picasso's abstract imagery, mass chaos and confusion surround the painting causing the viewer to look every which way in order to attempt to understand the scene set before them. The dismembered soldier with sword in hand dies what appears to be a Shakespearean death like that of Julius Caesar or Macbeth while the events unfold. This pictorial stage is complete with lighting, from the lamp in the woman's hand as she floats from the window and from the eye hanging in the center of the painting, stage lights radiate to enlighten the viewer. All of this scenery, setting, action and lighting, highlights the motion and the agony of death.

Drama, in any form, has the ability to bring the human aspect to the audience and reach a level of the utmost compassion, and Picasso evokes this emotion by focusing on the damage and destruction done from the bombing of war. Picasso also adds to the drama of his piece through his style of Cubism. Like a jigsaw puzzle, the artist's manipulated random pieces to make a landscape. *Guernica* is shattered in the great explosion of the German bombs, and the image has been broken as shards of glass. Picasso also uses color, or lack thereof, to add drama to his piece. "The dramatic intensity of the dark tones slowly making their appearance felt as the painting evolves can be likened to the gradual appearance of an image in a developing tray."⁵² By using dark and light grays for his palette, Picasso is actually making a greater impact. The monochromatic hues allow for despair and sorrow to speak through the chaos represented in the painting. "Considered from the point of view of the practicing artists (rather than that of philosophers), drama's preeminence derives... from its presumed ability to reach more people and move them more powerfully and completely than other art forms."⁵³ Rather than using an explosion of color, the use of various grays allows for Picasso's Cubist technique to further

emphasize destruction and dramatize the act of being blown apart by an explosion. The drama is heightened even more through the images of the loss of a child or fleeing for one's life as the women in the piece represent. By adding drama to his piece, Picasso brings the crisis to the forefront for an unaffiliated—or not personally involved—society and allows them to experience the war. Picasso's *Guernica* has impacted the world, becoming one of the best-known pieces of anti-war art in history.

Though there is little motion within *Third of May, 1808*, there is a great deal of drama in setting. There is a sense of silence and stillness within, almost as if the last aria has been sung before the curtain comes to a close and the opera is complete. The Christ-like figure represents the main character reaching his finale as the enemy comes against him, and the victims and rebels stand as the choir. However, the element which Goya uses with the most dramatic effect is light and darkness. The spotlight is a single burning lamp that illuminates the central figure as a fallen hero, adding to the drama of killing a man who has not yet finished fighting, just as Christ had not finished his fight at the Cross. Killing a man believed to be representative of Christ adds to the drama of the piece by depicting not only an attack on Spanish Patriots, but also Christianity and Christian goodness. This action furthers the concept of the wickedness of the French portraying them as barbaric and sacrilegious. The town behind serves as the backdrop to the scene. What was once a peaceful Spanish town is now a Capulet and Montague battleground. The scene presents itself with a minimal number of props and setting, and only one light source to illuminate the stage. Like Picasso, Goya's drama is evoked with lights and darks and the human condition is allowed to shine in the limelight.

Very similar to Picasso, Callot's woman in *Pillage of a Farmhouse* has her arms outstretched as if pleading to the gods of Grecian drama to save her and her child as she runs off

stage for her life. A sense of action is evident as the characters are seen running around the farmhouse and the soldiers move in for the kill and the defenseless run for their lives. Even the boarder frames it as a stage of the etching—the ceiling gives the impression of curtains as the soldier climbs the ladder like a stagehand as if he is fixing a theatrical issue rather than thieving. Even the man being burned upside down gives more the illusion of a prop rather than a dying man. Finally, the perspective given is that of a stage. Callot etches this scene as if he is sitting before it rather than in the midst of it, which makes whole room seems to be set up on a stage as the viewer sits in place of the audience. This vantage point establishes viewers as onlookers, forced to see but unable to stop what is in front of them heightening the anguish of the brutalities of violence.

