AN ORCHESTRATED LITANY OF LI(N)ES:

CONTRA EL GUERNICA. LIBELO, BY ANTONIO SAURA

Judy Neale
47 Francis St
Grey Lynn
Auckland
64 9 361 1149
judyneale@hotmail.com

For Antonio Saura

¿Qué hacer, pues, con la abandonada y apenas naciente cultura de la casi democracia española? Sin duda, en primer término, luchar para que la intolerancia y su cortejo de cadáveres no pueda nuevamente instalarse, erradicar el silencio o la huida como fatal condición del artista y del intelectual. En segundo término, y en la espera, propiciar el diálogo, no sentirse inútil, rellenar el vacío, como se llena la vida, de intentos y de resultados. Pero ¿cómo no pensar de este modo si el universo de la cultura sigue constituyendo, al menos para algunos pocos, la parte más brillante de la inmensa esfera donde los linderos se confunden e imbrican?

Antonio Saura, *Fijeza* 40

and (if it were not for) Wendy-Llyn Zaza . . .

[Reproduction of painting omitted for copyright reasons.]

Pablo Picasso, *Guernica*, 1937. Oil on canvas. 3.50 x 7.60 m. Museo Nacional Centro de Arte Reina Sofía. Reproduced in Hirschel B. Chipp, *Picasso's Guernica: History, Transformations, Meanings* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1988) xiv.

Contents

Glossary

ADLAN	*Amigos de las Artes Nuevas* – Friends of the New Arts.
DG de BA	*Director General de Bellas Artes* – Director General of Fine Arts.
ETA	*Euskadi ta Askatasuna* – Basque Homeland and Freedom (Basque Nationalist Movement, organised in 1959).
JONS	Juntas de Ofensiva Nacional-Sindicalista – Nationalist Syndicalist Juntas on Offense.
MoMA	Museum of Modern Art (New York).
NATO/OTAN	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation.
PCE	*Partido Comunista Español* – Spanish Communist Party.
PNV	*Partido Nacional Vasco* – Basque Nationalist Party.
POUM	*Partido Obrero de Unificación Marxista* – Workers' Marxist Unification Party (adherents of the Fourth International).
PSOE	*Partido Socialista de Obreros Españoles* – Spanish Socialist Workers' Party.
UCD	Unión del Centro Democrático – Centre Democratic Union.

Abstract

Antonio Saura penned *Contra el Guernica. Libelo* (1982) as a rejoinder in the deafening dialogue which heralded the 'return' of *Guernica* to Spain in 1981. Read as an attack on Picasso's painting –a modernist icon and symbol of the atrocity whose name it 'took'– Saura's litany of invective caused a minor scandal. The contention of this thesis is that *Contra el Guernica* in fact restores both *Guernica* and Gernika to their 'true' frames through a 'rehearsal' of the discourses relentlessly conducted around each during their interrelated cultural and historiographical trajectories. Others' li(n)es are thus understood to provide the 'pre-texts' of a Saurian revisionist (art) history spanning the Spanish Civil War, the Franco dictatorship and the transition to democracy.

While the overt intertextuality of Saura's pamphlet suggests that both object and event can only be known through their ideological textualised traces, I argue that this 'critical review' would also effect a 'return of the real': a re-viewing of the plastic reality of *Guernica* and of the traumatic reality of the Nazi/Nationalist saturation bombing of Gernika's civilian population. Indeed, I argue that, read as an art manifesto, Saura's pamphlet locates (Picasso's) art's potential not in the representation of the atrocity through symbolic iconography, but in the manifestation of its traumatic affect. In this semantic layer, *Contra el Guernica* is understood also to engage with a major twentieth-century debate in aesthetics: how to 'do justice to' an atrocity of this magnitude. Furthermore, I suggest that the intertextual presence of Saura's own art praxis serves both to 'enchain' his own painting with Picasso's, and to position it as more adequate to this task.

The polyphony and polysemy of Saura's text –no doubt partly responsible for the public's incomprehension– are in fact true to its primary intertexts. In their own 'manner,' both *Guernica* and Gernika resisted a singular interpretation, the former through its arcane and multilayered iconography and the latter as a result of the competing accounts of the circumstances of its destruction. However, while Saura's text resists closure, its retrospective resistance to Francoist actions and to (Pro-/Neo-)Francoist (re-)significations of both painting and atrocity is clear. My own explication of *Contra el Guernica* likewise 'resists' a 'final solution,' instead orienting the reader to the individual and social voices, languages and genres drawn into Saura's text for the orchestration of these political and aesthetic themes, and to the constant transpositions of their respective codes. This thesis thus reveals Saura's erudition and suggests keys to his "rompecabezas": dialogism and *double entendres, ironía asociativa* and black humour.

Introduction

The birth of fascism and the creation of new communist parties in Europe in the period between the First and Second World Wars redefined the social space in which artists and writers expressed themselves (Juliá, "Prólogo" vii). While communism involved the politicisation of art, the aestheticisation of politics was, for Walter Benjamin, the logical result of fascism, and would lead inevitably to war (241). Certainly, in 'Modern' Europe, politics, ethics and aesthetics shared common spaces: canvases canvassed and the manifesto was an instrument of the theoreticians of art and politics alike, thus forging in the minds of intellectuals an association between radical political ideas and the literary and artistic *avant-gardes*.[1] And certainly, the clash between fascism and communism would lead Europe to war once more, initially in Spain.

During the 1930s, Spanish daily life was overtaken with politics and, as in other parts of Europe, politics were frequently imbricated with aesthetics. Intellectuals, writers and artists of considerable calibre dedicated their talents to political ends, with the vast majority of Spanish vanguard artists supporting the left (Tusell 193). In *La velada de Benicarló,* the humanist and literary President (October-December 1931; May 1936-February 1939) of the Spanish Second Republic, Manuel Azaña y Díaz, wrote of "politics as an art, with the people as the palette" (qtd. in Thomas 35). In January 1937, nine months into the Spanish Civil War (1936-39), the beleaguered Republican government commissioned Pablo Ruiz y Picasso to contribute a large mural for the entrance hall of the Spanish Pavilion at the *Exposition internationale des arts et techniques dans la vie moderne*, scheduled to open in Paris on May Day.[2] The Spanish Ambassador in Paris, Luis Araquistáin, wished the legitimately elected government to be represented for propagandistic reasons: "[C]omo testimonio de la preocupación cultural del Gobierno republicano,[3] como garantía de normalidad de un Estado (se trataría de una exhibición estatal no de particulares), como instrumento de propaganda de una causa bélica" (Tusell 248). Picasso, and the many other artists who produced works for the Spanish pavilion, at least in part as propaganda for the Republic, may therefore reciprocally be regarded as having a palette/palate for politics.

1 For the years prior to 1931 in Spain, see Jaime Brihuega, ed. *Manifiestos, proclamas y textos doctrinales (Las vanguardias artísticas en España: 1910-1931)*. For 1931-1936, see Brihuega, ed. *La vanguardia y la República*.

2 In 1936, the Spanish Republican government had named Picasso Director of the Prado Museum. In January 1937, he began his most political work to date. Comprising two sheets of etchings with aquatint together with a facsimile of one of his surrealist poems, translated into French and English, *Sueño y mentira de Franco* was sold to raise funds for Spaniards in distress (Penrose 305).

3 After decades of conservative academicism in the plastic arts in Spain, the Second Republic created opportunities for vanguard artists to show their works; however this aperture was not evidenced in public collection policy (Tusell 190).

Based in Paris from 1901,[4] during the 1930s Picasso associated closely with the surrealist poets who at this time constituted the leading edge of the *avant-garde*, and were simultaneously fervent supporters of the Spanish Republic. Many of Picasso's coterie were committed members of the Communist Party, and some were directly involved in the activities of *Agence Espagne* – the Comintern-backed Paris propaganda office of the Republic and its news bulletin (Chipp 9-11).[5] The "Parisian School" of Marxism represented a fertile exchange between the revolutionary surrealists André Breton, Louis Aragon, Benjamin Péret and André Malraux, and German Marxist aestheticians including Benjamin and Max Raphael – émigrés who spent the greater portion of the 1930s in Paris (Solomon 505). Contemporary debates in Marxist aesthetics weighed the revolutionary potential of the aesthetic quality of 'autonomous' or 'self-referential' art, critiqued by some communists as inhering a disengaged or politically naïve stance in regard to world politics, against the political content of 'committed' art, frequently delimited as socialist realism.[6] However, in accordance with Marxist dialectics, even the self-referential modernist canvas might function as a rebuke to a society that sought to tailor all culture to its own interests (Eisenman 194).[7]

4 From 1900, Paris became the destination of "cualquier artista que se preciara o que se deseara salir de la mediocridad" (Tusell 183). Juan Gris, Julio González, Pablo Gargallo, María Blanchard, Daniel Vázquez Díaz, Manolo Hugué, Mateo Hernández and Picasso were among the handful of Spanish artists to connect with the Paris vanguards of the twentieth century (Bonet 12).

5 The poet Juan Larrea, who is cited in Saura's *Libelo* (14), and discussed in Chapter IX, worked for *Agence Espagne*. A number of Picasso's circle also took up arms to defend the Republic.

6 Marxists generally advocated some form of realism. The few Zhdanovists who emerged "as guardians of the cultural front" in Paris at this time championed socialist realism (Solomon 504). In *Illusion and Reality*, published in 1937, Christopher Caudwell suggested that surrealism, like political anarchism, negated itself in practice (Solomon 507). Jean-Paul Sartre argued that surrealist poetics, "in which the artist is regarded as a 'modest recording device' for the transmission of unconscious or collective experiences, tends inevitably toward quietism rather than toward revolution" (507). While Aragon left the surrealists in favour of a more orthodox communism (502), Breton left the Party soon after joining, dissatisfied with its cultural policy (Franck 389); surrealism's main concern in the later 1930s became "the defence of art's independence against the only political movement they had believed in" (Robert Short, qtd. in Solomon 507). In Spain, "atrapados entre las propuestas del arte deshumanizado [de José Ortega y Gasset (1925)] y la llamada hacia la literatura social, los jóvenes que habían abierto sus oídos al nuevo léxico político impulsarán en la segunda mitad de los años veinte diversas iniciativas editoriales con el propósito de encontrar una confluencia entre vanguardia y compromiso político y social" (Juliá, "Prólogo" vii).

7 Written for the symposium on Revolutionary Art staged by the Artists' International Association in London in 1935, Herbert Read's "What Is Revolutionary Art" serves to clarify debates in revolutionary aesthetics at this time. Read suggests that the Communists

> will tell you abstract art is dead, and that in any case it is incomprehensible to the proletariat and of no use to the revolutionary movement. Like the simple bourgeois of another generation, they ask for something they can understand, a 'realistic' art above all, something that they can use in propaganda. . . . For official Marxians, concentrating on their economic problems, do not see the relevance of the cultural problem, more particularly the artistic problem. The mind of the artist, they complacently assume, that too will, in Trotsky's phrase, limp after the reality they are creating. But everywhere the greatest obstacle to the creation of this new social reality is the existence of the cultural heritage of the past – the religion, the philosophy, the literature and the art which makes up the whole complex ideology of the bourgeois mind. The logic of the facts –the economic facts: war, poverty amidst plenty, social injustice– that logic cannot be denied. But so long as the bourgeois mind has its bourgeois ideology, it will deny the facts; it will construct an elaborate rationalization which effectively ignores them. The superrealists [surrealists], who possess very forceful expositors of their point of view –writers like André Breton– realize this very clearly, and the object of their movement is thus to discredit the bourgeois ideology in art, to destroy the academic conception of art . . . we can see, therefore, the place of surréalisme in the revolutionary movement. (513)

As a –if not *the*– leader of modernism, this latter position is far closer to Picasso's own. Antipathetic to political dogmas and polemic painting, yet wholly sympathetic to the Republic (Chipp 5, 17; Alix Trueba 20), Picasso must therefore have experienced a conflict of interest between the aesthetic reality of his art and the existential reality of events in his country when asked to produce such a propagandistic work. Nevertheless, three months later, on April 26, the 'incendiary' bombardment of the open Basque town of Gernika by the German Condor Legion, in the service of the insurrectionary Nationalist forces, roused Picasso to action (Penrose 309), providing his theme and title: *Guernica*.

The Civil War, and specifically the bombing of Gernika –the first undeniable (yet much denied in pro-Nationalist publications) evidence of massive and decisive foreign intervention in that conflict– spawned a pamphlet war conducted internationally by political propagandists and concerned intellectuals. Picasso's painting, arguably a contribution to this pamphlet war, itself became the subject of ongoing published debate between supporters of 'free,' 'autonomous' art and 'politically committed' art. Critiqued as "decadent" by the Soviets (Kemenov 657), Picasso and *Guernica* were also represented as "degenerate" by the fascist enemies of the Spanish Republic (Nash 14, 25). Initially rejected on ethical/aesthetic grounds even by certain Basque, Republican Embassy and pavilion officials (Fisch 20; Alix Trueba 81), *Guernica* nevertheless played an important propaganda role long after the destruction of the Basque foral centre, the demolition of the pavilion, and eventual Republican defeat in 1939. *Guernica* would also become a major modernist icon.

Written in direct response to *Guernica*'s much anticipated 'return'[8] to Spain in 1981 (Ríos 177), Antonio Saura's polemical and poetical pamphlet, *Contra el Guernica. Libelo* (1982), comprises 280 epigrams, or "greguerías,"[9] in which the Spanish artist ostensibly inveighs against this famous painting by his fellow countryman. No aspect of *Guernica*'s modernist aesthetic or perplexing iconography, nor of its cultural trajectory –from propaganda mural to modernist icon and from 'exile' to 'return'– nor any of the art/political discourses surrounding the artist and his painting, are spared in Saura's *Libelo*. His erudite and ironic invective, 'riddled' with direct and indirect quotations, was misunderstood by its commentators in the press and caused a minor scandal (Saura, *Fijeza* 148-49 n2),[10] thus

8 While *Guernica* was neither produced nor shown in Spain, Javier Tusell argues that "[e]l *Guernica* estuvo, antes del 10 de septiembre de 1981, en territorio español (el del pabellón, que tenía esta condición)" (250). The use of the word "return," as opposed to "arrival," is semantic and, to a degree, ideological: the pavilion represented Republican Spain.

9 Term coined by Ramón Gómez de la Serna for "waggish," "extravagant" epigrams, formulated as humour + metaphor = *greguería* (Morris 447).

10 While popularly interpreted as critical of Picasso and his painting, certain commentators observed that Saura's pamphlet instead impugned *Guernica*'s ability to signify yet another cause (Gómez López-Quiñones 140; Calvo Serraller, "El 'Guernica' como enigma" 118 n1).

mirroring in style and effect the artwork it rhetorically described, and palely reflecting the controversy and confusion surrounding a key intertext in both works: the Gernika atrocity.

In *Las tentaciones de Antonio Saura*, an extended conversation between the artist and Julián Ríos, from whose proposition *Contra el Guernica* sprang, Saura attributes this misunderstanding to a lack of humour, of a cultural reserve, or of both (177). Ríos argues that no one understood the irony of Saura's *Libelo* (177), nor the "humor negro" common to Saura's pamphlet and to his painting (187), and points to Saura's actual agenda:

> En realidad allí confluían muchos factores, el factor sociológico, los conflictos de aquella época, Picasso, que era una vieja pasión tuya y en cierto modo creo que de alguna forma también ajustabas un poco, en el sentido de ajustar piezas, ajustabas cuentas de un largo rosario, un largo collar, que tú tenías pendientes con Picasso y con el arte en general. (177)

In elaboration of Ríos's comments, Saura suggests:

> Lo cierto es que no se entendió. Todo el mundo pensó que era una gran broma, una especie de revancha, que yo detestaba al *Guernica* y a Picasso y no comprendieron que era un libro que había que leerlo al revés, exactamente al revés, y que incluso leyéndolo al revés había una cierta y voluntaria ambigüedad. En cierto modo es un arreglo de cuentas, como tú decías antes, con Picasso. Y sobre todo un arreglo de cuentas también sobre la beatería que ese cuadro provoca. (Ríos 178)

In *Fijeza* (1999), a posthumously published compilation of his writings on art, Saura reiterates this need for an inverse reading of *Contra el Guernica*, again noting that his audience missed the ambiguity and the irony of this satirical text. He also explicitly acknowledges his appreciation of Picasso and his painting, while deploring the outpouring of "stupidity" marking the latter's arrival in Madrid:

> [P]ocos comprendieron la necesidad, tan evidente para el autor, de una lectura "inversa" en la que, no obstante, ciertos equívocos se mantendrían. Esta letanía, sin embargo, contiene un homenaje a Picasso y una composición pictórica extraordinaria, siendo en realidad una prueba de amor más de repulsa. La intención, por supuesto, era ambigua, aunque no en el sentido en que fue interpretada por la crítica que tendió a tomar al pie de la letra aquello que nunca fue amargura ni revancha, sino erudición transformada en esperpento, regusto por la ironía asociativa, y repulsa a la generalizada estupidez desencadenada a la llegada a Madrid de la gran pintura. (149 n2)

The satirical nature of Saura's pamphlet is made explicit in his subtitle: *Contra el Guernica* is a *Libelo*, a satire, or lampoon. Equally explicit, and closely associated with satire, lampoon and caricature, is the invective mode (Cuddon 425). Almost every epigram in Saura's pamphlet begins with the word "Detesto," expressing dislike or disgust; "Desprecio," expressing contempt; or "Odio," expressing hatred. Saura's invective, then,

reiterates satire as the frame in which to understand a litany of pronouncements on *Guernica* –in toto a *pronunciamiento* or *grito*– directed in some manner at society's "moral as well as aesthetic values," the function of this genre (Cuddon 780). Jonathon Swift wrote of satire as "a sort of glass wherein beholders do generally discover everybody's face but their own, which is the chief reason . . . that so few are offended with it" (qtd. in Cuddon 780). How was it then, given Saura's generosity in framing his text for his audience thus, that so many took offence, so few understood it?

In *Contra el Guernica*, Saura pronounces (each) "Guernica" a "rompecabezas desajustado" (*Libelo* 9). This explicative thesis argues that Saura's satirical text mimics its antecedents –*Guernica* and Gernika– in presenting the public with a kind of "rompecabezas." In so saying, I do not wish to represent the devastating explosive and incendiary bombing of Gernika and the strafing of its inhabitants, however symbolic, as merely a puzzling 'text' –in effect to deny the reality of the atrocity as the Spanish Nationalists and their international supporters attempted to do– but rather to suggest the appropriateness of *Contra el Guernica*'s artistic system to the aftermath of the historical event and to the painting which 'took' its name. I shall use the Basque spelling –Gernika– to distinguish the town from the painting –*Guernica*[11]– which has arguably become the dominant signified of these three syllables (Raento and Watson n. pag.). This distinction, which is also made out of solidarity with the Basques, is refused by Saura through spelling or italicisation, thereby facilitating the transposition of the discourses of art, history and politics into one another, so that the meanings of one may be overlaid with the meanings of others (and, as we shall see, others' meanings). It is in such *double entendres*, in the transposition of political and aesthetic codes, and in the intertextual presence of others' voices, heard in each of Saura's epigrams, that, in the author's words, "ciertos equívocos se mant[iene]n" (Saura, *Fijeza* 149 n2), or the 'meanings' of his puzzling pamphlet 'lie.'

One intertext in the title of this thesis will be familiar to New Zealand readers as the words in which Justice Peter Mahon denounced our national carrier's cover-up of the circumstances which led to the loss of 257 lives on Mt. Erebus in 1979: "[A]n orchestrated litany of lies" (qtd. in "Erebus 25 years on" 1).[12] While there can be no comparison between this civil aviation tragedy and the (first 'successful') saturation bombing of an open town by Nazi aviation, the Spanish Nationalists' subsequent campaign of disinformation is clearly deserving of similar characterisation and censure. However, I have quoted Mahon's

11 The Castilian and French spelling used by Picasso, and also in Franco's monolingual, Nationalist Spain.
12 Air New Zealand flight TE901 crashed while carrying sightseeing passengers over Antarctica on 28 November 1979.

words since, with the minor alteration of "lies" to "li(n)es," they offer an equally apt definition of Antonio Saura's text (and of its primary object, Picasso's *Guernica*). *Contra el Guernica. Libelo* is an "orchestrated," in the Bakhtinian sense,[13] "letanía," in the author's own words (Ríos 177; *Fijeza* 149 n2), of others' lines/lies: 'pre-texts' for Saura's 're-view' of Picasso's iconic painting and, through intertextual transpositions and *double entendres*, his revision of Civil War and post-war (art) history, ethics and aesthetics.

In Chapter I, "*Contra el Guernica. Libelo*: Intertextual 'rompecabezas,'" I posit intertextuality as a fitting theoretical framework for disentangling Saura's "utterances," as I shall term each epigram, in reference to Bakhtin's definition of the utterance as a rejoinder in a pre-existent dialogue (276). In this chapter I will suggest that, through polyphony and transposition, Saura's utterances orchestrate multiple themes simultaneously. In addition to the interpretive difficulties associated with the polyvocality and polysemy of Saura's utterances, the erudite nature of Saura's intertexts supposes a reader thoroughly versed in Spanish history and the arts. Hence, I will suggest, its negative reception in the popular press: many readers will have been confounded, and angered, through failing to recognise the 'pre-texts' of Saura's invective. I will also argue that the polyphonic nature of Saura's *Libelo* subverts the (differently) unitary language of Nationalist and Transitional Spain.

Chapter II, "Gernika: Propagandistic 'rompecabezas,'" returns to the historical event, and to the media event that followed in its aftermath. Initial news reports confirming the atrocity were immediately countered by a disinformation campaign orchestrated by, and on behalf of, the Spanish Nationalists, which would obscure the circumstances of Gernika's destruction long after the end of the Civil War. Internationally, Republican and Nationalist sympathisers and also concerned Catholic thinkers published testimonials, 'scientific evidence' and passionate pleas in efforts either to persuade their governments to intervene, or to continue the pretence of non-intervention, in the Spanish conflict. The symbolic nature of the event, combined with public reaction, presented diplomats with their own "rompecabezas": what to do in response to foreign intervention in Spain, and to the potential for 'total war' to be waged on their own people in the immediate future. From the late 1960s, Neo-Francoists attempted to revise Spanish Civil War history from within Spain; how to represent Gernika in the best possible light for the victors and simultaneously pacify the still volatile Basque region became their conundrum, and added

13 Mikhail M. Bakhtin's borrowing of musical terms such as "orchestration" and "polyphony" signals the shift from seeing to hearing in his definition of the novel, or artistic prose, as multivoiced and dialogical. "Polyphony" results from the multiplicity of voices brought into play by the author for the "orchestration" of his or her themes (Holquist 430). Bakhtin's conceptualisation of the polyphonic text informs later theories of intertextuality (Hutcheon 126).

a further set of obfuscations to the historiography of Gernika. The intertextual traces of these discourses in *Contra el Guernica* are briefly introduced in this second chapter.

Chapter III, "*Guernica*: Iconographical 'rompecabezas,'" focuses on the intertextual presence in Saura's pamphlet of debates over the visual complexity of Picasso's modernist idiom, and its unintelligibility to the general public. Just as the propaganda surrounding Gernika precluded a single 'reading' of the atrocity, so too did Picasso's painting resist interpretation through the attribution of a singular 'correct' referent, or meaning, to each of its elements, or the painting as a whole, causing *Guernica* to be derided by certain Marxist theoreticians as a failure in terms of its use value as propaganda.

The fourth chapter, "Francisco (Franco) 'de Goya' a la República," examines utterances which take the reader further back in Spanish history through Saura's 're-cited' sightings of the iconographical intertexts in Picasso's painting, and his 're-view' of these images as bearers of meaning. However, I will argue that while this process re(in)states the political content of *Guernica*'s visual signs –particularly their representations of the Gernika atrocity– and the historical context of Civil War ideologies, it simultaneously calls into question the interpretations of the (art) historian.

Chapter V, "'Operación Guernica,'" analyses utterances which 're-cite' –and (in)cite resistance to– the dominant significations and re-significations of *Guernica* and Gernika at two nodal points in Spanish (art) history: the *dictadura* and the *dictablanda*. *Guernica*'s further re-signification, and its re-signification of Spain 'in return,' during the transition to democracy following the death of General Francisco Franco y Bahamonde in 1975, is the subject of the following chapter, "The 'return' of *Guernica*." In addition to the representations of (art) historians, those of political actors are problematised in the utterances discussed in these chapters. I will also suggest that Saura's utterances simultaneously rehearse (and re-hearse) twentieth-century debates in aesthetics and museology.

In chapter VII, entitled "The 'return of the real': 'Doing Bataille' with Franco," I discuss intertextual traces of the Bataille-Breton doctrinal battle over the (sur)realism of Picasso's painting, and over art's revolutionary potential more generally. I also discuss the pre-textual role these philosophers play in Saura's own retrospective battle with the Franco regime, through which the 're-pressed' event of Gernika returns, albeit through its textualised traces, and the 'real,' traumatic experiences of its victims are 're-viewed.' The following chapter, "Painting as a 'Campo de Bataille,'" continues these themes in relation to Saura's own art theory and practice, and his relationship with both Bataille and Picasso, as insinuated in *Contra el Guernica*. Here, I will suggest that while Saura pays homage to

Picasso in this text (and in his visual art), *Contra el Guernica* also functions as a settling of artistic accounts: a manifesto in which Saura locates *Guernica*'s ability to make manifest the trauma of fascist violence in the Bataillean, (non/de)-sublimatory aspects of its idiom, and locates his own painting as exemplary of such an art-affect.

In the final chapter, "*Encadenamiento* versus *beatificación*," I turn from Saura's theories of art-making to his theories of the making of modernist masters and masterpieces, specifically his theoretical and ethical position on the art-historiographical notions of genius and influence in relation to Picasso's and *Guernica*'s fame.

Taken as a whole, *Contra el Guernica. Libelo* serves to restore Picasso's painting to a 'true' frame. As Sara Mills notes, for Michel Foucault, the notion of truth is supported by a range of practices and institutions. Commentary, including literary (and, logically, art) criticism, serves to distinguish between discourses which are authorised and those which are not (58-59). Saura's commentary on *Guernica* thus keeps Picasso's visual text "in circulation as [containing] ideas which are 'in the true.'" However, following Foucault, it also confers status on Saura as the author of the commentary "because [he has] mastered and can even refine those ideas and express them more clearly than [Picasso], or relate those ideas more appropriately [to the present era]" (58-59). While Saura's commentary on Picasso's painting is predominantly carried out in the same discipline, I would argue that this is also a function of *Contra el Guernica*, in which Saura's own art/theory frequently makes an intertextual appearance. In this way, I suggest that a broad frame for understanding Saura's pamphlet is as a contribution to a major debate in postwar aesthetics: that of the 'manner' in which the artist or writer might 'do justice to' an atrocity such as Gernika.[14] As an informalist artist, art theorist and informal political actor, Saura contributed to debates over art's 'manner' of engagement with the traumatic reality of the Francoist epoch, coming down, I suggest, on the side of an art which might make manifest precisely such an affect. Much has been written on Picasso's painting (too much, Saura might have contended); however, *Contra el Guernica. Libelo* is deserving of study for the (art) historical and art-theoretical 're-visions' Saura orchestrates as he strips back over forty years' of pastiche and paraphrase in his rigorous 're-view' of *Guernica* – and Gernika.

14 In 1949, after the further atrocities of the Nazi Holocaust, Theodor Adorno wrote that it was "barbaric to write a poem after Auschwitz," and that the "new categorical imperative" was to prevent any recurrence of such atrocities (qtd. in Rollins 212). Adorno's statement has been interpreted as a critique of images, poetic and visual, as unable to do justice to suffering of this magnitude (211). He nevertheless became a "pessimistic advocate" of certain 'autonomous' works which he saw as "difficult and intractable," as "resistance," and as "creating a shudder of revulsion amongst the audiences for both '*avant-garde*' and 'committed' art," whereas he "distanced himself from all directly political art advocated, with different emphases on the concept of 'realism'" (Frascina and Harris, "Intro. I" 38-39).

Contra el Guernica. Libelo: Intertextual “rompecabezas”

For theorists of intertextuality, a literary text is not a self-sufficient, closed system but “a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centers of culture” (Barthes 146). As Roland Barthes’s words suggest, the pre-existent voices, discourses and codes that are interwoven in the text are not necessarily linguistic, but include all signifying practices, or ideologically marked sign usage in a culture. Thus the “social ensemble [is] considered as a textual ensemble” (Kristeva, qtd. in Makaryk 569). Situation within this ideologically co-ed social ensemble orients the text to its sociohistoric signification in the interaction of the various sign systems that traverse it (Makaryk 569). Coined by Julia Kristeva, “the term *inter-textuality* denotes th[e] transposition of one or several sign systems into another” (59-60), so that the codes of aesthetics, for example, may be transposed into those of history and politics, and *vice versa*: intertextuality grants semantic equality to both texts (Aparicio 76 n5). In Kristeva’s usage, transposition is a Freudian term; it is also a musical term, similarly denoting interpretation in a different key from that originally ‘noted,’ a useful analogy of the *double entendres* through which, in *Contra el Guernica,* discourses ostensibly concerning *Guernica* may be heard as concerning Gernika. While for Kristeva “language is always double, always involved in polysemy” (Allen 81), in Saura’s text the transpositions and *double entendres* can be understood as “orchestrated,” the intertextuality overt. Having transferred the critical focus from the ‘original’ author to the idea of textual productivity, intertextuality in fact concedes to the writer the power only of the arranger: “His only power is to mix writings, to counter the ones with the others” (Barthes 146).

Barthes’s and Kristeva’s work in this field draws on Mikhail M. Bakhtin’s notions of polyphony and orchestration. A Bakhtinian approach involves the identification of the various individual and social voices, languages and genres inserted into a text: pre-texts, in both senses of the word, for the “orchestration of his [the author’s] themes and for the refracted (indirect) expression of his intentions and values” (292). Both Kristeva’s notion of intertextual transposition and Bakhtin’s seminal discussion of the polyphonic text will be used to disentangle Saura’s “rompecabezas.” Indeed, in a number of Saura’s utterances, Freudian transposition –sublimation or concealment through metaphorical substitutions– is knowingly cited/sited/sighted in the discourses and iconography drawn into *Contra el Guernica* as ‘pre-texts’ for the orchestration of the author’s satirical (art) historical ‘re-visions.’ As Linda Hutcheon suggests:

> Even though we may no longer be able to talk comfortably about authors (and sources and influences), we still need a critical language in which to discuss those ironic allusions, those re-contextualized quotations, those double edged parodies both of genre and specific works that proliferate in both modernist and postmodernist texts. This, of course, is where intertextuality has proved so useful. As later defined by Barthes (1977, 160) and Riffaterre (1984, 142-3), intertextuality replaces the challenged author-text relationship with one between reader and text, one that situates the locus of textual meaning within the history of discourse itself. A literary work can actually no longer be considered original; if it were, it could have no meaning for the reader. It is only as part of prior discourses that any text derives meaning and significance. (126)

Hutcheon describes as "historiographic metafiction" the intertextual parody that "enacts, in a way, the views of certain contemporary historiographers: it offers a sense of the past, but a past that can only be known from its texts, its traces – be they literary or historical" (125). Furthermore, these cultural representations "are often not simply verbal representations, for *ekphrases* (verbal representations of visual representations) often have central representational functions" (121). Hutcheon's parodic historiographic metafiction further defines intertextuality as a fitting theoretical frame for discussing *Contra el Guernica*, in which the (art of the) past is known precisely through ironic allusions, recontextualised quotations and double edged parodies both of genre and specific works: dialogised traces of historical, literary and ekphrastic discourses. Saura's pamphlet thus reproduces the 'always already' intertextual nature of Picasso's *Guernica*, and also points to and satirises the sociohistoric signification of this painting –and, through transposition and *double entendre*, the Gernika atrocity– through the discourses relentlessly conducted around each.

The polyphony of Saura's text is explicit in the proliferation of direct quotations it contains. However, as Bakhtin notes, the speech of another may also be introduced into the author's discourse "in *concealed* form, that is, without any of the *formal* markers usually accompanying such speech, whether direct or indirect" (303). Bakhtin describes such a "hybrid construction" as "an utterance that belongs, by its grammatical (syntactic) and compositional markers, to a single speaker, but that actually contains mixed within it two utterances, two speech manners, two styles, two 'languages,' two semantic and axiological belief systems" (304). This concealment in Saura's utterances, essential to their semantic virtuosity, was undoubtedly missed by some of his readers. Indeed, for Bakhtin, any "concrete discourse," or "utterance,"

> finds the object at which it was directed already as it were overlain with qualifications, open to dispute, charged with value, already enveloped in an obscuring mist – or, on the contrary, by the "light" of alien words that have already been spoken about it. It is entangled, shot through with shared thoughts, points

> of view, alien value judgements and accents. The word, directed towards its objects, enters a dialogically agitated and tension-filled environment of alien words, value judgements and accents, weaves in and out of complex inter-relationships, merges with some, recoils from others, intersects with yet a third group: and all this may crucially shape discourse, may leave a trace in all its semantic layers, may complicate its expression and influence its entire stylistic profile. (276)

As the object of incessant and highly politicised (art) criticism, *Guernica* can clearly be understood to be "overlain with qualifications" and "charged with value" by "the alien words that have already been spoken about it." It is, then, into this "dialogically agitated" environment that Saura's words enter; it is against certain of these alien words that Saura inveighs. Unfortunately, the majority of Saura's readers apparently understood his invective to be directed squarely at Picasso and his painting. Such a reading rests on an understanding of the utterances of the satirist, the "self-appointed guardian of standards, ideals and truth" (Cuddon 780), as producing a moral-didactic, closed, authorial monologue, the invective as purely his own, rather than as a polyphonic and heterogeneous series of "rejoinders" in a pre-existent dialogue (Bakhtin 274). Rather than the vehicle for an attack on Picasso and *Guernica*, Saura's *Libelo* involves a far broader reaching engagement with the relentless contours of the debates conducted around the artist and his work. The puzzle –and the pleasure[15]– in the text lie in the recognition of the "traces" left by this engagement in the semantic layers of Saura's utterances.

This dialogical mode is characteristic of what Bakhtin terms a "centrifugal" text, in which a variety of social voices –the "heteroglossia" of a particular epoch– are not only heard, but presented in opposition to, and problematised by, other social voices and "languages." The centrifugal text thus encourages an open, demythifying reading of reality. It counters the "centripetal forces" which can only propose a "unitary language" as an ideal rather than as concrete reality, since, in spite of the centralising forces of any given culture, all national languages consist of diverse social voices and linguistic strata (270-72).[16] Bakhtin suggests that the sharpest and externally most marked manifestations of a dialogised style are the polemical, the parodic and the ironic (274), and that these forms are subversive, as they challenge the "verbal-ideological" life of the nation and the epoch:

15 I use this term in a general sense. In Barthes's usage, a "text of pleasure . . . comes from culture and does not break with it," whereas a "[t]ext of bliss . . . unsettles the reader's historical, cultural, psychological assumptions, the consistency of his tastes, values, memories, brings to crisis his relation with language" (qtd. in Allen 104). While *Contra el Guernica* draws on the cultural archive, 'bliss' is somewhat closer to the affect of Saura's text.

16 While the novel is the paradigm of the centrifugal text, Bakhtin includes all "artistic prose" in this category. He identifies the centripetal text with poetry (273-78).

> At the time when poetry was accomplishing the task of cultural, national and political centralization of the verbal ideological world in the higher official socio-ideological levels, on the lower levels, on the stages of local fairs and at buffoon spectacles, the heteroglossia of the clown sounded forth, ridiculing all "languages" and dialects; there developed the literature of the *fabliaux* and the *Schwänke* of street songs, folksayings, anecdotes, where there was no language-center at all, where there was to be found a lively interplay with the "languages" of poets, scholars, monks, knights and others, where all "languages" were masks and where no language could claim to be an authentic, incontestable face.
>
> Heteroglossia, as organized in these low genres, was not merely heteroglossia vis-à-vis the accepted literary language . . . that is, vis-à-vis the linguistic center of the verbal-ideological life of the nation and the epoch, but was a heteroglossia consciously opposed to this literary language. It was parodic, and aimed sharply and polemically against the official languages of its given time. It was heteroglossia that had been dialogised. (273)

As we have read, *Contra el Guernica* courted controversy, and may accordingly be deemed polemical. Saura himself notes the irony of his text. It is arguably also parodic: Julián Ríos places Saura's *Libelo* in the tradition of the "letanías e invectivas con inventiva" of, among others, Gustave Flaubert's "Dictionnaire des idées reçues" (179),[17] a parody of the taxonomical operations of the encyclopaedia-library (for Michel Foucault) or museum (for Eugenio Donato and Douglas Crimp) (Crimp 54-55). Parody is indeed often used to satiric ends (Hutcheon 133): as in the "low" genres discussed by Bakhtin above, Saura parodies a multitude of "languages" –the languages of artists, art theorists, art critics, Picasso historians and hagiographers; of politicians and political partisans; of philosophers, intellectuals, journalists, and of the 'man in the street'– in order, I suggest, to challenge and demythify the official languages of politics and art of his particular place and time. It is the readers' task, and mine, also to identify the many individual voices and inserted genres drawn into Saura's *Libelo* to orchestrate similar, satirical ends. Individual voices will be left to the following chapters, in which I discuss their intertextual presence in specific utterances.

Produced in pamphlet form by Turner, *Contra el Guernica. Libelo* may be understood to include within it the genre, and codes, of the political pamphlet, and also, I suggest, the related genre and codes of the art/political manifesto. The fact that Saura was a prominent *avant-garde* artist rather than a politician is no obstacle to a partial interpretation of his *Libelo* in a political light. As noted previously, politics and aesthetics shared common spaces at the time the object of his pamphlet was painted; furthermore, Saura himself may

17 A "Dictionary of Received Ideas" was to comprise part of a second volume of *Bouvard and Pécuchet*, Flaubert's last, unfinished novel (Crimp 54).

be considered a political actor, having engaged in (unspecified) political activity from 1959 until the end of the Franco regime ("Cronología" 161).[18] The insertion of these genres into *Contra el Guernica* effects, for example, the transposition of the codes of the 'free,' 'autonomous' painter of *Guernica* into the political codes of the 'free' subject of the (would-be) autonomous Euskadi, of which Gernika is the symbolic capital:

> Detesto al Guernica, fruto de la descarada y ofen-
> siva libertad de un hombre verdaderamente libre. (30)

As Miguel Ángel Gamonal Torres notes, "una de las bases del proyecto moderno resulta ser la autonomía de lo artístico, . . . a pesar de que vanguardia es, en origen, un concepto militar ligado a la radicalización política transmutada en estética a finales del siglo xix" (71). In catalogues for *Guernica*, Picasso's dealer, Daniel-Henry Kahnweiler, wrote of the artist: "He defended his freedom all the time" (qtd. in Oppler 219). Given contemporaneous Marxist demands for politically committed art, "Picasso –who proudly treasured his personal and artistic freedom– was bound to be in trouble" (Oppler 249). Indeed, "[e]sta polémica . . . ha marcado una fundamentación crítica que recorre cualquier visión, contemporánea o retrospectiva, de la producción artística del período . . . y que centra básicamente en la calidad artística de las obras presentes en el Pabellón . . . de 1937" (Gamonal Torres 73). Hence, in the words "la descarada y ofensiva libertad" we hear the social voices from one side of this doctrinal battle (at least: not only Marxist aestheticians found Picasso's artistic/political liberty offensive). Through intertextual transposition, the discourse of artistic liberty is overlaid with that of Basque political liberties –as enshrined in the *fueros* sworn to over centuries by Catholic monarchs at Gernika, and in the form of Basque political autonomy, achieved in 1936, and likewise celebrated at Gernika,[19] but 'detested' and revoked under the Franco dictatorship– such that in the same words we also hear traces of Spanish Nationalist ideology. However, not only does this utterance re(in)state the interrelationship of the discourses of aesthetics and politics of the 1930s, and draw in the politics of Gernika through their transposition, through the "ironía asociativa" noted by

18 Saura was associated with the left-wing Spanish exile publishing house in Paris, Éditions Ruedo Ibérico, providing, for example, 13 drawings and vignettes for the first two editions of their journal, *Cuadernos de Ruedo Ibérico* (June/July 1965; August/September 1965) (Pérez n. pag.).