Each of these pieces brings a different and unique perspective on war. Whether it is an attack on civilians, patriots, or soldiers, Callot, Goya, and Picasso each show how savage and ruthless war can be. The way an artist uses depiction determines how a work of art will present its subject and make an impact on a viewer. Brush strokes, style, color the use of shapes, and lights and darks all develop the overall image of a work enhancing its message and the various perspectives which it represents. Etchings give the impression of being created in the moment while Cubism gives the explosive sense of being broken. Demonization brings into specific relief the evil of the enemy in a variety of perspectives as he remains hidden or faceless or appears tyrannical through symbolism. As a symbol, Picasso's bull takes on a myriad of meanings representing Fascism or Franco, while Goya leaves the French army vague and inhuman. Finally, dramatization allows an artist to pull together elements creating a scene that stimulates viewers' emotions and moves them in ways worthy of the stage. Women with outstretched arms as they lament the death, or pending death, of their children; a Christ-like figure waiting for execution as

a sacrifice for Spain, defenseless clerics beaten and robbed—each of these images adds an element of horror and devastation to works of art that sparks antiwar sentiments among public opinion.

Historically, artists have often shown war as a gloriously heroic and worthwhile endeavor. Great statues of Caesar, Frederick the Great and Lord Nelson, all showing the great heroes of war, stand in places around the world. Paintings also often depict the greatness of battles won in history as the mighty rise and the losers fall. However, some artists have been compelled to use their talents to persuade people to see war as devastating, cruel, and senseless. In modern times, many artists repulsed by the callous nature of combat have opened the eyes of the public by painting the more gruesome scenes of war. During World War I, John Sargent's *Gassed* exposed the horrible effects of mustard gas in a painting that depicts "the blind leading the blind." Leon Golub's *Vietnam II* shows civilians screaming in terror as the enemy begins its attacks. These artists attempted to reveal the darkest and bleakest aspects of human nature in the same way that Callot, Goya, and Picasso put their art on display to speak against violence. In today's artistic community, many still follow in the style of these artists, such as Sandow Birk, an American artist who recreated Callot's *Miseries of War* in order to speak against American involvement in the Middle East. Just as Callot, Goya, and Picasso were able to speak to their audiences, so too do these artists have a voice. None of these images cry out triumph or honor. Viewers are not presented with the glorifying moment of the flag at Iwo Jima, or the Conquering of Yorktown—the moment when the battle is won and the victor returns home with a story while the defeated fades into the shadows. Here, these images do the opposite. They show what those outside of the military have to live through in times of war and what people fighting for their privileges must sacrifice. Rather than simply showing the great generals and the battles won,

these influential artists convey the agonies of death and destruction that come with war. Through his prints, Callot shows the brutal rape of women, the robbery of a convent, and the murder of peasants. Goya portrays a Christ-like figure kneeling in fearful submissiveness as the unseen French soldiers fire their guns directed at him. Picasso displays dismemberment of civilians and animals in a small town as the unseen German bombs attack. These artists have a desire to expose what really happens during war and its aftermath to ravaged victims rather than to glorify the heroes of the victors. Through demonization, depiction, and dramatization these artists each illuminate the brutalities of violence and war in works which impacted their societies and continue to influence the public today.



The Third of May 1808, by Francisco Goya (1814), located in the Museo del Prado, Madrid



Destruction of a Convent, plate six from the Miseries of War, by Jacques Callot (1633).



Guernica, by Pablo Picasso (1937), located in the Museo Reina Sofia, Madrid

END NOTES

¹ Ian Harvey, "The Story Behind the Painting – Washington Crossing the Delaware," *The Vintage News*, <https://www.thevintagenews.com/2019/03/31/washington-crossing-the-delaware/> (accessed March 2020).

² Esther Averill, *Eyes on the World* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1969), 147.

³ Joanna Bourke, “War and Art: A Visual History of Modern Conflict” (London: Reaktion Books, 2017), <http://www.reaktionbooks.co.uk/pdfs/war-and-art-intro-V2.pdf> (accessed October 2021).

⁴ Ibid (accessed October 2021).

⁵ William Astore, “Let’s Stop Glorifying War,” *HuffPost*, https://www.huffpost.com/entry/lets-stop-glorifying-war_b_2742511?guccounter=1&guce_referrer=aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuZ29vZ2xlLmNvbS8&guce_referrer_sig=AQAAABz2GLKDJXtVnc-9WdNBeLaEpGQobHn-a-gF24jJ4ngEs8eb2VKh_JurSRAbS9agAvhaDh2BajC5AJsZRrr3XlDWOTTh7Nf-xt9ZkysoQbuANnL66f_urmdt_KJj-AYKg4nY5uNi2O0fQyd5SYlJt1I28LBEw0j3HnOn7lre1fqI (accessed March 2020).

⁶ George Heard Hamilton, *Painting and Sculpture in Europe 1880-1940* (Kingsport, TN: Kingsport Press, 1967), 458.

⁷ “Depiction” (Dictionary.com, 2020), <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/depiction> (accessed April 2020).

⁸ Bourke, War and Art, 7 (accessed October 2021).

⁹ Ibid (accessed October 2021).

¹⁰ Ishaan Tharoor, “Eighty years later, the Nazi war crime in Guernica still matters” (London: *The Independent*, 2017), https://www.independent.co.uk/news/long_reads/nazi-war-crime-guernica-80-anniversary-bombing-spain-picasso-hitler-franco-a7704916.html (accessed March 2020).

¹¹ Elizabeth Drumm, “‘Guernica’ on Stage: Examples by Fernando Arrabal and Jeronimo Lopez Mozo” (Portland, OR: Reed College, 2009), <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27742608>, 47 (accessed April 2020).

¹² “Guernica Remaking South Africa” (GuernicaRemakings.com, 2020), <http://guernicaremakings.com/about-guernica-remakings-south-africa/> (accessed April 2020).

¹³ Tharoor, “Eighty years later, the Nazi war crime in Guernica still matters” (accessed March 2020).

¹⁴ O’Brian, *Picasso*, 326.

¹⁵ James Voorhies, “Francisco de Goya (1746–1828) and the Spanish Enlightenment” (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2000), http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/goya/hd_goya.htm, (accessed February 2020).

¹⁶ Frederick B. Artz, *From the Renaissance to Romanticism: Trends in Style in Art, Literature, and Music, 1300-1830* (Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1962), 230.

¹⁷ Rachael Rettner, “Goya’s Mystery Illness: Nearly 200 Years Later, Docs Have a Diagnosis” (New York: LiveScience.com, 2017), <https://www.livescience.com/58890-goya-mystery-illness-diagnosis.html>, (accessed March 2020).

¹⁸ Ibid (accessed March 2020).

¹⁹ Voorhies, “Francisco de Goya (1746–1828) and the Spanish Enlightenment,” http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/goya/hd_goya.htm, (accessed February 2020).

²⁰ Charles Esdaile, *The Peninsular War: A New History* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003), ix.

²¹ Roy Morris Jr., “Painter and Witness Francisco De Goya” (McLean, VA: Warfare History Network, 2020), <https://warfarehistorynetwork.com/2016/06/03/painter-and-witness-francisco-de-goya/>, (accessed February 2020).

²² Ibid (accessed April 2020).