19 Brought under the Castillian crown during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the Basques nevertheless conserved their *fueros*, which enshrined a degree of fiscal, legal and administrative autonomy, finally lost in 1876, under Alfonso XII, in retribution for (partial) Basque rebellion in the Carlist Wars. Regional autonomy was the recognised model for the Spanish State in the Republican Constitution of 1931. It also became apparent that its realisation was the key to obtaining full Basque Nationalist Party (PNV) support for the Republic in the Civil War; reciprocally the principal leaders of the PNV knew that autonomy was only possible within the framework of the Republic (Fusi 303). President José Antonio Aguirre took his oath at Gernika using the traditional formula for the legitimation of new power: "Ante Dios, humillado, en pie sobre la tierra vasca. Con el recuerdo de los antepasados. Bajo el árbol de Guernica" (qtd. in Fusi 304).

Saura (*Fijeza* 149 n2) we also hear the subsequent, Cold War ideological representations of autonomous art as exemplary of the 'free world.' As Gamonal Torres wryly observes:

> [L]a conocida contraposición hecha por Clement Greenberg en 1939 entre vanguardia y *kitsch*, . . . planteada desde criterios estéticos y éticos, posibilitó al crítico americano reforzar una interpretación de la modernidad artística en sus aspectos puramente formales y autorreferenciales que arrojaba al arte político al infierno del mal gusto, o casi del mal absoluto, permitiendo a partir de ahora situar la cuestión en términos de descalificación moral y artística adaptada al período de la Guerra Fría, concebida como un combate entre la libertad y el totalitarismo. . . . [E]l arte abstracto, paradigma de la libertad artística y sólo sujeto a la libre voluntad del artista, estaba siendo instrumentalizado y convertido, aunque de una manera más sutil, en arte de propaganda. (72)

While Saura undoubtedly takes an interest in each of these debates –indeed, in the 1950s his own painting was appropriated to the representation of Franco's Spain as modern[20]– none of the (in)cited social voices is the authentic voice of the author. Rather this, and every utterance in *Contra el Guernica*, re-presents the dialogised heteroglossia of an epoch in European, particularly Spanish, (art) history. Broadly speaking, the period in question opens in 1931, with the proclamation of the Spanish Second Republic, and closes in 1981 with the 'return' of Picasso's painting to the newly democratic Spanish state. However, Saura's 're-cited' sightings of older cultural icons and institutions also draw in long-deceased voices, and the various discourses productive of the period under 're-vision.'

Written in response to *Guernica*'s much hyped arrival, represented by many politicians and journalists as signifying the end of Spain's transition to democracy (Tusell 275), the dialogical or centrifugal text of Saura's *Libelo* stands in contrast to, or "*Contra*," the ideologically saturated "unitary language" of the insurrectionary Nationalist forces, of the dictatorship of General Franco, imposed in 1939 and prolonged until his death in 1975, and of the different but similarly unifying dominant discourses of Spain's Transition, and to the re-signification of *Guernica* in these discourses. As such, it is subversive, contesting the official (ideological) languages of politics and art of this historical period.

20 Regarding *El Paso*, co-founded by Saura in 1957, we read: "A ojos de los sectores oficiales el grupo El Paso era un perfecto embajador de la cultura española. La novedad de sus obras ofrecía una imagen inédita y moderna del régimen de Franco. . . . Hoy resulta difícil digerir esta imagen de El Paso presentado como arte oficial del régimen franquista y es que el grupo no asustó al régimen. . . . Sólo con el tiempo fueron rechazando su condición de representantes oficiales de un régimen del que no eran partidarios" (Luis Burgos n. pag.). Refuting any criticism of collaboration, Saura himself writes:

> [S]olamente participé en una exposición oficial española, en la Bienal de Venecia de 1958, y de común acuerdo con Antoni Tàpies, Eduardo Chillida y mis compañeros del grupo El Paso que fundé en Madrid in 1957. Una actividad que difícilmente se puede calificar de franquista, sino más bien de franca oposición al régimen. Esta participación nos sirvió precisamente como medio para manifestar públicamente nuestro rechazo del régimen, habiéndonos negado a partir de entonces, tanto Tàpies como yo mismo, a cualquier manifestación semejante hasta el advenimiento de la democracia. (*Escritura como pintura* 19-20)

Bakhtin suggests that in order to fulfil specific historical tasks, the "unitary language" of ideological discourse "gives expression to forces working toward concrete verbal and ideological unification and centralization, which develop in vital connection with the processes of sociopolitical and cultural centralization" (270-71). The "unitary language" of the Spanish Nationalists during the Civil War and the ensuing Franco regime is epitomised by the ideological discourse of 'One Spain,' geographically and linguistically (Castilian) speaking, developed precisely in connection with the processes of socio-political and cultural centralisation: efforts directed towards the constitution of a unitary, authoritarian, centralised and monolingual state and against a perceived fragmentation of Spain due to imperial losses and, internally, to demands for regional autonomy, or separatism, by the Basques, Catalans and, to a lesser extent, the Galicians and Aragonese.

Nationalist/Falangist ideology championed the (imaginary) unity of Spain under the Catholic monarchs, characterising the Civil War as a "crusade of liberation," and Fernando el Católico as the "first authentic caudillo," thereby insinuating Franco into this 'great' lineage (Preston 45), and masking the economic and social reality of a war fought to protect the interests of the possessing class in Spain: the "agrarian-financial-industrial elites" (Preston 3; Southworth 397). When, on 6 August 1936, the bishops of Pamplona, Monsignors Olaechea and Múgica, signed a joint pastoral defending the legitimacy of the Nationalist uprising, appealing for the unity of Basque and Navarrese Catholics against 'Communism,' and obliquely condemning the collaboration of the Basque Nationalist Party (PNV) with the Republic, "la teoría de la cruzada quedaba ya formulada" (Fusi 295). The Nationalists had speculated on the neutrality of the PNV –the dominant political force in Bizkaia– on account of their strong Catholic faith. However, from 1931-36, as well as being Catholic, the PNV was popular, autonomist and democratic, and could gain nothing from a national Spain that "prefería una España roja a una España rota," as the right-wing, Alfonsist leader José Calvo Sotelo had declared in 1935 during a debate on Basque Nationalism (qtd. in Fusi 297). On 18 July 1936 the PNV had therefore declared its "adhesión inequívoca a la democracia y distanciamiento cauteloso de las fuerzas de la izquierda revolucionaria" (Fusi 298). In his last public address before his death, printed in the French Communist Party organ, *L'Humanité* (30 April-1 May 1937), the Spanish Nationalist General Emilio Mola Vidal declared: "We shall raze Vizcaya, and its bleak and desolate site will rob Britain of all desire to sustain the Bolshevik Basques in arms against us. We must destroy the capital of a perverted people who dare to defy the irresistible cause of nation" (qtd. in Wingeate Pike 112). They, or their special aviation unit, the

German Condor Legion, had just razed the symbolic capital of the Basques: Gernika. Now they threatened Bilbo.

As noted, for Bakhtin, the monological text is a mythifying discourse which can only represent an ideal, rather than a concrete society. The 'unity' of the Catholic Spain of Isabel and Fernando at the centre of the Nationalists' verbal-ideological world is indeed a myth. Between 1479 and 1512, the unification of the Iberian Peninsula, save Portugal, under the Trastamara-Habsburg dynasty created the "Spanish crown" but not a unified "Spanish nation" (Payne 1). Ramón Tamames has posited the importance to this early 'unity' of the balance achieved between centralised monarchy and an underlying federalism, "un pacto que implica[ba] lo federal en una perspectiva de cooperación entre diversidades" (14). Regional rights and privileges, including Basque and Navarrese *fueros* and Catalan *usatges*, were retained (Payne 5; Abellán 5). The only legal body whose writ pertained in every region was the Inquisition –"la institución defensora de la integridad nacional representada por la religión católica como pieza esencial de la constitución española" (Abellán 5)– which united Catholic Spain through the expulsion of Jews and Muslims. Exile would in fact become a constant in Spanish history from the time of *los Reyes Católicos* (5). Thus the unitary language of the Nationalist crusade neutralised differences, masking a conflictive, heterogeneous culture. Concrete Spanish Nationalist society in fact similarly entailed exclusion and exile:

> [L]a consustancialidad entre España y el cristianismo . . . acabó inspirando toda nuestra historia, produjo las dos grandes expulsiones de judíos y moriscos y la persecución de protestantes, primero, y de liberales después, por la trasposición que se hizo de la fe religiosa al mundo de ideas y sentimientos en que históricamente se había encarnado. (García Escudero 120)

Following the Nationalist victory, the forces of centralisation and unification were embodied in a regime of personal power, based on "una doctrina política autoritaria; organicista; sin libertades efectivas; con un partido único . . . y proscribiendo el pluralismo político y sindical, el sufragio universal libre y el parlamentarismo democrático como sus viscerales enemigos" (Areilza 142). These forces were expressed in monological texts. The permanent and immutable 'principles' of the movement "[t]enía[n] una vertiente teocrática, apoyada en una simbiosis de Iglesia y Estado, reflejada en un sinnúmero de documentos, discursos, pastorales, homilías y leyes" (143). Again, the unitary language of the verbal-ideological world of the Nationalists neutralised differences, masking a conflictive, heterogeneous culture: "No se podía intentar siquiera una exégesis interpretativa conducente a un análisis racional de las motivaciones del conflicto" (139). And again it was a

myth. The dialectic of *vencedores y vencidos* served as doctrinal support for the Franco regime, which for years refused amnesties, pardons and any form of reconciliation (139).

This doctrinal intransigence made the process of national reconciliation long and difficult. The choice of Admiral Carrero Blanco as General Franco's successor "supuso una vuelta más al tornillo represor de los discrepantes" (143) since, as a *continuista*, Carrero Blanco "hoped to perpetuate the regime under a closely invigilated monarchy" (Preston 127). Thus the historical task of the transition to democracy after the death of Franco was that of the belated reconciliation of the 'two Spains,' the victors and vanquished in the Civil War, and again unitary language gave expression to forces working toward concrete ideological and socio-political unification. While the difference in the unitary language of Spanish Nationalism and that of the Transition lies in that the latter was genuinely intended to be inclusive –when don Juan Carlos I undertook to be "Rey de todos los españoles, . . . [l]a cuestión no radicaba tanto en repetir la manida expresión como en llenarla de un nuevo contenido político, que ahora no podía ser otro que la democracia" (Juliá, "La larga marcha" n. pag.)– the desired unity was still mythical: it required the suppression of real differences; the silencing of the heterogeneous and conflictive social voices, memories and histories of the Spanish people. As Antonio Gómez López-Quiñones argues, "[l]a transición política . . . supuso un gran pacto social en el que grandes dosis de desmemoria se alzaron como condición *sine qua non* para la realización exitosa de un proceso complejo, delicado y, eventualmente, reversible" (129). Similarly, José María de Areilza notes that after the coronation of Juan Carlos I in November 1975,

> [l]a idea de crear un espíritu de consenso nacional capaz de redactar una constitución que fuera aceptada por la inmensa mayoría se abrió paso en la mente de unos y otros, llevando dentro de sí el corolario indispensable de que no se volviera a mencionar, ni discutir, ningún hecho de la guerra civil capaz de suscitar nuevos enconos. (151)

As we have seen, Franco actively proscribed discussion of the conflicts that culminated in the fratricidal Civil War, yet were kept alive during the vindictive peace of his dictatorship. Spain's transition to democracy was achieved through a social pact of collective amnesia, following hard on the heels of the enforced amnesia, or "distorted historical memory" (Preston 34), and often brutal suppression of political difference and dissidence, particularly in Euskadi (Payne 244-47), under the Franco regime. This period in Spanish history thus represents a concrete, if literal, example of the state of "unspoken warfare," or power struggles and conflicts that are not expressed linguistically, postulated by Michel Foucault as characteristic of modern societies ("Two Lectures" 90). In resist-

ance to hegemonic representations, Foucault advocates the "insurrection of subjugated forms of knowledge" (81), and proposes a "genealogy" which combines erudite knowledge with local memories, historical contents and naïve knowledges that have been masked, or considered inadequate as sources of information about a culture (80-87). The recovery of subjugated memories and knowledges is indeed an important project that is being undertaken in democratic Spain: "La denuncia de la amnesia ha ocupado un papel central en la cultura democrática española" (Gómez López-Quiñones 129), and is, I suggest, one of the themes, or operations, of *Contra el Guernica*: "Desprecio . . . la repentina amnesia del Guernica" (*Libelo* 41). Again, however, we should note that the memories 're-collected' in Saura's text are drawn from a multiplicity of conflicting social and individual voices, such that any one memory, any one history, any one view of *Guernica*, or Gernika, is contested. Furthermore, as an early denunciation of amnesia, or re-citing/siting of conflicts, Saura's *Libelo* was even more polemical and puzzling. As recently as 23 February 1981 the *intentona* of Lieutenant Colonel Antonio Tejero had demonstrated the conditionality of Spanish democracy.[21]

The local memories and historical contents that had been masked, or considered inadequate as sources of information about Spanish culture included, of course, the memories and histories of the *vencidos*: Republicans, Anarchists, Communists –either Stalinist or supporters of the Workers' Marxist Unification Party (POUM)– unionised labour, regionalists and Basque nationalists, all denied and written against in official Francoist historiography, "a direct instrument of the state, written by policemen, soldiers and priests, invigilated by the powerful censorship machinery" (Preston 30). In relation to Gernika, multiple revisions of this atrocity were penned by Neo-Francoist historians including Ricardo de la Cierva, whose efforts are addressed in "Gernika: Propagandistic 'rompecabezas.'" Paradoxically, the anti-intellectualism of the Franco regime meant that erudite knowledge, the knowledge of the intellectual, literary, 'French-educated' man or woman of letters and the visual arts –precisely that of Saura's own milieu– was one of the knowledges that had been subjugated. It thus constituted an insurrectionary form of knowledge. If Nationalist/Falangist ideology championed a reactionary 'New State' of Isabel and Fernando, promising to kill the legacy of the nineteenth century, "liberal, decadent, masonic, materialist and Frenchified," and "to return to impregnate ourselves with the sixteenth

21 Following Adolfo Suárez's resignation on 29 January 1981, King Juan Carlos I nominated Leopoldo Calvo Sotelo as Presidential candidate. On 23 February, voting on Calvo Sotelo's investiture was interrupted by an attempted *coup d'état* led by Tejero. This event caused the Communist writer Rafael Alberti to call for a halt to proceedings to bring *Guernica* to Spain (Tusell 273).

century, imperial, heroic, proud, Castilian, spiritual, mythical and chivalrous" (Federico de Irrutia, qtd. in Thomas 494), Republican, regionalist and leftist ideologies conversely had their roots in the rational thinking and progressive socioeconomic reforms of the enlightened *afrancesados*, and in the 1812 *Cádiz Constitución*. The sponsors of the Spanish Second Republic (at least at the outset) included such intellectual heavyweights as José Ortega y Gasset, Ramón Menéndez Pidal, Ramón Pérez de Ayala and Gregorio Marañón (Santos 6-14); its leaders were free-thinkers directly or indirectly informed by the Institución Libre de Enseñanza founded under the Restoration. Regional autonomy was recognised as the model for the Spanish State in the Republican Constitution of 1931 (Viñas 303), and the Republic also represented the interests of the now conscientised working classes.

While many of the social voices in Saura's *Libelo* are drawn from the popular Spanish press –"de la que saqué unos dossiers fantásticos" (Ríos 177)– these enter into dialogue with the 'hi-brow' "languages" of critics, theoreticians, historians and practicioners of art, culture and politics. The consequent art- and literaturisation of Saura's text therefore presumes an ideal bourgeois reader, thoroughly versed in the arts. As Frances R. Aparicio suggests, the presence of erudite intertexts leads to a resistance to interpretation: "Si, por un lado, la presencia de intertextos implica una actitud radicalizadora ante el lugar privilegiado de la literatura, por otro . . . intertextos 'eruditos' conducen a un mayor hermetismo y una resistencia a la significación en el proceso de la lectura" (77). Saura's text therefore becomes even more of a "rompecabezas" for the general reader, just as Picasso's *Guernica* was for the average gallery-goer.

In conversation with the young Saura, Picasso once remarked: "On ne peut pas se débarrasser, n'est-ce-pas?" Saura paraphrases Picasso's ambiguous statement as follows: "[N]o podrás librarte de mí de la misma forma que yo tampoco he podido hacerlo del pasado" ("La imagen pintada" 170). Reflecting on this conversation many years later, Saura remarks: "[L]os signos de determinada carga cultural persisten para quien los sepa ver. Es evidente que no puede existir una pintura analfabeta" (Ríos 173), a perception succinctly re-presented in the words of his *contertulio*, Julían Ríos: "[L]a Historia –la del Arte y la de España– también pinta" (157).

In addition to understanding Saura's *Libelo* as subversively re-introducing a plurality of voices in contest of the dominant discourses of *Guernica* and Gernika, an available reading of Saura's pamphlet, then, is as a didactic manifesto of how to 'read' a painting. However, we must keep in mind that, in his *Libelo*, Saura's own erudition is always dialogical. I will now suggest that these erudite intertexts are also drawn into *Contra el*

Guernica for the orchestration of a dialectically opposed theme. As Bakhtin argues, not only does the dialogical text orchestrate all its themes, all objects and ideas depicted and expressed in it, by means of the social diversity of speech types and inserted genres with whose help heteroglossia enters the work (263), but also "the possibilities of orchestration make any segment of text almost infinitely variable" (431), such that in any segment of Saura's text we may hear "overtones" which inflect multiple themes simultaneously. To the genres of the political pamphlet and the art/political manifesto, I will now add those of art history and art criticism –the public seems to have understood *Contra el Guernica* as a particularly harsh review– and a slightly obscure poetic genre: divided into two hundred and eighty 'verses,' Saura's pamphlet resembles a long poem, and since it is specifically directed albeit 'against' rather than 'to' a painting, it recalls the minor poetic genre of ekphrasis, which "giv[es] voice to a mute art object"; offers "a rhetorical description of a work of art" (Jean Hagstrum, qtd. in Mitchell 152); or, more broadly, is "the verbal re-presentation of visual re-presentation" (James Heffernan, qtd. in Mitchell 152), a form that is not so distant from an art critic's review.

While Saura laments the paucity of intellectual debates in politics and the arts, and of *avant-garde* art *per se* in Spain during the cultural closure of the Franco years –"la incultura en la que se ha mantenido el pueblo" (*Fijeza* 31)– he is not necessarily in agreement with the myriad pronouncements made by art critics and politicians in relation to *Guernica*, and 're-cited' in his *Libelo*. If, on the one hand, then, *Contra el Guernica* may be understood to suggest that the 'truth' of Picasso's *Guernica*, and works of art generally, be sought in the rebus of intertexts that the artist draws into the work to illustrate his or her themes, on the other hand, I suggest that the genres of ekphrasis and the art review are drawn into dialogue in order to problematise interpretation. As Norman Bryson argues:

> What we have to understand is that the act of recognition that painting galvanizes is a production, rather than a perception, of meaning. Viewing is an activity of transforming the material of painting into meanings, and that transformation is perpetual. . . . The viewer is an interpreter, and the point is that since interpretation changes as the world changes, art history cannot lay claim to final or absolute knowledge of its object. (Qtd. in Preziosi 156)

I suggest that debates surrounding the incommensurability of image and word (or the 'real world' and language generally), and thus the impossibility of containing or completely explaining a work of art, since something will always elude the frame constructed for it,[22] nuance the following utterances, and Saura's text as a whole:

22 See Jacques Derrida's introduction to *The Truth in Painting*, and also Susan Sontag's essay, "Against Interpretation."

> Odio al Guernica por la cantidad de libros malos que se han escrito y se van a escribir y porque ninguno de ellos explica satisfactoriamente mi desprecio. (19)
>
> Detesto a Ribemont Dessaignes que escribió con profética intuición "Nada de lo que se dijo sobre Picasso podrá ser exacto." (30)[23]

A way to theorise this process of (mis)representation would be to locate painting as the seen, mute object in opposition to the seeing and speaking subject in the system of power relations of image and text (Mitchell 157); more broadly, the sheer volume of representations or re-significations of *Guernica* (and Gernika) in Saura's text would seem to suggest a postmodernist critique of the power relations of representation in general. Indeed, I argue that the dominant theme of *Contra el Guernica* is that the relentless discourses conducted around the artist and his work distance *Guernica* both from its 'plastic reality' and from an original signified: Gernika. In his orchestrated litany of (others') li(n)es, Saura 're-cites' a multitude of received ideas: re-presentations, re-contextualisations and re-significations of *Guernica* through political, art-critical and art-theoretical discourses. Art critics' lines share space with (Neo-)Francoist 'lies,' such that each of their saurian 'truths' is subjected to Saurian satire. As (art-)historiographical metafiction, Saura's overtly intertextual text demonstrates that we can only know art, and history, through such textual traces, and that these are always ideological. As Vincent Leitch argues: "Intertextuality posits both an uncentered historical enclosure and an abysmal decentered foundation for language and textuality; in so doing, it exposes all contextualizations as limited and limiting, arbitrary and confining, self-serving and authoritarian, theological and political" (qtd. in Hutcheon 127).

However, this same process necessarily impugns *Guernica*'s own ability to re-present the atrocity: it too is a 'mere' rebus of intertexts; it too refers to prior, predominantly visual, representations. Thus, as disentanglers of Saura's "rompecabezas," once having identified its pieces –the inserted genres and erudite intertexts that traverse this text– we find that its frames are multiple; the puzzle remains "desajustado." Further variations on Saura's themes provide the subjects for the subsequent chapters of this thesis; for now we

23 Ribérmont Dessaignes's words, "[r]ien de ce qu'on peut dire de Picasso n'est exact," are quoted on an introductory page, and translated on p. 461, of Roland Penrose's *Picasso: His Life and Work*. Also recalled are Michel Leiris's words: "To take up a pen, line up words as if they could add anything to Picasso's *Guernica*, is the most useless of undertakings" (qtd. in Oppler 210). Picasso himself commented of *Guernica*: "But it isn't up to the painter to create symbols; otherwise, it would be better if he wrote them out in so many words instead of painting them. The public who look at the picture must see in the horse and the bull symbols which they interpret as they understand them" (qtd. in Oppler 102).

will turn to the two “rompecabezas desajustados” which are key intertexts of *Contra el Guernica*. *Libelo*, and whose ‘style’ this pamphlet reproduces.

Gernika: Propagandistic "rompecabezas"

Once Franco's *pronunciamiento* of 17 July 1936 was foiled and the ensuing Civil War reached a military impasse some ten days later, the requirement of both sides to seek war materiel from abroad resulted in a war of international ideology (Wingeate Pike 29) in which the destruction of Gernika would become a strongly contested symbol. For three and a quarter hours on the afternoon of 26 April 1937, the German Condor Legion, in the service of the insurrectionary Nationalist forces,[1] dropped tons of high explosive and incendiary bombs on this open Basque town, intermittently swooping to strafe the fleeing human and animal population with machine-gun fire, killing many hundreds of civilians, injuring countless more, and levelling some seventy percent of the buildings.[2] Evidence of the atrocity was provided by the Mayor of Gernika, José de Labauría Porturas; members of the Autonomous Basque Government; the diocesan Vicar-General, Mgr. Ramón Galbarriatu; and numerous eyewitnesses, including canon Alberto de Onaindía y Zuluaga. It was immediately corroborated by the first international journalists to arrive at the scene, among them the *Times* correspondent George Lowther Steer.[3]

While in the aftermath of the bombardment General Emilio Mola Vidal brazenly threatened to raze Bizkaia (112), the Spanish Nationalist Generals Franco and Gonzalo Queipo de Llano y Serra, more mindful of the international backlash, denied (any complicity in) the atrocity (Southworth 32-33). So began the campaign of disinformation orchestrated by Franco's Rebels, aided by their international supporters, and perpetuated by Neo-Francoist historians long after the Civil War had ended. The first denials, hastily improvised by the head of military censorship, Luis Bolín Bidwell,[4] and broadcast twenty-

1 Admiral Wilhelm Canaris, the chief of the German secret service and a close friend of Franco, convinced Adolf Hitler and Hermann Göring (and also Benito Mussolini) that intervention was in Germany's (and Italy's) best interests. Göring stated that the Spanish war presented an excellent opportunity for testing his new, inexperienced Luftwaffe (Chipp 18). General von Reichenau likewise argued that Spain provided invaluable experience for future war, and "Blitzkrieg efforts" (qtd. in Thomas 807). General Hugo von Sperrle commanded the Condor Legion –all German forces in Spain– while Lieutenant Colonel Wolfram von Richthofen commanded the Luftwaffe. General Faupel acted as Hitler's ambassador to the Nationalist Government in Salamanca. Although Sperrle was responsible to Franco, the Condor Legion operated as an independent unit. As Hirschel B. Chipp argues, the provision of autonomy to an air force formed and trained for tactical operations requiring a constant, close liaison with ground forces "undoubtedly contributed to subsequent confusion over questions of authority and responsibility in the bombing of Guernica" (21).

2 Early reports suggested 800-1000 dead (Southworth 18-19). The figures from Republican sources were 1654 killed and 889 wounded (Southworth 366). Castor Uriarte, the city architect of Gernika in 1970, reported that 71% of dwellings had been destroyed, others damaged beyond repair (Chipp 34).

3 Other correspondents included Noel Monks of the *Daily Express*, Christopher Holme for Reuters, various reporters for the American press and Mathieu Corman for the new, communist-controlled, *Ce Soir*. Georges Berniard, the only French national correspondent to witness the destruction prior to the town's investment by General Mola's troops, was taken prisoner and forced to sign a statement corroborating the Nationalist version of events (Southworth 11-30).

4 Bolín had previously worked as the London correspondent for the Madrid monarchist daily, *ABC*. From London, with the help of Douglas Jerrold –a right-wing Catholic Franco supporter, and a director of the English publishing company Eyre and Spottiswoode– and Major Hugh Pollard, a right-wing adventurer, Bolín organised Franco's flight from the Canary Islands to Spanish Morocco to lead the insurrection against the Popular Front Republic (Rankin 78-79).

four hours after the event on Radio Requeté, Radio Nacional at Salamanca (ironically entitled "Lies, Lies, Lies"), and by the "Radio General," Queipo de Llano, presented two essential positions: firstly, Gernika had been destroyed from the ground by "Red" incendiaries, and secondly, misty conditions *that* day kept Nationalist planes from the air (32-33, 264). Franco's additional lie denying the presence of any foreign air force in National Spain was simply "part of the make-believe world of European diplomacy at that moment" (34-35). As Herbert Southworth argues:

> If Salamanca had admitted that organized units of the German air force were in Spain, the English and French governments would have had to take some action. Unable or unwilling to take that action, these governments and everybody else preferred to maintain the fiction that the Germans and Italians in Spain –if such there were– were volunteers. (35)

Pierre Vilar accordingly argues that while the Spanish and German chains of command cannot escape responsibility for the atrocity, professional journalists and partisan press agents were equally important historical figures, "since they were responsible for the repercussion that followed – that is for its new dimension" (xv): the bitter controversy and battle of the pens over the 'truth' of Gernika, founded on the news stories and official statements introduced above. One aspect of this controversy was, then, the now irrefutable evidence of massive German intervention. Published and upheld by the politically conservative and journalistically prestigious *Times* in London and New York, Steer's testament established world opinion about the destruction of Gernika, provoking an outcry among the left. It also embarrassed a conservative British government committed to non-intervention as part of a broader policy of appeasement in face of increasing German rearmament and aggression (Southworth 14, 26, 331),[5] a policy that facilitated Franco's victory (Viñas 267). In France, however, the dominant news agency *Havas*, in collaboration with the French Foreign Ministry, or *Quai d'Orsay*, initially suppressed evidence supporting Basque claims, then widely circulated a dispatch from their correspondent, Georges Botto. This had been written after a supervised visit to Gernika following the town's investment by Mola's (predominantly Italian) troops, sent through Nationalist censorship at Vitoria, acknowledged in its author's journalese to be false, and further doctored to support Nationalist contentions (Southworth 396). Botto's report introduced the spurious scientific 'evidence' indicated to journalists by the Nationalist officers: negative as to bomb splinters, bomb

5 Southworth notes that the British Foreign Minister, Sir Anthony Eden, also had the report from the British Consul in Bilbo, which left no doubt as to the truth of the bombing. He suggests that this was not released for fear of unleashing the opposition of the Labour Party and compromising 'non-intervention' (211).

splatter and bomb holes –although "a few have been located on the outskirts"[6]– and positive as to the use of mines (four craters in the town itself) and fire accelerants (75). Salamanca even claimed to have witnesses able to identify those who had held the torches and poured the gasoline (36).

Southworth argues that by suppressing and inventing the news at will, the French Foreign Ministry and *Agence Havas* defused possible public demands for French intervention in the Spanish war, to which the secretary-general of the *Quai d'Orsay*, Alex Léger, was firmly opposed (350-52). Furthermore, the Foreign Ministry was nominally headed by Yvon Delbos, "a Radical Socialist unfriendly to the Spanish Republic" (396). The French position, and actions, are satirised in one semantic layer of the utterance, "[o]dio la 'manifestation du genie de la France' del Guernica" (*Libelo* 9). The non-interventionism of the USA, France and England, in the full knowledge of the actual interventions of Germany, Italy and, on the side of the Republicans, Russia, is further characterised as betrayal in the utterance, "[o]dio al Guernica, reliquia de un mundo traicionado" (14).

However, not only did the bombardment provide conclusive evidence of German intervention, it also prefigured the horrors of aerial bombardment to follow in World War II. Indeed, by 28 April, the English press was predicting Coventry (Vilar xiv). What to *do* about Gernika was therefore a "rompecabezas" for the English and French diplomats responsible for foreign policy, whose worst fears are recalled in the utterance: "Detesto al Guernica porque el telón de fondo de su decorado pertenece a una obra cuyo final aún no ha acontecido" (*Libelo* 7). Here, Saura plays representations of *Guernica* as a "theatre backdrop" and "stage décor"[7] to be revisited in Picasso's and other artists' later works

6 This text is drawn into the utterance, "[d]etesto ciertas salpicaduras en la parte derecha del Guernica" (*Libelo* 15). On Castor Uriarte's *Plan of Guernica* (1970), the structures totally destroyed on 26 April 1937 are indicated in black. The centre of the town is fully blacked out, while only a few "salpicaduras" appear at the lower right near the Rentería bridge (Chipp 35), the declared target in German reports on the bombardment (Southworth 277). Transposing the codes of politics and painting, Saura plays on the presence of paint splatter on the trailing leg of the woman at the lower right of *Guernica* (see 1:1 scale reproduction of this painting in Alix Trueba), perhaps also alluding to Georges Bataille's "acts of sabotage against the academic world and the spirit of system," which rest upon desublimatory non sequiturs termed "ink spots" or "quacks" by Bataille, and to the desublimatory "ink blots on the ego ideal" which, for Bataille, result from psychoanalytical "alteration" (Bois, "Use Value" 16; "*Abattoir*" 50). Saura's "salpicaduras en la parte derecha" are thus readable as desublimatory ink blots on the ego ideal of the political right, and as satirising the psychological and journalistic 're-pression' of the true scale of the atrocity.

7 Hirschel B. Chipp writes that on entering the Spanish Pavilion, "to the visitor's right, covering the entire end wall and designed like a theatre backdrop, was Picasso's *Guernica*" (145). In 1968, Douglas Cooper wrote: "The stark setting of houses and walls (both internal and external) which enclose the pictorial space is conceived like a stage décor, and the sense of theatre is increased by the attitudes and gestures of the figures as well as by the temporal ambiguity produced by an electric light hanging in the centre of an apparently outdoor scene" (qtd. in Oppler 317). Reinhold Hohl linked *Guernica* with Antonin Artaud's 1932 Manifesto, "The Theatre of Cruelty" (Oppler 319). Saura perhaps also draws in the ideological distinction between art and craft, and criticisms of Picasso for working in stage design, his only previous experience with such large format painting. Picasso created the set, backdrop and costumes for Jean Cocteau's *Parade* (1917), performed by Sergei Diaghilev's *Ballets Russes*. The backdrop depicted a backstage circus scene, whose winged horses provided source material for *Guernica*. Picasso's dealer, Leonce Rosenberg, criticised the artist's collaboration with the ballet (FitzGerald 72). Cocteau held that, for the *avant-garde*, "[t]o paint a set for a Russian Ballet . . . was a

against Gernika "como telón de fondo de una de las pinturas más importantes de todos los tiempos" (Alix Trueba 32), and subsequent reproductions of this atrocity.

The destruction of Gernika was also a symbolic event on account of the town's special significance for the Basques. As Vilar argues, in a war fought by Basque nationalists in the name of traditional liberties, the destruction of their traditional foral centre broke the morale of the Basque people, yet bound them to fight to the end (xii-xiii). Furthermore, the slaughter of such deeply Catholic people belied Nationalist representations of the war as a Holy Crusade (Southworth 397). Previously, the killing of clerics in the Republican zones had provided the Catholic sector abroad with arguments against a 'Red' Spain, hardening the originally cautious attitude of the Vatican,[8] influencing government policies, and contributing to the blocking of aid to the Republican victims of the conflict (Viñas 280). Conversely,

> [l]a exaltación religiosa suministró una coartada a la ayuda a Franco e incluso, ante ciertos públicos, justificó la intervención fascista "en defensa de la civilización occidental y cristiana". Esta hipertrofia de los aspectos religiosos llevó a proyectar la guerra civil como *guerra santa*, de alcance universal. (280-81)

In France, the testimony of Father Onaindía, circulated by Catholic papers and also by the Communist Party organ, *L'Humanité*, was therefore all-important, although it enjoyed a narrower readership than that of Steer and his colleagues abroad. In response, more subtle, socially concerned Catholic thinkers including François Mauriac, Georges Bernanos and Jacques Maritain joined the pamphlet war in an attempt to counter Spanish Nationalist support among Catholics in France and the United States (281).

In Spain itself, the subject of Gernika was interdicted to serious research for more than thirty-two years (Southworth 279); it was an offence to allege that anyone but "Red separationists" had destroyed Gernika (William P. Lineberry, qtd. in Southworth 256). Even *Guernica: The Official Report* (1938),[9] which was thoroughly dishonest in its conclusions, was suppressed in Spain since one section recorded eyewitness testimonies confirming the use of both explosive and incendiary bombs (Southworth 291). Nevertheless, Nationalist

---

crime" (qtd. in FitzGerald 72). Michael C. FitzGerald comments: "Even if Cocteau overdramatized the situation, the division between the worlds of theatre and the visual arts did exist" (72). Since Saura, too, has created theatrical backdrops (for example the set for *La casa de Bernarda Alba*, Madrid 1963), we know that criticisms of *Guernica* as mere craft are not his own. Also recalled is Michael Fried's definition of modern painting as self referential and antitheatrical (12-23).

8 The complicity of the Vatican is recalled in the utterance, "[o]dio las reliquias carcomidas extraídas del 'lignum crucis' de la caja del Guernica" (Libelo 25). While in one semantic layer *Guernica* is described as a worm-eaten relic removed from its 'sacred' crate, Saura's *humor negro* simultaneously recalls the gift from the Franco regime to Pope Pius XII of a crucifix carved from the wood of one of the destroyed churches of Gernika (Southworth 239). The gift accepted by the Pope is thus depicted as a 'lousy' relic carved from the "wood of the cross" of the 'coffin' of Gernika.

9 Published in England by the pro-Franco Catholic Douglas Jerrold, one of the directors of Eyre and Spottiswoode.

positions were gradually undermined and the bombing eventually admitted, but only with the provisos that neither Franco nor Mola were consulted nor informed, and that the real destruction was caused by Asturian dynamiters, or retreating Basque/Republican militia.

In 1965, the Ministry of Information and Tourism created the Section of Studies on the War of Spain in order "to combat certain hostile interpretations of the war and the origins of the regime" (252, 278). Southworth notes that, as the official spokesperson for the regime on Civil War matters, Ricardo de la Cierva published at least nine fallacious and self-contradictory scenarios purportedly correcting the "myth of Guernica" (278).[10] The first of these was published in 1967, in *Crónica de la guerra de España*, a serial history of the war edited by the historian and available in newspaper kiosks throughout Spain. In Chapter 62, "Arde Guernica," La Cierva presented a variety of accounts including those of Labauría, Steer and Hugh Thomas; the Nationalists Bolín, General Martínez Esparza, Juan Antonio Ansaldo and Luis María de Lojendio;[11] and the Germans Adolf Galland and Helmuth Dahms. Southworth suggests that La Cierva himself was "vague and irresolute" in his conclusions, showing that "the Neo-Franquistas were having difficulty in deciding exactly what position to take on this highly controversial event" (267). However, by arguing that "Guernica was simply an episode more, although an extremely sad one –but not so sad as that of neighbouring Durango, less bruited about by propaganda– in the interminable chain of small and great tragedies which formed the Spanish Civil War" (qtd. in Southworth 267), La Cierva minimised the enormity of the atrocity. He also presented accounts he knew to be false, since he had access to *Guernica: The Official Report* (Southworth 291).

Southworth suggests that in 1968-69, against the background of increasing social and political agitation and government repression, police brutality and tortures, military courts and laws of exception, felt particularly fiercely in the Basque country, the Neo-Francoist school received political support for a new, "artfully conceived" account of Gernika that might pacify the Basques and lessen the barrier between Bilbo and the regime (275-76). The death of Bolín in 1969, and the publication the same year in (then) West Germany of documents verifying that Gernika had indeed been bombed by the German air force,

10 My discussion of La Cierva's texts draws on Southworth's dissection of these documents (252-91, 364-75).

11 Martínez Esparza headed the first Nationalist troops to enter Gernika, and wrote in a technical military journal: "[O]ur planes bombed this [arms] factory, and they also bombed the railway station to prevent the arms being exported." He also claimed to have detected "two completely different kinds of ruins. On the one side, the bombed arms factory, the railway station [neither was in fact hit] and their surroundings; on the other, ruins of a more recent character, the result of arson and dynamite" (qtd. in Southworth 243). Lojendio prepared military communiqués for the foreign press during the war, and became the Mitred Abbott of the Valley of the Fallen. His military history of the war noted "the ruins of Guernica, destroyed by fire and dynamite of the Marxists demoralized in their flight" (qtd. in Southworth 239). Ansaldo found the ruins of Gernika to resemble those of Irun (which was largely burnt by its defenders) (Southworth 6, 244).

further facilitated, and necessitated, a more aggressive Nationalist 'revision' of the event (277).[12] La Cierva's second attempt to do this was published on 30 January 1970 in the leading Falangist daily, *Arriba.* Southworth notes that, for the first time in a newspaper of mass circulation, it was admitted that Gernika was bombed by the Germans. He also notes that in this article La Cierva described Picasso's *Guernica* as "fenomenal." However, rather than admitting the role of the Condor Legion, La Cierva alleged that a special testing group carried out the operation directly from Germany, and that Franco had therefore been "disturbed." The death toll was calculated at "not even a dozen" (qtd. in Southworth 278-79). Furthermore, while the historian exculpated the putative "Asturian dynamiters," he replaced these with "Separatist Basque action groups," thus, in Southworth's words, attributing the Spanish part of the blame to "the spiritual fathers of ETA" (279).[13]

La Cierva's third effort took the form of a letter to the editor of *El pensamiento Navarro* (15 February 1970), in which he retracted his thesis of the special German group, instead claiming that "[t]he principal and determining cause of the destruction of Guernica was the German [Condor Legion] bombing (in which not a single Spanish plane nor a single Spanish pilot participated, and for which orders were lacking as to the destruction of the town)." He went on to declare Gernika "a military objective of the first order (communications, two armament factories)," also adding that "the cooperation, negative and positive, of the destruction commandos of the Army of Euzkadi, whose chief was José Antonio de Aguirre . . . seems very probable" (qtd. in Southworth 280-81). Southworth interprets this statement as an indistinct way of suggesting that the (imaginary) destruction commandos did not help put out the fires –their so-called negative cooperation– but did help set the fires: their imaginary positive cooperation (281). Thus the original blanket denials of the bombardment of Gernika were replaced with an equally fallacious position which La Cierva would again advance in April 1970, in reply to a letter to the editor of *Historia y Vida*:

> In view of the documentation which I possess, I believe probable the negative and positive participation, in part of the destruction, of the special commandos for urban demolition and communications, which, beyond any doubt, existed in the Basque Army Corps commanded at that time by President don Antonio de Aguirre y Lecube himself. (Qtd. in Southworth 283)

12 This documentation was published by the West German historian Manfred Merkes (Southworth 276).

13 Following its inception in 1962, ETA (Euskadi ta Askatasuna: Basque homeland and freedom), whose revolutionary goals were the independence and reunification of the Basque territory, the transformation of economic, social and cultural structures and the creation of a socialist regime, supplanted the PNV as the dominant political force in the Basque country. ETA received active support from younger elements of the Basque clergy and passive support from much of the population (Southworth 271).

Thus, while the original denials of the Nationalists are 'hated' in the utterance, "[o]dio el negativo del Guernica" (*Libelo* 31), La Cierva's new, (mis)calculated position is hated in the consecutive utterance: "Odio el positivo del negativo del Guernica" (31).[14]

In these third and fourth revisions, La Cierva also claimed the "absolute lack of any symbolic intention in the bombing," since neither the Casa de Juntas nor the Trees of Gernika suffered any damage (qtd. in Southworth 282). Southworth logically responds that this "also proved, then, the deliberate attempt to destroy the rest of the town completely" (282). He argues that one of the reasons for La Cierva's "feverish and ill-prepared activity around the subject of Guernica at this time" was the regime's desire to re-symbolise both *Guernica* and the atrocity it re-presented (282). Indeed, in the latter document, La Cierva returned to the subject of the painting, now suggesting that "[t]he desires of the Spanish government to recuperate the painting *Guernica* of don Pablo Picasso show that in Spain a partisan political value is no longer attributed to this masterpiece" (qtd. in Southworth 283).

La Cierva's fifth account of the event appeared in the second edition of his *Leyenda y tragedia de las brigadas internacionales*, also published in 1970; his sixth formed part of his doctoral thesis, *Información, propaganda y poder* (1970). Of his seventh, Southworth writes:

> Perhaps the lack of results from the Pérez-Embid-La Cierva "Operación Guernica" had dampened the enthusiasm of the official historian. Nothing tangible had been gained by historical concessions to the Basques, not even Picasso's painting. At any rate, the élan and aggressiveness of the sole possessor of the Truth on Guernica seem to have escaped Ricardo de la Cierva in his seventh account of the tragedy, that found in the second volume of his *Historia ilustrada de la guerra civil española*. (285)

In this text, La Cierva again reached the conclusion that a combination of bombing and incendiarism from the ground had destroyed Gernika. Thus, while admitting the bombardment of Gernika, by failing to admit the incendiary bombing which explained the destruction of the town, La Cierva failed to solve *his* "rompecabezas": how to revise Nationalist

14 The "positive" and "negative" of La Cierva's cynical findings take on new meanings in the words of the Director General of Fine Arts, Javier Tusell, himself charged (with Rafael Fernández Quintanilla) with the recovery of *Guernica* during the Transition. Tusell writes that on 14 April 1971 Picasso made a new declaration regarding *Guernica*, "que, si bien tuvo aspectos positivos desde el punto de vista del Estado Español, al mismo tiempo resultaban también negativos" (259). In Tusell's text, "el positivo" refers to "la vinculación que recalcaba entre el *Guernica* y sus estudios anteriores y posteriores y, sobre todo, a la remisión que hacía al texto más largo fechado en noviembre de 1970," while "el negativo" refers to the fact that "Picasso se volvía a referir a la República y no a instituciones democráticas, aunque presumiblemente pensara en ellas" (259). Also recalled are discourses regarding the influence of African masks on Cubism:

> There are certain African masks from the ivory coast in which the eyes are made as cylinders sticking out ferociously from the face, and an echo of this exchange of a dark hole for a protruding circle, negative for positive, is introduced into some of the constructions, when for instance the hole in the centre of the guitar is transformed into a projecting cylinder . . . the conception of substituting negative for positive became a diverting exercise which appealed to his [Picasso's] friend Apollinaire. (Penrose 195-96)

history in the best light possible and at the same time pacify the Basques (and obtain the talismanic *Guernica* for Madrid). La Cierva's own professional failure naturally also perpetuated public uncertainty over the 'facts' of the historical event. His efforts, and those of other Neo-Francoist journalists and historians who attempted to rewrite Gernika history to the advantage of the Spanish Nationalists, are satirised in the utterance:

> Detesto al Guernica, cabaretero "tableau vivante",
> cacofonía internacionalista, accidente de la histo-
> ria, leyenda gris cada vez más negra, híbrido de
> txistularis y fandangos. (27)

In the words "cacofonía internacionalista" and "leyenda gris cada vez más negra,"[15] we hear not only allusions to international participation in the Spanish Civil War and its historiography, and a comparison of Spanish Nationalism's record with the dire record of the colonial adventure of the emulated *Reyes Católicos* in Latin America, but perhaps also fragments of La Cierva's title, *Leyenda y tragedia de las brigadas internacionales*, whose thesis of the shared guilt of Nazi/Nationalist aviation and "Separatist Basque action groups" is heard in the phrase "híbrido de [Basque] txistularis y [Spanish (Nationalist)] fandangos." In this context, an available reading of the "leyenda gris cada vez más negra" is of the worsening historiography of La Cierva and his colleagues, or rather the gradual revelation of the extent the tragic atrocity.[16]

La Cierva, however, rejected the evidence of the Nazi flier, Adolf Galland, who claimed that crossroads and bridges were the Condor Legion's targets, and that the bombing of

15 As usual, the utterance is also readable as a 're-citation' of the art discourses conducted around Picasso and *Guernica*. "Leyenda gris," for example, also draws in the contribution of the Spanish painter, Juan Gris, to synthetic cubism, and thus, indirectly, to Picasso's *Guernica*:

> Synthetic Cubism, the second great phase of the movement, which aims at re-assembling the fragmented objects in the picture in accordance with the artist's formal intentions . . . was first clearly formulated by Juan Gris, who in 1910 began to paint in a style very similar to Picasso's and Braque's. In 1924 he gave a lecture entitled "Possibilities of Painting" in which he [defined] the new creative process as a "synthesis," and describ[ed] it as a path leading from abstraction to reality, from the general to the particular, the reverse of that followed by Cézanne and Analytic Cubism. (Boeck 165)

16 A further reading of the *leyenda negra* and the (typically Andalusian) fandangos in the context of the painting, and its Andalusian painter, is of *Guernica*'s relationship to the *españolada* - the Romantic representation of Spain as traditional and atavistic (Tusell 183): "Often associated with (and blamed on) Merimée's and Bizet's Carmen, the *leyenda negra* (literally, black legend) was the critical response in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to the notion that Spain was represented by Andalusia and that the latter was characterized by singing, dancing, gypsies, and bullfighting" (Morris 447). (See also p. 51, n. 13). The Andalusian poet, Federico García Lorca, and musician, Manuel de Falla, are both explicitly cited in *Contra el Guernica* as contributors, in some sense, to *Guernica* (27, 29, 41). However, Lorca wished to represent the 'true' Andalucía as opposed to the 'tourist' version (Morris 376), and Falla was taught by the musicologist and folklorist Felipe Pedrell, who "felt that Carmen and its imitators were giving a false image of Spain and its music" (Trevelyan 105-06). Saura thus invokes both (criticism of) *Guernica*'s *costumbrismo*, and suggests the 'truth' of his atavistic representation of Gernika, and indeed of its perpetrators. Lorca was executed by the Nationalists during the Civil War; Falla died in exile in Argentina. In *Bodas de sangre* and *El amor brujo* Saura's younger brother, the filmmaker Carlos Saura, pays tribute to Lorca and Falla respectively, and to the hybrid Moorish-Gypsy culture of *al-Andalus* –despised by the Spanish Nationalists, yet promoted by them in order to increase tourism during the dictablanda– as, I suggest, does Saura himself in his Libelo.

the town itself was “an accident” (Southworth 375) –no doubt that cited in Saura’s “accidente de la historia”– such that further Nationalist voices are drawn into dialogue: “The hypothesis that Salamanca and the Condor Legion presented a common front before the whole world, including Berlin, to hide their act finds support in the testimony of Adolf Galland . . .” (375). Unfortunately for the Nationalists, Vicente Talón –unwittingly, Southworth wonders– published in *Arde Guernica* (1970) a document that stated not only that the bombing of the town was an accident, but also that the bombardment of Gernika was requested by Rebel ground troops and ordered by Spanish air command: the 7 May 1937 telegram from Franco’s headquarters that apparently covered for the Condor Legion vis-à-vis its superiors by requesting that General Sperrle inform Berlin that “[f]rontline units requested directly to Aviation the bombing of the crossroads.” While the object in publishing this document may be found in the subsequent lines, which state that “because of the lack of visibility, because of the smoke and clouds of dust, bombs from the planes hit the town,” and that “the Reds took advantage of the bombing to set fire to the town” (qtd. in Southworth 372), “[el] accidente de la historia” became thereby an irreversible accident of historiography. Two years later, the Neo-Francoist expert on aviation aspects of the Civil War, Jesús Salas Larrazábal, accordingly admitted in *La Guerra de España desde el aire* (1972 edition) that the Condor Legion had been ordered to carry out the attack (Southworth 373), finally putting paid to the long-standing argument that Mola and Franco were unaware of plans to bomb Gernika, and then distressed by the results. Salas Larrazábal continued to insist, however, on a purely tactical reason for the bombing –to prevent the use of the Rentería bridge either by Republican units in flight, or, as stated in a later text, by up-coming reserves (495)– thus refusing to admit the wider strategic and symbolic dimensions, and intentions, of the saturation bombing.

In terms of casualties, Talón considered that “not more than two hundred” had perished at Gernika; in a new work La Cierva re-presented Talón’s figure as “little more than a hundred” (qtd. in Southworth 364-65). Salas Larrazábal did not credit that even a hundred could have died (Southworth 365). At the time of the atrocity, the Basque Minister of Justice, Jesús María de Leizaola, cited 592 dead in Bilbo hospitals; Pedro Calzada, who carted many of the dead directly to Gernika’s cemetery, counted approximately seventy-five bodies, noting that still others were carried on stretchers. These figures do not include those who died later as a result of their injuries, nor those whose bodies remained in the fires, the debris from which was only cleared years afterwards. Republican sources gave a

total of 1654 killed and 889 wounded (364-66). These figures, and the evidence for them, were equally available to the Neo-Francoist historians.

For the duration of Franco's life, contradictory statements regarding actions, responsibilities, intentions and fatalities in relation to the destruction of Gernika therefore presented Spaniards and the wider world with chronologically the first of our three "rompecabezas." As Southworth concludes, it is hardly surprising in a class struggle masked as a Holy Crusade, during which the 'crusaders' stood Basque Catholic priests up against the wall and shot them, and fascist mercenaries in their pay bombed a town full of practising Catholics, that "the regime that spread the false news about Guernica in 1937 [could] not bring itself to confess the truth about Guernica in 1970 or in 1975. . . . It is no wonder that the crusaders lied, lied and lied again rather than admit this particular atrocity" (397).

The tons of bombs dropped "by Nazi aviation in its first general attempt at extermination" (Juan Larrea, qtd. in Oppler 282), the "more tons of ink than of bombs" purportedly spilled by Republican sympathisers in the aftermath of the event (Bernardo Gil Mugarza, qtd. in Southworth 392), and the litany of lies orchestrated by the defenders of Franco's 'crusade' are drawn into dialogue, and formally reproduced, in the 'saturation bombing' of Saura's invective: indeed, "Odio," "Detesto" and "Desprecio," the three verbs which repetitively introduce his invective, resound with the Nazi's/Nationalists' similarly repetitive delivery of hatred, detestation and disgust in the form of explosive bombs, incendiary bombs and machine-gun fire.[17] The number and arrangement of Saura's utterances and part-utterances may likewise be significant of bomb and body counts. Furthermore, the Biscayan town whose name could not be mentioned at the meetings of the Non-Intervention Committee in London (Vilar xi), nor genuinely investigated in Franco's Spain, is shouted in most every utterance of *Contra el Guernica. Libelo.*

17 Interestingly, Juvenal's satire has been described as "saturation bombing" (Cudden 781)

Guernica: Iconographical "rompecabezas"

Throughout the Renaissance, an important function of painting was to convey (frequently biblical) narratives through symbolism, dramatic poses, allegory, anecdote, allusions to literature and titles –sources outside of the painting itself– such that every element of "the image as a riddle" was "a code, a system of signs put forward for the express purpose of translation, a puzzle for the viewer to solve" (Manguel 10, 63-64). From the fifteenth century forward, European painters simultaneously dedicated themselves to the achievement and perfecting of illusionism: "The pictorial conquest of the external visual world . . . completed and refined many times and in different ways during the previous half millennium" (Alfred H. Barr, qtd. in Mitchell 230). Both of these practices would be rejected in modernism, frequently held as beginning with Claude Manet's paintings of the 1860s. For Michel Foucault, Manet's modernism rested on "the new and substantial relationship of painting to itself." He considered that Manet and Flaubert "both produced works in a self-conscious relationship to earlier paintings or texts. . . . They erect their art within the archive" (qtd. in Crimp 54). For Clement Greenberg it would be the formal attributes of Manet's paintings that qualified him as the first modernist painter: "[B]y virtue of the frankness with which they declare the flat surfaces on which they were painted" (775). Georges Bataille wrote of "the crisis of subject matter" in Manet's painting; of taking the subject as "the mere *pretext* for the painting itself" (qtd. in Bois, "Use Value" 14). Yve-Alain Bois suggests that Bataille in fact "conceives of the semantic deflation of the picture [Manet's *The Execution of Maximilian*] as less a simple absence than as a violence, a desublimatory act of aggression (even though he does not mention Manet's often declared disgust for history painting)" (14). Modernist painting was, then, above all self-reflexive, concerned with the unique attributes of its own medium and the expulsion of others from it –seeking presence in the place of discourse– and violently opposed to the received codes of fine art traditions.

In specific relation to Picasso's painting, Claude Lévi-Strauss suggests that "[r]ather than bring an original message it expends itself on a kind of trituration of the code of painting. An interpretation of a second degree: an admirable discourse on the pictorial discourse much more than a discourse on the world" (qtd. in Penrose 484). However, as the surrealist painter and Picasso biographer Roland Penrose has noted, even if "[t]he subject as such has indeed lost much of its significance for us . . . attempts to rid painting completely of subject matter are of little interest to Picasso" (435). Furthermore, for Picasso, *Guernica*

was “less of a real painting” on account of “outside considerations” (qtd. in Penrose 485). To Jerome Seckler, the artist remarked “que para resolver *un problema* privativo de este cuadro excepcional tuvo que hacer uso del simbolismo y de la alegoría” (Larrea 241). Juan Larrea argues that “las circumstancias políticas” constituted the painterly problem (241). Seckler and Larrea, however, came to diametrically opposed interpretations of *Guernica*’s symbolism and allegories. While, in concession to accessibility, Picasso may have (re)turned to these pre-modern devices, *Guernica* is still very much a modernist painting, as we hear from the individual and social voices drawn into dialogue in Saura’s pamphlet. In the eyes of these (disgruntled) commentators, the subject remains the pretext for the painting itself: “[U]n pretexto para llenar una superficie de 7 por 3 metros” (*Libelo* 42); *Guernica* is non-illusionistic, the flatness of its surface is frankly declared: “[S]iendo dibujo coloreado más que pintura” (7); it is non-representational, it does not mirror the external visual world through colour and form: “[E]l barrido del espejo del Guernica” (30);[1] it is not a traditional history painting in which the victors and the apparatus of war are depicted, the accepted genre for the treatment of a battle scene: “[S]in ser un cuadro de historia” (7). It is also erected within the archive. Picasso not only ‘drew’ into *Guernica* certain icons of art history, he also inserted the various genres, or *avant-garde* ‘isms,’ that he had protagonised, such that his mural represents “la suma de todos los estilos anteriores de Picasso: etapas azul y rosa, cubismo y surrealismo; más aún: figuras y técnicas procedentes de su amplia experiencia” (Calvo Serraller, “El ‘Guernica’ como enigma” 118). This self-referential feature of Picasso’s painting also is heard detested in *Contra el Guernica*:

> Detesto al Guernica porque habiendo organizado
> imágenes reconocibles, reúne extremosa deformación, onírica carga y sentimentalismo popular. (13)

Here, “[las] “imágenes reconocibles” are those aspects of Picasso’s painting which are recognisable through their realism, or as re-presentations of prior, well-known works. “[E]xtremosa deformación” indicates cubism, while “onírica carga” invokes Picasso’s (contemporaneous, contested) surrealism. His Blue and Rose Periods are sighted/cited as “sentimentalismo popular.” The simultaneous presence of all of these styles, together with

1 Mirror and window are metaphors for illusionistic art. “[E]l barrido del espejo del Guernica” thus refers to the sweeping aside of painting’s requirement to be a description, or reflection, of a scene: “Painting could claim again its ancient right to exist as an object in itself, radiating its own associations and undiminished by being merely the reflection of something else” (Penrose 149). In the complete utterance, “[o]dio el escalofrío y el sofoco provocados por el barrido del espejo del Guernica,” Saura cites, and hates, conservative art critics’ ‘shock’ at *Guernica*’s modernist idiom. However, through the transposition of the codes of painting and history, “el escalofrío y el sofoco provocados por el barrido del espejo” of Gernika recall the ‘chilling,’ ‘feverish’ burning and suffocation of the victims caused by the ‘clean sweep’ of the town with machine-gunfire, incendiary and explosive bombs, also suggesting consumption with fever and rage over the obliteration both of the town from the map, and of the event from Nationalist histories.

the other modernist features of *Guernica*, both shocked viewers and resisted interpretation on account of the consequent multiplication and complication of referents and meanings. Indeed, after the initial shock of *Guernica*'s experimental idiom (Penrose 307), what most confounded pavilion visitors and future critics, and incensed the hard-line (Zhdanovist) Marxists, was the visual polysemy of the painting, the impossibility of finding an exact referent for every pictorial sign: the keys to a singular meaning of the image as 'riddle,' and therefore to its use value as propaganda. Following the exhibition of *Guernica* at the New Burlington Galleries in October 1938, Anthony Blunt charged that the painting was merely a series of "abstruse circumlocutions" (qtd. in Martin 136) and, as paraphrased by Russell Martin, "too esoteric for ordinary people to decipher or enjoy" (136). Blunt's words are 're-cited' (and re-sited[2]) in the utterance:

> Detesto los "abstrusos circunloquios" con que
> Anthony Blunt, crítico marxista y consejero real,
> "envió a colgar los hábitos a Picasso" tras haber
> pintado el Guernica. (34)

Writing for the *Spectator*, the art critic Roger Hinks similarly objected to Picasso's having "introduced all sorts of intellectual puzzles and period oddities into a work which ought to make a frontal attack on the emotions" (qtd. in Martin 135). Some ten years later, the Marxist scholar Max Raphael would also write of the "pseudo-intellectual activity of solving riddles, especially riddles that seem vague, antiquated, and petty bourgeois," complaining that "the allegories used by Picasso admit of several contradictory solutions" (qtd. in Oppler 265). Such criticisms of *Guernica*'s riddling iconography are drawn into dialogue through the individual voice (un)cited in the utterance:

> Odio la "penuria técnica y la tartamudez temática,
> el acartonamiento de anticolores del puzzle de afi-
> cionado del Guernica". (43)

2 Saura turns the charge of "abstruse circumlocutions" back on Blunt. Moreover, while the phrase "envió a colgar los hábitos a Picasso," also from "Picasso Unfrocked," suggests that Picasso should leave the priesthood, or "temple of art" (Blunt, qtd. in Martin 136), it is also reminiscent of the "campaign of calumny" (Southworth 147) conducted by Catholic partisans of the Nationalist cause against Father Alberto Onaindía y Zuluaga, who witnessed the Gernika atrocity:

> The correspondent of the *New York Times* with the Rebels, William P. Carney, cabled on May 4 that the Insurgents called Onaindia "just an unfrocked young priest." The cathedral chapter in Valladolid, capital of Falangist violence, said at first that Onaindia was unknown and that he was a personage invented by the Basques. When this fiction could no longer be maintained, the chapter adopted another position: Alberto Onaindia was an "impostor," because he had called himself "dean" of the chapter, whereas in reality he was a "canon." Moreover, he was "well known for his separatist ideas" and had been absent from his post for five years. (147)

Southworth adds: "When Father Onaindia took a public position concerning what he had seen in Guernica, he was given the standard treatment reserved for all Spanish priests who sided with the Republic. If they could not be imprisoned or shot, they were slandered and 'defrocked'" (149). In Saura's text, then, Onaidía's 'defrocking' for painting an unflattering picture of Gernika is recalled.

More positively, Roland Penrose notes that in works such as *Guernica* Picasso indulged "his predilection for ambiguity, as a means of approaching truth. . . . [He] did not limit himself to oversimplified conventional interpretations. . . . [He] left the spectator the liberty of choosing his own interpretation" (309). Similarly, Hirschel B. Chipp saw confirmed in *Guernica* Picasso's "characteristic tendency to transform meanings: his delight in playful and witty *double entendres* and in high-spirited quasi-dadaist assaults on anything resembling a cliché" (x). Picasso's surrealist circle in fact drew liberally on Freud's analysis of the dream, defined, in Hal Foster's words, as a process of condensation and displacement; a "rebus of metaphor and metonymy" (*Return* 2). Picasso's "rebus," as Wilhelm Boeck termed *Guernica* (230), may be summarised as condensing and displacing autobiographical (Picasso's sentimental life),[3] transpersonal (the Civil War and specifically the bombardment of Gernika), and self-referential elements (art-historical intertexts including Picasso's own 'isms,' motifs and themes). This subconscious, or "subterráneo" conflation of autobiographical and historical/hermetic elements is 'detested' in the utterance:

> Detesto el orden subterráneo del Guernica y la conjunción del caos personal y el peso de la historia. (12)[4]

Countless debates and articles and a not inconsequential number of books have been dedicated to reductive attempts at 'solving' Picasso's puzzling painting, either through recourse to any one of these elements, or through positing an exact referent for specific pictorial signs, notably the bull, the horse and the lamp bearer,[5] or for the painting as a whole.[6] Picasso himself largely refused to elaborate on the meaning of his painting, saying "[s]í, claro, los símbolos. . . [sic] Pero no es preciso que el pintor cree estos símbolos. . . . Hay animales, son animales destrozados. Para mí, es todo, que el público vea lo que quiera" (qtd. in Calvo Serraller, "El 'Guernica' como enigma" 116).

3 As the personal suffering backgrounding *Guernica*, Antonio Mejias-Rentas notes the dissolution of Picasso's marriage to Olga Koklova in 1935, in part because of his illicit relationship with Marie-Thérèse Walter which produced a daughter in 1937, when he was also beginning a new relationship with Dora Maar (n. pag.). Maar herself commented that Picasso's art is at any one time a function of the changes in five private forces – his mistress, his house, his poet, his set of admirers and his dog (Krauss, "In the name of Picasso" 212).

4 This is also a reference to Fernando Arrabal Terán's *Guernica*, in which "el caos personal y el peso de la historia" come together as the wife of Arrabal's bickering couple –"el caos personal"– literally feels "el peso de la historia" when rubble from the bombing of Gernika falls on her in the toilet (*Guernica* 108).

5 Herbert Read, Vernon Clark and Jerome Seckler all argue that the bull represents fascism, and the disembowelled horse the Spanish Republicans. In Seckler's case, this 'information' was derived from Picasso himself. Juan Larrea, on the other hand, argues that the horse represents Franco, and the bull the Spanish people (Larrea 239-47; Calvo Serraller 116; Chipp 195-96). For a recent article on the Larrea vs. Seckler debate, see Robert Gurney, pp. 49-62. Eberhard Fisch focuses predominantly on the lamp-bearer in *Guernica by Picasso.*

6 In *Picasso's Guernica after Rubens' Horrors of War*, Alice Tankard reverses Heinrich Wölfflin's distinctions between renaissance and baroque art to represent *Guernica* as a classical reaction against Ruben's baroque painting, cited in the utterance: "Desprecio a Goya y a Rubens que prestaron sus figuras alzadas con las manos en alto" (*Libelo* 17), discussed in Chapter IV, "Francisco (Franco) 'de Goya' a la República."

William S. Rubin was the first to note the synthesis of three major themes in *Guernica*: the *corrida*, the Mediterranean myth of the Minotaur, and the crucifixion (290-309). However, the 'meanings' of the painting are further complicated by the transposition of the codes of each of these themes into those of the historical event, the autobiography of the artist, and the art archive, as Saura demonstrates with bravura in his own transpositions of these codes throughout *Contra el Guernica*. This can be demonstrated in the utterance:

> Odio al Guernica porque a pesar de su rompe-
> cabezas desajustado recordará para siempre los
> insultos proferidos en su nombre. (9)

Here, Saura draws into dialogue not only the above debates on *Guernica* as an iconographical "rompecabezas," he also reproduces *Guernica*'s artistic system. This utterance 're-cites' not only the discourses surrounding Picasso's painting, but also certain intertexts in *Guernica* –Picasso's 'isms,' his private life and the atrocity– orchestrating further transpositions of these in the process. In one semantic layer, then, Saura's utterance enters into dialogue with the "alien words" of, among others, Hinks, Blunt, Raphael, Larrea and Seckler, chiding them, and celebrating the fact that in spite of *Guernica*'s riddling idiom, it will forever remind us of the insults offered in its name. Or rather, as this name is also that of the Basque town, it will forever remind us of the insults heaped upon Gernika and its people. In the latter context, "rompecabezas" takes on disconcerting Bakhtinian "overtones": the Nazi/Nationalist breaking of the heads (and bodies) of the people slaughtered in the atrocity, or, in Benjamin Rowland's words, the "breakup of mind and spirit that takes place in such a catastrophe as the raid on Guernica, a catastrophe symbolical of the ruin threatening to overwhelm the whole of western civilization" (qtd. in Chipp 168). Thus we might also hear the assertion (or lament) that, in spite of their destruction, the town and the people of Gernika will forever remind us of the insults offered in *their* name.

Returning to the context of the painting, we should note that cubism itself has been described as a "rompecabezas": "El cubismo rompe con la concepción clásica de la perspectiva. . . . La superficie del cuadro se llena de formas planas que encajan como piezas de un 'rompecabezas'" ("Cubismo").[7] Thus the cubist portrait deconstructs, or *rompe*, the *cabeza*. In Picasso's later, surrealist phase, also sighted/cited in *Guernica*, "the human form was to be torn apart, not with the careful dissection practised during the years of analytical Cubism, but with a violence that has rarely been paralleled in the work of any artist" in "a declaration of rage against humanity itself" (Penrose 258, 276). As intertexts in

7 See also Albert Gleizes's article, "Rompecabezas cubista."

Saura's utterance, Picasso's artistic codes are thus inflected with those of the atrocity, and *vice versa*. Furthermore, we now hear the argument that, in spite of *Guernica*'s cubist/ surrealist idiom (as distinct from its 'insoluble' riddles), it is able to signify the atrocity.

Through further transpositions, Picasso's alleged mistreatment of his lover, the surrealist photographer and active political leftist, Dora Maar, can also be heard in this utterance. Maar was Picasso's model for the woman holding the lamp in *Guernica*, and also for his subsequent 'weeping woman' series, initiated with studies for the (dry-eyed) mother holding the dead child in *Guernica* (Alix Trueba 57-58). Alberto Manguel claims that Maar was goaded to cry by the artist's deliberate cruelty so that he might depict her thus (184). Upon her subsequent breakdown, Picasso and Paul Éluard arranged for Maar to see their friend, the psychiatrist Jacques Lacan, in whose view Maar's mental state illustrated his psychoanalytical theories of identity (Manguel 195), which Manguel likens to cubism:

> According to Lacan, our identity stems from the mirror images that exist outside ourselves: this "alienating identification" is how we learn to see ourselves. Trapped in an image that is fundamentally alien to us –an image made of myriad haphazard and fractured images, as in a Cubist collage– our ego is, in Lacan's words, "an inauthentic agency," functioning to conceal its essential lack of unity (195).

"Rompecabezas desajustado" thus also draws in Picasso's two-fold 'breaking' of Maar's head, transposing his cubist/surrealist idiom and his cruel taunts: insults offered in *her* name. Indeed, in spite of the latter, psychological abuses, Maar's famous photographs will record forever the painterly 'insults' –or "metamorphosis"[8]– of *Guernica* (and thus recall those of Gernika, and also her own abuse).

As we shall discover in later chapters, the term "rompecabezas" is also one that Saura applies with approval to Velázquez's, Picasso's and his own 'monstrous' paintings. For the theatre buff, this utterance also recalls Jerónimo López Mozo's re-presentation of *Guernica* as a "rompecabezas [desajustado]" in "Guernica (Happening)" (1975) (21-22). Finally, in addition to being, or being re-presented as, a "rompecabezas," the recovery of the painting during Spain's transition to democracy led Javier Tusell and Rafael Fernández Quintanilla through a labyrinth of legal paperwork and delicate negotiations to prove the Spanish Second Republic had indeed purchased the work, and that the current Spanish State was its

8 Maar's photographs of the various 'states' of *Guernica* are recalled in Saura's utterance: "Detesto a Dora Maar porque al fijar el proceso de realización del Guernica ofrece con demasiada evidencia las tripas de la metamorfosis, la lucha con la imagen que desenmascara la presunción del cartelón" (*Libelo* 18). "Metamorphosis" was also the term given to the unification of heterogeneous components of surrealist painting; the linking of disparate fragments such as technological and biomorphic forms (Boeck 194): painterly 'insults.' Also drawn into dialogue is Picasso's 1935 statement that "it would be very interesting to preserve photographically, not the stages, but the metamorphoses of a picture. Possibly one might then discover the path followed by the brain in materializing a dream" ("Conversation with Picasso" 8).

legitimate destination. The solution to this facet of the *Guernica* puzzle was obtained in the archive of the Republican ambassador to France, Luis Araquistáin (Tusell 251). Hence those not keen to see *Guernica* returned to Spain might detest this man's impeccable record-keeping: "Detesto al embajador Araquistáin que desde su tumba realizó la compra-venta del Guernica" (*Libelo* 42). Araquistáin's files contained a crucial letter, dated 28 May 1937, in which Max Aub, a cultural attaché of the Republican Embassy in Paris and an assistant to the commissar general of the Spanish Pavilion, recorded the Republic's financial arrangements with Picasso (Tusell 252). Tusell notes that "[l]a transacción entre Araquistáin y Picasso a través de Aub permaneció confusadamente conocida a través del tiempo." In 1965, Aub wrote to Josep Renau about the payment, "pero no mencionaba la contrapartida, y advertía que se había hecho 'con la condición del que el cuadro siguiera siendo suyo' (de Picasso)," leading Tusell to suggest that Aub "ocultó –o había olvidado– parte de lo sucedido" (253-54). Ellen C. Oppler surmises that "the Republicans in exile kept an unwritten agreement not to confirm Picasso's remuneration," since to do so "could have strengthened Franco's claim that *Guernica* legally belonged to Spain" (70).

Tusell's and Fernández Quintanilla's mental challenge is yet one more (more contemporaneous) referent of Saura's description of *Guernica* as a "rompecabezas," and thus one more indication of the parallel structure of his own text. Regarding Saura's own literary "rompecabezas," then, I suggest that *Contra el Guernica*. *Libelo* remains true to the visual polysemy of Picasso's painting, just as this lengthy litany of invective 'does justice to' the cruel and prolonged bombardment of Gernika.

In the following chapter I will discuss utterances in which debates over *Guernica*'s consequent (in)ability to signify the atrocity are re(ad)dressed by Saura. I will suggest that through his 're-citation' of art historians' interpretations of *Guernica*'s borrowed iconography, Saura at once re(in)states these meanings, and contests their validity.

Francisco (Franco) 'de Goya' a la República

Just as the origins of Spain's most recent civil war are rooted in centuries of history, here necessarily condensed into the briefest schema, so too are the works of the visual artists discussed in this thesis, Saura and Picasso, deeply informed by Spain's (and Europe's) cultural patrimony. Picasso drew inspiration from the Catalan Romanic, and, among later Spanish painters, *El Greco* (Domenikos Theotocopoulos), Diego de Velázquez and Francisco de Goya y Lucientes. Around 1901, fellow artists in France christened him "*Le petit Goya*" (Boeck 114), and his *Guernica* was quickly equated with Goya's *El tres de mayo* (Oppler 211). In 1957, Picasso produced a series of forty-five variations on Velázquez's *Las meninas* (1656). For his part, Saura acknowledges an enduring obsession with Velázquez's *Crucifixión* (1631), productive of an extensive body of work ("Crucifixiones" 58). A similar obsession with Goya is evidenced in his compulsive re-workings of Goya's *Perro enterrado en la arena* (1820-24): *Retratos imaginarios* and *Perros de Goya* (1958-), or "degoyaciones," in which Goya's dog substitutes for the artist's (missing) head (Ríos 18, 117-18).[1] However, not only do Saura and Picasso owe a painterly debt to Velázquez and Goya (and Saura to Picasso), in the twentieth century they, and all Spaniards, endured (or enjoyed) a repetition of the political conditions of Goya's historical period.

Goya, Catholic, but on balance an *ilustrado* (Saura, *Fijeza* 244), was an official painter at the courts of three successive Spanish Bourbon kings: the 'enlightened despot,' Carlos III (1759-88), credited with bringing the European Enlightenment to Spain and making it the *Ilustración española*; the 'unholy trinity' of Carlos IV (1788-1808), Queen María Luisa and minister Manuel Godoy, who yielded to the crisis presented by the French Revolution of 1789, and whose subsequent fall was "probablemente el punto de partida de esta zigzagueante sucesión de actos de fuerza que ha sido realmente la historia de España (García Escudero 118); and, lastly, the "indeseable" arch-reactionary Fernando VII (1814-33), who sadly "sentó las bases de golpismo de Estado, de los pronunciamientos militares, de las dictaduras" (Tamames 17), and from whose court Goya would seek exile in France.[2]

1 Saura also wrote on Goya (*Fijeza* 241-50, 271-308) and organised the 1996 exhibition, *Después de Goya. Una mirada sujetiva* (Sierra 50).

2 The Spanish *Ilustración* proposed public administration of Spain's colonies, suppression of the Jesuits to lessen the influence of the Church in the State, disentailment of church lands, restructuring of the taxation system, the creation of an official bank to provide funds for Treasury and avoid financial dependence on overseas income, attention to the arts and trades, and the initiation of public works (Tamames 18). However, reforms remained within the framework of the unalterable belief in the divine right of kings, which no merely constitutional arguments could usurp. When Carlos IV's cousin, Louis XVI, was beheaded, Spain declared war on France; two years later, Godoy made peace and gave military support to France against Britain. In 1805, the British fleet defeated the Spanish-French navy, ending Spanish sea power. In 1807, Godoy and Napoleon conspired to divide Britain's ally Portugal between them. However, by 1808, French forces purportedly on route to northern Portugal had occupied Spain. Carlos fled with the Queen and Godoy; he then abdicated

Edward Malefakis argues that only at this point in history is the ruse, widely employed in Spanish historiography, of "las dos Españas," trapped in the interminable and brutal conflict depicted in Goya's *Duelo a garrotazos* (1820-24), truly justified. While in other European nations ideological frictions were gradually replaced by the imposition of a single ideological vision, social division became a characteristic of Spanish society: "Por primera vez en la historia española dos ideologías diametralmente distintas rivalizaron la una con la otra de una forma más o menos continuada" (31-35). The patterns set in the contests between conservatives and liberals during Goya's time would last most of the nineteenth century. Their ideological debates over absolutism and the consubstantiality of Church and State at the root of Spain's profound socioeconomic problems, accompanied by their variously violent or constitutional attempts to find solutions, would be tragically reproduced during the 1930s and the Civil War. Fernando's abolition of the 1812 Cádiz Constitution, his "política de venganza" and his "régimen absolutista" (38), imposed during Goya's royal appointment, would be replayed under the dictatorship of General Franco.

While twentieth-century Spanish liberalism descends from the *Ilustración española*, Spanish Nationalist ideologues invoked *los Reyes Católicos*, admiring not Goya's paintings but those of Velázquez. The monarchist poet, and apologist for the 'Movement,'[3] José María Pemán, for example, proclaimed the Civil War "a new war of independence, a new *Reconquista*, a new expulsion of the Moors! . . . Twenty centuries of Christian civilization are at our backs; we fight for love and honour, for the paintings of Velázquez, for the comedies of Lope de Vega, for Don Quijote and for El Escorial" (qtd. in Thomas 403). Given this practice of invoking Spanish cultural icons to 'illustrate' historical and ideological narratives, I will argue that when a historical Spanish artist's work appears as an intertext in *Guernica* it is not merely form that is borrowed, but that historical codes are transposed into the codes of Picasso's art; ideological codes are transposed into iconographical codes, accessible, in Saura's words, to "quien los sepa ver" (Ríos 173). Likewise, when in Saura's utterances these works are sighted, or heard cited, as an intertext in Picasso's painting –a second and third level of intertextuality– we hear not only the dis-

in favour of his son Fernando. Under Napoleon's sway, Fernando abdicated in favour of Carlos, who was then obliged to pass the crown to "el Rey Intruso," José I (Joseph Bonaparte). *Madrileños* revolted, and throughout Spain the populace waged guerrilla war, aided by Portuguese and British forces. By 1812, large numbers of French troops had been diverted to Napoleon's Russian campaign, thus facilitating French defeat in 1813 (Simonis *et al*. 32).

3 The "Movimiento Nacional," comprising the Falange Española Tradicionalista and the JONS, represented the forced coalition of disparate pro-Franco parties: Falangists, Carlists, authoritarian Catholics and aristocratic monarchists (Preston 4).

courses of iconography and influence – "the preoccupations of the art historian" (Danto ix), but also the sounds of ideologies clashing.

In a group of five consecutive utterances, Saura satirically inveighs against the 'lenders' of five icons identified by Picasso scholars as sources for elements in *Guernica*. Two of these are Spanish artists. The first Spaniard, and the first on Saura's list, is the Beatus of Liebana. Through the 'loan' to Picasso of his cadaver, as 'faithfully' reproduced in *The Flood* from the *Apocalypse of Saint-Sever*, his is also one of the earliest historical voices to be drawn into Saura's litany:

> Desprecio al Beato de Liébana que prestó un ca-
> dáver para el Guernica. (17)

The Flood, an eleventh-century French manuscript in the Spanish Mozarabic tradition, proposed by art historians including Decio Gioseffi and Anthony Blunt as a source for the fallen soldier/toppled statue at the base of *Guernica*, is one of eight variations on the original Spanish eighth-century *Apocalypse* of the Beatus of Liebana (Oppler 92 n84). As the *Guernica* scholar Ellen C. Oppler observes, "the flood victim of the Biblical catastrophe provided a fitting detail for Picasso's vision of a modern apocalypse" (92). Ruth Kaufmann argues that Picasso's introduction of this motif into his *Crucifixion* (1930), in combination with others drawn from so-called heretical or demonic Christian art, Mithraism and the *corrida*, served to link the crucifixion with 'primitive' religious rites: Picasso's contribution to surrealism (557). In relation to their reappearance in *Guernica*, Kaufmann suggests that "[t]his borrowing seems completely appropriate when one considers that in both the *Crucifixion* and the *Guernica* he is looking at the same subject –human irrationality in the form of hysteria, brutality and sadism– with the same approach derived from Surrealist interests – that of the anthropologist and psychiatrist" (559). Finally, from a historical perspective, Eberhard Fisch points out that it was the Beatus of Liebana who initiated the intellectual resistance against the Muslim rulers of Spain, and that the extensive circulation of his commentary on the apocalypse, interpreted as the divine prophecy of the decline of Arab supremacy, led eventually to the *Reconquista* (53). As an iconographical intertext sighted in Picasso's painting, the flood victim from the manuscript of the Beatus has thus been interpreted to invest *Guernica* with apocalyptic, psychoanalytical and ideological meanings. As a 're-cited' sighting in Saura's *Libelo*, this 'saturated' icon can be understood not only as one of the earliest formal influences identified in *Guernica*, but also as a 're-collection' of precisely these apocalyptic, surrealist and ideological codes. Saura's utterance thus draws into dialogue the ideological discourse of the Crusade, at once

inflecting National Catholicism with (un-)Christian, brutal and sadistic drives, reinvesting *Guernica* with this content, and, through the transposition of artistic and political codes, reinvesting Gernika with crusading Nationalist soldiers (and cadavers) in order to re-(ad)dress the hysterical ideology, brutality and sadism of this atrocity.