-
- ²³ Reva Wolf, "Onlooker, Witness, and Judge in Goya's Disasters Of War" (Boston: Boston College, 1990), found in *Fatal Consequences: Callot, Goya, and the Horrors of War* (Hanover, NH: Dartmouth College, 1990), 38.
- ²⁴ Arn, "How Goya's 'Third of May' Changed the Way We Look at War" (accessed April 2020).
- ²⁵ Susan Sontag, *Regarding the Pain of Others* (New York: Macmillan, 2004), https://monoskop.org/images/a/a6/Sontag_Susan_2003_Regarding_the_Pain_of_Others.pdf, 34-35 (accessed April 2020).
- ²⁶ Ibid (accessed April 2020).
- ²⁷ Amelia Ishmael, "Images of Violence: Jacques Callot's *Misères et Les Mal-Heurs de la Guerre*" (June 2008), <http://www.ameliaishmael.com/historicising/Callot.pdf>, 6, (accessed February 2020).
- ²⁸ Yuri Long, "From the Library: The Book of Illustrations of Romeyn de Hooghe" (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 2014), <https://www.nga.gov/content/dam/ngaweb/exhibitions/pdfs/2014/de-hooghe-brochure.pdf>, 3-4 (accessed March 2020).
- ²⁹ Gregory Hanlon, *Italy 1636: Cemetery of Armies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 156.
- ³⁰ Merriam-Webster, "Demonize" (*Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary*, 2020), <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/demonize>, (accessed March 2020).
- ³¹ Patrick McCaughey, "A witness to Guernica: Picasso's Weeping Woman" (Melbourne: The National Gallery of Victoria, 2014), <https://www.ngv.vic.gov.au/essay/a-witness-to-guernica-picassos-weeping-woman/>, (accessed March 2020).
- ³² Charlotte Doyle, "Exploring the Creation of Picasso's Guernica: Composition Studies, Chance, Metaphors, and Expertise" (Bronxville, NY: *Creative Research Journal*, 2008), Vol. 20, Issue 4, 3.
- ³³ Geraldine Mercier, "Picasso against Franco: what the archives of the Musée Picasso-Paris reveal" (Barcelona: Picasso Museum, 2017), <http://museupicassobcn.org/congres-internacional/en/mercier/> (accessed April 2020).
- ³⁴ "Dream and Lie of Franco II" (New York: *The Met 150*, 2020), <https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/336519> (accessed April 2020).
- ³⁵ "Guernica: Questions of Meaning" (PBS), https://www.pbs.org/treasuresoftheworld/guernica/glevel_1/5_meaning.html (accessed April 2020).
- ³⁶ Patrick O'Brian, *Picasso: A Biography* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1976), 327.
- ³⁷ Jackson Arn, "How Goya's 'Third of May' Forever Changed the Way We Look at War" (New York: Artsy.com, 2019), <https://www.artsy.net/series/-1583427101/artsy-editorial-goyas-third-may-forever-changed-way-war> (accessed April 2020).
- ³⁸ Wolf, "Onlooker, Witness, and Judge in Goya's Disasters of War," 46.
- ³⁹ Hugh Thomas, *Goya: Third of May, 1808* (New York: The Viking Press, 1972), 20.
- ⁴⁰ Ali Pitargue, "A Journalist's Reflection on Goya's 'Third of May, 1808'" (Medium.com, 2018), <https://medium.com/@apitargue/a-journalists-reflection-on-goya-s-the-third-of-may-1808-a5f092036f53> (accessed April 2020).
- ⁴¹ Mary Connell, "Atrocities of War" (Charlottesville, VA: e-Vision, 2001), https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C1&q=Goya+third+of+May+firing+squad+&btnG=&httpsredir=1&article=1000&context=evision, 2 (accessed April 2020).

-
- ⁴² Thomas, *Goya*, 77.
- ⁴³ Sontag, *Regarding the Pain of Others*, 34, (accessed April 2020).
- ⁴⁴ Averill, *Eyes on the World*, 147.
- ⁴⁵ Ishmael, "Images of Violence," 6.
- ⁴⁶ "Dramatization" (Dictionary.com, 2020), <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/dramatize> (accessed April 2020).
- ⁴⁷ Richard Shusterman, "Art as Dramatization" (*The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 59, no. 4, 2001), www.jstor.org/stable/432289 (accessed April 2020).
- ⁴⁸ Sontag, *Regarding the Pain of Others*, 37.
- ⁴⁹ Shusterman, "Art as Dramatization" (accessed April 2020).
- ⁵⁰ Ibid (accessed April 2020).
- ⁵¹ McCaughey, "A witness to Guernica: Picasso's Weeping woman" (accessed April 2020).
- ⁵² "A Journey through the Exhibition: Guernica" (Melbourne: National Gallery of Victoria), https://www.ngv.vic.gov.au/picasso/education/ed_JTE_ITG.html (accessed April 2020).
- ⁵³ Shusterman, "Art as Dramatization" (accessed April 2020).