Before returning to the Beatus, and to Saura's list of artists' 'loans' to Picasso, I will first discuss the intertextual presence of the ideology of National Catholicism in an utterance in which the iconography of two better-known Spanish artists, Goya and Velázquez, is less explicitly sighted/cited:

> Odio el aquelarre obsceno del Guernica y su carbonería poblada de pasionarias de muerte y fétidas Meninas copulando con las bestias. (23)

Here, the first-heard voice, subjected, I suggest, to Saurian satire, would be that of a hostile, partisan viewer, alienated from Picasso's idiom and virulently critical of his "obscene" aesthetics/politics. Indeed, the ultra-rightist Blas Piñar López asserted that the Picasso paintings that he had seen were "in the worst taste, obscene and gravely offensive to the Chief of the Spanish State and Head of the *Movimiento Nacional*," while *Fuerza Nueva* praised the destruction of Picasso's "pseudo-artistic daubings" and denounced his work as "unmitigated obscenity and pornography with which communism hopes to demoralize Christian culture" (qtd. in Preston 168).[4] Also drawn into dialogue is the language of the art critic, personified in the individual voices of Christian Zervos and Juan Larrea, this time describing Picasso's "aquelarre" with partisan approval. In 1937, Zervos wrote the lead article in a special double-issue of *Cahiers d'Art* dedicated to *Guernica* and containing articles by leading poets and writers on art in Paris,[5] all of whom were simultaneously staunch supporters of the Republican cause. In his review, Zervos likened Picasso's iconography to "instruments of witchcraft":

> These visionary forms are more powerfully evocative than shapes drawn with every realistic detail; they challenge people to understand their actions and to see them as they really are. As with instruments of witchcraft, they spread malignant germs against the leaders whom Picasso has condemned to death. (Qtd. in Oppler 208-09)

4 These criticisms followed the November 1971 attack on three bookshops displaying Picasso prints, an acid attack which destroyed twenty-four Picasso engravings in the Theo Gallery in Madrid, and the molotov bombing of Picasso's first studio in Barcelona (Preston 168).

5 Contributors to this issue (12.4-5) included Larrea, Georges Duthuit, Paul Éluard, Michel Leiris, José Bergamín Gutiérrez, Amédée Ozenfant and Jean Cassou. Leiris's "Faire-part," written for this issue, is a referent of the phrase "Oficio de Difuntos" (*Libelo* 23); Larrea, Cassou and Bergamín are explicitly named in Saura's *Libelo* (14, 21, 46).

Larrea similarly suggested that, in *Guernica*, Picasso "[hizo] un acto mágico en contra del franquismo al que tenía que representar por medio de un símbolo del mismo modo que el hechicero se sirve de una figurilla de cera" (247). Saura also draws into this utterance the voices of the Picasso scholars who have traced the theme of the "partouze" (*Libelo* 25), conflated with the *corrida*, in works leading to, and informing *Guernica*. In Picasso's *Vollard Suite* (1933), for example, the Minotaur (the bull and the artist), his model and the horse are coupled in varying combinations; Picasso "takes his place in their orgies as one of their guests" (Penrose 283). In this reading, the 'obscene coupling of Picasso figures' is re-sighted/cited. Referents of the polysemic phrase "pasionarias de muerte" include the Passion of Christ, and the representation of Mary's suffering in the *Pietà*, which has indeed been cited by art historians as a referent of the mother holding the dead child in *Guernica* (Calvo Serraller, "El 'Guernica' como enigma'" 115). 'Coupled' with the "Meninas" – maidservants of the (Holy) Infant/a of the Catholic Monarchy (consubstantial with the Church)– this referent suggests Picasso's further conflation of the Christian symbolism of the crucifixion with pagan and sexual themes at this time, as noted by art historians such as Kaufmann.[6] In these semantic layers, then, Saura's utterance draws in both ultra-rightist political discourses and the discourses of art criticism and connoisseurship surrounding Picasso's painting.

In a further semantic layer, in which the codes of *Guernica* are transposed into those of Gernika, I suggest this utterance also satirises the hypocrisy of the discourses of National Catholicism in relation to the reality of the atrocity inflicted on the Basque town. The average Spanish reader would instantly recognise the reference to Velázquez's *Las meninas* (1656);[7] the *aficionado* would also recognise Goya's *Aquelarre* of 1797-98 and/or his *Aquelarre* from the *Pinturas negras* (1820-24) of the Quinta del sordo as intertexts, and would therefore ponder their functions in Saura's *Libelo*. During Goya's appointment as *pintor de Cámara* to Carlos IV, plays about diabolism and witchcraft were a staple of popular Spanish theatre, and Goya himself painted a series of witchcraft scenes. The Duchess of Osuna commissioned some of these paintings (Hughes, *Goya* 151-52). However, Robert Hughes suggests that while Goya's Osuna witch paintings respond in part to the fashion for the Gothic, and for folklore in general, these paintings are also "full of ferocious satire against the Spanish clergy." Yet, Hughes suggests, "one is compelled to feel

6 Kaufmann notes the overt sexuality of Picasso's Mary Magdalene figures –a possible referent of Saura's "Meninas"– and his confounding of her facial features and genitalia (554-57).

7 He or she might also make a connection with Picasso's lesser, 'rank' *Meninas* (1957) in the Museu Picasso in Barcelona.

that Goya's fierce indignation against such men is there because, in betraying the precepts of the church, the priests have betrayed religion. . . . What Goya hates most, with a cold and unrelenting passion, is hypocrisy" (156). Saura, too, has noted Goya's "críticas feroces tanto a la Inquisición como a las órdenes religiosas" (*Fijeza* 244). In his cited sighting of the iconography of Goya's *Aquelarre* (1797-98) in *Guernica*, I suggest that Saura 're-cites' not only the aesthetic loan, but also Goya's encoded satire of this religious hypocrisy. Transposing the diabolical scene of *Guernica* into the diabolical scene of Gernika, he sat(i/y)rises the 'consecrated' hypocrisy of National Catholicism, unmasking the gap between the abstract ideal and the concrete reality that this ideology attempts to conceal: the chasm between the ideological discourse of *Madre Patria*, in which women's roles were proscribed as nun, or wife and mother –and as symbolic protector of the closed body of the State– and the actual slaughter of Catholic men, women and children in the Nationalist 'Crusade.' Of Goya's *Aquelarre* (1797-98) specifically, Hughes writes:

> [T]he witches have gathered to receive their orders from and pay homage to the devil, in the form of an enormous *cabrón*. . . . One crone holds up an emaciated infant, who seems barely alive. A younger and relatively pretty witch, to her right, gazes raptly at Satan as she cradles her capture –a newly seized infant, fairly plump and in much better condition– in her arms: a parody of the Madonna and Child. The gray corpse of a starveling child lies on the ground to the left, and above it a half-naked crone holds up what looks like . . . a trio of dead fetuses. (*Goya* 153)

Goya's crones, in parody of the Madonna and Child, bring Satan their foetal and fetid offerings; a younger witch is enraptured by the *cabrón*. In Saura's "aquelarre obsceno," "pasionarias de muerte," invoking Goya's parody of the Madonna and Child, and "fétidas Meninas," invoking Christian maidservants 'gone rotten,' gather to sacrifice to, and "copula[r] con las bestias."

Interestingly, *aquelarre* is a Basque word, an agglutination of *akerr*, male goat, and *larre*, meadow. During the Inquisition, Basque women were accused of witchcraft; more specifically, Mark Kurlansky suggests, of flying to a secret meadow to have group sex with a billy goat –"copulando con las bestias"– precisely the "obsceno" of Saura's "aquelarre," and ob- or off-scene of Goya's. These women were charged with acts of bestiality and childmurder, tortured and killed as witches (95-99). Saura's "ironía asociativa" and "erudición transformada en esperpento" (*Fijeza* 149 n2) thus conflate the persecution of Basque 'witches' from the time of the Catholic Monarchs with the 1937 bombardment of Gernika during the Francoist 'Crusade': in each case, Basques were not considered true Christians,

and were burnt alive. Furthermore, during the 'witch-hunts' of Franco's vindictive peace, Basques were tortured and executed, just as Basque 'witches' had been before them.

Also invoked in the phrase "pasionarias de muerte" are the words of Julián Zugazagoitia, reporting on the Nationalist assault on Málaga, Picasso's birthplace, on 8 February 1937, when fleeing civilians were machine-gunned from the air as they would again be in Gernika: "Madres que se negaban a desprenderse de sus hijos muertos, perdieron la razón" (251). Josefina Alix Trueba suggests: "No es casualidad que esta dramática descripción de Julián Zugazagoitia nos recuerde tanto al horror que se desprende del *Guernica*. Picasso debió de sentirse hondamente afectado y este recuerdo afloraría poco tiempo después" (25). Drawn into Saura's phrase, Picasso's probable association of the mothers of Málaga and those of Gernika –both mad with grief for their slaughtered children– with his borrowed iconography of the *Pietà*, reminds us that in 1937 the majority of Basques were devout Catholics, including those in Bizkaia and Gipuzcoa who sided with the Republic. In this context, however, "pasionaria" simultaneously interpolates "La Pasionaria," the famous Basque Communist orator, Dolores Ibárruri, an association encouraged by the proximity of the word "sardina" in the previous utterance but one (*Libelo* 23), since the young Ibárruri worked as a *sardinera*.

Thus, through the transposition of pictorial and political/historical/ideological codes, Saura's "carbonería" 'draws' in not only Picasso's *grisaille* (shades of 'charcoal') painting –rhetorically described by (art) critics as positively spellbinding or 'cursed' as a pornographic jumble of distorted forms– and his painterly debt to Velázquez and Goya. It also draws in and contests the official history of the atrocity: Gernika and its "coalyard" –the town burned by incendiary bombs– were peopled by Christian Basques ("pasionarias de muerte" as the Madonnas and Christs of the *Pietà*) and/or politically committed "[P]asionarias." Indeed, some of the strongest supporters of Basque separatism would shortly be found among the younger Basque clergy (Payne 244-46), but these were falsely represented in Nationalist discourse as anti-Christian 'Reds,' and slaughtered. Even Saura's seemingly inconsequential use of the word "poblada" is polemical.[8] As Herbert Southworth notes, early Nationalist accounts spoke only of the destruction of the town, altogether eliding the issue of casualties (34), while Neo-Francoist accounts falsely represented the number of fatalities, claiming Basque estimates to be lies.

8 Saura also refers to painting, and "el problema del espacio vacío como un lugar que ha de ser poblado por elementos" (Ríos 34).

Yet another reading is available if we consider Velázquez's and Goya's iconography as signifying Spanish Nationalists and Republicans respectively. In the fratricidal Civil War, the Basque people, and indeed individual families, were divided between monarchist (Carlist) "Meninas" and Republican, including Communist, "[P]asionarias." While it was the insurgent Rebels who drew on the inheritance of Velázquez who created the orgy of destruction at Gernika, in which the bodies of animals and people were piled together – "copulando con las bestias"– these "fétidas Meninas" would falsely attribute the incendiarism of the "carbonería" to the Basque/Republican/Communist "[P]asionarias." The pro-Nationalist writer Douglas Jerrold preferred to believe Nationalist forces would never have committed such quantities of ammunition to "indulge in an orgy of lunatic folly" (qtd. in Southworth 100). From 1969, when the bombardment was admitted, Neo-Francoist accounts would apportion blame to both adversaries. These discourses, also, are heard in the mutual symbolic presence of "Meninas" and "[P]asionarias" at Saura's satirical orgy.

In focusing, here, on the ideological associations that Saura brings to Goya's first *Aquelarre* and to Velázquez's *Las meninas*, I have subsumed his and others' understanding of the importance of Goya's second *Aquelarre* and *Las meninas* in the history of art. For Saura, Goya's *Pinturas negras*, the group of paintings to which the second *Aquelarre* belongs, represent "uno de los conjuntos más sobrecogedores de la historia del arte. . . . Constituyen una isla aparte en la historia del arte" (*Fijeza* 162). *Las meninas* is "el cuadro central del arte español," both for its plastic qualities, its "características afirmativas de hecho pictórico por excelencia" (108), and also for its "teatro mental" (107), or "rompecabezas conceptual" (111). Of the descriptors applied to *Las meninas* in *Fijeza*, at least two are applied to *Guernica* in Saura's *Libelo* –"rompecabezas" (9) and "teatro mental" (12). Saura thus places Picasso's painting in the same league, or lineage. For Saura, in their painterly innovations Velázquez and Goya anticipate and serve as sources for modernism. He repeatedly refers to the words of Goya's report to the Academia Real de San Fernando –"la primera definición escrita de la modernidad" (*Fijeza* 276)– to describe the painterly relationship of Velázquez, Goya and modernists such as Picasso: "'[Y]o no distingo más que cuerpos luminosos y cuerpos oscuros, planos que avanzan y planos que se alejan, relieves y concavidades' con la que Goya, admirador de Velázquez, definiendo su propia pintura, definió también la modernidad" (110, 245, 276). More specifically, like *Guernica*, Velázquez's *Las meninas* and Goya's *Pinturas negras* are cited by Saura as exemplary of "la mirada cruel," "el arte del mal," and/or "lo monstruoso": characteristics for Saura of great and intense painting (161-65). Hence it is reasonable to suggest that we also hear

traces of Saura's own art-theoretical discourse in one semantic layer of this utterance. Entering into dialogue with partisan critics and Picasso connoisseurs, all of whom have added to the discourses surrounding Picasso's painting, Saura's own voice invokes the relationship between Velázquez, Goya and Picasso, specifically the power of *Guernica* once stripped of the discourses that usurp its 'monstrous' plastic reality: precisely, and paradoxically, the symbolical contents elucidated above:[9]

> [P]ara poder resentir el poder transmutador del *Guernica* de Picasso . . . es preciso desembarazar al cuadro del contenido mítico y simbólico, sagrado en el fondo, en el que la historia lo ha sumergido y vulgarizado. El mal, en este caso como en tantos otros, se halla en la intensidad de la mirada cruel de su artífice que lo transforma en fenómeno pictórico, en latigazo visual percibido en un instante. (*Fijeza* 164-65)

However, if for Saura it is more *Guernica*'s plastic reality –indebted to Velázquez and Goya– than its symbolism that truly represents both great art and the human monstrosity manifested in Gernika, he nevertheless re(in)states the dissident significations of this painting's iconography.

---

9 For Saura, "[e]l monstruo humano, en realidad, representaría la imagen arquetípica del mal hecho en él, y solamente en el siglo xx el monstruo pictórico adquiere una validez en sí mismo no solamente como objeto del lenguaje liberador, sino también como consecuencia del mismo" (*Fijeza* 165). Of Velázquez and *Las meninas* Saura writes:

> En realidad, fue Velázquez el primer pintor que pintó monstruos, pero el ojo-pincel de Velázquez no era un ojo cruel, ni tampoco, seguramente, le permitieron serlo, y aun habiendo sido el primero que reprodujo el monstruo tratándolo como lo que era, es decir como un ser humano, y no como imagen del castigo divino o blasfemia de su semejanza, su propia condición de humanista le impidió acercarse al capricho o la rabia. La crueldad de sus pinceladas estuvo al servicio de lo apacible, siendo *Las meninas* su verdadero cuadro monstruoso, precisamente por su cualidad especular y la complejidad de las trampas que el pintor tiende para encubrir las apariencias y mostrarnos el laberinto del pensamiento pictórico. (165)

Of Goya's witchcraft scenes and his *Pinturas negras*, Saura writes:

> Aparece en Goya la mirada cruel, no tanto a través de una temática levemente alucinatoria dependiente del trasfondo oscurantista de una época en donde, tras la pérdida irremediable del sentido mágico, creerá practicar, a través del ritual tenebroso y residual de la misa negra o el aquelarre, el denuesto al dogma imperante. . . . En realidad será en las *Pinturas negras* de la Quinta del Sordo donde se confirmará lo apuntado. (161-62)

Furthermore, in this utterance (and many others), not only do we hear Saura's discourse of what constitutes great painting, we also recognise the constituting discourses of his own 'monstruous' art: in this instance his *Quinta del sordo* series (1980). Speaking of *Rumor*, one of this series, Ríos suggests to Saura: "Este me parece uno de los de más impacto tuyos y que recuerda enormemente, claro, a las figuras de Goya, sobre todo los aquelarres, esas figuras hocicudas, los labios que salen, sobre todo pienso en el gran cabrón, el del museo Lázaro Galdeano [our first *Aquelarre*], y en las pinturas negras [to which our second *Aquelarre* belongs]" (147). Saura notes that in these works, "la idea es la de revivir la atmósfera de La Quinta del sordo, Y [sic] de recrearla realmente como un teatro mental, en una confusa y misteriosa ceremonia" (Ríos 145). Here, then, Saura's own work is also defined as "teatro mental," thus claiming equivalence with Picasso and Velázquez (and also with Arrabal's "ceremonia de la confusión") as well as homage to Goya. Saura's utterance thus serves to locate his own work within the genealogy Velázquez . . . Goya . . . Picasso . . . [Saura]. (In 1989, Saura would in fact produce his own 'rank' *Menina I* and *Menina II*.) This 'line' was continued by North American abstract expressionist painters including Jackson Pollock, whose *Number 1* (1950) took over the MoMA wall-space vacated by *Guernica* in 1981 (Oppler 113) and is cited on the last page of Saura's *Libelo*: "Detesto al Guernica porque el espacio por él dejado va a ser ocupado por un cuadro todavía más ínfame de Jackson Pollock" (46). As Hal Foster notes, "the anxiety of influence that flowed from Pablo Picasso through the milieu of Jackson Pollock to ambitious artists in the 1960s" is parallelled, or contested, by another twentieth-century genealogy: "[T]he angel with whom we wrestled was Marcel Duchamp by way of Andy Warhol, more than Picasso by way of Pollock" (*Return* xiii). Saura's disparaging attitude to this alternative genealogy is discussed in the final chapter, "*Encadenamiento* versus *beatificación*"; his painterly relationship with Picasso is discussed in Chapter VIII, "Painting as a 'Campo de Bataille.'"

Towards the end of his appointment to the courts of *los Borbones*, Goya produced his more overtly political *El dos de mayo de 1808 en Madrid* (1808-14) and *El tres de mayo de 1808 en Madrid o Los fusilamientos en la montaña del Príncipe Pío* (1814). These monumental history paintings depict the revolt and subsequent repression of working class *madrileños* by French *cuirassiers* and the Egyptian Mameluke mercenaries fighting for them in the *Guerra de la independencia* of 1808-14. Produced over a slightly longer period, Goya's *Fatales consecuencias de la sangrienta Guerra en España con Buonaparte. Y otros caprichos enfáticos*, a cycle of etchings commonly known as the *Desastres de la guerra*, record his response to the same historical conditions. For Hughes, the *Caprichos enfáticos* from this series evoke "the shattered hopes of Spanish liberals and *ilustrados* in the wake of Napoleon's defeat after Fernando VII returned to the throne, abolished the 1812 Constitution, and set in train an iron policy of repression, censorship, inquisitorial tyranny, and royal absolutism" (*Goya* 273). André Malraux describes Goya's *Desastres* as "[e]l libro de apuntes de un comunista, a la hora en que su país ha sido invadido por la Unión Soviética" (qtd. in Rojas, *El Valle* 80). In relation to *Los Desastres*, *El dos* and *El tres de mayo*, Carlos Rojas refines Malraux's notion as follows:

> Allí descubre también el monstruo irónico que habita al hombre y le obliga a matar en nombre de las más nobles abstracciones sociales: la Libertad, la Fe, el Progreso y la propia Razón, . . . son mucho más que el testimonio de un afrancesado, a la hora en que su país ha sido invadido por la *Légion de Réserve* napoleónica. Son el terrible examen de conciencia de un cristiano racionalista, en nombre de todos sus hermanos los asesinos. (*El Valle* 80-81)

Saura, who has read Malraux on Goya (*Fijeza* 241), himself describes *El tres de mayo* and the *Desastres* as an "hermoso y terrible comentario al empleo del ejército y de la violencia como sometimiento de la voluntad libertadora del pueblo" (245). One of the five loans explicitly listed by Saura is the principal figure of *El tres de mayo*:

> Desprecio a Rubens y a Goya que prestaron para
> el Guernica sus figuras alzadas con las manos en
> alto. (17)

The "figura alzada con las manos en alto" "lent" by Goya is the white-shirted *fusilado* kneeling before the French firing squad, suggested by many art historians as a source for the falling woman at the lower right of *Guernica*: "The upraised hands of Goya's principal figure bear a striking resemblance to those of the woman in the air in *Guernica*, which are similarly thrust upward" (Fisch 64). While Goya's painting may be read as a general

protest at the "horrors of war,"[10] I would suggest that Hughes's, Malraux's, Rojas's and Saura's extra-textual framings of Goya's loan are equally applicable.

As an *ilustrado*, and *afrancesado* (Saura, *Fijeza* 244), Goya was among the *vencidos*; Spain's regained sovereignty was personified in the arch *anti-ilustrado* Fernando VII, just as, in 1939, Picasso would be among the *vencidos* and the Spanish 'monarchy' would be assumed by the arch-reactionary General Franco, "monárquico por tradición personal, pero a condición de que la monarquía esperase hasta después de su muerte" (Areilza 143). Furthermore, as Rojas implies, liberal Republicans found themselves drawn into a fratricidal civil war in order to protect their 'enlightened' beliefs. While in the majority of cases in the Republican zones repression occurred "al margen de la ley y en contra de la manifiesta voluntad de las autoridades legítimamente construidas" (Solé i Sabaté 600), Loyalist battalions were nevertheless sometimes guilty of atrocities; Anarchist groups, and also the Marxist but anti-Stalinist POUM, at times found themselves fighting not only the Nationalist Rebels, but also Soviet-led Communist battalions.

In the 'loan' of Goya's *fusilado*, then, we hear the cries of the *populacho* who supported Fernando VII, the firing of French muskets, and also the cries and shots of their Egyptian mercenaries in the previous day's slaughter. Through this association we hear the cries of the syndicalised twentieth-century workers slaughtered by Franco's Army of Africa regulars, and thus the ideologies of Franco,[11] even though these were inherited from his nineteenth-century counterpart, Fernando VII. But we also hear the anguish of the liberal *afrancesado* Goya, of twentieth-century Spanish Anarchists and the POUM, of Manuel Azaña,[12] and of the *Agrupación al Servicio de la República* founded by José Ortega y Gasset, Ramón Menéndez Pidal, Ramón Pérez de Ayala and Gregorio Marañón, "liberales insobornables . . . [quienes] rechazaron lo que consideraban secuestro de la República a manos del comunismo, el socialismo revolucionario y la revolución libertaria, y optaron por el exilio para salvar sus vidas amenazadas y las de sus familias" (Santos 6).

10 The title of the Peter Paul Rubens's painting from which Picasso 'borrowed' his figures.

11 Many have noted the irony in the Nationalist depiction of the Civil War as a Crusade given Franco's use of Muslim Moroccan troops (for example, Ross 91); the parallel I draw here with the Mameluke mercenaries stems in large part from their mutual misrepresentation as 'Moors,' for example in the text of Picasso's painting, *Retrato de la marquesa de culo cristiano echándoles un duro a los soldados moros defensores de la virgen* (1937-38) (Chipp 16).

12 As Josep Maria Solé i Sabaté notes, Republican authorities were unable to end the bloodbath: "Sus repetidas denuncias ante la barbarie y sus órdenes insistentes para poner fin a los desmanes no sirvieron de nada, al menos de los primeros meses de la guerra. Las lágrimas de Azaña cuando recibió la noticia de lo sucedido en la Cárcel Modelo de Madrid el 22 de agosto son la mejor imagen de su impotencia para restablecer la legalidad" (596). Saura's phrase, "el pim-pam-pum del Guernica," both emphasises the "hipo permanente del Guernica" (*Libelo* 24) and also draws in Azaña's conciliatory "Discurso de las tres 'P'" of 18 July 1939: "De estos muertos que han caído embravecidos en la batalla luchando magníficamente por un ideal grandioso y que ahora, abrigados en la tierra materna, ya no tienen odio, ya no tienen rencor, y nos envían, con destellos de su luz, tranquila y remota como la de una estrella, el mensaje de la patria eterna que dice a todos sus hijos 'Paz, Piedad, Perdón'" (qtd. in Zugazagoitia 465).

In *El Valle de los Caídos* (1978), Rojas describes Goya as "el antiguo converso de la armonía ilustrada y el idealista de la razón" and has Fernando menace the artist for this reason: "[F]uiste un traidor y un afrancesado en la francesada"; "[t]e disculpé que sirvieses a los franceses durante la guerra y olvidé luego tus hablillas y contactos con tus amigos liberales, esta lepra que pretende destruirme" (16, 17, 22). The anti-*afrancesado* (anti-intellectual, anti-liberal) ideology voiced by Fernando VII and reproduced in Franco's Spain (Preston 45) is explicitly drawn into Saura's *Libelo* in the phrases "pintado por un gabacho" (19) and "del afrancesado Picasso" (18). The alert reader 'hears' the menacing Bakhtinian overtones of Saura's utterances; the overlaying of aesthetic codes with ideological codes: Picasso, the "Frenchified" Spanish painter, is slated as an anti-Spain, liberal intellectual in Francoist discourse. Indeed, from 1904, Picasso virtually became a French artist:

> Slowly and timorously, as his fame began to increase, even the official world was eventually to acclaim his presence as an honour to France and her traditions. Outside Spain, however, Picasso has always felt himself to be a stranger. He has never asked for French nationality, but he has accepted France as his country of adoption at first willingly, and later, since his return to Spain has been made impossible by political events, with good grace. (Penrose 97)

While sarcasm may predominate in the original quotation, we also sense, then, the menace attached to the word "intacto" in the phrase "prefiriendo mantener intacto, en el extranjero, su enorme sentido de lo que para él suponía ser español" (*Libelo* 28), once inserted into Saura's dialogical utterance.[13] Just as Goya felt forced into exile under Fernando VII, neither Picasso nor his paintings would have been safe in Francoist Spain; many 'enlightened,' 'Frenchified' works were indeed banned or destroyed, since, for the Francoists,

> el estallido de la guerra de España era la consecuencia de un proceso degenerativo que llevaba de la Ilustración al liberalismo y de éste al comunismo de manera ineluctable. De ahí que se procediera con especial cuidado a la depuración de las bibliotecas y del escalafón de profesionales de la ensenañza. . . . Para un maestro, haber asistido a un homenaje a Gorki o "proceder de la Institución Libre de Enseñanza" era argumento suficiente para recibir una sanción, aunque sólo fuera parcial. (Queipo de Llano 628)

The iconography of Goya's *fusilado* was in fact doubly loaned to *Guernica*, in its second appearance re-cast during the metamorphosis of the soldier with fist raised in

13 Also heard is the discourse of Picasso's 'Spanishness.' Tusell notes that "la imagen romántica de una España tradicional y atávica pero dotada de fuerza y de autenticidad . . . [formó] una parte del éxito de los primeros artistas españoles que acudieron a la capital del arte – París," and that "la presentación de Picasso . . . en París estuvo ligada a una cierta reedición de la 'españolada', como la que la pintura 'regeneracionista' implica . . . [aunque] ése fue sólo un primer paso" (183). Eunice Lipton notes that his 'Spanishness' was a factor in Picasso's representation as a 'seer' in idealist art-criticism (345), including that of Apollinaire (35). Picasso's "investment" in this subject position –something between an emotional commitment and a vested interest (Moore 64)– is challenged by the individual voice drawn into this utterance.

Communist/Republican salute to a toppled plaster statue (the figure at the base of Picasso's finished painting known to us as the "cadáver," loaned by the Beatus). Rojas identifies the pose of Goya's *fusilado* as that immortalised in the bullfight by Martincho, a famous bull-fighter of Goya's day, and notes that this pose simultaneously evokes the crucifixion, an interpretation corroborated by the fact that the right hand of the *fusilado* also shows the stigmata (*El Valle* 80, 139). As stated previously, the conflation of the crucifixion and the *corrida* (and also Mithraic ritual bull sacrifice) is understood by many art historians to be an important key to *Guernica*. Of present interest is Frank D. Russell's identification of the mid-metamorphosis soldier/statue with the "matador defying death in the *pase natural*, a gesture which translates the helplessness of the crucifixion into the triumphant control of the bull fight" (53). Saura draws Russell's discussion of Picasso's conflation of the *torero* and Christ in the *pase natural* into the utterance, "[o]dio la cornada del natural en la verónica de la larga cambiada del Guernica" (*Libelo* 31). Interestingly, another of the famous bullfighters of Goya's day, Joaquín Rodríguez (*Costillares*), was the inventor of the modern form of the *verónica* (Rojas, *El Valle* 103, 163) added in Saura's "[pase] natural en la verónica," hence, I suggest, completing the relationship between Goya's *fusilado*/"Martincho"/Christ and Picasso's soldier/"Costillares"/Christ. The first voices heard in this utterance thus include those of the (art) historians Russell and Rojas.

The transposition of iconographical and political/historical codes permits a second reading of "la cornada del natural . . . del Guernica" as the wounding, or sacrifice, of the Basque citizen *–natural de Gernika–* in the prolonged 'alteration' of the town by bombardment: "la larga cambiada" of Gernika. The Christian overtones of "verónica," as Veronica's veil, again remind us of the Catholicism of the Basques, and thus the hypocrisy of the Nationalist Crusade. For Larrea, for example, "[m]erced a esta forma pictográfica . . . el miliciano defensor de la República clama al cielo . . . calificando al mismo tiempo de anticristiano al catolicismo franquista" (248). In this context, "la verónica" is suggestive of the Stations of the Cross, and therefore of Gernika's bombardment as "a modern calvary," as Herbert Read characterised *Guernica* in his 1938 essay of the same title (Oppler 218): a 'veiled' intertext in this utterance.[14]

A further reading suggests the re-signification of *Guernica* both through Picasso's occluding of the Republican soldier/*torero*/Christ symbolism during the metamorphosis of

14 Read's metaphor for *Guernica*, and also the *El País* 25 February 1981 description of the "calvario" of *Guernica*'s repatriation (qtd. in Van Hensbergen 300), inflect the utterance "[o]dio las siete estaciones del calvario del Guernica" (*Libelo* 35).

his painting, and also through its cultural trajectory – two further "larga[s] cambiada[s] del *Guernica*" whose consequence was the "cornada" or 'sacrifice' of original meanings and referents. Indeed, the potential for the ideological appropriation of *Guernica* was understood by certain Marxist critics to have been facilitated by Picasso's (therefore doubly symbolic) iconographical choices.[15] This new reading of Saura's utterance is of the death of realism, or naturalism, in modern art: "[L]a cornada del natural." Within Picasso's oeuvre specifically, this utterance recalls the death of his Neo-classical phase (ended upon his engagement with surrealism), indicated by his decision to rework the soldier/*torero*/ Christ icon as a toppled Neo-classical statue. In these semantic layers of Saura's text, Veronica's veil stands in for outmoded painterly illusionism as in her veil was discovered the true likeness of Christ,[16] in turn a subject worthy of academic artists.

This hermetic interpretation is echoed in Saura's utterance, "[d]etesto . . . la corrida del Bombero Torero del Guernica" (*Libelo* 24).[17] "Bombero" here refers to *l'art pompier*, a term pejoratively applied to French academic art, particularly pretentious history painting of the late nineteenth Century, that is, everything that Picasso reacted against, but that prevailed in Franco's Spain: "En la España de la inmediata posguerra . . . el arte moderno sobrevivió en condiciones difíciles. Ocupaban mucho espacio los partidarios del arte *pompier*" (Bonet 16). Its name derives from the habit of posing nude models wearing firemen's helmets (*pompier* is French for fireman, or *bombero*) to substitute for ancient helmets (Chilvers 367). The figure at the base of the finished painting is frequently described by critics as classical, Roman or Greek and, in studies for *Guernica*, as wearing "un casco de soldado griego" (Alix Trueba 36) or "classical headgear" (Russell 20). Lying broken at the base may thus signify the death of old styles. Yet, in relation to the barbarity of Gernika, Picasso's slain "Bombero Torero," who carries a broken soldier's/picador's sword, may suggest not only the end of 'civilised' art, but also of civilisation itself, and of a 'civilised' kind of warfare. Indeed, in May 1940, transposing the codes of aesthetics and politics, Picasso would suggest: "Our generals, they're professors of the Ecole des Beaux

15 Such discontent is explicit in the utterance "[o]dio al puño levantado que apretando una espiga se oculta tras el actual sol-bombilla del Guernica" (*Libelo* 24). However, since in military terms "bombilla" out-perfoms "espiga," Saura's utterance also suggests Picasso's revision escalated the symbolism of political resistance (even though the "little bomb" is in the hands of the Fascists and not the Republican soldier).

16 For Saura, Veronica's veil is "the first monotype" (Ríos 101). In conversation with Saura, Julián Ríos associates Veronica's veil with veiling in Velázquez's *Crucifixión* (1631) –"La melena que le cae es un auténtico velo y ahí podríamos llegar al velo de Verónica" (86)– a key painting for Saura, as discussed in Chapter VIII, "Painting as a 'Campo de Bataille.'" Also invoked is the aesthetic relationship of *Guernica* to Picasso's *Minotauro y yegua muerta delante de una gruta frente a una joven con velo* (1936) (Alix Trueba 35).

17 "Bombero Torero," the name of the Easter Sunday mock bullfight performed by padded dwarfs and young fighting cows, also alludes to the comic version of the *corrida* performed by the *toreros* Antonio Ordóñez and Luis Miguel Dominguín, prominent flamenco musicians and other members of Picasso's circle in his home (Van Hensbergen 246).

Arts" (qtd. in Penrose 336). Many Spaniards see in the *corrida* "a particularly intense metaphor of human fate: the struggle between human consciousness (the torero) and the raw power of nature, as epitomized in the bull" (Hughes, *Goya* 351). Gernika was not destroyed by the raw power of nature alone. However the human force that dropped the incendiary bombs, in a 'total war' waged against a defenceless population, was certainly both modern and unconscionable: a further signified of this utterance.

In this chapter, I have focused on the ideological content of the iconography of three Spanish painters 'borrowed' by Picasso for *Guernica*, and drawn into *Contra el Guernica*. *Libelo* to orchestrate certain of Saura's themes. As I have argued, most all of Saura's utterances contain within their semantic layers references, if not to specific artists, iconography or paintings, then to the discourses of art. Through the iconographical intertexts discussed in this chapter, Saura shows *Guernica* to be the bearer of ideological codes as well as the hermetic codes of art, both a source of 'meaning' in Picasso's painting. By identifying the political and aesthetic referents of these intertexts, we identify the 'pieces' of Picasso's and Saura's "rompecabezas." However, both remain "desajustados," since we also establish that any given icon may be interpreted in a number of different ways. While, in one utterance, the voice of an art historian suggests the figure at the base of Picasso's painting is influenced by the cadaver of the Beatus of Liebana, another claims it evokes the matador defying death in the *pase natural*; for still other voices, this figure refers to the Roman centurion of earlier, related Picasso paintings, a classical statue, or Picasso's own Neoclassical sculptures and paintings of plaster busts, and thus a self-referential statement on modern art. Even among those who agree on the provenance of this figure, different interpretations are offered: Oppler adjudged the cadaver an apt symbol for a modern catastrophe; Kaufmann noted its function in Picasso's surrealism; Fisch noted the relationship of its 'lender,' the Beatus, to the *Reconquista*. In this way Saura demonstrates that a single element may have origins in multiple sources, and is in any case inflected with multiple meanings. In Picasso's painting, as in the dialogical text, the possibilities of orchestration make any segment of 'text' almost infinitely variable. In revealing/reproducing this aspect of Picasso's artistic system, I suggest Saura's pamphlet serves, in one semantic layer, as a didactic manifesto of how to 'read' Picasso's painting; that is to say, through the analysis of individual iconographical intertexts in relationship to their original artistic/socio-political contexts and to those of the secondary text –Picasso's painting– as well as to Picasso's own and the greater archive.

However, it is also important to note that these different 'meanings' are drawn into dialogue in Saura's utterances through the insertion of the individual and social voices of frequently partisan detractors, connoisseurs, art critics, historians and hagiographers. In other(s') words, we hear the discourses conducted around the artist and his work: the dialogised heteroglossia of a particular epoch of Spanish (art) history. In this dialogically charged environment, interpretation of Picasso' painting is problematised: if each interpretation is different, and frequently ideological, then the notion of a singular, transcendental meaning is contested. At an art-theoretical level, then, I suggest that interpretation *per se* is problematised. In the power relations of word and image, the 'interpreter' speaks for the seen, mute object: *Guernica*'s plastic reality is usurped by the dialogue of the audience's enquiry. In this semantic layer of *Contra el Guernica*, Saura orchestrates his litany of critical and interpretive 'li(n)es' precisely to inveigh against the relentless discourses conducted around Picasso's painting, so that we might re-view the "fenómeno pictórico" or "grito" that is *Guernica*.

In the political arena, this problematising of interpretation serves to question the dominant ideologies, received ideas or 'lies' surrounding *Guernica* and Gernika. At this semantic level, Saura's 're-cited' sightings of the cadaver of the Beatus of Liebana, Velázquez's *Meninas* and Goya's *Aquelarres* serve to resite the ideology of twentieth-century National Catholicism as apocalyptical, hypocritical and motivated by destructive psychological impulses. Goya's *fusilado* is likewise a 'pre-text' drawn in to *Contra el Guernica* in part to orchestrate the Saurian theme of the return, or perpetuation, of the political conditions of the arch-reactionary Fernando VII's reign under the dictatorship of his twentieth-century counterpart, General Franco; of their mutual anti-liberalism, anti-intellectualism and *degollación* of modern constitutional democracy in Spain, and their '*degoyación*' of modernism in Spanish painting.

Having discussed a number of utterances which, at least in one layer, re(in)state *Guernica*'s anti-Francoist political significations, in the following chapter I will argue that Saura's text also 're-cites,' and (in)cites resistance to (Pro-/Neo-)Francoist (re-)significations of *Guernica* and Gernika.

"Operación Guernica"

Following the closure of the Paris World's Fair in November 1937, *Guernica* travelled throughout Scandinavia, recontextualised and largely uncontroversial amidst an exhibition of 118 modernist works by Picasso, Henri Matisse, George Braque and Henri Laurens. In September 1938, Picasso returned *Guernica* to the Republican cause, shipping his painting to the National Joint Committee for Spanish Relief in London, where it was exhibited at the New Burlington and Whitehall galleries, the latter charging "a pair of reusable boots" as admission, and then in Manchester as a fundraiser for a food-ship to Spain. *Guernica* was then shipped to the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign in New York, where it docked on 1 May 1939, for exhibition throughout the United States in this cause (Chipp 156-59).

In November 1939, *Guernica* was included in the Picasso retrospective curated by Alfred H. Barr at the New York Museum of Modern Art (MoMA), the most comprehensive exhibition of the artist's work to date (Chipp 161). At Picasso's behest, *Guernica* then remained on permanent loan to MoMA, "siendo el mismo cuadro un exiliado" (Tusell 256), awaiting the restoration of the democratic freedoms lost in the Civil War. From its base at MoMA, *Guernica* continued to travel until 1957, although, as Javier Tusell notes, "desde 1953 ya no lo hizo con un sentido de propaganda de uno de los dos bandos de la Guerra Civil, sino en su condición de obra decisiva del arte del siglo xx, quizá porque se habían ido apagando los ecos universales de la Guerra Civil Española." Nevertheless, Tusell adds, "para los españoles disconformes con el régimen político existente en España s[eguía] siendo un importante símbolo de disidencia" (255). While, in some sectors of Spanish society, appreciation for Picasso's work grew under the dictatorship, both Picasso and *Guernica* continued to pose a propaganda problem for the Franco regime: "[L]os despachos diplomáticos nos muestran una apreciación creciente del pintor, aunque no tanto del *Guernica*, y un temor indudable a la vinculación entre la genialidad artística de Picasso y su repudio al régimen" (257).

In 1968, the Director General of Fine Arts (*DG de BA*), Florentino Pérez Embid, proposed the 'return' of *Guernica* to Spain for a projected museum of modern art. Herbert Southworth locates the subsequent campaign to claim Picasso's painting for Madrid within the context of the (unsuccessful) "Pérez Embid-La Cierva 'Operation Guernica'" (1969-70) (285), under which the former was to undertake the recovery of the painting (also termed "Operación Retorno"), while, as we have read, Ricardo de la Cierva was charged with revising Civil War history in the best possible light for the Nationalists.

With *Guernica*'s imminent 'return' to Spain during the transition to democracy, the original polemics surrounding Picasso's painting returned resoundingly to the Spanish press (Calvo Serraller 114; Alix Trueba 117), providing "fantastic" material for Saura's *Libelo* (Ríos 177). As I have argued, Saura's utterances 're-cite' a litany of 'pre-textual' representations of Picasso's *Guernica*: texts which both pre-date *Contra el Guernica* and are drawn in to this text for the orchestration of specific themes. Each of Saura's utterances, ostensibly an attack on Picasso's painting, is overlaid with further aesthetic, art-historical and political discourses; frequently, the codes of *Guernica* are transposed into those of Gernika. In this chapter and the next, I argue that Saura's citings of the various ideological representations and (re-)significations of *Guernica* and Gernika at different stages in the interrelated cultural biography of the former and historiography of the latter orchestrate a revisionist (art) history of the painting and the event. In the current chapter, I focus on *Guernica*'s re-signification during two nodal points in their mutual trajectory: the first thirty or so years of the Franco dictatorship, or *dictadura*; and the slight opening to modernisation, 'europeanisation' and historical revision of the *dictablanda*.

To orchestrate his (art) history in relation to the earlier period, Saura's satirical utterances draw in the "pintorescas polémicas" surrounding the validity and significations of the painting (Calvo Serraller 114), overlaying these with the dominant discourses of *Guernica* (and Gernika) as "pura política pintada," or "una trompeta de propaganda," reproduced by representatives of the Franco regime (Tusell 256). In relation to the *dictablanda*, Saura's utterances 're-cite' the Neo-Francoists' orchestrated campaign symbolically and physically to appropriate *Guernica*, and simultaneously to de-symbolise Gernika. Throughout Saura's *Libelo*, dominant discourses are overlaid with the prominent discourses of *la otra España*, constituting *Guernica*/Gernika as a sign/site of resistance to the Francoist and Neo-Francoist regimes.

Saura's opening utterances introduce the aesthetic and political debates surrounding *Guernica*'s (and Gernika's) signification as (mere) political propaganda for the *vencidos* in relation to the painting's subsequent fame also as a modernist masterpiece –indeed a sign for modern art– and to its endless replication and (re-)presentation(s):

> Odio al Guernica porque siendo dibujo coloreado
> más que pintura, es uno de los cuadros más fa-
> mosos del siglo XX. (7)
>
> Detesto al Guernica porque es un cartelón y por-
> que como sucede a todo vulgar cartelón su ima-
> gen es posible copiarla y multiplicarla al infinito. (7)

As we have read, *Guernica*'s heavy outlines filled with areas of flat paint –"siendo dibujo coloreado más que pintura"– count among the modernist strategies employed to challenge traditional methods and goals of academic painting, particularly naturalism and illusionism, and which were subjected to the invective of conservative (art) critics. During the intensely politicised debates in aesthetics of the 1930s, such innovations were more sinisterly categorised as "degenerate" by the fascist regimes (Lipton 322). Both social voices are heard in one semantic layer of these utterances. However, in the words "dibujo coloreado," we also hear the individual voice of Jean Paulhan, a progressive, antifascist critic who remained influential during the German occupation of Paris, and for whom the quality he termed *matière* –the autonomous language of the materials of painting– was "not in Picasso who makes admirable colored drawings" (qtd. in Cone 99). The revolutionary Communist painter Ramón Gaya also critiqued "la tinta plana" (property of the "dibujo coloreado") in (Republican) Civil War poster art, suggesting, however, that it corresponded to the 'low,' capitalist form of the advertising poster, suitable only as propaganda for overseas audiences: "[S]iendo dibujo coloreado más que pintura, . . . es un . . . vulgar cartelón."[1] Paradoxically, *Guernica*'s modernist aesthetic was criticised by a number of Spanish Republican Embassy/Pavilion officials, and denounced by Soviet critics such as Vladimir Kemenov, for lacking the accessibility (of social realism) considered necessary to revolutionary/propaganda painting (Alix Trueba 81; Calvo Serraller 114; Kemenov 657).[2] In a purely aesthetic critique, the American artist Darby Bannard would later suggest that *Guernica* failed on formal grounds similar to those critiqued by Paulhan and Gaya.[3] Each of these individual voices also leaves its trace in the semantic layers of Saura's first utterances.

1 Gaya championed "el arte libre" and "un cartel-pintura . . . en donde lo emocional pu[dier]a tener toda su temblor. Y ese temblor . . . no habita en la tinta plana, ni en el odioso sombreado mecánico, ni en ningunos de los hábiles trucos del cartel sino en … la mano desnuda, en el brazo verdadero." For Gaya, flat paint, as a device of the poster, could only "servir para nuestra propaganda en el extranjero" (54-56). In "Contestación a Ramón Gaya," the Communist poster artist and *DG de BA*, Josep Renau, conversely argued that "[e]l profundo valor expresivo de la tinta plana ya se hizo patente a través de las realizaciones plásticas de Picasso y los cubistas" (138-39). Miguel Ángel Gamonal Torres notes the prominence of this debate in relation to the Pavilion artworks (74). Clement Greenberg's formalist definition of modernism, which, as Gamonal Torres also notes, marginalised political painting as *kitsch*, was instrumental in locating Picasso and cubism in the formalist genealogy of modernism. However, *Guernica*'s monochromatic colour scheme has also been associated with "cartelismo" (Calvo Serraller, "El 'Guernica' como enigma" 117), hence the irony: no *vulgar cartelón* should be considered a modernist masterpiece according to the dominant, Greenbergian discourse of modernism; nor, for Gaya, could its flat paint represent the revolution.

2 Saura invokes the Basque adherents to this position in the utterance: "Detesto a los políticos vascos y a Aurelio Arteta que no consiguieron la sustitución del Guernica en el pabellón español de 1937" (*Libelo* 42).

3 In 1968, Bannard suggested that *Guernica* failed on account of "touch and scale": "When Cubist painting got big, then the 'pieces' got big, they had to be filled with paint; and so they were, with flat evenly painted areas," whereas smaller, early Cubist works "kept some of the sensuality of oil paint as a hedge against its radical intent," through an incising brushstroke worked with the fingers and wrist (24-25).

Through the transposition of the ideological codes of politics and aesthetics, Gernika itself becomes a 'atrocious' painting able to "multiplicar[se] al infinito."[4] Indeed, on 6 May 1937, in his denunciation of fascism and those responsible for the destruction of Gernika specifically, Senator William Borah of Idaho described this atrocity as a painting, and a masterpiece: a concrete expression of what is heard through transposition in the phrase, "uno de los cuadros más famosos del siglo XX":

> Here Fascism presents to the world its masterpiece. It has hung upon the wall of civilization a painting that will never come down – never fade out of the memories of man. So long as men and women may be interested in searching out from the pages of history outstanding acts of cruelty and instances of needless destruction of human life they will linger longest and with the greatest horror over the savage story of the Fascist war in Spain. (Qtd. in Southworth 186)

While the international supporters of democracy and the Spanish Republic viewed Gernika as a 'masterpiece' of fascist aggression, the Spanish Nationalists and their supporters cynically suggested that Gernika was a masterpiece of Republican propaganda.[5] Furthermore, for these social voices, *Guernica* was famous for its name –synonymous with the purported 'propaganda success' of Gernika– rather than its artistic merit: "[S]iendo dibujo coloreado [de rojo] más que [*grisaille*] pintura, es uno de los cuadros más famosos del siglo XX." The pro-Nationalist Hellmuth Dahms, for example, insisted that "'The Death of Guernica' [as he called Picasso's painting] achieved 'great fame' because of its title" (qtd. in Southworth 253). Reciprocally, some considered the 'propaganda success' of Gernika to

4 Not only would the Nazi/Nationalist atrocity of Gernika "multiplicar[se] al infinito" in the saturation bombings and gas chambers of the Second World War and Nazi holocaust to follow, *Guernica* would also be stylistically and thematically revisited in paintings such as Picasso's *Charnel House* (1945). Furthermore, in addition to *Guernica*'s international exposure, countless replicas and reproductions of the painting also exist: "Ever since, critics have prodded it and poets made verses about it, prints without number and even Czechoslovakian postage stamps have rained over the two hemispheres" (Russell 3). For a range of artists' responses to *Guernica*, see *The Legacy Project*.

5 In 1937, while Marxists were debating the propagandistic use value of *Guernica*, Pro-Nationalist writers such as the English Catholics Arnold Lunn and Douglas Jerrold strove to promulgate the lies of Franco's press officer, Luis Bolín, loudly lamenting the supposed propaganda success of the destruction of Gernika, in this discourse 'falsely' attributed to the Nationalists by well-funded, lying Republicans (Southworth 391). In June 1955, when the Spanish Nationalists still denied the bombardment of Gernika, and while *Guernica* was on exhibition in a European capital, "un representante del Estado Español se quejó ante el director de un periódico católico por la 'indudable exageración' de considerarlo como una obra maestra de la pintura, pero, sobre todo, por sugerir que el bombardeo había sido tan catastrófico como se mostraba cuando, según este representante del régimen, el tema del Guernica no era sino 'una trompeta de propaganda'" (Tusell 256). *La guerra española de 1936* (1966) –the Spanish translation of Helmuth Dahms's 1962 work– was the second book that admitted the bombardment to pass Spanish censorship. In a footnote, Dahms accepted Hugh Thomas's (1961) figure of 1,654 dead, but charged "dinamiteros" with destroying a large part of the town. Southworth suggests it likely that Dahms's footnote was the origin of a discourse to be developed by the Neo-Francoist school, in which the damage done to Durango was held to be relatively greater than that done to Gernika, but that Gernika was the subject of more propaganda (253). As noted previously, Ricardo de la Cierva argued that

> Germany in 1937 could not carry out "tests" of urban destruction for the simple reason that the Luftwaffe was not conceived as a strategic arm until much later in the Second World War. . . . Guernica was simply an episode more, although an extremely sad one – but not so sad as neighbouring Durango, less bruited about by propaganda – in the interminable chain of small and great tragedies which formed the Spanish Civil War. (Qtd. in Southworth 267)

In *Arde Guernica* (1970; 1973), Vicente Talón likewise wrote of the destruction of Gernika as "more than anything else a master motive of political propaganda. . . . Above all, Guernica constitutes a unique model of well-produced political publicity" (qtd. in Southworth 393).

be attributable to Picasso's painting. In 1967, the Franco biographer, Brian Crozier, wrote that the "success" of the painting had contributed to his belief that the Germans had bombed the town (qtd. in Southworth 277). In *España en llamas* (1968), Bernardo Gil Mugarza argued that "[p]ractically, the bombing of Guernica had a world-wide impact more because of the famous painting of Picasso than for the destructive effect of the bombs" (qtd. in Southworth 270). It is these voices that are of greatest interest to my argument. However, the disjuncture of the positions held by subscribers to all of the above political/aesthetic tendencies in relation to *Guernica*'s actual fame and canonical status,[6] and to each other, is heard through the *ironía asociativa* of Saura's introductory utterances.

Indeed, as we have read, Picasso might more accurately be described as investing in the subject position constituted in the modernist (and Gaya's) discourse of the free artist, drawn explicitly into *Contra el Guernica* in the phrase "la descarada y ofensiva libertad de un hombre verdaderamente libre" (30). Picasso in fact "disliked the notion of being commissioned to create an artwork; and despite his strong support for the embattled Spanish Republic, the mural necessarily would be something of an overt piece of propaganda – and the great Picasso was not a poster artist, after all" (Martin 2). Yet, clearly, the modernist *Guernica* simultaneously succeeded in its propaganda role for the Republic, even though, contrary to more conventional propagandistic art, the painting permitted countless interpretations. For some, this semantic virtuosity contributed to its fame and, consequently, its reproduction: "Sobre el hecho de que el *Guernica* es el cuadro más famoso de nuestro siglo no caben diversidad de opiniones. Ningún otro ha dado lugar como él a comentarios, interpretaciones y estudios apasionados en todas las regiones del planeta, ninguno se ha reproducido y sigue reproduciéndose como el *Guernica*" (Larrea 236): "[U]no de los cuadros más famosos del siglo XX, . . . su imagen es posible copiarla y multiplicarla al infinito." However, for the detractors of Picasso's "cartelón," the unw(o/a)nted fame and the multiple available readings of the painting are differently interrelated with its reproducibility: "[C]omo sucede a todo vulgar cartelón su imagen es posible copiarla y multiplicarla al infinito." While, in one semantic layer, this last phrase draws in a further debate in Marxist aesthetics –Walter Benjamin's notion of the liberatory potential of the reproductive technology that Gaya disdained in the arts[7]– more concretely, *Guernica*'s reproducibility harmed the Nationalist cause by 'advertising' the infamy of the original Nazi/Nationalist

6 Saura himself deems *Guernica* "una de las pinturas más importantes del siglo XX" ("Para salvar el Guernica" n. pag.).
7 Benjamin felt that painting's loss of "aura" (uniqueness and authenticity) in the age of mechanical reproduction might signal the end of painting, bringing art closer to the masses and allowing culture to become more collective. However, he also noted the ideological potential of this reproducibility, as it permitted politics to become more spectacular (217-51).

atrocity (and *its* subsequent 'reproductions' during the Second World War). We therefore also hear echoed in Saura's utterances a persistent refrain of those culpable of the Gernika atrocity: that the much presented and much reproduced painting was successful in turning international opinion against them. By the late 1960s, this "multiplica[ción] al infinito" of the famous *Guernica*, and thus the relentless re-presentation of the infamous Gernika to international gaze, necessitated, in the minds of the Neo-Francoists, the appropriation and re-signification of the painting to serve the international interests of the current regime. Given *Guernica*'s (and Gernika's) special 'significance' for the Basques, the capture of Picasso's painting was also conceived in terms of pacifying this volatile region. Southworth suggests:

> In 1969 there began a series of events, all related to Guernica, and each related to the others, and the whole to a propaganda campaign intentionally constructed to pacify the Basque provinces. Since 1937, a barrier existed between Bilbao and the Franco regime, Guernica. Since the end of the war when Nationalist leaders thought of Guernica, their thoughts increasingly turned not only to the tragedy itself but to the mysterious, symbolic representation of that tragedy: the painting of Pablo Picasso. . . . And if this magic talisman were captured from the enemy, might not its strange power be made to work in favour of Madrid, rather than against Madrid? (277-78)

La Cierva's letters to the editors of *El Pensamiento Navarro* and *Historia y Vida*, in February and April 1970 respectively, make public this attempt to capture and resignify *Guernica*:

> And under the painting of Pablo Picasso –why not?– may this work of mine become another stepping stone to the end that the sacred name of Guernica – sacred for the Basque country and for Spain– be finally a symbol of reconciliation and of liberty for ALL OF US and not a symbol of resentment and of fear, as unfortunately is at times the case. . . . The desires of the Spanish government to recuperate the painting *Guernica* of don Pablo Picasso show that in Spain a partisan political value is no longer attributed to this masterpiece. (Qtd. in Southworth 282-83)

The Neo-Francoist bid for *Guernica* can thus be understood in terms of Arjun Appadurai's concept of the "tournaments of value" (21) conducted over "economic objects circulating in different *regimes of value* in space and time" (4). While acknowledging that, from a theoretical point of view, it is human actors who encode things with significance, Appadurai argues that, from a methodological point of view, "it is the things-in-motion that illuminate their human and social context. No social analysis of things (whether the analyst is an economist, an art historian, or an anthropologist) can avoid a minimum level of what might be called methodological fetishism" (5). Put simply, objects such as *Guer-*

nica can be understood to have agency: "Although men appear to be the agents in defining [certain objects'] value, in fact without [these objects], men cannot define their own value; in this respect, [these objects] and men are reciprocally agents of each others' value definition" (Nancy Munn, qtd. in Appadurai 20).[8] Appadurai stresses the importance of the commodity's trajectory, or "cultural biography," specifically the "paths" and "diversions" through which certain objects gain semantic richness, describing as "tournaments of value" the bids for possession of such commodities precisely for the sign values –derived from this trajectory– they bestow upon their owners (13-21). Furthermore, what is at stake in the "tournaments of value" over their possession "is not just status, rank, fame, or reputation of actors, but the disposition of the central tokens of value in the society in question, . . . their forms and outcomes are always consequential for the more mundane realities of power and value in ordinary life" (21).

As Antonio Gómez López-Quiñones argues, in its trajectory to date, *Guernica* "[supo] ganarse tanto el reconocimiento unánime de pieza maestra de la modernidad pictórica española, como un aura inmarcesible de símbolo-fetiche para una serie de causas políticas" (143). While Gómez López-Quiñones concludes (and I suggest Saura would thoroughly agree), "que a fuerza de significarlo casi todo, ha corrido y corre el riesgo de terminar no significando nada" (143), the essential point here is that not only would the Neo-Francoist capture of *Guernica* re-signify the painting, but that, 'in return,' the painting would re-signify the regime. Not only would Neo-Francoist possession "minimizar el saldo moral capitalizado por el cuadro y . . . re-significar su intensa (y elástica) carga política, acercándola a las tesis modernizadoras, europeístas y reconciliadoras de la dictadura en los años setenta" (143), but *Guernica* –an incarnate sign whose signifieds included left-wing politics, European Modernism and a universal cry for peace against the horrors of war– would reciprocally be the agent of the value definition of the regime as inclusive, reconciliatory, modern, Europeanised and pacifist. Nevertheless, a radicalised sector of the regime published a hostile response to suggestions of *Guernica*'s repatriation (Tusell 258).

Saura's utterances (in)cite resistance to the encoding of *Guernica* with new meanings by Neo-Francoist actors, likewise satirising the "tournaments of value" conducted over Picasso's painting for the sign values it would bestow. Resistance to the symbolic appropriation and re-signification of *Guernica* through its reproduction (along with the reproduction of Nationalist discourse) in Nationalist publications, is heard in the utterance:

8 The 'certain objects' in Munn's study are the highly prized shells of Kula exchange in the Western Pacific.

> Odio al Guernica porque su imagen, inocentemente empleada como portada para diversos libros franquistas, demostró el engaño que entraña al poder ser utilizada indiferentemente por uno y otro bando. (19)

Here, the word "inocentemente" is heard satirically, in inverted commas, although the formal markers are missing. As Southworth notes, at this point the Spanish censorship had already "forgiven" Picasso, and the painting, whose reproductions had previously only entered Spain clandestinely, had been reproduced in various history books (278).[9] In 1962 *Guernica* was reproduced (as was a photograph of the ruined town) inside Carlos Seco Serrano's illustrated history of the war, in which the professor and historian noted the burning and destruction of Gernika, but not who burned or destroyed it (Southworth 251).[10] *Guernica* likewise appeared on the dust jacket of Carlos Rojas's *Diálogos para otra España* (1966);[11] in the serialised history *Crónica de la guerra de España*, edited by La Cierva, which, as we have read, both minimised the severity of the atrocity and alleged incendiarism by the Basques themselves; and on the cover, endpapers and in the text of *Comentarios a mil imágenes de la guerra civil española* (1967), written by the monarchist poet José María Pemán. In this text Pemán, an apologist for Franco's *Movimiento*, admitted the bombing of Gernika. However, Southworth notes that in the caption to a photograph of a ruined house in Gernika and its exposed staircase, Pemán asks: "Where does this wounded staircase lead to? To peace? to love? to hatred? This staircase must be continued, in a future of fraternity, formed with equal parts of much forgetfulness and sober remembrance." A second image of the devastated town carries the legend: "Guernica bombed. One of the most profound sorrows of the war. And a sad fruit of violence. Fortunately, the Guernica later rebuilt has been reborn from its ashes" (qtd. in Southworth 268).

Pemán's last statement is drawn into the utterance "[o]dio el renacer de tiza y hollín en la bandeja del brasero del Guernica" (*Libelo* 34), which ostensibly addresses the thematic and formal relationships of *Guernica* with Picasso's later painting, the *Charnel House*, but also inveighs against the cynicism of Franco's adoption of the town and the high priority

9 The ultra-right-wing *El Alcázar* also printed a photograph of *Guernica* with Pérez Embid's comment that "*Guernica*, given by Picasso to the Spanish people, is part of the cultural patrimony of this people and should be on exhibition in Spain as proof of the definitive end of the contrasts and differences aroused by the last civil conflict" (qtd. in Martin (193), thus, in Russell Martin's words, "reducing the memory of war that took the lives of half a million Spaniards to something of a lamentable disagreement, its statement in support of the move accompanied by a reproduction of the painting whose subject was the single most indefensible incident of that war" (193).

10 It is significant that Picasso's painting was omitted from the 1968 edition (Southworth 251).

11 Rojas, however, should not be considered an apologist for the regime. Southworth suggests that "the indulgence of the censorship may well have been due to the fact that Rojas's book was concerned with the philosophical problems of the two Spains, and not with the history of the Spanish Civil War" (253).

placed on its reconstruction by the Nationalist government (Southworth 239). Wilhelm Boeck suggests that "we are reminded of *Guernica* by the *Charnel House* of 1945-48, which is painted in the same subdued colors as the older work, and which is intended as a moving, realistic rather than allegorical, requiem for the silent victims of a degenerate brutality" (232). Indeed, while Dora Maar suggested that the *Charnel House* was inspired by a documentary film of "una familia aniquilada en su cocina," Picasso himself suggested "que se había inspirado en fotografías de los campos de concentración" (qtd. in Alix Trueba 98),[12] in which context Saura's choice of the words "tiza y hollín" to represent the materials of Picasso's *grisaille* paintings also conjures up the charred and calcified human remains in the ashes of the Gernika conflagration, a spectre which would likewise be 're-born' in the gas chambers, or 'ovens,' of the Nazi holocaust. Saura thus recontextualises Nationalist claims of Gernika's rebirth from the ashes of its devastation: as a testing ground for 'total war,' Gernika was in fact 'reborn' in the Nazi atrocities of the Second World War to follow. Additionally, claims that sooty deposits found in Gernika were evidence of the use of petrol by Basque incendiarists, and also the victims' purported 'exaggeration' of the atrocity –in Andalusia "tiza" means "exaggeration" as well as "chalk"– leave further traces in the words "tiza y hollín."[13]

In further contest of *Guernica*'s resignification through its reproduction in tandem with reproductions of the ingenuous Neo-Francoist discourse of reconciliation (given ongoing repressions), and in resistance to "much forgetfulness" (Pemán) and minimisations when not outright falsehoods (La Cierva) regarding recent Spanish history, in the following two utterances Saura restores *Guernica* to its anti-Francoist frame, and the painting's pro-

12 The phrase "la bandeja del brasero" thus draws in contesting interpretations of the *Charnel House* as inspired either by a kitchen fire or by the gas 'ovens' of the holocaust. The Picasso aficionado may also recall Wilhelm Boeck's suggestion that all Picasso's paintings inspired by historical models reveal "a mind that consumes the thing seen in the fire of enthusiasm and recreates it from the ashes as something new that belongs to Picasso alone" (110). Also, "el renacer . . . del Guernica," understood as the renaissance of classical artistic values in this painting, is balanced by "la perla barrueca . . . del Guernica" (*Libelo* 34) of the following utterance, in an allusion to Picasso's stylistic fluctuation between the classical and the baroque, noted by many critics. Alfred H. Barr, for example, argued: "Picasso's career is a 30 years war in which the opposing forces of classical formalism and romantic feeling, of geometry and sentiment, are alternately victorious" (qtd. in Lipton 335). In relation to *Guernica*, Francisco Calvo Serraller notes "el encuadramiento frontal clásico y un vigoroso ritmo diagonal de carácter barroco ("El 'Guernica' como enigma" 115). Saura thus (re)cites the two modes sighted and cited in *Guernica.*

13 Georges Botto's dispatch stated: "The attention of journalists was also called to the fact that the places where the fire did not catch on, especially the houses of reinforced concrete, were drenched with gasoline, and they could see in the interiors signs of flames which must have been caused by kerosene because the smoke has covered the walls with very thick soot" (qtd. in Southworth 75). In a supposedly technical analysis of the cause of Gernika's destruction, published in *Le Journal*, 3 May 1937, the pro-Nationalist correspondent Max Massot wrote: "The ruins offer this particular contrast of white and black, of plaster and charcoal, which everywhere in the world is the undisputed appanage of fire. One hundred airplanes bombarding for twenty days without stopping could never have realised a 'work,' which the hand of man has signed with a burning brand, the word 'fire' (qtd. in Southworth 78). This (artful) "work" of "white and black, of plaster and charcoal," attributed to the victims themselves, is also drawn into Saura's utterance.

hibition in Spain, its illegal possession by dissidents, and its continued devaluation as art are re-(in)stated:

> Odio al Guernica porque durante muchos años fue la única pintura presente en casa de todos los intelectuales españoles. (20)
>
> Odio el "cornear del toro de Picasso contra un calzoncillo en el fondo del equipaje"[14] cuando el cromo pornográfico del Guernica intentaba pasar clandestinamente la frontera. (20)

As a whole, Spanish intellectuals had supported the Republic, as General José Millán Astray's infamous cry, "¡Mueran los intelectuales!" chillingly verifies.[15] At this point in Spanish (art) history, Picasso was considered "una gloria nacional en casi todos los ambientes intelectuales" (Tusell 258). Saura's reference to intellectuals' possession of reproductions of *Guernica* thus attributes, somewhat tautologically, a dissident signification to this painting.[16] Indeed, as Josefina Alix Trueba argues, "[p]ese a las intenciones expuestas por el Gobierno de Franco, en el sentido de acercar la figura de Picasso, lo cierto es que su nombre segu[ir]ía molestando intensamente al regimen"(111). Simultaneously drawn into this utterance is a criticism of the cultural closure of the Franco dictatorship: that *Guernica* was "la única pintura" in the homes of intellectuals demonstrates and remon-

14 I have not identified the quotation, which attributes comic, sexual and political agency to the *Guernica* bull (and to Picasso himself). However, through a reversed reading, Saura's *ironía asociativa* and *encadenamiento* come into play. If the bull in the pornographic reproduction of *Guernica* is understood as the victim of the metaphorical goring, by which it is pinned against the underwear in the bottom of the luggage –or rather in the background of a painting depicting a military squad– such a reading recalls the fate of Goya's *El 3 de mayo*, clandestinely evacuated in 1939 to avoid the Nazi/Nationalist bombardment of Madrid: "Por Mataró bombardeado, cruzaba la tela en un camión descubierto. La barandilla de hierro de un mirador, rota y torcida por la metralla, desgarró el lienzo por detrás del fanal del piquete, . . . le cosieron la camisa de la abuela del mayordomo en el reverso, para restaurarlo. (Rojas, *El Valle* 141). Furthermore, Carlos Rojas compares Goya's *Toro bravo* (c. 1792-93) with "el minotauro de Picasso y el propio astado de *Guernica*" ("versiones afeminadas de esta fiera incomparable") (132), going on to suggest that "el piquete de *Los Fusilamientos en la Montaña del Príncipe Pío* [*El 3 de mayo*] se transfigura en un repetido minotauro, con las bayonetas por cuernos" (143): a shared taurine pedigree to complement the (re)paired military gorings –metaphorical and historical– sustained by *Guernica* and *El 3 de mayo* during clandestine attempts to 'penetrate'/flee Spain. "[E]l toro de Picasso" is thus read as enchained with Goya's painting –indeed as a metaphor for *El 3 de mayo*– while Saura also draws in Rojas's criticism of Picasso's "effeminate" bull, in contrast to the original inserted quote, in which the bull (on one level a metaphor for Picasso himself) is cast as mock bullfighting with underpants in a suitcase, which no doubt he actually did, and also as engaged in a sexual romp. If the original author suggests the continuing potency of *Guernica* (and Picasso), Saura's addition also recalls (criticisms) that Picasso 'disported' himself thus, including at the Spanish-French border, where he used to go to gaze across to Spain, while other Spaniards were engaged in more dangerous 'transports.'

15 At a meeting at Salamanca University in 1936, Millán Astray, the founder of Spanish Foreign Legion and Franco's mentor, cried "¡Viva la Muerte!," the Foreign Legion slogan adopted by the Falange Española. The rector and philosopher of the '98 generation, Miguel de Unamuno, judiciously responded: "Just now I heard a necrophilistic and senseless cry: 'Long live death.' And I, who have spent my life shaping paradoxes which have aroused the uncomprehending anger of others, I must tell you, as an expert authority, that this outlandish paradox is repellent to me" (qtd. in Thomas 486), thus provoking Millán Astray's infamous rejoinder.

16 Intellectuals were not the only dissenters to own a print of Picasso's painting. *Guernica* also hung in many Basque homes "as a memorial to the lives and hopes that were destroyed in the civil war, and as a symbol of defiance against the durable dictatorship of Francisco Franco" (Martin 192). Saura's citings of Basque participation in the "tournaments of value" over *Guernica* are discussed in the following chapter, in relation to the transition to democracy.

strates the sanctions against –and hence the unavailability of– modernist art more generally in Franco's Spain. Neither would Franco grow to appreciate the modernist aesthetic: when the *Caudillo* opened Madrid's Museo de Arte Moderno, for which *Guernica* had ostensibly been sought, he expressed his contempt for the paintings it housed (Chipp 170). In the second utterance quoted above, *Guernica* is accordingly reproduced in/described as a "cromo pornográfico"[17]: a cheap, offensive print contesting the regime's physical and aesthetic boundaries. As Russell Martin notes, a poster of *Guernica* had either to be printed within Spain, at great personal risk, or abroad; necessarily contraband, foreign reproductions of *Guernica* had to "pasar clandestinamente la frontera":

> It had to be smuggled across the border from France or procured from a daring and entrepreneurial printer who risked jail or the loss of his business if he were caught offering it for sale. Copies of *Guernica* were torn down as a matter of course by members of the feared guardia civil when they were discovered in the houses they searched, and the black-and-white image that elsewhere in the world had become synonymous with a cry for peace remained a call for sedition in the eyes of those who enforced the caudillo's rule. (192)

These utterances thus retrospectively contest the "innocent employment" of *Guernica* on the covers of Neo-Francoist publications, instead contextualising its reproduction as a further 're-pression' of Spanish history: part of the campaign to re-signify both the painting and the regime, and to de-symbolise Gernika.

To progress from the symbolic appropriation of *Guernica*/Gernika to the physical appropriation of Picasso's painting –agent of the regime's own re-signification– the Neo-Francoists had first to convince the *Caudillo* of the desirability of doing so, and then to 'joust' with the artist himself. Florentino Pérez Embid, who knew Franco to be the ultimate recipient of his November 1968 letter (addressed to Vice President Admiral Luis Carrero Blanco) proposing the return of *Guernica* to Spain, suggested that "la propaganda anti-española de los años de la guerra exageró la significación del cuadro, atribuyéndole una desmesurada carga política" (qtd. in Tusell 257). Of Picasso himself, Pérez Embid argued

> que estaba considerado en el mundo "como el primer gran nombre en la historia de la pintura después de Goya", pero, sobre todo, añadió que, "según es frecuente entre los artistas, en algunas ocasiones ha adoptado actitudes políticas estrafalarias, nada coherentes ni sostenidas durante mucho tiempo." (Tusell 256)

17 Further layers of discourse heard in the term "pornográfico" are discussed in Chapter VII, "The 'return of the real': 'Doing Bataille' with Franco."

Tusell argues that "[e]sta visión del artista como ser imprevisible era la única que podía lograr de Franco una actitud comprensiva respecto de los propósitos de recuperación del cuadro" (256). In *Contra el Guernica*, Saura juxtaposes Pérez Embid's (mis)representation of Picasso's eccentric, fickle and incoherent politics, necessitated by the historical conditions of this first attempt to recover *Guernica*, with a quotation from the artist's surrealist poem, *Sueño y mentira de Franco* (1937):

> Detesto al pintor que a pesar de "haber adoptado
> actitudes políticas estrafalarias, nada coherentes
> ni sostenidas durante mucho tiempo", escribió:
> "las banderas que fríen en la sartén se retuercen
> en el negro de la salsa de la tinta derramada en
> las gotas de sangre que lo fusilan." (45)

At first reading, Saura's black-humorous juxtaposition of quotations seems to collude with Pérez Embid's representation of Picasso as eccentric and politically incoherent. However, *Sueño y mentira de Franco* is widely considered the artist's most overtly critical, anti-Franco work. As Hirschel B. Chipp suggests, while Picasso's poems are generally surrealist in spirit and ambivalent in meaning, "*Dream and Lie* . . . is direct and unambiguous in its attack on the Caudillo" (11). Similarly, Pierre Daix argues that "[e]l poema es automático en sus encadenamientos verbales, pero su tema es político: denuncia de Franco y las desgracias que inflige a España" (qtd. in Alix Trueba 24). Picasso's surrealist style in this instance therefore implies neither incoherence nor a lack of political commitment.[18] By using Picasso's own words, Saura mocks the wishful thinking and (self-)deception of the Franco regime –the new '*sueño y mentira de Franco*'– that the artist's political stance was eccentric, arbitrary and unsustained. Through juxtaposition with the very next utterance, citing Picasso's most unequivocal statement on *Guernica*, Saura further attests to the political (dis)content of this (partially) surrealist painting and its painter:[19]

> Odio al pintor que afirmó: "en el mural que tra-
> bajo ahora, y que se titulará Guernica, manifiesto
> mi repudio a quienes han hundido a España en
> un océano de dolor y de muerte." (45)

18 This utterance also invokes the critical debates over the validity and signification of *Guernica* begun among Republican supporters in 1937 and revived in the Spanish press during the build-up to the arrival of this painting. As Juan Larrea has protested, a number of critics

> concede a Picasso cierta especie de genialidad plástica, mas le niega el talento lógico y discursivo. Supone que nuestro artista obra exclusivamente por impulsos apasionados, como en sueños; que sus celebraciones son elementales; que su conciencia dispone de un campo de operaciones reducido. Hasta se ha llegado a afirmar que a fin de cuentas Picasso no sabe lo que ha querido decir ni hacer con las figuras de que se compone el *Guernica*. . . . *Guernica* posee, contra lo que generalmente se ha creído, una coherencia premeditada y profunda. (237, 250)

19 Saura's juxtaposition of Picasso's surrealist and realist language also refers to their combination in *Guernica*, and to debates over Picasso's (sur)realism, the focus of Chapter VII, "The 'return of the real': 'Doing Bataille' with Franco."

It is not difficult to guess which social voices are heard expressing hatred for the painter who sent this message to the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign in New York, subsequently published in the *New York Times*, 19 December 1937, and henceforth ubiquitously quoted in texts on Picasso and *Guernica*.[20] Saura's juxtaposition of Picasso's constantly reproduced words with those of Pérez Embid brings the artist's statement into the present of the *dictablanda*, to resist Picasso's, *Guernica*'s and Gernika's ideological re-signification through the dominant discourses of this nodal point in Spanish history.

In December 1968 Pérez Embid gained Franco's approval to make a bid for *Guernica* (Tusell 257), and in February 1969 Joaquín de la Puente, the assistant director of the Museo de Arte Contemporáneo, was entrusted with documenting the necessary negotiations and making contact with Picasso. The advice of the bullfighter Luis Miguel Dominguín, a close friend of Picasso, was sought in regard to this approach (257):

> Detesto al chulo torero que tras afirmar "en mi casa jamás entrará señora tan fea", aceptó ser bufón y criado del monosabio Picasso en la época blanda del Guernica. (28)

Of interest here is Saura's reference to the "época blanda del Guernica," thus dating "[e]l chulo torero" Dominguín's assistance to Picasso[21] (and) to the *dictablanda*, but also suggesting a weakening of *Guernica*'s power to signify resistance to the Franco regime. In resistance both to the re-signification of the dictatorship as "soft," and to Neo-Francoist attempts to diminish the painting's dissident signification, the consecutive utterance detests "la actual época azul del Guernica" (28): a play on Picasso's Blue Period (1901-04) –interpreted as a compassionate reflection of the literal and moral poverty witnessed in the artist's early years in Barcelona and Paris (Franck 17; Boeck 123)– and the fascist era, known as the "Era Azul" after the Falangist colours. Here, both *double entendre* –through which the object of the utterance is both *Guernica* and Gernika– and the transposition of the codes of aesthetics and politics contribute to the semantic virtuosity of Saura's words. If the voices of art critics are heard to detest the presence of elements of Picasso's earlier style in *Guernica*, further, more political voices detest the continued presence of fascism in Gernika during the putative "época blanda." In the latter semantic layer we are reminded that political agitation in the Basque Country was increasing at this time –precisely the domestic problem triggering "Operación Guernica"– and that repressive measures were

20 See Alix Trueba 63; Barr 18; Chipp 160; Gurney 55; Penrose 324.
21 This utterance also refers to Dominguín's collaboration with the artist in *Picasso y los toros*, to which the bullfighter contributed the text, also published in the Venezuelan newspaper *El Nacional* in 1973.

extreme. From 1970, the so-called *generales azules*, including Alfonso Pérez Viñeta and Tomás García Rebull, the Captain-General of Burgos, "used their political influence to block reform from within the party and their repressive apparatus to smash opposition from outside" (Preston 153). When, under duress, García Rebull hesitated to confirm the death sentences handed down to *etarras* in the Burgos Trial, Pérez Viñeta called him "*blando*," and also called for another crusade (Preston 156).[22] "[L]a actual época azul" thus suggests the reappearance of "el terror azul" and "la represión azul" of the first months of the Civil War (Solé i Sabaté 588, 590), in contest of any characterisation of the *azules*, and the political climate in Euskadi, or Spain in general, as *blandos*.

Furthermore, in (retrospective) contest of moves to overlay *Guernica* with fascist meanings, Saura overlays fascism with the codes of Picasso's art: through transposition, fascism is inflected with the moral and literal poverty represented in Picasso's Blue Period.

Nationalist/Falangist violence in relation to the investment of *Guernica/*Gernika with meanings/soldiers is remembered in two further utterances: "Odio al Guernica y su canto de Viva la Muerte" (*Libelo* 9), and "Odio al Valle de los Caídos del Guernica" (9). In these utterances, Saura ostensibly inveighs against *Guernica*'s '*pinta de fascista*,' whilst drawing in actual descriptions of the painting's violent aesthetic and (inverted) 'V' strewn with stricken forms: "Picasso's great triangular seismograph of mayhem" (Russell 81). In the former utterance, the painting is "hated" for singing the Foreign Legion slogan adopted by the *Falange Española*, that is to say for going, or appearing to go over to the enemy.[23] In one semantic layer, we hear echoes of the social voices of (frequently Marxist) critics inveighing against *Guernica*'s failure to signify the Republican cause –as indeed we did in the phrase "el engaño que entraña al poder ser utilizada indiferentemente por uno y otro bando" (19)– or, rather, the hateful re-signification this might facilitate. Yet we also hear the social voices of the Neo-Francoists themselves, hating *Guernica*'s continued ability to (de)cry the 'Viva la Muerte' wreaked upon Gernika in 1937: the reality of the atrocity committed by a regime sworn to kill, yet repeatedly denied by them, and thus the need for

22 From the mid 1960s, increased Basque nationalist and worker militancy, supported by the younger Basque clergy and student intelligentsia, was met by intensified police brutality and legal repression, including the intermittent imposition of a state of emergency in Bizkaia and Gipuzcoa. ETA militants carried out three assassinations (including that of Carrero Blanco) and other less bloody forms of direct action and sabotage. Scores of Basque Nationalists, not only *etarras*, were arrested and prosecuted. The repression culminated in the trial of sixteen nationalists accused of terrorism, including ETA leaders and two priests, held before a military tribunal in Burgos in 1970 (Payne 242-47). Stanley Payne notes:

> The "Burgos trial" quickly mushroomed into the nearest thing to a political crisis that the Franco regime had seen since the 1940s. . . . ETA terrorism . . . marked the first revival of violent methods by the leftist opposition in twenty years. Its sharp repression . . . marked a halt or at least a distinct slowdown in the gradual process of moderation and liberalization in Spain. . . . Finally, the recrudescence of an extreme form of regionalist rebellion coming in the final phase of Franco's life posed a severe question for the unity and continuity of the Spanish regime in the future. (247)

23 This is also a reference to Pierre Reverdy's *Le Chant des morts*, illustrated by Picasso.

the painting's appropriation so that it might indeed sing their tune (similarly invoked in one semantic layer of "el cara al sol del Guernica" (36)).[24]

Through Saurian *ironía asociativa*, we may also remember Picasso's own words of resistance uttered at the third Communist-sponsored Peace Congress in Sheffield, England, in November 1950, "I stand for life against death; I stand for peace against war" (qtd. in Penrose 378), as a direct repudiation of the Falangist slogan and actions. I suggest that Saura also draws into dialogue the dissident voice of Fernando Arrabal Terán (with whom he collaborated), specifically his gratuitously bloody cinematic representation of the Spanish Civil War, *Viva la Muerte* (1971).[25] Through this last intertext, *Guernica* is (positively) described as a shocking and intractable work, creating a shudder of revulsion, as 'resistance,' or in terms of its "distanciamiento brechtiano" (Calvo Serraller 117); reciprocally, Gernika itself is characterised as gratuitously violent.

The second of this pair of utterances operates in a similar manner. While there was no physical monument to the Republican dead under Franco, *Guernica* is to Basque Nationalists, and to Republicans, as the Valle de los Caídos is to the Nationalists.[26] As with the previous utterance, in a literal reading of "[o]dio al Valle de los Caídos del Guernica," Picasso's painting is heard hated for serving as a monument to fallen Nationalists, whether by an original failure to signify or by its appropriation under the *dictablanda*. And again, it is conversely hated as serving as a monument to, and reminder of, the Nazi/Nationalist atrocity: Gernika's monument to *its* fallen. In a further 'hearing,' the atrocity of the fallen village and villagers of Gernika, situated in a Biscayan valley, is cited and indicted. Also, the erudite voice of the Civil War historian and novelist, Carlos Rojas, is drawn into dia-

24 The *Cara al Sol*, or *Himno de Falange Española*, was written in 1935 by a group of Falangists including José Antonio Primo de Rivera, music by Juan Tellería.

25 Saura also 'detests' Picasso's painting "porque . . . mantiene rozagante su ceremonia de la confusión" (*Libelo* 14), again drawing Arrabal's literature into his pamphlet, and enchaining Picasso with this writer. Picasso's *Guernica* indeed inspired the set for Arrabal's play *Guernica*, although the reference to Picasso's painting was edited out of the original Spanish edition (Madrid: Taurus, 1968) and its title was given as *Ciugrena*, an anagram of *Guernica*. The reference here is to Arrabal's novel, *Arrabal celebrando la ceremonia de la confusión* (1963). For Arrabal, *la ceremonia* is a formula to express "la imposibilidad total de comunicación con un sistema extraño, ajeno, superior e inaccesible . . . cuyos ritos preñarán de sentido de deambular sorprendido de sus personajes" (Berenguer 46). Ángel Berenguer characterises Arrabal's works from 1952-57 as "Teatro de exilio y ceremonia" (36), although the descriptor *ceremonio* also appears in the titles of later works. He places Arrabal's *Guernica* on the cusp between his *Teatro de exilio y ceremonia* and his *Teatro pánico*. Saura also speaks of *pánico* in relation to Abstract Expressionist painting, which he links to his own (dis)figurative informalism: "Una naturaleza trascendida vese reflejada en una fusión dinámico-estática de carácter pánico, bajo formas no representativas, en las cuales todos los signos se deshacen en un fluir amoroso de intenso lirismo que deja paso a la presencia de un vacío casi absoluto" (*Fijeza* 10). An earlier Arrabal novel, *El entierro de la sardina* (1960), and also a Goya painting of the same title (1812-19), are drawn into the utterance "[d]esprecio el calendario democrático del país en el día del entierro de la raspa de la sardina del Guernica" (*Libelo* 23). Arrabal wrote "Saura" for the catalogue to *Peintures sur papier*, while Saura illustrated five of Arrabal's *relatos pánicos* for *Margen* (1966), *L'Odeur de la sainteté* (1974) and *Le Matin des amours* (1988).

26 On the 40th anniversary of the bombing, a full-sized replica of *Guernica* was constructed in Gernika as a backdrop for a memorial mass for the 1937 victims. Hirschel B. Chipp suggests that this invocation of *Guernica* was "less an attempt to recall the past than a manifesto in favour of present demands for Basque autonomy" (177).

logue: his polemical novel, *El Valle de los Caídos*, depicts a parallel art/history of the despotic reign of Fernando VII and the Franco dictatorship, in part through Goya's *El tres de Mayo* and Picasso's *Guernica* respectively. Previously, in *Diálogos para otra España*, he had more succinctly stated that "ambos cuadros denuncian el mismo crimen. . . . Denuncian incluso el mismo asesino" (242).

Finally, a contemporaneous visual artists' critique of the Neo-Francoists' participation in "tournaments of value" over *Guernica* is drawn into Saura's *Libelo* in the utterance:

> Odio las figuras recortadas y salidas del cuadro,
> tal como las pintó el Equipo Crónica, velando la
> noche de guerra en el Museo del Prado. (13)

Rafael Solbes and Manuel Valdés, Valencian artists who signed their work *Equipo Crónica*, produced eight variations on *Guernica* in specific protest of "Operación Retorno" (Oppler 126-27). The "figuras recortadas y salidas del cuadro" belong to the painting *La visita* (1969), in which the *dramatis personae* of *Guernica* leap from Picasso's painting – itself described as "[la] suerte de un siglo . . . denunciada en noche de Guerra" (Rojas, *Diálogos* 233)– into the museum's halls. Saura's phrase "velando la noche de guerra en el Museo del Prado" thus places the attempted Neo-Francoist appropriation of *Guernica* (and re-places the painting itself) on a war footing. Saura also draws in Rafael Alberti's 1956 play, *Noche de guerra en el Museo del Prado*. In a further semantic layer, this utterance recalls the Nationalists' bombardment of the Prado Museum during the Civil War, whilst they alleged the destruction of art treasures by the Republicans.[27] Both painting and utterance also function as a kind of prolepsis, a future tense in art: as Tusell notes, "[r]esulta muy curioso el hecho de [que] un cuadro del Equipo Crónica fechado en 1969 y titulado *La Visita*, profetizó la instalación del cuadro en el Casón errando tan sólo en la pared donde hacerlo" (269). The Casón del Buen Retiro would indeed eventually become *Guernica*'s

27 In November 1936, one month after Picasso's appointment as Director of the Prado, the museum was struck by artillery shells fired by Nationalist troops attempting to enter Madrid through the Casa del Campo. The German Condor Legion supported Franco's drive with bombing attacks. The Prado was severely damaged on the roof and upper floors. The Prado treasures followed the hurriedly evacuated government to València, where they were stored in the Museo Provincial de Pinturas and in the reinforced Torres dels Serrans. Picasso's close friend José Bergamín Gutiérrez was designated conservator and asked to report on the condition of the art after its journey and to take protective measures against air attacks on València. In February 1939, when the Nationalists were pressing into Catalunya, Julio Álvarez del Vayo organised the removal of the paintings from Figueres via Paris to Geneva, as Picasso had suggested, to be held at the then United Nations on behalf of the Spanish people (Chipp 7; Thomas 857; Renau, *Arte en peligro* 11). This aspect of Civil War history is also recalled in the utterance: "Odio el 'exorcismo mágico de los demonios del Guernica' y su renuncia de sacos terreros, aullidos de sirenas, museos desguazados y camiones repletos con destino a Ginebra" (*Libelo* 27). Josep Renau notes that the Nationalists falsely claimed that the Prado paintings had been "destruidas por el vandalismo rojo," or "vendidas a los rusos . . . [o] a los americanos," or "entregadas al Gobierno francés de Frente Popular. . . . Fueron tantas y tan absurdas las especies de este jaez que pululaban en la época, tanto en la prensa 'nacional' como en la 'gran' prensa internacional" (*Arte en peligro* 28).

'resting place' –and critiqued as such by Saura, as we shall see shortly– but under entirely different political conditions.

In this chapter, I have discussed a number of Saura's utterances which serve, at least in one semantic layer, to demonstrate (against) the re-signification of *Guernica* and Gernika through the dominant political discourses of two nodal points in Spanish history, the *dictadura* and the *dictablanda*. As "proto-ideological elements," or "floating signifiers," *Guernica* and Gernika do not have fixed meanings, but are "structured into a unified field through the intervention of a certain nodal point . . . which 'quilts' them, stops their sliding and fixes their meaning" (Žižek 87). In this analysis, what is at stake in the ideological struggle is which of the nodal points –Slavoj Žižek gives the example of political systems– succeeds in totalising such free-floating elements and thus controlling their meaning (88). Naturally, in relation to the Basque town, "[t]hose who are able to control the meanings related to that particular space hold important power" (Raento and Watson n. pag.). Saura's text resists the fixing of Gernika's 'meaning' through the nodal points of the *dictadura* and the *dictablanda*; or, in terms of representational politics, it resists (Neo-)Francoist re-presentations. As Anton Kaes argues, "the past . . . is not out there to be visited and photo-graphed like a foreign country; the past has always to be reconstructed and reconstituted, re-presented on the basis of re-presentations" (qtd. in Gómez López-Quiñones 135). Saura's revisionist history re-presents not only the representations of the Francoist and Neo-Francoist regimes and their international supporters, but also the representations of those 'unrepresented' under these regimes: the subjugated local memories, historical contents and knowledges of *la otra España*. Furthermore, Saura's dialogical utterances frequently cite dominant representations of *Guernica* and Gernika and simultaneously (in)cite resistance to these dominant representations, or discourses, through which (Neo-) Francoist power has been produced and reproduced. As Michel Foucault argues, "where there is power, there is resistance and yet, or rather consequently, this resistance is never in a position of exteriority to power" (*History of Sexuality* 95-96). Recommending the inversion of the first part of this proposal so that the statement may be better intuitively understood –"where there is resistance, there is power"– Foucault suggests that we use resistance "as a chemical catalyst so as to bring to light power relations, locate their position, find out their points of application and methods used" ("Afterword" 209, 211). This, I suggest, is one operation of *Contra el Guernica*. *Libelo*.

In drawing in the individual and social voices of practitioners and theorists of the visual and literary arts as 'pre-texts' to orchestrate his revisionist political history, Saura

also reproduces the actual interrelationship of art and politics in Spain (and Europe) in the 1930s and throughout the Franco regime, with repercussions for artists as well as those marginalised for strictly political reasons. Not only were modernist artists and artworks suppressed, so too were the institutions, publications and debates in aesthetics supporting and surrounding the *avant-gardes*. Through this process, Saura resuscitates these philosophical debates and simultaneously orchestrates a revisionist art history of *Guernica*, pointing to its constitution in the discourses of key Spanish and European figures such as Gaya, Renau, Rojas, Paulhan, Kemenov and Benjamin, and also 're-membering' the creative relationship, or *encadenamiento*, between Picasso and fellow artists and writers such as Goya, Arrabal, Alberti, Reverdy and the members of *Equipo Crónica*.

In all the utterances discussed, Saura draws attention to the multiplication of *Guernica*'s significations in accordance with the interrelated political and aesthetic discursive formations through which the reproduction, or indeed the original, is constituted, or, for Saura, 'framed.' It is precisely this discursive re-signification of *Guernica*, rather than the painting and its creator, that Saura satirises in *Contra el Guernica. Libelo.* These same themes will again be addressed in the following chapter, in relation to the nodal point of the Transition, when Saura penned his satire.

The 'return' of Guernica

On 24 October 1969, the French newspaper *Le Monde* published Florentino Pérez Embid's statement that *Guernica* should return to Spain. While Pérez Embid believed that "tenemos el deber de ofrecer a Picasso tanto cuanto se pueda y él se merece, de estar dispuesto a que el cuadro *Guernica* venga a España" (qtd. in Tusell 257), including "el inevitable señuelo del Prado, arma importante en manos de cualquier director general de Bellas Artes" (Tusell 257), Picasso's response to such ambitions, made through his lawyer Roland Dumas and published in *Le Monde* three weeks later, stated unequivocally that "[e]l *Guernica* solamente volverá a España con la República" (qtd. in Alix Trueba 109). On 14 December 1970 Picasso addressed MoMA, now stressing that *Guernica* should only be returned to the Spanish state "cuando las libertades públicas sean restablecidas en España" (qtd. in Tusell 258), and designating Dumas, or his proxy, as sole adjudicator of whether such liberties had been restored (Tusell 259; Alix Trueba 109). Picasso died at ninety-one, in April 1973, without any such change being effected in his native country.

Only General Franco's death on 20 November 1975 made possible the political 'conditions' of *Guernica*'s 'return.' On 22 November 1975 the Spanish monarchy was restored under Franco's designated successor, Juan Carlos I. The King subsequently chose Adolfo Suárez –previously Secretary General of Franco's *Movimiento Nacional*, but a proponent of institutional reform, to be attained in concert with the opposition parties– to replace Franco's more politically conservative Prime Minister, Carlos Arias Navarro. Suárez facilitated the introduction of a two-chamber parliamentary system; the *ley de la reforma política* of September 1976 recognised universal human rights and suffrage, the Spanish Communist Party (PCE) was legalised in 1977, and Spain's first free general elections since the Civil War were held on 15 December that year. Suárez's Central Democratic Union party (UCD) gained nearly half the seats in the *Cortes* while the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party (PSOE), led by Felipe González Márquez, received the second largest portion of the vote (Boeglin n. pag.).

Three months prior to the elections, the royally-appointed independent Republican Senator, Justino de Azcárate, had proposed the return of *Guernica* with the remains of King Alfonso XII, Niceto Alcalá Zamora and Manuel Azaña "como una demostración pacífica y unánime de la terminación definitiva de la Guerra Civil" (qtd. in Tusell 262). On 19 October 1977 the Senate had approved a similar proposal to formally solicit the return

of *Guernica* by MoMA (Tusell 262). This round in a new series of "tournaments of value" over *Guernica* is recalled in the utterance:

> Desprecio el "involuntario regreso del cadáver artístico del Guernica organizado por el necrofílico servicio de recuperación de ilustres españoles que nunca desearon retornar a su patria en vida." (40)

However, I would argue that the morbid phraseology of this (un)cited individual voice is also drawn into *Contra el Guernica. Libelo* to orchestrate Saura's theme of the 'death' of *Guernica* on its return to Spain six years later, in 1981. If, in Spain, "cuando se murió el dictador en 1975, su obra política fue enterrada con él" (Malefakis 664), 'in return,' Picasso's *obra política* too, would, in Saura's *Libelo*, 'die,' and indeed be embalmed (16), lie in State (16), receive a burial (21, 23, 27), and rest in peace (16) through its re-signification in the dominant discourses and institutions of the Transition. Once again, the individual and social voices drawn into *Contra el Guernica* to orchestrate variations on the theme of *Guernica*'s demise simultaneously resuscitate twentieth-century debates in art, and particularly museology, 're-membering' the early autopsies conducted over *Guernica* by the left and also the moribund art criticism and character assassinations penned by the right.

In 1931, the Marxist critic Francisco Mateos announced the death of Picasso's art: "La pintura anticolectiva, desde Rafael a Picasso, ha tenido el tránsito y el ritmo de una vida, y hoy asistimos a su muerte con una poca de indiferencia. . . . La pintura burguesa ha muerto; volvamos a empezar" (287-88). In 1935, the fascist writer Ernesto Giménez Caballero similarly characterised Picasso's "*pintura pura*, o cubista," and also "la variante 'surrealista'" (389, 391), as cadaverous and suicidal art, and branded the artist a charlatan:

> El *hermetismo purista* ha valido para que todos vayamos descubriendo poco a poco que en el santuario no había dioses, sino unos cuantos charlatanes aprovechados, profesionales del hieratismo y de la farsa. El *arte puro*, a fuerza de destilaciones y más destilaciones, ha terminado por no tener nada que destilar y trabajar en vacío. Sutilizando el ímpetu poético, adelgazando la vitalidad creadora, ha llegado el arte puro a una pura forma ósea, rígida; a una mueca glacial y cadavérica. Un verdadero suicidio. A un quitarse la vida que aún le sostenía. . . . No es de extrañar que, a fin de cuentas, los rusos bolcheviques hayan desdeñado a Picasso como a un burgués de la "intelighentsia." (388, 391)

As Giménez Caballero suggests, many Soviets did indeed link Picasso's 'dying' *arte puro*, or 'art for art's sake,' to his 'dying class.'[1] In 1947, in a criticism of *Guernica* specifically,

1 The 1947 Soviet denunciation of the *avant-garde* declared:

> Even those formalists, who, like Picasso, have repeatedly professed sympathy for the struggle of democracy against fascism show a marked unwillingness to apply the progressive aspects of their world outlook to their artistic practice. . . . By proclaiming 'art for art's sake,' void of all contact with the struggle, aspirations and interests of the

the Marxist philosopher and art historian Max Raphael likewise placed Picasso squarely among the decadent bourgeoisie: "Picasso, the greatest artist of our time, was unequal to the challenge of his age, belonging as he did to a class and intellectual climate which had outlived their usefulness" (qtd in Oppler 265).

Since, for many Marxist thinkers, "la llamada a la revolución interior del Surrealismo . . . conflict[ó] con la revolución colectiva" (Brihuega, [Introduction] 14), the alliance between the Communists and surrealists was severely strained.[2] Nevertheless, surrealism in fact represented a break with 'pure' art, in favour of greater political compromise. While in the 1910s and 1920s strategies for artistic renovation had become "medio cristalizadas en torno a la retórica de la 'pureza,'" with the advent of the Spanish Second Republic and the Civil War, "los años 30 se v[iero]n invadidos de una manera estrepitosa y súbita por la problemática del compromiso político de las artes plásticas, . . . el Surrealismo . . . se revel[ó] como una de nuestras opciones vanguardistas" (Brihuega, [Introduction] 13-14). Likewise, Javier Tusell suggests: "A la estética de la 'pureza' le sustituyó la del compromiso político y . . . las fórmulas poscubistas y posfauvistas, que habían sido mayoritarias en el Salón de 1925, se vieron amenazadas por el mucho más inquietante (y más subversivo en lo político) surrealismo" (188). In the utterance,

> Detesto al Guernica porque a pesar de llegar drogado, disfrazado con la peluca del arte por el arte, arropado de beato y sospechoso pacifismo, no fue detenido en el aeropuerto ni será juzgado ni condenado a la hoguera nacional (22),

Guernica's arrival, "drogado, disfrazado con la peluca del arte por el arte, arropado de beato y sospechoso pacifismo," therefore infers a cover-up of the painting's subversive (super)reality, also recalling its representation in both fascist and Marxist discourses.[3] However, Jaime Brihuega notes that "prácticamente el único proyecto artístico lanzado desde la derecha con un talante explícitamente político fue *El Arte y el Estado* de Giménez Caballero," quoted above. In contrast with the political left, "[e]n general, los intelectuales

---

wide masses, . . . they are are playing into the hands of the decadent bourgeoisie who in their efforts to preserve their domination look with hatred upon the development of the consciousness of the masses . . . upon any rousing of their activity through the means of realistic art rich in ideological content. (Kemenov 657-58)

2 Jaime Brihuega records that, until 1932, "el Surrealismo francés . . . mantiene buenas relaciones con el Partido Comunista; a partir de 1933 comienzan a producirse fricciones (aunque todavía aparecen números de *Le Surréalisme au service de la Révolution*); en 1935 y tras los enfrentamientos surgidos en el Congreso de los Escritores para la Defensa de la Cultura, de París, el Surrealismo y el Comunismo rompen definitivamente" ([Introduction] 14-15 n6).

3 The phrase "disfrazado con la peluca" perhaps also draws in a contemporary comment in the press regarding the return from exile of Santiago Carrillo. In a later, satirical newspaper article, Antonio Burgos wrote that "[e]n aquellos días volvían todos los exiliados . . . había vuelto Santiago Carrillo para incorporar su peluca al Museo de la Transición. La clandestinidad de los comunistas se acabó el día que Carrillo se quitó su peluca, de modo que nunca se sabe si . . . Suárez legalizó el PCE o legalizó la peluca de Carrillo" (n. pag.).

y artistas con una ideología política de derecha permanecieron junto a los que (independientemente de una orientación determinada) propugnaban la idea de una incontaminación política del arte, fuese éste o no de vanguardia" ([Introduction] 48-49). Dressed in apolitical, beatific and pacifist disguise, the Republican propaganda painting is thus not merely 'suited' to, but fully assimilated to, the right-wing camp. Saura orchestrates his own 'redress' over *Guernica*'s 'investment' with suspect significations, and the coerced collective amnesia regarding recent Spanish (art) history, by reminding that Nationalist aesthetics/politics would in fact have condemned *Guernica* –as they did Gernika– to "la hoguera nacional." As the ex-Republican Ambassador Luis Araquistáin noted in a letter to Picasso in 1953: "[E]l cuadro se encuentra en poder de usted y no [ha] recalado en la España actual, donde probablemente lo habría destruido en un auto de fe por su significación política e histórica" (qtd. in Tusell 253).

In *Contra el Guernica*, *Guernica*'s 'death' is not the result of a suicidal style, representative of a dying class, but rather this representative of the murdered classes was 'killed' through the dominant discourses of Transitional Spain:

> Detesto el final de la transición sellada artística-
> mente por la puntilla y descabello del Guernica. (26)

In a witty exchange of Transition discourse, *jerga taurina* and Picasso-speak, *Guernica* seals Spain's Transition through (its own) ritual slaughter. Spain's Transition was in fact triply "sellada artísticamente" by *Guernica*: the arrival of the 'Red' painting purportedly sealed artistically the political Transition and, as modernist masterpiece, likewise sealed the artistic, or cultural Transition. This double event was further commemorated in the printing of one of the world's largest postage stamps,[4] timed to coincide with Picasso's centenary and the opening of the *Guernica* exhibition to the public on 25 September 1981. 'In return,' however, *Guernica* was 'finished off,' its *grito* silenced in the "descabello," or *coup de grâce* of its re-signification in dominant Transition discourses. Drawn into dialogue here is Picasso's exclamation: "Finish a work! Complete a picture? How absurd. To finish an object means to finish it, to destroy it, to rob it of its soul, to give it the '*puntilla*' as to the bull in the ring" (qtd. in Penrose 486).

Indeed, at this new nodal point in Spanish (art) history, *Guernica* was once more 'repressed' into service: its imminent return heralded in dominant discourses –reproduced *ad*

4 Some protested the fact that the stamp had been printed from an old copy of *Guernica*, not a recent photograph (Oppler 135 n179). Many would have recalled that Franco had returned to sender a letter bearing a 1966 Czechoslovakian stamp of *Guernica* commemorating the thirtieth anniversary of the International Brigades, "deemed doubly illegal under the provision of Article 28, Section 1d of the Universal Postal Union Treaty of Vienna of 1965" (Chipp 170).

nauseum in Spanish and international newspapers– as signifying the completion of Spain's transition to both political and cultural modernity:

> Para *Pueblo* el *Guernica* significaba "la consolidación de la democracia". *El País* . . . declaró que, con su llegada, "la Guerra Civil ha terminado," . . . *Diario 16* tituló su editorial "Una pintura para todos". De hecho, el *Guernica*, otrora testigo de la enconada división de los españoles durante la Guerra Civil, se había convertido ahora en un símbolo de reconciliación nacional. *ABC* lo definió . . . como "el último exiliado de la Guerra Civil". La prensa internacional también destacó el carácter simbólico que el cuadro había adquirido desde 1937 y el significado que tenía para una España democrática. (Tusell 275)

Tusell, the then *DG de BA*, himself reproduced this discourse in relation to the cultural transition: "*El País* . . . publicó un artículo mío, en el que se definía aquella llegada al hogar como la transición final a una democracia en el terreno cultural" (275).

Saura notes the irony, and inveighs against the sheer hypocrisy of "la satisfacción política y artística declarada a la llegada del Guernica, ya que es bien sabido que el arte no debe nunca mezclarse con la política" (*Libelo* 13). Playing on Clement Greenberg's highly influential exposition of modernist art's essential separateness from social and political circumstances, "Modernist Painting" (1961), Saura reminds of the modernist icon *Guernica*'s actual political content and context: to have made left-wing political art in Nationalist controlled Spain in 1937 would have been a life-threatening undertaking. Picasso was reviled during the Franco regime, for his politics and his art. Now all this was to be forgotten in the purposes of national reconciliation and nation building. In dominant discourses, *Guernica* now signified neither the atrocity of Gernika, nor a partisan position, nor even the brutality and horrors of war in general, but peace, reconciliation and democracy. Through this latest diversion in its cultural trajectory, *Guernica* was now the agent of Spain's value definition as politically and culturally democratic and modern.

In relation to the political sphere, glib, aphoristic reproductions of these dominant Transition discourses are cited and slighted in utterances such as "[o]dio al Guernica, embajador de concordia" (*Libelo* 9); "[o]dio al Guernica, consuelo de democracias" (9); and "[o]dio la entrada en la OTAN del Guernica" (22). Spain was excluded from the United Nations at Potsdam in 1945, after the allied defeat of fascism in World War II. For the *vencidos*, her entry to the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO, or OTAN in Spanish) should (only) come to pass with a return to democracy. As José María de Areilza notes,

> el exilio español no comunista jugaba la carta europea en Francia, Gran Bretaña, Italia o el Benelux, y personalidades notorias del PSOE abogaban por el ingreso de España en la OTAN tan pronto como desapareciese la dictadura franquista y se restableciera la democracia plenaria en nuestro país. (42)

As we have read, the re-establishment of Republican liberties, or democratic freedoms, was also Picasso's requirement for the delivery of *Guernica* to the Spanish State. Thus the political and economic 'return' of the formerly partisan *Guernica* – agent of Spain's value definition as democratic and modern– was her access to institutions such as NATO.[5]

In Saura's *Libelo*, the constituting discourses of Spain's unity and democracy, centred on *Guernica*'s return, and the attribution of agency to *Guernica* in these discourses, are drawn into dialogue with various subjugated social voices in the semantic layers of utterances such as "[d]esprecio la caja de caudales del Guernica conteniendo 'un solo grito, el de la paz'" (16), in which the high returns from *Guernica*'s circulation in the present ideological regime of value carry a literal and metaphorical cost, the latter evidenced in the uneasy, even oxymoronic, juxtaposition, or assimilation, of "grito" to "paz";[6] "[d]etesto la urna electoral 'con una sola papeleta' del catafalco del Guernica" (16), in which the metaphor of the democratic electoral box[7] is superseded by the metaphor of democracy dying, or 'lying' in (the Spanish) State; "[d]esprecio al Guernica porque su llegada 'cierra un capítulo de agravios y venganzas culturales por motivos estrictamente políticos'" (22), in which, through a change in punctuation, political motives are attributed to, rather than ended by, *Guernica*'s arrival; and "[d]etesto y celebro a un tiempo 'el regreso del último exiliado, el último viaje del Guernica', en la gozosa certeza de su aniquilamiento" (43). While many Spaniards may genuinely have taken delight in *Guernica*'s arrival, they may nevertheless have detested the loss of its signification of resistance to the Franco regime: *Guernica*'s 'death' as a sign/site of this resistance. More hostile voices are heard to anticipate with pleasure the annihilation of *Guernica*'s ability to exhibit their anti-democratic and exclusionary tendencies to the world: "[L]a gozosa certeza de su aniquilamiento" (43).

A related utterance, "[o]dio el nuevo exilio del Guernica" (10), makes explicit the alienation felt by the sectors of Spanish society for whom long struggled-for political conditions –revolutionary society/return of the Republic/regional self-rule– had not been realised in Spain, such that they, and *Guernica*, faced internal exile.[8] While the nightmare

5 Spain in fact finalised her membership of this organisation on 8 October 1981, one month after the arrival of *Guernica* in Madrid and a fortnight before the exhibition of this painting and related works was opened to the public.

6 I have not identified the individual voice cited in this utterance; however the context is that of the "militant pacifism" of the collective agreement to renounce revenge during the transition to democracy (Preston 41).

7 Javier Tusell notes: "Fue frecuente la comparación de la protección acristalada del cuadro a una urna electoral destinada a recibir votos pacíficos de los españoles" (276).

8 Neither fully centralist nor federalist in terms of territorial organisation, the Constitution of 1978 created "un Estado sin nación predominante, pero donde conviven las diversas naciones presentes," open to further devolution. Fourteen members of Congress, including the PNV representatives, abstained from voting on the Constitution, as did 33% of Spaniards in the public vote to approve the text, held on 6 December 1978. It also made Spain a secular state (Boeglin n. pag.).

of Francoism *per se* had ended, Spain was now a parliamentary monarchy, and the left had reason to fear the restored Monarchy for its links with the Army and with Francoism:

> [U]na izquierda política y social que había sufrido mucho bajo el franquismo . . . entraba en escena con una fuerte tradición republicana y un rechazo histórico de la monarquía. Tenía muchas razones para ello, viniendo como venía de un siglo XIX y un siglo XX tan espantosos en el que la monarquía española había recurrido una y otra vez a unos militares derrotados en Cuba y Filipinas para perseguir a los trabajadores, había accedido a un primer ensayo de dictadura con el general Primo de Rivera y finalmente parecía haber aceptado el paraguas del franquismo para sobrevivir. (Solé Tura n. pag.)

While elections had again been held in 1979, the Socialists would not govern alone until 1982. For the political left and regional separatists, then, "la llegada del Guernica" meant the "fin de una pesadilla de cuarenta y dos años y comienzo de otra" (*Libelo* 11).[9]

In the following two utterances, Saura draws attention to the 'significance' of *Guernica*'s military escort and royal 'accommodation': an acceptance *of*, as well as *by*, the institutions and apparatus of power:

> Odio al Guernica porque a su llegada a Madrid a las 8,35 en el jumbo "Lope de Vega"[10] tras una espera de cuarenta y cuatro años fue escoltado por la fuerza pública. (8)

Here, Saura's *ironía asociativa* draws in Picasso's historical rejection of *Guernica*'s being "escoltado por la fuerza pública" when, in 1934, Spanish Republican authorities wishing to exhibit his paintings lacked the funds to insure them, proposing instead their escort by the Guardia Civil: "Picasso was not placated by the promise of a military escort: the Guardia Civil had come to symbolize for Picasso's coterie –made up in large part of artists of anarchistic thought– the persecution of freethinkers and Gypsies" (Chipp 4). Accordingly, "la exposición acabó realizándose tanto en Barcelona como en Madrid gracias a una entidad de carácter privado como fue ADLAN [*Amigos de Las Artes Nuevas*]" (Tusell 190). Forty-four years late(r), Saura complains: we finally have *Guernica*, but the self-same lackeys of the institutions of power that stifled progressive political and artistic expression in Spain,

9 For the survivors of Gernika, these events no doubt caused literally recurring nightmares; in 1939, during the exhibition of *Guernica* in Manchester, the *Evening Chronicle* headline announced "'Nightmare' Picture of Guernica Bombing Comes to City" (qtd. in Chipp 158): respectively a further signified, and pre-textual referent, of this utterance.

10 The irony of arriving in Iberian Airlines' jumbo *Lope de Vega* (flight IB 952) may lie in the appropriation of the 'great' Lope by José María Pemán, noted on page 41, when, for others, "los Lope de Vega [son] pregonadores de todas las mediocridades de su tiempo" [in the sense of social realism] (Pérez Mink 395). Saura may also 're-cite' Octavio Paz's comparison of Picasso and Lope: "[T]he same eccentric relation between the artist and his public"; the "erotic life of the two artists and their works"; their "inexhaustible fecundity" (177-78). While this text was published post-*Libelo*, this may not be Paz's first expression of these ideas. Paz is explicitly cited in *Libelo* (31). Lope's line "Is this fury then so great?" is also quoted in relation to Picasso's anger over the atrocity, and to *Guernica* (Oppler 211).

and ripped the 'Red,' 'anti-Spain' painting from its walls, are now permitted physically and symbolically to (re)locate it within the institutions and discursive formations of that power:

> Odio la osamenta del Guernica que regresa a la patria con honores castrenses "para ocupar su nicho en el cementerio de desmemoriados pro-boscídeos nacionales." (8)

In resistance to the tribute of "honores castrenses" to *Guernica*'s returning 'bones,' and to the painting's further re-signification through its location in an edifice of the (restored) Bourbon dynasty, Saura attributes *Guernica*'s returning *as* a lifeless skeleton precisely to its collusion with these institutions: to its acceptance of a military escort and a (funeral) niche in the prestigious Prado Museum. The individual voice drawn into dialogue in this utterance reminds that the Prado was originally the Academy of Sciences, a natural-history museum designed in 1787 by Juan de Villanueva for the enlightened, but absolutist, Carlos III (Hughes, *Goya* 69, 149): "[E]l cementerio de desmemoriados proboscídeos nacionales" – the museum/mausoleum of forgetful national(ist) 'big-noses,' both royal and elephantine. By conflating popular caricatures of the prominent Bourbon nose with the trunks of the proboscideans formerly displayed in their museum, Saura suggests the defunctness or 'museal' nature of both the Bourbon dynasty and the Prado (which also houses their deceased ancestors' portraits). Since it is popularly held that an elephant never forgets, Saura also satirises the apparent 'amnesia' of the reinstalled monarchy. He reminds that the new determining socio-political circumstances of *Guernica*, lest *we* forget, are the military, the Bourbon dynasty currently represented by Juan Carlos I (and the aristocracy in general – historically supporters of the conservatives and the Catholic Church, and largely against the Republic in the Civil War[11]), and the museum as theorised by Theodor W. Adorno:

> The German word museal [museumlike] has unpleasant overtones. It describes objects to which the observer no longer has a vital relationship and which are in the process of dying. They owe their preservation more to historical respect than to the needs of the present. Museum and mausoleum are connected by more than phonetic association. Museums are the family sepulchres of works of art. (Qtd. in Crimp 49)

11 In a foreword to *The New State* by the Carlist writer Víctor Pradera, Don Juan de Borbón commented on the atrocities in the Spanish Civil War: "Surely there is a universe of difference between accidentally killing civilians while attacking military objectives, and deliberately murdering men, women and children in cold blood" (qtd. in Southworth 237). Southworth notes: "It is not clear to which incidents he was referring with the words 'accidentally killing civilians while attacking military objectives.' Did not he mean the destruction of Guernica? Perhaps. He then stated: 'The Badajoz and Guernica myths have been analyzed and refuted in Mr. Robert Sencourt's admirable book, *Spain's Ordeal*. I need deal no further with those points.'" (237)

Before addressing further variations on the theme of *Guernica*'s 'museal' mortality amidst an inappropriate (taxonomical) family, I wish to return to a second semantic layer of the "nuevo exilio del Guernica" (*Libelo* 10): the painting's literal, geographical exile within Spain. For some social voices, both *Guernica* and Gernika remained in physical exile: the Basque town not in Euskadi, but Spain; its monument not in Gernika, but Madrid. Tusell, who was ultimately responsible for deciding *Guernica*'s Spanish destination, insists that it was necessary to elect a specific venue to prevent further stalling by the other parties involved in the negotiations over the return(s) of *Guernica*, since Picasso's descendants now claimed *droits morals* over the painting's transfer. In a letter from Jacqueline Roque to Adolfo Suárez, "sugerida por quienes negociábamos el retorno por parte de España," Picasso's widow reminded the President that the artist had repeatedly expressed the wish that *Guernica* and its studies be housed in the Prado Museum (Tusell 265-68). Tusell suggests:

> No se hizo por deseo de que un Estado central impusiera la ubicación del cuadro en su capital sino, al margen de que ésa fue siempre la voluntad inequívoca de Picasso, por lo positivo que iba a ser despejar un interrogante que no podía servir sino para favorecer maniobras dilatorias. (265)

In further justification of his choice of the Prado, he notes:

> En mayo [de 1980], el vespertino madrileño consultó a un importante grupo de intelectuales, políticos y artistas acerca de la instalación del cuadro. La opinión expresada con más frecuencia favoreció al Museo del Prado. Durante el verano, período en que, como veremos, se llevaron a cabo las obras de remodelación del Casón del Buen Retiro para alojar el cuadro, una encuesta realizada por una revista madrileña puso de manifiesto que casi el 40 por 100 de los españoles consultados quería que éste fuera instalado en el Prado, mientras que 20 por 100 se inclinaba a favor de Barcelona, el 10 por 100 a favor de Guernica y el 7 por 100 a favor de Málaga. La decisión acerca de la localización del cuadro prevista por Picasso y por los responsables de la política cultural de entonces se vio así ratificada por la opinión pública. (266)

These "tournaments of value" conducted between different groups within Spain over the possession of *Guernica* are drawn into Saura's *Libelo* through the subjugated social voices, and choices, of the people of Barcelona, Málaga and, repeatedly, Euskadi:

> Detesto al Guernica "porque nosotros pusimos los
> muertos y ellos disfrutan del cuadro." (10)

> Odio al Guernica porque debiendo permanecer
> castigado en un pueblo vasco, prefirió residir en
> Madrid en un amplio hotel con aire acondicionado. (15)

> Odio a quienes en Málaga, chica patria del pintor,
> prefieren que el cuadro, en lugar de agusanarse,

> "se quede en Madrid para que sea contemplado por muchas más personas." (42)
>
> Detesto al Guernica porque el hecho de permanecer en la capital del reino "no vamos a sentir la misma emoción que si lo viéramos en nuestra tierra." (42)
>
> Odio especialmente a los vascos y catalanes que reclaman insistentemente la goma de borrar del Guernica. (43)

Josefina Alix Trueba notes that, as early as 1977, "[e]n el País Vasco com[enzaban] a alzarse voces para que el *Guernica* [fuese] instalado en el Museo de Bellas Artes de Bilbao o en la propia villa de Guernica" (112). On 28 September 1981, Javier Angulo reported that "una campaña a favor de la instalación del 'Guernica' en la villa foral del mismo nombre . . . ha[bía] sido promovida por la comisión de la investigación del bombardeo de Guernica." This group held that the UCD Government "est[aba] utilizando la obra como tapadera democrática de una política centralista y represiva" with respect to Euskadi (pag. illeg.), and planned a public demonstration which, in the words of their manifesto, should reflect the

> protesta del pueblo de Euskadi por el secuestro del *Guernica* y la denuncia de la creciente represión sobre el pueblo vasco, en contraste con la falsa imagen que . . . el Gobierno de UCD pretenderá dar al mundo con la *solemne* e hipócrita apertura de una exposición de Picasso en Madrid. (Qtd. in Angulo pag. illeg.)

On *Guernica*'s eventual arrival in Madrid on 11 September 1981, the Basque Nationalist Party declared bluntly at Gernika: "Nosotros pusimos los muertos y ellos se quedan con el cuadro" (qtd. in Tusell 275), as 're-cited' in Saura's utterance listed above. For these social voices, the installation of *Guernica* in Madrid thus implied the "auténtico secuestro cultural realizado por el gobierno de Madrid," quoted, but minimised by Tusell: "No obstante, las protestas se apagaron poco después, y la insistencia inicial en que el cuadro fue instalado en la villa vasca de *Guernica* sólo fue mantenida formalmente como vindicación política, aunque . . . se mantendría con el transcurso del tiempo" (275-76).

While in one semantic layer of the utterance, "[d]etesto la broma pesada del megalómano y falso director del Prado que exigió en su testamento la introducción en el Museo de su propia obra" (*Libelo* 44), the "megalómano y falso director del Prado" is Picasso, in a further semantic layer it is Tusell, a key player in the latest "tournament of value" over *Guernica*, who demands the painting's placement in the Prado as the legacy of his own

(imminent) directorship of the museum.[12] Indeed, Picasso left no last will and testament, nor written request that *Guernica* be hung in the Prado (Tusell 265). In reply to Tusell's (no doubt valid) argument that "[l]a propia política museística seguida, con los nombramientos de un Pérez de Ayala para la dirección del Museo del Prado (o un Picasso, ya estallada la Guerra Civil) merecería hoy en día severas críticas" (190), (un)cited voices[13] call into question Tusell's own museological policies, specifically the 'inter(n)ment' of the living, partisan-political *Guernica* –"dolor al rojo vivo" (Rafael Alberti, qtd. in *Libelo* 20)– in the Prado 'mausoleum,' or, for his predecessor Josep Renau, 'jail': physically/ discursively/taxonomically separated from its geographical, political and art-relations.[14]

Renau, the Communist *DG de BA* and instigator of Picasso's directorship of the Prado in 1936, apparently shared Adorno's thesis of "*museal* mortality as a necessary effect of an institution caught in the contradictions of its culture and therefore extending to every object contained there" (Crimp 50). For Renau, the "pesadilla taxonómica" and other

> concepciones museológicas en la exhibición pública usual de obras y objetos de arte, abstraídos de su función histórica real y encerrados *en las mismas jaulas* [representaban] el arte al servicio de especialistas y eruditos, y no los especialistas, los eruditos y el arte al servicio de las gentes. . . . El carácter de clase [del Prado] era manifiesto y estaba directamente ligado a la *función específica* que el "gran arte" –antiguo como moderno– ejerce en nuestros tiempos. (199 n6)

He accordingly argued:

> Los valores de nuestro pasado histórico no pueden continuar por más tiempo condenados a la estrechez de los museos, entre las manos del eruditismo profesional. El arte [del pasado] [sic] no es un patrimonio exclusivo de las ideologías muertas. Su dinamismo vital no puede realizarse al margen de las relaciones sociales, de las fuerzas productivas de la humanidad. (16)

12 While the directorship of the Prado was a source of pride to Picasso, he ignored the written entreaties and enticements of Renau and Wenceslao Roces to return forthwith to Spain to take up this position (Alix Trueba 21-23).

13 Tusell notes that the "director del Prado dimitió de su cargo a mediados de octubre, arguyendo que no se le había consultado sobre su instalación. Así era pero ni había expresado su disconformidad hasta entonces ni tampoco había la posibilidad de informarle de lo que iba a suceder por las razones de seguridad indicadas. En cambio la remodelación recibió la aprobación general de los expertos, incluidos los del Museum of Modern Art" (276). I suggest that his resignation is cited in the utterance: "Odio al Guernica, conciliador de dimisiones" (*Libelo* 11), which may also refer to President Suárez's resignation on 29 January 1981.

14 However, this does not imply that Saura concurs with demands that *Guernica* hang in Gernika. Saura in fact contends this proposition:

> El argumento moral de la necesidad de la presencia del *Guernica* en el País Vasco difícilmente se justifica frente a los daños que acarrearían su transporte. Es, precisamente, por su valor artístico y su contenido simbólico por lo que esta importante pintura no debe nunca más viajar y ser sometida a un riesgo innecesario. No debe permitirse la degradación de una obra que, para bien o para mal, se ha convertido en algo más que una pintura. El símbolo afectivo no solamente de la terrible destrucción de una ciudad vasca, sino de la guerra civil española por entero. Por esto, la desgraciada frase "nosotros recibimos las bombas y ellos se quedan con el arte", que suena a rastrera falacia política, además de ser una expresión tramposa, demagógica, que demuestra el desconocimiento de una obra tan significativa para la cultura española, resulta insoportable; todavía más para quienes conocieron la guerra civil y sufrieron de cañonazos y bombardeos. ("Para salvar el Guernica" n. pag.)

As an alternative to these moribund ideologies and institutions, Renau advocated the creation of popular museums,

> submuseos o supermuseos –es igual– en los que diversas obras y objetos de arte . . . pudieran *convivir* sin discriminación de géneros y especies y rememorar didácticamente la que había sido su función e inter-función en los distintos y sucesivos tiempoespacios sociales en que nacieron y vivieron. (199 n6)

Further complicating claims over the possession of *Guernica*, Saura adds his own voice to the dissenters of Málaga, Barcelona and Euskadi, and the Cuenca Museum to the possible destinations of *Guernica*, precisely on Renau's grounds of *convivencia*:

> Detesto al Guernica porque no escogió como última morada al Museo de Cuenca en donde hubiera gozado de agradable compañía. (37)

In the phrase "última morada," or "last resting place," Saura again alludes to the 'museal' 'death' of *Guernica*, here mitigated by the offer of agreeable company in the Cuenca Museo de Arte Abstracto Español: the offer of an afterlife. This utterance reminds that Francoist Spain, and consequently Transitional Spain, lacked the infrastructure for modern and contemporary art. As Juan Manuel Bonet notes, "el retorno a la democracia . . . trajo consigo nuevas realidades . . . en el ámbito de las infraestructuras culturales. . . . Al Estado le cupo, de 1977 en adelante, la tarea de recuperar el tiempo perdido, mostrando el arte español no visto hasta entonces" (20).[15] The permanent collection of the Centro de Arte Reina Sofía, where *Guernica* finally "[ha] hallado conveniente morada" (Saura, "Para salvar el Guernica" n. pag.), would not be inaugurated until September 1992. Besides the Museo de Arte Contemporáneo in Madrid –renovated in the 1960s, and lacking significant Picassos and modernist works generally (Bonet 12)– the privately organised Cuenca Museum held the most important modern, 'dissident' art collection, including works by *El Paso* and Saura himself, "en donde [*Guernica*] hubiera gozado de agradable compañía." Saura thus claims *Guernica*'s compatibility with the dark "estética de Cuenca" (18) as opposed to that of the 'Old Masters' of the Prado, and posits the Cuenca Museum as a "museo popular" in which *Guernica* might speak, among friends, of the conditions of its making rather than of its superficial attributes. In this utterance, then, Saura insinuates his own work while simultaneously drawing in Renau's/Adorno's critiques of the museum as an instrument of power, and contesting the dominant discourse of Spain's completed

15 In 1995, in critique of post-1936 museum practice generally, and the collection policy of the Reina Sofía specifically, Saura himself commented: "Al menos por ahora, y a pesar de algunas adquisiciones recientes, ciertamente tímidas, se trata de un museo verdaderamente necrofílico, una manifestación de los beneficios del *viva la muerte*" (*Fijeza* 354).

transition to modernity in the cultural sphere, also purportedly sealed by *Guernica*'s 'return.'

Interviewed on *Guernica*'s departure from the United States, the chief curator of painting and sculpture at MoMA, William S. Rubin,[16] indeed declared that Picasso's painting could not only become a symbol of national reconciliation, "the final act in the closing of the Civil War," but could also "annihilate the last vestiges of parochialism" in the arts in Spain (qtd. in Oppler 135 n180). Saura cites this faithful reproducer of the dominant Transition discourses in the utterance:

> Detesto al director del Museo de Arte Moderno
> de Nueva York, quien afirmó que el Guernica
> "puede borrar los últimos vestigios de parroquia-
> lismo en el arte español." (44)

Further voices contest Rubin's (and the Spanish State's) claim that the arrival of this single, albeit major, modernist masterpiece signified Spain's fully-fledged modernity in the cultural sphere, and particularly any notion of a new, unified Spanish appreciation of *Guernica*, by claiming that this painting was in fact a "rotten prize" for choosing democracy:

> Odio el premio podrido del Guernica concedido a
> los españoles por sus méritos en las oposiciones
> de ingreso a la democracia. (36)

In the phrases "premio podrido del Guernica" and "oposiciones de ingreso," the codes of art and politics, *Guernica* and Gernika, are overlaid. "Oposiciones de ingreso" are held to enter government positions and also art academies. Picasso's own outstanding "méritos en las oposiciones de ingreso" are recorded by his biographers; however, the outdated parameters of the Academy meant that Picasso spent little time in this institution.[17] From the beginning of the twentieth century, these anti-modern parameters were also reflected in the lucrative prizes awarded to academic (frequently History) paintings in *Las Exposiciones Nacionales*, in Tusell's words, "premios inaceptables, . . . objeto[s] de fuertas críticas" (230, 232). As noted, in the predominantly conservative artistic climate of the 1930s, the much vaunted Picasso exhibition only came to fruition through private channels at the end

16 As chief curators of MoMA, Rubin and Alfred H. Barr Jr. "were . . . key 'namers', whose exhibitions and catalogues produced the history of modern art, making particular interpretations and allotting values to the art objects brought within the museum's canon" (Frascina and Harris, "Intro III" 173). The loss of *Guernica* in the current "tournament of value" over the painting conversely inhered a loss to the status of MoMA's curators as 'keepers' of modernist art.

17 At fourteen, Picasso successfully completed the entry examination to the higher class at the Academy of Fine Arts, Barcelona, for which one month was normally prescribed, in only one day. Penrose notes: "There could be no hesitation on the part of the jury. They were at once convinced that they were faced, for the first and perhaps the last time, with a prodigy" (33). In October 1897, at age sixteen, Picasso again passed in one day the entrance exam for the Royal Academy of San Fernando in Madrid. Penrose suggests, however, that Picasso found the courses laid down by his professors at the Academy stultifying, and spent more time at the Prado (39).

of the Republican period (232). No Picasso painting would have received an official prize even at this time. Thus, in one semantic layer of this utterance, Saura recalls the lack of appreciation of Picasso's and of *avant-garde* painting generally in Spain in the decades of the notorious "premios podridos."[18]

In the context of the Transition, the "premio podrido del Guernica" –either *to* or *of* a now 40 year-old painting– may allude to a lack of appreciation of the *neo*-vanguards, to a current cultural backwardness that undermines any claims to artistic modernity. "Rotten prizes" went both ways however. At the Carnegie International Exhibition of 1937, the award of the first prize in painting to George Braque's *The Yellow Tablecloth* antagonised the Sanity in Art Movement. Hirschel B. Chipp notes that this extended controversy hung over *Guernica*'s exhibition in San Francisco in 1939 (163). More definitely, among the most artistically and politically conservative Spaniards, any prize to or of *Guernica* was rotten full stop. The award of *Guernica* to Spain for her (re-)entry into democracy during the Transition constitutes a fine repri(ze/se/sal), then, since the "premio podrido" for Spain's entry into democracy during the Second Republic –Gernika, the 'masterpiece' decried by Senator William Borah– was dealt out by precisely the most artistically and politically reactionary Spaniards. These social voices are among those heard hating *Guernica*'s entry into the Prado in 1981:

> Odio la irrupción del toro de Guernica en una tienda
> de porcelanas. (15)

Here, Saura shares another in-joke with the art fraternity: in 1981 the Basque painter José María Ucelay recalled that when Picasso had claimed not to know what a bombed town looked like, Juan Larrea had likened its appearance to "a bull in a china shop, run amok" (qtd. in Van Hensbergen 33).[19] When *Guernica* toured the US in 1940-41, the American painter Frederic Taubes declared –knowingly or coincidentally– that *Guernica*'s images might suggest, precisely, "*The Bull in a China Shop*" (qtd. in Oppler 245). Cited in the new context of *Guernica*'s entry into the Prado, these reciprocal remarks suggest bourgeois shock at *Guernica*'s placement among finer ornaments or commodities: out of its taxonomical and economic class. The metaphor of the bull –a key element in Picasso's art, and frequently a sign for the artist himself– is reworked in the consecutive utterance:

18 In 1952 Saura would complain: "El surrealismo es también completamente desconocido en España. Hasta ahora no he visto un solo comentario que estudie la plástica surrealista ni tampoco sobre Mondrian, una de las figuras imprescindibles del arte abstracto. Se confunden los términos, y los mismos críticos olvidan nombres y posturas" (*Escritura* 31).
19 Ucelay himself is cited in Saura's *Libelo* in relation to the *Guernica* figures' "dedos-penes" (15). Ucelay claimed that Picasso told President Aguirre, "[t]hey're not fingers, they're cocks" (qtd. in Van Hensbergen 33).

> Odio al toro de ida y vuelta del Guernica introduciéndose violentamente en el aposento reservado de las Meninas. (15)

The *Guernica* bull, "like other Picasso bulls, may be read as Picasso" (Russell 61). Consequently, Saura's 'charge' of violent entry is doubly inflected, citing conservative (dis)taste both over *Guernica*'s penetration of parts private to the 'Old Masters,' and the minotaur Picasso's penetration of the private parts of young maids.[20] Many Nationalists had no doubt been outraged when, with the approval of Franco, Picasso was offered "a choice of three rooms in the Prado where *Guernica* would receive treatment equal to that of Goya's *May 3, 1808* and Velázquez's *Las Meninas*" (Chipp 177). A radicalised section of the regime had in fact protested that

> pretender que ese cuadro entre en España es un insulto al patriotismo [que], aunque no está de moda, lo tenemos en el corazón y un desprecio a los muertos que hicieron posible que la nación siga marchando. . . . Sin el cuadro *Guernica* y sin Picasso hemos vivido muy tranquilos los españoles y no tenemos añoranza de lo que ambas cosas representan. (Qtd. in Tusell 258)

This sentiment remained among die-hard Franco supporters in 1981: "La extrema derecha lo trató con desprecio, reiterando que el bombardeo a que aludía el cuadro había sido realizado por los alemanes, y no por Franco, que no habría ordenado tal acción" (Tusell 275). However, in the phrase "toro de ida y vuelta del Guernica," the bull/Picasso/*Guernica* are painted political turncoats: a cry of betrayal rather from *la otra España*.[21] Yet, in a further semantic layer, the violence of *Guernica*'s entry may suggest the continued power of its (partly) surrealist idiom. Domingo López Torres records that, in 1930, "los *camelots de roi*[22] irrumpieron violentamente en la sala donde se proyectaba "L'Age d'or" [de Luis Buñuel] destrozando todos los cuadros [surrealistas] que se exponían en el vestíbulo." When a subsequent surrealist exhibition failed to incite the right, some argued that "la virtud del surrealismo está en estas manifestaciones explosivas y cuando la explosión no se produce es porque ya es cosa pasajera y no tiene razón de ser" ("Aureola" 180). Earlier violent entries to art exhibitions are thus also suggested, as is the idea that *Guernica* has not lost *its* power of resistance.

20 The theme of the *partouze* in *Guernica*, noted in Chapter IV, "Francisco (Franco) 'de Goya' a la República," is also discussed in relation to Saura's discourse of *la belleza obscena* in Chapter VIII, "Painting as a 'Campo de Bataille.'"

21 Picasso's refusal to make a public declaration as to the political orientation of the bull disgusted Larrea, who as a result characterised the artist as "chamberlainesco" (qtd. in Gurney 55).

22 Followers of the French right-winger, Charles Maurras, who pamphleteered on behalf of the Spanish Nationalists, supporting their denials of the bombardment of Gernika (Southworth 151, 165, 177).

However, as the following utterance reminds us, critics of *Guernica*'s style were to be found also at the left of the political spectrum:

> Odio al Casón del Buen Retiro, también llamado en otros tiempos "Museo de reproducciones artísticas", por su predestinación, como sus dos nombres indican, para acoger el espantapájaros gris y negro del Guernica. (8)

In 1941, the Marxist writer Vernon Clark deemed Picasso's "scarecrow figures" and use of black and white unsuccessful on the grounds that recourse to such iconography and formal means created emotional distance from the painting's content: the atrocity (qtd. in Oppler 252-56). Carlos Rojas notes that, in his judgement of *Guernica*, Clark "coincid[ió] con Kamenov [Vladimir Kemenov], y di[jo] los mártires 'espantapájaros'" (*Diálogos* 248), such that either one or both of these Marxist critics is drawn into dialogue here.

However, if for Clark *Guernica*'s failure to bear the weight of social meaning (Oppler 256) was due to Picasso's idiom, for others, its current failure to signify is (again) related to its location in the "Casón del Buen Retiro, también llamado en otros tiempos 'Museo de reproducciones artísticas.'" For these social voices, the museum's two names signal *Guernica's* withdrawal, or retirement –"Buen Retiro"– from left-wing/Basque/Republican and also modernist significations. In the first case this is due to the discursive formations of the Casón as an annex of the Prado. In the second case it is due to its metaphorical location in André Malraux's *Musée imaginaire*,[23] comprised of any artwork that can be reproduced photographically as a "colour-plate": "Museo de reproducciones artísticas."[24] Malraux argued that by placing a work of art among works of art created before and after it, modern viewers 'hear' *le chant de la metamorphose*: a dialogue in a common optical language of colours, shapes and forms (Manguel 13). Interestingly, *Guernica*'s placement in the Casón was determined precisely by viewing its photographic reproduction in relation to Luca Giordano's *Allegory of the Golden Fleece*:

23 André Malraux, *Le Musée imaginaire* (1947). Saura refers to Malraux's "museo imaginario," uncited (*Fijeza* 93; "Crucifixiones" 60). Wilhelm Boeck's comment that "[m]odern man has access to the art treasures of the past in an 'imaginary museum,' . . . Picasso has always made abundant use of all historic stages: he has often sought inspiration in the treasures of the past, motivated by an inner need of which he is frequently unaware" (95), may be recalled.

24 The museum bore this name around 1900. A further possible referent of Saura's "museum of artistic reproductions" is the travelling museum of reproductions of Spanish paintings created by the *Misiones Pedagógicas*, instituted under the Second Republic in May 1931. Renau notes that

> [e]ste museo ha recorrido centenares de pueblos y aldeas, y los resultados fueron sorprendentes. Copias de Berruguete, Velásquez, Goya y de muchos otros maestros, cumplían admirablemente con la finalidad de popularizar nuestro tesoro artístico entre las capas más humildes de la población. . . . Esta obra ha dejado profundas huellas de su paso no sólo en los espíritus, también materialmente: 44.838 reproducciones fotográficas de las obras expuestas, la mayoría de gran formato, con marco y bajo cristal, quedaban entre la población campesina para decorar escuelas y ayuntamientos rurales, centros sindicales y obreros. (*Arte en peligro* 105, 109)

> Decidida por la Dirección General de Bellas Artes la instalación del "Guernica" en la sala de Lucas Jordán, tras pruebas efectuadas con una reproducción fotográfica a tamaño natural, pudo comprobarse que su posición mejor correspondía a la pared más corta del rectángulo de 11 por 20 metros de la sala, precisamente la más próxima a la calle de Alfonso XII, y a eje con la composición de la gran pintura de la bóveda. (García de Paredes and Picardo 158)

Guernica's 'optical dialogue' with Giordano's frescoes –"la gran pintura de la bóveda," painted for Felipe IV in 1692– is 'heard,' or rather cited, in the following utterances:

> Desprecio al Guernica porque va a ser presentado
> en un salón de baile del siglo XVII cuya alta bóveda "multiplicará los efectos ópticos del cuadro." (8)

> Detesto las pinturas de Lucas Jordán que ornan
> el Casón del Buen Retiro porque al decir de un
> especialista del Museo del Prado se producirá entre ellas y el Guernica "si no una simbiosis, sí un
> feliz maridaje." (9)

In these utterances, individual voices (perhaps the *DG de BA*) claim that *Guernica*'s (re-) presentation in the "salón de baile del siglo XVII" of the Casón del Buen Retiro, beneath "las pinturas de Lucas Jordán, . . . 'multiplicará los efectos ópticos del cuadro,'" or, in Malraux's terminology, that the grouping of these disparate artworks will orchestrate *le chant de la metamorphose*. In Malraux's Imaginary Museum, artworks "lose both their original significance as objects and their function (religious or other); we see them only as works of art and they bring home to us their makers' talent" (Malraux, qtd. in Crimp 58). While acknowledging "the specious unity imposed by photographic reproduction on a multiplicity of objects," Malraux concludes that, in this process, style "seems to emerge as a real entity, not a mere classification" (qtd. in Crimp 59), which is to construct

> art as ontological essence, created not by men in their historical contingencies, but by Man in his very being. This is the comforting "knowledge" to which *Museum Without Walls* [Imaginary Museum] gives testimony. And concomitantly, it is the deception to which art history, a discipline now thoroughly professionalized, is most deeply, if often unconsciously, committed. (Crimp 59)

Malraux's concept of *le chant de la metamorphose* is indeed similarly orchestrated by art historians and the curators of the physical art museum, in which the loss/proliferation of significations through taxonomical regroupings distances the artwork from its historical and political contingencies. Thus the optical effects of the Imaginary Museum provide Saura with a further metaphor for the political effects, or constructions, of the *museo* '*real*': an institutional form, with a particular (Bourbon, aristocratic) history, which

legitimates the hegemony of a particular definition of culture, and also the hegemony of the privileged classes, both culturally and economically (Bourdieu and Darbel 179), whilst distancing *Guernica* from an original, and indeed oppositional, signification.

However, while "Malraux was enraptured by the endless possibilities of his museum, by the proliferation of discourses it could set in motion, establishing ever new series of iconography and style by reshuffling the photographs" (Crimp 61), he also spoke of this process within the actual museum as a "profanation":

> When an artist of the Middle Ages carved a crucifix, when an Egyptian sculptor hewed out a funeral-mask, they were creating what we would term fetishes or holy images; they did not think of their carvings as art objects, . . . and the idea of their being brought together in the same museum, in order that we might study their lines and masses, would have struck their makers as nothing more nor less that a profanation. . . . Every work of art is created to satisfy a need, a need that is passionate enough to give it birth. Then the need withdraws from the art-work as blood from a body, . . . and it is only our own need, our own passion which can summon it forth again. . . . Works born of love may find their way to the store-loft or to the museum, which is scarcely a happier fate. Any work is dead, the moment love has ebbed. (Qtd. in Solomon 564-65)

Maynard Solomon argues that for Malraux, "the Utopian radiance is petrified, condensed, congealed within the art object, awaiting contact and confrontation with the revolutionary catalyst – consciousness" (563). In Saura's text, *Guernica*'s "cadáver congelado" (*Libelo* 27), languishing in a 'deadly' institution of monarchical, pro-Francoist power, is likewise distanced from "the need that was passionate enough to give it birth" –the bombardment of Gernika– and awaits the revolutionary catalyst.

I suggest that one function of *Contra el Guernica* is to provide this revolutionary catalyst. In addition to 're-membering' important twentieth-century debates in museology –Adorno, Renau, Malraux– I suggest that Saura's 're-citation' to excess of the autopsies and 'moribund' art criticism of *Guernica* –Mateos, Giménez Caballero, Raphael and Kemenov– and of the 'deadly' discourses conducted equally relentlessly around this painting during the Transition, problematises the authority of these voices, precisely to 're-hearse' their spurious re-significations of *Guernica* and thereby resuscitate the 'reality' of the painting and the atrocity it commemorates. As discussed in relation to the nodal points of the *dictadura* and *dictablanda*, the latter reality returns through Saura's transposition of the codes of *Guernica* and Gernika; in relation to the Transition period, we note the same operation in an utterance in which *Guernica*'s 'death' is 'celebrated' in a further institution of Spanish power – the Catholic Church:

> Odio las reliquias de San Pablo Nepomuceno sal-
> dadas en la capilla ardiente del Guernica. (26)

In this utterance, *Guernica* –as both the "remaindered remains" ("reliquias . . . saldadas") and the "settled" debt of "Saint" Pablo, Diego, José, Francisco de Paula, Juan Nepomuceno, María de los Remedios, Cipriano de la Santísima Trinidad Ruiz y Picasso, as *Guernica*'s 'creator' was christened (Penrose 9)– is vigiled in "la capilla ardiente del Guernica": a conflation of the museum and the Catholic church, but also of the candle-lit funeral chapel and the 'consecrated' conflagration of Gernika. Attempts to devitalise *Guernica* through its re-signification in the discourses or institutions of Spain's traditional power, specifically to appropriate this modernist and political icon to the cause of Spain's Transition and the vigilant(e) 're-pressions' this process implies, is negated by Saura's orchestration of the return of the 'real,' the theme of the following chapters. In these, *Guernica*'s "cadáver artístico" (*Libelo* 40) will be understood in terms of its surrealist idiom and its relation to Saura's own post-surrealist painting.

The 'return of the real': 'Doing Bataille' with Franco

The surrealist movement in the literary and plastic arts sought to experience and express the (super) 'real,' outside of everyday reality, as accessed through practices calculated to facilitate the invasion of consciousness by the unconscious mind:

> Después de 1917, en que Apollinaire encuentra justa etiqueta para la libre expresión del subconsciente, comienza una lucha interna, lucha de ideas para encontrar el verdadero camino de la nueva tendencia, que descubre por fin André Breton y aclara más tarde Aragon, diciendo que "es el método del conocimiento del mecanismo 'real' del pensamiento, y de las relaciones 'reales' de la expresión, y las relaciones verídicas del pensamiento expresado y del mundo sobre el que obra verdaderamente." (López Torres, "Surrealismo" 315)

More specifically, surrealism "claimed as its own the point where desublimatory impulses confront sublimatory imperatives," and was "drawn to the abject in a testing of sublimation." It was also this point that split surrealism into two principal factions. The first was led by the 'orthodox' surrealist, Breton, while the 'dissident' faction centred around Georges Bataille and the review *Documents* (1929-30)[1] (Foster, *Return* 157). The oppositional postures of these two philosophers regarding the question of the dialectic, or of materialism versus transposition, were fundamental to the ideological and aesthetic debates of the 1920s and 1930s (Adamowicz n. pag.). Surrealists such as Breton sought to bring about revolution through a privileging of the low, dirty and rejected, including eroticism and the unconscious (Nechvatal n. pag.). However, Breton's idealism and his sublimatory transpositions of abject matter into metaphor were antithetical to Bataille's non-dialectic materialism. While Bataille engaged with Marxism from 1932-39, he was "less interested in class struggle than in de-classing," critiquing the idealist tendency of the majority of materialists, and their obsession with an ideal form of matter (Bois, "*Abattoir*" 49; "Use Value" 29).[2]

In relation to the surrealists' interest in the unconscious, Bataille railed against those (namely Breton) who would lay claim to psychoanalysis, yet, "trying to escape its consequences, take refuge in the most mysterious unconscious (although Freud wanted nothing more than to bring everything to light by rigorously eliminating the least mystery retained

1 Contributors to *Documents* included Robert Desnos, Michel Leiris, André Masson and Jacques Prévert.

2 Bataille considered materialism, and above all dialectical materialism, to be idealist:

> Most materialists, despite wanting to eliminate all spiritual entities, ended up describing an order of things whose hierarchical relations mark it out as specifically idealist. They have situated dead matter at the summit of a conventional hierarchy of diverse types of facts, without realizing that in this way they have submitted to an obsession with an ideal form of matter, with a form which approaches closer than any other to that which matter should be. (Qtd. in Bois, "Use Value" 29)

by the unconscious)." For Bataille, "[t]he elements of a dream or a hallucination are transpositions; the poetic use of the dream comes down to the celebration of unconscious censorship, which is to say, of secretive shame and cowardice" (qtd. in Bois, "*Abattoir*" 49-50). Against Breton's idealism and his "game of transpositions,"[3] Bataille pitted his weapons of 'base materialism' –matter as irrecuperable matter, unassimilable waste– and the *informe*, defined in *Documents*' "critical dictionary" as

> not only an adjective having a given meaning, but a term that brings down in the world, generally requiring that each thing have its form. What it designates has no rights in any sense and gets itself squashed everywhere, like a spider or an earthworm. In fact, for academic men to be happy, the universe would have to take on shape. All of philosophy has no other goal: it is a matter of giving a frock coat to what is, a mathematical frock coat. On the other hand, affirming that the universe resembles nothing and is only formless amounts to saying that the universe is something like a spider or spit. (Qtd. in Bois and Krauss [Frontispiece])

Yve-Alain Bois argues that the *informe* "is a term allowing one to operate a declassification, in the double sense of lowering and of taxonomical disorder. Nothing in and of itself, the formless has only an operational existence . . ." ("Use Value" 18). As an operation rather than a theme, substance or concept, the *informe* participates in the general movement of Bataille's thought, which he termed "scatology" or "heterology," the science of that which is wholly other (15, 30).

In the *Second Manifesto of Surrealism* (1929), Breton characterised Bataille as an "'excrement-philosopher' who refused to rise above big toes, mere matter, sheer shit, to raise the low to the high" (qtd. in Foster, *Return* 157), whereas for Bataille, Breton was a "'juvenile victim' involved in an Oedipal game, an 'Icarian pose' assumed less to undo the law than to provoke its punishment: for all his confessions of desire, he was as committed to sublimation as the next aesthete" (qtd. in Foster, *Return* 159).[4] Elza Adamowicz suggests that in their art criticism, "Dali's [sic] paintings or Picasso's sketches, far from being the central subject, are simply a point of departure, a support, or a battlefield, . . . pre-texts for poetical development or polemical exchange . . . the philosophical jousting between the 'excremental philosopher' . . . and the 'doddery idealist'" (n. pag.).

Traces of the Breton-Bataille polemic are heard in the semantic layers of *Contra el Guernica. Libelo*: cited/sited as important aesthetic debates both backgrounding and appro-

3 In "L'Esprit moderne et le jeu des transpositions," first published in *Documents*, Bataille characterised Breton's poetic use of the unconscious as "the game of substitutions" or "transpositions" (Krauss, "Cadaver" 66).

4 The mythical Icarus, and his father Daedalus, fled the Cretan King Minos using wings fastened to their shoulders with wax. Icarus flew too close to the sun, the wax melted, and he fell to his death in the Icarian Sea (Moncrieff 183).

priating (Picasso's) surrealist painting, and also as 'pre-texts,' in turn, for the orchestration of a Saurian theme which I shall term the 'return of the real.' Under this rubric, I discuss the return of the 're-pressed' event (Gernika),[5] of the 're-pressed' (sur)realism of Picasso's painting, and of the 'real' –either as *informe* or as trauma– in Saura's own oeuvre, also insinuated in *Contra el Guernica*. In each of these ways, I will suggest, Saura 'does Bataille' with the Franco regime.[6] The first two of these 'returns of the real' are the subject of the current chapter; the 'return of the real' in Saura's painting is discussed in the next.

In the following utterance –itself not unlike surrealist verse– we find the codes of the battle of the pens over the historical reality of Gernika transposed into those of the Breton-Bataille doctrinal battle over (Picasso's) surrealist painting:

> Odio la cosecha de pajaritos de ceniza del Guernica, la indigestión de buñuelos de antracita del Guernica, la escena de antropofagia del Guernica, el cáncer de niebla del Guernica, la gangrena filosofal del Guernica, las geométricas y polvorientas babas del Guernica, el interior de las tripas de la ballena roja del Guernica. (34)

Lydia Gasman suggests that Picasso's visceral fear of air raids stemmed directly from his identification with the victims of the diving and machine-gunning aeroplanes serving Franco, especially at Gernika (58), and that these raids constituted the "'intersubject, [or] [sic] co-subject' of Picasso's *Guernica* . . . of shattering passages in his war-time texts, and of their guarded transpositions in concurrent artworks" (56). She points to the prevalence of winged entities as metaphorical transpositions of predominantly enemy warplanes in Picasso's surrealist, "automatic" writings of this period, noting that Picasso saw Republican planes as "pigeons," whereas "the flight of partridges" may "have been a euphemism

5 In his foreword to Herbert Southworth's *Guernica! Guernica!*, Pierre Vilar upholds criticisms of "history reduced to the event, such as positivists had conceived it" and stresses the added dimension of media representations of the event, which render it "monstrous" (x). He suggests that Southworth's book responds well to Pierre Nora's call: "Today, when the whole of historiography has based its modernity upon the obliteration of the event, the denial of its importance, and its dissolution, the event returns –a different event– and with it, perhaps, the potential for a purely contemporary history" (qtd. in Vilar x). I argue that not only this "monstrous" media event returns in *Contra el Guernica*, but also the historiographically 're-pressed,' 'monstrous' event that triggered such a response. As in Southworth's deconstruction of the 're-pressions' of Gernika –in Vilar's words, his "irrefutable analysis of the phenomenon 'event-information'"– Saura demonstrates that, "while there are two memories of any Spanish event . . . this does not mean that the lie is as strong as the truth" (Vilar xvii). However, beyond reference to these textual 'truths,' it is the traumatic, 'real' experience of Gernika, psychoanalytically speaking, that I also suggest 'returns' (albeit through *its* textual traces).

6 Saura also does battle with Franco without recourse to Bataille, for example, through 'Francophonics': "[F]rancamente grosera" (*Libelo* 45) can be read both as frankly discourteous/vulgar/stupid and as discourteous/vulgar/stupid *à la* Franco. In the consecutive utterance, Saura's "cambalache de francos oro" (45) recalls Juan Larrea's discussion of the conflation of the *Caudillo* and the French *franc* in Picasso's *Sueño y mentira de Franco*: "[A]parece el general rebelde . . . adorando, como si fuera una hostia en su custodia, un cuerpo redondo . . . y cuya naturaleza se define por las dos palabras . . . '1 duro,'. . . no es, pues, una hostia, sino una moneda, . . . y la moneda francesa lleva en castellano . . . el mismo nombre del cabecilla español: Franco. . . . [E]l general faccioso manifiesta así su posición de servidumbre ante una situación y una sistema económico desalmados" (244).

that diminished for him the supreme Nazi eagles: the Stukas . . .” (61-63). Saura’s “cosecha de pajaritos de ceniza” very likely alludes to Picasso’s avian transpositions of Nationalist bombers and the ‘grim reaping’ of these ‘fire-birds’’ ‘young,’ or ‘shells.’ Unexploded incendiary bombs stamped with the German Imperial eagle dropped by Nazi/ Nationalist aviation,[7] or, in the words of one of their defenders, “the monstrous egg-laying of an anonymous bird of prey”[8] (Max Massot, qtd. in Southworth 79) –further “pajaritos de ceniza”– were found by the first foreign journalists to enter the burning town (Southworth 182, 436 n29) and were no doubt more assiduously harvested following the town’s investment by General Mola’s troops. Historical events, their ideological interpretations and Picasso’s artistic transpositions –the latter two functioning respectively as propagandistic and poetic ‘re-pressions’ of the reality of Gernika– are thus condensed in this phrase. While the black, grey and white bird depicted flapping on the table/sacrificial altar of Picasso’s mural –a painterly “pajarito de ceniza”– may also be a referent, this icon is not generally interpreted as a transposition of Nationalist aviation, but as a cock – one of several elements drawn from the symbolism of Mithraic sacrificial rites. It is rather *Guernica*’s sun-cum-light bulb that has been interpreted, in part, as a metaphor or “allegory of the Nazi bomb” (Max Raphael, qtd. in Oppler 263).[9]

Despite the evidence of explosive and incendiary bombing provided by the inhabitants of Gernika, the Basque Government and the foreign press, Nationalist generals alleged, twenty-four hours after the atrocity, that Gernika had been destroyed from the ground by ‘Red’ incendiaries and that bad weather *that* day –the *siri-miri*– had kept Nationalist planes from the air. Within days, however, the *siri-miri* lifted and vanished forever from Salamanca’s vocabulary (Southworth 32-38). A Nationalist communiqué of 2 May 1937 conceded that it was “possible that a few bombs fell”; Gernika, which had originally been declared a non-military objective fifteen kilometres from the front became, in this account, a military objective six kilometres “from the first line of combat” when it was “destroyed”;

7 George Steer reported that these thermite incendiary bombs were marked with the initials of the German Rheindorf factory and dated 1936. His description of the stamped Nazi eagle “with scarecrow wings spread” (qtd. in Rankin 121) is no doubt also drawn into Saura’s “espantapájaros . . . del Guernica” (*Libelo* 8); given Picasso’s avian transpositions of enemy bombers, Saura may also thus describe *Guernica* as an apotropaic against the same.

8 Massot’s report that a single aeroplane thus lit petrol poured in the town by “the Reds” was printed twice in Nationalist Spain (*Heraldo de Aragón*, 2 and 5 May 1937) and also in the French pro-Nationalist newspaper *Le Journal*, 8 May 1937 (Southworth 79).

9 Picasso’s literary transpositions of Nationalist aviation included the winged eye, “both an archetypal symbol and a simile of the winged bomber” (Gasman 63). Gasman suggests that Picasso’s “gyro-compass eyes” –rendered graphically in black ink as three intersecting circles seen in perspective, with wings/lashes added– represent “perhaps his most ingenious visual adaptation of the ancient winged eye as an emblem of the winged Stukas” (63). Both this Renaissance emblem of divine omniscience, and bombs, are cited as referents for *Guernica*’s “sol-bombilla.” No aeroplanes or bombs are realistically represented in *Guernica*, however this sun-cum-light bulb is simultaneously *sol*, Eye of God and *bombilla*: light bulb or (small) bomb (Rosenblum 45).

the open town "was a classical military objective with an importance that thoroughly justified a bombing. Yet it was not bombed. The destruction of Guernica was the work of . . . incendiary dynamiters" (qtd. in Southworth 37-38).

At this semantic level, "el cáncer de niebla del Guernica" cites/sites the 'cancerous confusion' over the m(i/y)stifying *siri-miri* as part of the moribund logic –"la gangrena filosofal del Guernica"– that the Nationalists fed the world, and which would gradually eat into their own stance, eventually leaving them 'without a leg to stand on.' In this context, "la indigestión de buñuelos de antracita del Guernica" suggests a "botched job" in handling the 'inflammatory'/'explosive' material of Gernika. Read as Nationalist discourse, the "botched job" is ascribed to putative Asturian dynamiters –hot-burning anthracite is mined in Asturias and used in explosive work– a contention that was hard to stomach for the victims. Read as anti-Francoist or Neo-Francoist discourse, the "botched job" refers to Luis Bolín's original, inherently flawed, yet nevertheless 'repeating' and (ultimately self-) poisonous propaganda regarding the atrocity, particularly Nationalist denials of the use of incendiary bombs.[10] With these devices, the perpetrators of Gernika "bl[e]w out human entrails and burn[t] holes in children with lumps of thermite" (George Orwell, qtd. in Rankin 122), such that the "buñuelos de antracita" also recall the masses of molten thermite that penetrated the flesh of the Nazi's/Nationalist's victims, thereby exposing "el interior de las tripas": a return of the traumatic 'real' in Saura's text.[11] [12]

The Spanish filmmaker Luis Buñuel also leaves a trace in the semantic layers of this phrase, a poisonous taste in the mouths of the Nationalists, and a further clue to the surrealist overtones of this utterance. Buñuel –radically anti-bourgeois, anti-clerical, and a Republican spy to boot (Van Hensbergen 235)– contributed the film *Madrid '36* to the Spanish pavilion,[13] but it is perhaps to the 'black' spools of his *Viridiana* that the "buñuelos de antracita" refer in one sense. In deference to the policy of increased openness of the *aperturistas*, the exiled Buñuel was permitted to return to Spain in 1961, and, astonishingly, to represent Spain at Cannes. His film, which won both the *Palme d'Or* and

10 Southworth speaks of the "oblique, illogical" reasoning of the Spanish Nationalists (270), and of the "compounded confusion existing among Nationalist sympathizers on the subject of Guernica. Each one contradicts the other in searching for a coherent account that will fit the undeniable facts and still save the honor of the Rebels" (113).

11 Thermite, the tradename for the mix of powdered aluminium and iron oxide used in these bombs, reached 2,500ºC when ignited and produced molten metal (Rankin 121) which perhaps formed 'doughnuts.' Jacques Lacan plays on "traumatic and '*trou*'matic" in his definition of the 'real' (Foster, *Return* 136); Saura's anthracite "buñuelos" likewise form a Lacanian 'hole' (*trou*) for the 'real' to poke through.

12 In *Sky Memoirs*, Blaise Cendrars wrote that only "shit" could come from the sky, "absolute and deglutinous black, . . . a black beast, blood, throat, lung, gland, a living sponge" (qtd. in Gasman 60); the conjunction of Saura's "buñuelos de antracita" with "el interior de las tripas" suggests this text as a further possible source, and a reading of "buñuelos" as (the effect of) incendiary bombs.

13 *Madrid '36* deals with the Nazi/Nationalist bombardment of this city (a prelude to Gernika) during the Civil War.

a secondary prize for black humour, cost the Under-Secretary of Cinema his post (Buñuel had not made any of the albeit minor changes José Muñoz-Fontán had requested), and *Viridiana* –deemed sacrilegious and blasphemous– was banned in Spain. Gijs Van Hensbergen equates travelling to France to see *Viridiana* with ownership of a copy of *Guernica*: "In the years of 'silent resistance' both were transformed into powerful cultural icons that spoke in code of their owners' rejection of the increasingly outdated values of the Franco regime" (273).

Buñuel's better-known film, *Un Chien andalou* (made with Salvador Dalí in 1929), shares an anti-ocular theme with Bataille's *Histoire de l'oeil* (1926). While the "buñuelos de antracita" –anthracite "doughnuts" or "fritters"– may be read as (the effect of) 'rounds' of sizzling thermite, in this context their globular form perhaps also suggests a Buñuelian/Bataillean/Picassoesque metaphor for the eyes: as afflicted/depicted in Gernika/*Guernica*; for Picasso's own 'smouldering' eyes;[14] and for the artist's surrealist attack on visuality.[15] Interestingly, Daniel Brown notes that in "The Practice of Joy Before Death," Bataille willed the explosion of his eyes: "[T]here are explosives everywhere that will blind me. I laugh when I think that my eyes persist in demanding objects that do not destroy them" (n. pag.). For Bataille –following Freud's 1905 discussion of the dominance of the eye over the nose as a consequence of man's erect posture– the destruction of the eye liberated humanity from a 'higher,' repressed existence, permitting a return to the baser origins of human nature (n. pag.). Saura draws in/on Bataille to orchestrate a 'return of the real' in the psychoanalytic sense: through a negation of the journalistic and sublimatory 're-pressing' of the traumatic seen/(ob)scene of Gernika/*Guernica*, the carnage of the incendiary bombing and the trauma of its victims are 're-viewed' as the effect/affect of base (Nationalist) human nature/desublimatory art.[16] Indeed, "la indigestión" caused by the

14 Many writers stress the size or intensity of Picasso's eyes: "[L]arge, sad, passionate, deep. . . . X-ray eyes, a seer's eyes" (Baer 86, 88); "so intently did he look at drawings that Gertrude Stein's brother Leo wondered whether there would be anything left on the paper. In his old age his eyes would become a surrogate sexual organ"; "Picasso's *mirada fuerte*, the strong gaze on which Andalusians famously pride themselves" (Richardson 263). In "Los ojos de Picasso," Rafael Alberti poeticises the power of Picasso's eyes and their centrality to his art.

15 A further possible referent of Saura's "buñuelos de antracita," Picasso's explosion-producing spherical gyro-compass eyes were frequently depicted blindfolded (Gasman 64). Surrealist painting challenged the integrity of optical experience (Brown n. pag.). In *Story of the Eye*, Bataille attacks the eye explicitly and metaphorically, "annul[ling] metaphor through metaphoric excess" (Bois, "Use Value" 32). His metaphors for the eye include eggs, testicles and the sun. Bataille's Simone places one of the testicles from the bullfighter Granero's first kill into her vagina as the next bull gores his eye; her orgasm is simultaneous with Granero's demise. Saura discusses this text with Julián Ríos, commenting that in "mi *Sauromaquia* me refiero también a él [Granero]" (65-66). Bataille's metaphoric correlation eyes-testicles is drawn into *Contra el Guernica* in the utterance, "[d]etesto el enigmático simbolismo de los testículos del toro del Guernica" (*Libelo* 16), and perhaps inflects the phrase "los otros ojos" (26). In the opening scene of *Un Chien andalou*, inspired by Buñuel's dream of his mother, two men slice a woman's eye with a razor. Brown argues: "That the act was motivated by a fear of castration can be observed with Freud's substitutive relationship between the eye and the sexual organ" (n. pag.).

16 Freud argued that the trauma victim had 'missed' a shocking occurrence –for Freud's example of the primal scene of parental sexual intercourse we may substitute the bombing of Gernika– by not having had time to armour him/herself

"buñuelos de antracita" –unwonted word images reproducing the visual "quacks" in *Guernica*– recalls the "heartburn" Breton suffered at the desublimatory *non-sequiturs* which eruct in Bataille's texts (Bois, "Use Value" 16).[17]

In the Breton-Bataille doctrinal battle over Dalí's *Jeu lugubre* (1929), Breton claimed that Dalí's images transmuted into "'a hallucinatory landscape': Cimmeria" (qtd. in Adamowicz n. pag.). Adamowicz suggests that Breton evokes "Cimmeria," as the ancient Greeks designated "a mist-covered country situated at the ends of the earth," in order "to suggest . . . that Dali's 'brute phenomena' are indeed sublimated in a poetic transposition of the pictorial" (n. pag.). Drawn into the phrase "el cáncer de niebla del Guernica," Breton's misty Cimmeria thus suggests the hallucinatory nature of the *siri-miri*, and of the Nationalist 'vision' of Gernika more generally, and courts a Bataillean critique: "Dreams and Cimmerias are the lot of totally irresponsible persons whose unconscious strategy is quite cunning since they innocently place revolt outside the law" (Bataille, qtd. in Adamowicz n. pag.). A Bataillean 're-view' of *Guernica*/Gernika would refuse all sublimation of their respective 'brute phenomena': whereas "Breton turns a blind eye" to the violence of the imagery in Dalí's paintings, Bataille "focuses on images of rotting matter, mutilation, bestiality and abjection, and on actions of violent dismemberment, masturbation, ejaculation or castration" (Adamowicz n. pag.), claiming that "[i]n front of his paintings, all I want to do is let out a pig's scream" (Bataille, qtd. in Adamowicz n. pag.). It is precisely Bataille's celebration of "ignoble matter and putrefaction" (Adamowicz n. pag.); "his fascination with rot and waste, with the decomposition of everything" (Bois, "Use Value" 37), that makes him the 'gangrene-philosopher' in a further semantic layer of "la gangrena filosofal del Guernica." Or rather the sightings/citings of "gangrena," "indigestión," "cáncer," "antropofagia," "tripas" and "polvorientas babas" claim the *Guernica*/Gernika bodies as basely Bataillean, as provoking "a pig's scream" rather than transposition and sublimation.

Contrary to Bataille's refusal of the fetishising or ontologising of (base) matter, Michel Leiris wrote of spit as "the very symbol of the formless [*informe*], and of the unverifiable, of the non-hierarchized" (qtd. in Bois, "Use Value" 18). Bois argues that Bataille in fact

---

against it, to register it consciously rather than unconsciously. He/she must therefore repeat the traumatic event in order to integrate it into a psychic economy, or symbolic order. Lacan defines the 'real' in terms of trauma, the unconscious and repetition. For Lacan, the traumatic is also a missed encounter with the real, therefore the real cannot be represented, only repeated, indeed *must* be repeated (Krauss, "Pulse" 163-64; Foster, *Return* 131-32). Foster argues that repetition in pop art serves to screen the real, understood as traumatic, that this need points to the real, and that the real ruptures the screen of repetition (*Return* 132). Saura's constant re-viewings of the traumatic event would effect the same affect, I suggest.

17 Bois suggests: "The whole of Bataille's writing rests on such apparent non-sequiturs (which he calls 'ink spots' or 'quacks' in his essay 'The Language of Flowers,' which gave André Breton heartburn): 'bunches of radishes,' 'the tooth deadened by novocain,' in all his texts we find these rude belches, the virulence of which owes much to irony. [*Documents*' 'critical d]ictionary' accumulates them, functioning, so to speak, as one big quack" ("Use Value" 16).

chose spiders and spittle –*esputos* or "babas"– to illustrate his notion of the *informe* "because, besides their character as reject, they escape from geometry, the idea, morphology." He suggests that "metaphor, figure, theme, morphology, meaning –everything that resembles something, everything that is gathered into the unity of a concept– that is what the *informe* operation crushes, sets aside . . ." ("Figure" 79). Importantly, then, Saura's/Picasso's Bataillean "polvorientas babas"[18] are anomalously "geométricas." Furthermore, the abjection or *ob*scenity of "la antropofagia" is mitigated, or sublimated, through scenification – "la *escena* de antropofagia." Foster defines the obscene as a term between Bataille's *informe* and the abject (*Return* 164), arguing that the obscene –the object without a scene– comes too close to the viewer, whereas the pornographic object is staged for the viewer who is thus distanced enough to be its voyeur (153). Likewise, in "la gangrena filosofal," the wholly other is re-subjected to the taxonomical procedures of the philosopher set aside by the operations of the *informe*; "el cáncer" is transposed into metaphor through the Bretonian "niebla," or "Cimmeria"; and in the phrase "el interior de las tripas de la ballena roja del Guernica," the abject "interior de las tripas" is distanced through resemblance with, or metaphorical transposition into, "la ballena roja," and is thus prevented from coming too close.[19]

Saura's utterance therefore suggests that while certain elements of "la ballena roja," as *cartelón rojo*, are nonsublimatory, other aspects of the painting sublimate the 'real' –as do Picasso's transpositions of bombers into birds and bombs into *Guernica*'s sun/light– and that *Guernica* may not be neatly appropriated to the operations of the *informe*, but simultaneously invites Bretonian transpositions. Undermining interpretation of Picasso's imagery as (im)purely Bataillean or Bretonian, Saura locates it instead at the point where desublimatory impulses confront sublimatory imperatives: the surrealist point of contention.

Furthermore, this point of contention resonates with the confronting sublimatory and desublimatory drives present in Spanish society and historiography in 1981: the impulse to 'forget' in order to reconcile the 'two Spains' was in direct conflict with the imperative to recall and record all that had been said and done under the Franco dictatorship. At this semantic level, Saura's utterance 're-views' both the traumatic event –a 'return of the real' in the psychoanalytic sense– and also its 're-visions' in Nationalist discourse; by re-

18 Bataille's "critical dictionary" contains one entry for "Dust" and two for "Spittle" (Bois, "Use Value" 38). Saura also draws in the saliva-like drips of paint cited in *Guernica*: "[T]rails of white that run like saliva from the teeth of the horse" (Penrose 316).

19 We may also recognise a similarity between this description and that of the "'crueles borrones' con los que el Greco acabó por sumergirnos al final de su vida, ya en el interior de la ballena del *Sueño de Felipe II*, para mostrarnos, al decir de Aldous Huxley, una pintura convertida en vísceras y en fragmentos autónomos y conjuntados" (Saura, *Fijeza* 172).

sighting/citing the traumatic event, Saura desublimates, or 'does Bataille' with the Franco regime's repressive actions and propagandistic 're-pressions.' Indeed, in a political reading of this utterance, "el cáncer de niebla" and "la gangrena filosofal" invoke the fascist ideology of the purification of Spain through the 'surgical' removal of its allegedly 'cancerous' parts: the 'Reds,' Catalans and Basques. In justification of the Nationalist rebellion, Millán Astray (the founder of the Spanish Foreign Legion and Franco's mentor) accordingly "barked that fascism was the surgeon that would cut out these cancers" (Rankin 83).

However, Saura's black humour not only invokes specific historical Nationalist 're-pressions,' his (customary) use of the present tense also locates the "cáncer de niebla" or "gangrena filosofal" surrounding Gernika in the present of the Transition, thus satirising contemporary sublimations. Finally, in relation to *Guernica*, Saura inveighs against the renewed and exhaustive 'dissection' of the painting in the press at this time.

Intertextual transpositions of the codes of art, history and politics similarly riddle two consecutive utterances in which Saura draws on/in Bataille to attack Franco in person:

> Detesto el Guernica porque a pesar de los materiales empleados con tacañería y haber sido enrollado y desenrollado en dieciocho ocasiones, sólo tiene unas ligeras arrugas en la cabeza del caballo, junto a la lámpara. (15)
>
> Detesto el caballo y la lámpara del Guernica. (15)

Here, "los materiales" refer to the artist's materials, and to Nationalist war materiel, both purportedly "empleados con tacañería."[20] However, just as a technical study of *Guernica* undertaken prior to its transfer to Spain gives the lie to the individual/social voice heard, in the first semantic layer, condemning the paucity of Picasso's paint (Cabrera and Garrido 147) and lamenting *Guernica*'s survival, so too did 'non-embedded' journalists' reports

20 The cited voice may resent Picasso's "tacañería" relative to the sum paid by the Republican Government, ostensibly to reimburse Picasso for the materials used in this painting, but rather reflecting its purchase, the artist's standing and the symbolic value of *Guernica* to the Republic. In his rediscovered letter of 28 May 1937, Max Aub recorded:

> Esta mañana llegué a un acuerdo con Picasso. A pesar de la resistencia de nuestro amigo a aceptar subvención alguna de la Embajada por la realización del *Guernica*, ya que hace donación de este cuadro a la República Española, he insistido reiteradamente en transmitirle el deseo del Gobierno Español de reembolsarle al menos los gastos que ha incurrido en su obra. He podido convencerle y de esta suerte le he extendido un cheque por valor de 150.000 francos franceses, por los que me ha firmado el correspondiente recibo. Aunque esta suma tiene más bien un carácter simbólico, dado el valor inapreciable del lienzo en cuestión, representa, no obstante, prácticamente una adquisición del mismo por parte de la República. Estimo que esta fórmula era la más conveniente para reivindicar el derecho de propiedad del citado cuadro. (Qtd. in Tusell 252)

This payment was in addition to a prior instalment of 50.000 francs, a 'fair' price for a Picasso work in 1937, as Tusell argues (254). Voices critical of the cost (and quality) of the works supplied by 'communist' artists to the Pavilion are cited in the utterance: "Detesto al alfarero Alberto Sánchez, a los chatarreros Julio González y Alexander Calder, al cineasta y blasfemo Luis Buñuel, todos ellos 'ingenieros del alma' al decir de su patrón Louis Aragón, cómplices de Picasso en el atraco al Banco del Guernica" (35). Aub is slated as an "inventor de pintores y banquero del Guernica" (21).

give the lie to the pro-Nationalist writer Douglas Jerrold, heard in the second semantic layer, whose opinion that Nationalist forces would never have committed such quantities of ammunition to "indulge in an orgy of lunatic folly" was advanced as 'evidence' against the accusations of saturation bombing (qtd. in Southworth 100). Thus, through *double entendre*, Saura simultaneously satirises received ideas regarding *Guernica* and Gernika.

In the same manner, concerns expressed by conservators over the condition of the painting, as it had been rolled and unrolled on (in fact more than) eighteen occasions, are overlaid with pro-Nationalists' concerns to conceal (responsibility for) the bombing sorties –which had similarly 'flattened out' Gernika (at least) eighteen times– by means of some eighteen revisions of this event, likewise rolled out and retracted in repeated efforts to conserve Nationalist 'face' – in each semantic layer suffering only minor "arrugas."[21]

The location of *Guernica*'s "arrugas" is not specified in the technical report published by José M.ª Cabrera and M.ª Carmen Garrido (although the quality of its materials is):

> Los materiales de pintura utilizados por Picasso fueron de buena calidad, pero para los traslados de un cuadro de tan gran formato (3,50 x 7,75 m.) era necesario en cada caso, desclavar el lienzo, enrollarlo y volverlo a clavar sobre el bastidor en su nuevo destino, lo que originó múltiples arrugas con desprendimientos de color y bordes desgarrados . . . . (147)

I suggest that, whether through opportune fact or artistic licence, Saura cites/sights/ sites these "arrugas en la cabeza del caballo, junto a la lámpara," to orchestrate his satire of Franco.[22] The political referent of "el caballo . . . del *Guernica*" –as with that of the bull– gave rise to heated debate. I suggest that in these utterances the horse 'equals' Franco and his ilk, as famously and obdurately argued by Juan Larrea (241-47). As the "cabeza" of the Nationalist movement, Franco personally is singled out. His face is regrettably only lightly 'wrinkled' – worried or scathed. Alternatively, as "tricks" or "swindles" marring (Pro/

21 By Alix Trueba's account, *Guernica*'s eighteenth relocation, and thus rolling and unrolling, took place in Boston in April 1940 (94). It would have been "rolled and unrolled" on at least forty-two occasions before 1957 (89-104), when Picasso requested the painting travel no more on account of the damage thus caused (Cabrera and Garrido 147).

Gernika was 'flattened' by three squadrons of six planes each, totalling eighteen payloads, according to Squadron Leader von Beust's account (Oppler 167), perhaps drawn into this utterance. However, more recent accounts suggest that a fleet of more than fifty planes flew repeated sorties over Gernika (Chipp 26).

One can only speculate on which pro-Nationalist versions of this event are cited in this utterance. Those published in Spain include an official publication of 1947 and another by the Servicio Histórico Militar (1968); nine by the official Civil War historian, Ricardo de la Cierva (1967-1970); plus those of Manuel Aznar, Luis María de Lojendio, and Alfonso Gutiérrez de la Higuera with Luis Molins Correa (all 1940); Gen. Martínez Esparza (1949); Adolf Galland (Spanish translation 1955); Lt. Gen. Franco Salgado with Luis de Calinsoga (1956); Gen. Díaz de Villegas (1957); Gen. Jorge Vigón (1957); Col. José Gomá (1958); Manuel Aznar (1961); Helmuth Günther Dahms (Spanish translation 1966); Carlos Seco Serrano (1962); James Cleugh (Spanish translation 1963); Tomás Salvador (1966); Brian Crozier (Spanish translation 1970); José María Pemán (1967); Bernardo Gil Mugarza (1968); Vicente Talón (1970; 1973); Jaime del Burgo (1970); José Manuel Martínez Bande (1971) and Jesús Salas Larrazábal (1972; 1973) (Southworth 239-70).

22 Reports on the conservation of *Guernica* were presented in Madrid newspapers, on Spanish television, and in super-8 films (Cabrera and Garrido 156 n6); this detail may thus have been known to Saura, and to the general public.

Neo)-Francoist accounts of the historical event, the "arrugas" are (un)popularly considered relatively few. In both readings the damage to the Francoist regime is lamentably minor, just as it repeatedly alleged the damage to Gernika to be. Interestingly, Picasso considered the damage caused to the surface of the peripatetic painting as "heridas de guerra" (qtd. in Cabrera and Garrido 147), such that Saura's polysemic "arrugas" 're-verse' Picasso's own metaphor for the damage suffered by *Guernica*.

Most importantly, in each of the above utterances "el caballo" is paired with "la lámpara," and in each I take "la lámpara" to refer to the zenithal "sol-bombilla" (*Libelo* 24) rather than "el quinqué de Musidora" (10) (equally close to the horse's head in *Guernica*). Josefina Alix Trueba likewise refers to the sun-cum-ceiling-light as "lámpara" –"el disco solar . . . es sustituido por una lámpara encendida" (54)– and notes that the lamp held by Picasso's 'muse,' Dora Maar, "queda fijada en forma de quinqué o de jarro" (45). I suggest that in aligning Franco's head with the sun/light, Saura draws in Roland Penrose's interpretation of *Guernica*'s sun as being informed by Bataille's *soleil pourri* (putrid sun) (312 n12), also sighted/cited as the "sol-bombilla" (*Libelo* 24), as the "bombilla" lent by [the 'mad'] Van Gogh (17), and in the guise of the *Cara al Sol*:

> Odio la "vuelta a la sombra" del cara al sol del
> Guernica. (36)

While the irksome playing of this Falangist hymn at close-down on Spanish radio until the mid-1960s (Preston 37) is an obvious referent of this utterance, I suggest that Saura also inflects (Franco's) "cara al sol" with Bataille's doubly inflected notion of looking at the sun. At the heart of Bataille's article, "Soleil pourri," published in a special issue of *Documents* dedicated to Picasso, is the division of the sun into two: the sun "that was shining at the moment of Icarus's elevation," and a second sun "that melted the wax, causing failure and a screaming fall when Icarus got too close" (qtd. in Bois, "Figure" 81). For Bataille,

> man's ideal of elevation is itself the cause of his fall. . . . Icarus fell because he wanted to get too close to the sun. He did not take into account the sun's division in two; he only wanted to see the *elevated* sun, without considering its base combustion – the error that all those who have the presumptuousness to look at the sun directly commit in their turn. (Bois, "Dialectic" 69)

If we take Saura to characterise Franco's "cara al sol" as an Icarian pose, it is the insurrectionary general's desire for elevation, and his sublimations, that necessarily lead to his "vuelta a la sombra." His base drives (to expend life, as we shall see shortly) are sublimated by lofty Nationalist rhetoric. Keeping music as his intertext, Saura de-classes the 'elevating' Falangist hymn, dragging it down to the status of a pop song: "Vuelta a la som-

bra," released by Triana on *Sombra y luz* in 1978. Thus "the murky twilight of Franco's senile decay" (Preston 7) or his mortal "vuelta a la sombra" are 'accompanied' by the return of popular elections and the mass-cultural hype over *Guernica*'s imminent 'return'.[23]

However, Bataille writes that in opposition to this Icarian, sublimatory manner of (not) looking at the sun, "the scrutinized sun can be identified with a mental ejaculation, foam on the lips, and an epileptic crisis. In the same way that the preceding sun (the [elevated] one not looked at) is perfectly beautiful, the one that is scrutinized can be horribly ugly" (qtd. in Bois, "Dialectic" 69-70). If "observed with enough concentration this supposes a kind of madness and the notion changes its meaning because in light it is no longer the production which is apparent but the waste, that is to say the combustion, expressed well enough, psychologically, by the horror which is seen in an incandescent arc lamp" (Bataille, qtd. in Penrose 312 n12). Penrose notes that Picasso's sun shows some analogy to Bataille's latter, "putrid" sun and that *Guernica* was painted in the room in which Bataille had held his discussions with the group *Contre-attaque* (312-13 n12). As further evidence of Bataille's "Soleil pourri" as a source for Picasso's sun –and thus, in Saura, the object of Franco's obstinate gaze– Penrose points out further iconographical links between the article and Picasso's *Crucifixion* (1930), a painting much cited as informing *Guernica*:

> [Bataille] goes on to describe the Mithraic rite in which 'the initiate was spattered with the blood of a slaughtered bull'. The bull itself is also in this case an image of the sun but only when slaughtered. It is the same as the cock, 'of which the horrible cry, particularly solar, is always close to the cry of a creature whose throat is being cut.'. . . The references to the mythological significance of the bull and the cock are also particularly important when it is remembered that before 1930 there are few references to these creatures in Picasso's painting and that the *Crucifixion* was painted in the spring of that year with its allusions to the sun-moon myth and Mithraic rites. (312-13 n12)[24]

"Soleil pourri" is thus also related to Bataille's 1933 text, "The Notion of Expenditure," in which he links the self-destructive drives of the unconscious with "primitive" cultural practices; human dejecta with animal/human/financial sacrifice and other "non-productive" expenditures. Among these forms of expenditure, characterised by the princi-

23 As a lowering towards the base or popular, "la 'vuelta a la sombra'" also reflects Picasso's trajectory from high modernism to accessible populism – a trajectory in Picasso criticism noted by Eunice Lipton: "[O]ne of the by-products of the Civil War was to take Picasso's work off the pedestal of high, disinterested and disengaged art where the critical tradition of idealism had placed him, . . . [thus helping make] Picasso a more accessible artist in the 1930's [sic]" (277).

24 Penrose follows Ruth Kaufmann's attribution to Picasso (via Bataille) of the surrealist linkage of the Christian crucifixion with pagan, specifically Mithraic, sacrificial rites. As far as I am aware, nobody has made the further link between Picasso's Mithraic symbolism of the sun and the cock and Basque religious symbolism: "The Basque cross appears to be related to sun worship. . . . In many valleys, the sun, *eguzki*, was the eye of God, *jainkoaren begi*, . . . circular sun images, Basque crosses, were carved over the doorways of homes. Carvings of roosters were sometimes added to further greet the rising sun" (Kurlansky 80-82). Whether Saura makes this connection in linking the *Cara al Sol* with *Guernica*/Gernika is uncertain; however, that it is Franco who obstinately stares at the noonday sun is clear.

ple of loss, he cites Christian crucifixion, pagan sacrifice, war, jewels, spectacles, the arts and "perverse" sexual activity (362-66). Following Marcel Mauss, Bataille argues that in "primitive" civilisations nobility, honour and rank sprang from the spectacular destruction of wealth and from human sacrifice (365-66), but suggests that modern bourgeois society is characterised by the loss of obligations (to provide such sumptuary spectacles) imposed by wealth, and therefore the loss of "[e]verything that was generous, orgiastic and excessive" (368). Thus the current "attenuation of the masters' brutality –which in any case has less to do with destruction itself than with psychological tendencies to destroy– corresponds to the general atrophy of the ancient sumptuary processes that characterises the modern era." Instead, "[c]lass struggle . . . becomes the grandest form of social expenditure when it is taken up again and developed, this time on the part of the workers, and on such a scale that it threatens the very existence of the masters" (371).

Through the associations the arts-educated reader may make between the citing/siting of "la cabeza del caballo, junto a la lámpara," replayed in the "cara al sol," and Bataille's non-sublimated 'regard' for the *soleil pourri*, Saura 'does Bataille' with Franco, satirising the *Caudillo* and his Falangist supporters as mad, avaricious, glory-seeking members of a defunct elite, giving vent to psychological tendencies to destroy through the ritual sacrifice of an expendable class of Spaniards (so likening the Gernika dead to crucified Christs or cocks, as Picasso did), and simultaneously characterising working class struggle as the grander form of social expenditure.

That Bataille champions the desublimation of the unconscious drives underlying non-productive expenditure, manifested in human sacrifice and in obstinately staring at the sun, should not be taken as his support for fascism. Indeed, his renewed collaboration with Breton in forming the group *Contre-attaque* was specifically conceived to fight the rise of this movement (Jones n. pag.). "Soleil pourri" in fact largely addresses art. Eunice Lipton suggests that this text proclaims

> the ultimate power of the sun which cannot be experienced by man without his harming himself, almost blinding himself. Bataille likens the experience to the mythic sacrifice of the bull whose blood during the moment of sacrifice spurts in one's face –"a beautiful shower of warm blood"– just as the rays of the sun pierce one's eyes. Ecstasy and pain, becoming and death, tumescence and ejaculation are partners. He offers the example of Icarus who flies higher and higher in order to attain his dream but ultimately as he nears the sun his wings melt and he plunges toward his death. For Bataille the most exquisite and creative moments are at that peak, seconds before, even at the edge of, and tasting, annihilation. To make art one must look the sun in the face. (303-04)

Bois argues that Bataille did not believe that art could express this dichotomy, and generally condemned art as an "ineluctably idealist form of 'transposition'" ("Figure" 81, 83). However, at the very end of "Soleil Pourri," Bataille conceded that Picasso's art (alone) demonstrated some possibility in this regard:

> [A]cademic painting more or less corresponded to an elevation –without excess– of the spirit. In contemporary painting, however, the search for that which most ruptures elevation, and for a blinding brilliance, has a share in the elaboration or decomposition of forms, though this is, in ever so small a degree, only noticeable in the paintings of Picasso. (Qtd. in Bois, "Figure" 81-82)

Bois argues that Bataille more generally viewed

> art's trajectory as a dizzying fall through an excess of elevation: art is access to the "wholly other" by means of what Denis Hollier would later call "high transgression." But what of "base transgression," of a fall toward the low through which the *informe* drags down what it de-classes? For Bataille, art, even Picasso's, is unable to partake of low transgression. ("Figure" 83)

The "'vuelta a la sombra' del cara al sol del *Guernica*" may thus also be read in relation to Bataille's critique of art's "dizzying fall through an excess of elevation." The difficulty for the reader is to know whether Saura 'does Bataille' with *Guernica* as an example of Icarian high transgression or claims it with and for Bataille as exemplary of the search for that which ruptures elevation, and for a blinding brilliance –whether he 're-views' it as sublimatory or non-sublimatory art– the same difficulty encountered in interpreting Franco's "cara al sol," although the cost to life, albeit the lives of others, is the same.

This same dichotomy, and equivocation, is heard in the utterance:

> Detesto al hombre-antorcha que al estrellarse traicionado por su paracaídas cerrado inauguró los parisinos lampadarios del destino del Guernica. (43)

Reading this utterance firstly as descriptive of *Guernica*, we recognise Picasso's "hombre-antorcha," as the traumatised woman "falling like a living torch from a window" (Rosenblum 50), while the "parisinos lampadarios," or Parisian street lamps –a symbol of the Enlightenment[25]– inform the "quinqué" extended by "la Musidora" (*Libelo* 10) from the window at the right of the painting, frequently interpreted precisely as a symbol of *l'âge*

25 The installation of streetlamps in Madrid during Carlos III's reign provided a "potent metaphor for the mighty project of *éclaircissement* –clarification and illumination of issues by the light of unaided reason– that so inspired the liberal humanists of France, Italy and Germany" (Hughes, *Goya* 51). However, in 1921, Picasso considered ordering a Parisian street lamp (and a *pissotière*) to relieve the respectability of his Fontainebleau villa (Penrose 247), such that the same intertext might suggest a Bataillean lowering towards the base.

des lumières, of rational light shed on the scene.[26] As an allegorical or symbolic figure, particularly of the Enlightenment –and thus of (Bretonian) human elevation– the latter would be anathema to Bataille, as "it is humanism that Bataille is after, and thus all systems (he loves revolution for the revolt, not for the utopia of its realization)" (Bois, "Use Value" 17). In contrast, the non-symbolic victim –who, should she survive, would be condemned to a repetition of the traumatic event, itself unscreened by the symbolic– is more appropriable to Bataille's quest for a rupture of elevation and a "blinding brilliance" in art.

However, in Saura's utterance, the two figures are conflated. While we can understand the lamp-bearer herself –for Frank D. Russell, "the painter's own signature" (qtd. in Fisch 127 n11)– as the "hombre-antorcha,"[27] she does not fall betrayed, except as an allegorical representation of the Republic,[28] but rather leans from the window. Nevertheless, Picasso may be considered one referent of the "hombre-antorcha" who illuminates Gernika's fate through his painting. What is of interest in this reading is Picasso's 'manner' of doing so – "al estrallarse traicionado por su paracaídos cerrado"– suggestive of Icarus, the "hombre-antorcha" whose desire for elevation/sublimation was betrayed by his molten wings of wax: "paracaídos [en]cer[r]ado." If, then, it is an Icarian manner that "inauguró los parisinos lampadarios del destino del Guernica" (in an allusion to its inaugural exhibition at the 1937 World's Fair, held in *la ville lumière* and dedicated to science and technology, the inheritance of the Enlightenment)[29], this utterance would seem to locate *Guernica*'s/ Picasso's surrealism as sublimatory, and thus in Breton's, idealist camp – Icarus is indeed Bataille's descriptor for Breton.[30] Breton idealises modernist painting, giving it meaning, the antithesis of Bataille's desire for art to operate a 'declassification' of modernist thought. Guillaume Apollinaire in fact lauded Picasso's Icarus-like elevation:

> Picasso is among those who Michelangelo said merit the name of eagles because they surpass all others and break through the clouds to the light of the sun. And today all shadow has disappeared. The last cry of the dying Goethe: "More light!" ascends from his work sublime and mysterious. (Qtd. in Penrose 489-90)

26 Wolfgang Virmond called the woman with the lamp "a traditional symbol of enlightenment" (qtd. in Fisch 127 n11).
27 Saura in fact notes her inaugural presence in Picasso's painting: "Odio la única sobreviviente del primer boceto del Guernica iluminando el sangriento fórceps de su propio parto" (*Libelo* 33).
28 This is Larrea's interpretation of the woman who extends the lamp in *Guernica* (248).
29 A vast chandelier containing 10 kilometres of fluorescent tubes was installed on the first floor of the Eiffel Tower, which was simultaneously lit from below by 30 naval spotlights ("Illuminating the Eiffel Tower" n. pag.). Street lighting, however, was not functioning; and fireworks displays were held during the Exhibition (Van Hensbergen 58-59). Saura's utterance also draws in such historical conditions surrounding *Guernica*'s first showing.
30 Also drawn into this utterance is *The Fall of Icarus*, 1958, Picasso's mural for the UNESCO building in Paris (Penrose 427-29), and thus the concept of *encadenamiento* –discussed in Chapter IX– within Picasso's own oeuvre.

However, as the Parisian leading light, or torchbearer, of surrealism, Apollinaire may himself be considered a referent of Saura's "hombre-antorcha."[31] Apollinaire facilitated the exchange of ideas between poets and painters in Paris. Immediately prior to painting *Guernica*, Picasso was in fact writing surrealist verse rather than painting; *Guernica* is partially informed by surrealism. Apollinaire's crediting with an inspirational role in Picasso's painting again apparently claims *Guernica* for the idealist surrealists.[32]

Yet, since it is through his fall (whether or not due to the sun's base combustion) –"al estrellarse traicionado por su paracaídas [en]cer[r]ado"– that Picasso effects this (blinding) brilliance, we also detect a Bataillean appropriation, or reading, of *Guernica*'s prophetic potential, albeit through high transgression. Bataille's critique of art's/Breton's Icarian pose, his guarded approval of Picasso's decomposition of forms, Apollinaire's plaudit to the high-flying Picasso's sublim(ity/ations) and Huidobro's *Altazor* (see footnote 32) are therefore plausibly all heard in this utterance. Read in relation to art history/theory, not

31 On artistic creativity, Ríos says to Saura: "[L]a antorcha o el testigo . . . [va] pasando de unos a otros" (159), such that "el hombre-antorcha" can be understood to represent the Saurian process of *encadenamiento* the two are discussing.

32 Picasso's friendship with Apollinaire began in 1905 and lasted until the poet's death in 1918 (Lipton 31). Apollinaire also influenced the Chilean poet Vicente Huidobro, who joined his Parisian circle in 1916 (Jiménez 73). Huidobro's *Altazor* (1931), a cycle of seven *cantos* plus preface ("Altazor o el viaje en paracaídas (prefacio)"), begun in 1919, describes the trajectory of "un Angel rebelde o Icaro moderno" (Schopf n. pag.): "Y si queriendo alzarte nada has alcanzado / Déjate caer sin parar tu caída sin miedo al fondo de la sombra / . . . / Cae y quema al pasar astros y los mares" (134, 135). José Olivio Jiménez suggests that this metapoem "se apoya sobre un mito básico: Altazor (alto azor), encarnación del poeta, desciende a las honduras –como Orfeo, como Eneas, como Dante– con ayuda de su paracaídas, la poesía" (85-86). He argues that "[c]omo Apollinaire y como Breton, Huidobro attribuye al poeta la capacidad de trascender todas las antinomias, de alcanzar por proyección imaginativa una superrealidad donde desaparecen los compartimentos en que escinde el mundo de la experiencia normal" (69). Taking Huidobro's *Altazor* as a referent of Saura's "hombre-antorcha que al estrellarse traicionado por su paracaídas cerrado inauguró los parisinos lampadarios del destino del Guernica," this utterance recalls Huidobro's role in transmitting the poetics of the French literary 'light,' Apollinaire, to the Spanish vanguard. Indeed, Huidobro "es conocido sobre todo como agente de enlace entre la vanguardia francesa y sus adeptos de España e Hispanoamérica, como desencadenante del ultraísmo" (Jiménez 72, 75). This revolutionary, imagist, surrealist, literary movement (as with *Modernismo* in general) sought the independence of art from the socially and politically contingent and the elevation of the author and his work. Javier Tusell notes the influence of ultraísmo on the early artistic vanguards and also the criticism they consequently attracted for their privileging of personal creativity and the 'game' of art over political commitment (186). However, while Altazor's poetic fall may correspond to Breton's suggestion that the idea of surrealism was "to revitalize the psychic forces by a 'vertiginous descent' into the self in quest of that secret and hidden territory where all that is apparently contradictory in our everyday lives and consciousness will be made plain" (Cuddon 882), it also invokes the double declassification in the senses of lowering and taxonomical disorder of Bataille's *informe*. Altazor's physical trajectory is accompanied by a linguistic journey which "comienza por un lenguaje cargado de contenido, de información, de ideología . . . hasta desembocar en una mera armonización" (Jiménez 84). During this journey, (Bretonian) metaphorical transpositions in which "[l]as modificaciones [verbales] se operan sólo en el plano del significado" give way to verses in which "[se van] alterando paulatinamente los significantes," until the final lines are composed of pure phonemes (90). Huidobro's *creacionismo* – which continues *ultraísmo* and informs *Altazor*– attempted to destroy existing language by breaking the bonds between words (or signs) and their significations (85), thus anticipating the postmodern idea that there is no single reality, but only representations of reality, and that these representations are culturally controlled. In this respect, Huidobro's destruction of dominant meanings brought poetry and politics together again. Paradoxically, given the idealism of Huidobro's search for "la belleza ideal" and "un verbo puramente poético" (84), this operation coincides with Bataille's own hatred of the hegemonic definitions of words (Bois, "Use Value" 16). Thus, as a referent of Saura's utterance, Altazor's fall from the sun/Apollinaire may also invoke Bataille as one of the Paris luminaries revealing the philosophical location, or "destino," of *Guernica*. Picasso painted Huidobro's portrait between 1920-1925 (Penrose 242). The poet dedicated *Ecuatorial* to Picasso (Jiménez 79). Regarding the lines of *Ecuatorial*, "El último rey portaba al cuello / Una cadena de lámparas extintas" (qtd. in Jiménez 81), Jiménez suggests that "Huidobro, al igual que Apollinaire, percibe el tránsito entre dos épocas, el ocaso de las monarquías" (81), perhaps suggesting the reinstalled Bourbon monarchy, implicated in *Guernica*'s fate, as a further referent of Saura's "parisinos lampadarios."

only are *Guernica*'s relationship with surrealism and *ultraísmo/creacionismo*, and the subsequent criticisms levelled against *Guernica* as a ludic, ivory tower, apolitical work recalled, but the two philosophical strands of surrealism are again drawn into dialogue. Saura again suggests the presence in *Guernica* of both sublimatory and desublimatory modes, possibly also suggesting that *Guernica* displays the dichotomy Bataille presumed could not be achieved in paint (Bois, "Figure" 81), and, most importantly, that *Guernica*'s success in illuminating the horror of Gernika –and prophesying the bombardments of World War II to follow, which would similarly 'light up' Paris– were due to its Bataillean aspects.

In this same utterance, artistic codes are again transposed into political and historical codes; the sublimatory idealism of Breton's art criticism/ideology (or Picasso's symbolic iconography) 'screens' the idealism and power to shed light on the 'matter' of Gernika's fate exercised by the Basque Nationalist "hombre-antorcha," Joseba (Eusebio) Elósegi.[33] Or rather, the latter's ("excessive," in the Bataillean sense) self-immolation involves an un-sublimated 'return of the real' in an effort also to exorcise the fate of Gernika. On 18 September 1970, when Franco attended the Spanish national *jai alai* championships in Donostia (a *pelota* championship had likewise been scheduled for Gernika the day of the 1937 bombardment), Elósegi doused himself in petrol, set himself on fire, then dropped seven metres onto the *frontón* in front of the dictator, shouting "'*Gora Euzkadi Askatasuna*' ('Long live free Euzkadi')" (qtd. in Southworth 309). After a slow recovery from severe burns he was sentenced to seven years' imprisonment. On 28 August, before his immolation, Elósegi had written in his diary:

> I have already said that I do not intend to eliminate Franco. I want only for him to feel on his own flesh the fire that destroyed Guernica. . . . because Guernica represents for the Basques something more than a pile of stones. Its destruction

33 Elósegi commanded the sole military unit in Gernika on the afternoon of 26 April 1937, when he fired a light machine gun, the only antiaircraft protection the town had. On 14 May, he was in charge of the battery that shot down a German Heinkel 51 bomber near Bilbo, piloted by Hans Joachim Wandel, whose 26 April diary entry contained the word "Garnika" [sic]. Elósegi saved the pilot from the wrath of the Basque soldiers (Martin 207; Southworth 309). Wandel admitted to George Steer that Gernika had been bombed with "highly efficient" incendiary bombs (qtd. in Southworth 17). He also informed British investigators that his orders were to machine-gun from the air anything moving (Southworth 228). In the summer of 1937, when the Nationalist forces completed their rout of the Basque region, Elósegi was captured in Bilbo and held in the Penal de Dueso. The officer preparing his trial claimed: "This is the man who destroyed Guernica, the sadistic officer who set fire to the sacred town of the Basques, the chief of the gang of dynamiters who sacked the town after destroying it, the man responsible for thousands of dead in an innocent and undefended town" (qtd. in Southworth 309). Elósegi was sentenced to death, but escaped to exile in France. The Nazis imprisoned him, but he escaped again. In 1946 he was arrested for flying the *ikurriña* (Basque flag) from a church during a fascist celebration (Martin 207). In *Quiero morir por algo*, Elósegi records the trauma of the town's victims and his own haunting by this event (Rankin 120). Elósegi's election as a PNV senator in the 1977 elections could also be said to have (re)inaugurated Gernika's 'enlightened,' democratic destiny, and permitted a historical revision of the event.

> signifies persecution and oppression. And the man who personalizes all this will be there before my eyes. (Qtd. in Southworth 309)

Southworth's comment that "the flames from Elósegi's clothing also lighted the failure to desymbolize the destruction of Guernica" suggests a further reading of Saura's "hombre-antorcha" as 'illuminating' Gernika's destiny: "A few days later," Southworth continues, "news of the imminent opening of the great trial in Burgos of sixteen militant members of ETA, six of whom faced a death sentence, began to appear in the world press" (309). Elósegi's negation of the Nationalist de-symbolising –or rather re-symbolising– of Gernika may also be understood as a negation of sublimation, drawn into *Contra el Guernica* to recall and retrospectively 'do Bataille' with the Franco regime's "Operación Guernica." Again, through the reciprocal transposition of political into artistic codes, the "hombre-antorcha," understood as a non-metaphorical, non-symbolical, non-sublimatory image in Picasso's painting, is successful in making manifest the reality of the atrocity.

In *Guernica*, Picasso's 'high' modernist style is 'lowered' by the need to express the political reality of the Civil War. However, where this involves recourse to allegory or metaphor, *Guernica* does not partake of Bataillean base transgression; it is rather Picasso's decomposition of forms and his refusal of symbolism and transposition that orchestrate the 'return of the real.' Bois argues that Picasso's art did in fact partake of low transgression, and that from 1926 to 1932 Picasso was even "tempted by excremental nontransposition" ("Base" 56). Ironically, he notes, it was Breton who championed the base materialist side of Picasso's work, overlooked by the 'excrement-philosopher' himself (only to resort once more to his "game of transpositions" after this brief encroachment on Bataillean ground) ("Figure" 85). I suggest that this specific locus of the Breton-Bataille polemic is recalled in the utterance, "[o]dio el 'montón de recuerdos' del estercolero del Guernica" (*Libelo* 36).

In "Picasso dans son élément" (published in 1933 in response to the *Documents* group's claim that Picasso was a realist painter), Breton initially focuses on the materiality of Picasso's painting process in transparently Bataillean terms, going "as far as to consider the work of art as a form of excretion, focusing on the perishable materials used by the painter." However, when shown "a small canvas composed of a single large lump, which [Picasso] claims represents an excrement . . . Breton overcomes his 'slight disgust' by imagining how the artist would magically transform this base matter" (Adamowicz n. pag.): "Any slight and passing repugnance that might have been aroused by this solitary lump around which the painter had not yet started to weave his magic was more than exorcised . . . visualizing the shiny, brand new flies which Picasso would conjure up"

(Breton, qtd. in Bois, "Figure" 85-86). Bois, like Adamowicz, argues that Breton is only too aware of the Bataillean, anti-transpositional character of the first part of his text, and he too notes that Breton's peroration on the imagined shiny flies is directed against Bataille, "mark[ing] a return to idealization, to the symbolization characteristic of surrealism" ("Figure" 86).[34] In this text, Breton continues the debate begun by Bataille in "Le Langage des fleurs," in which he refers to an image of the Marquis de Sade throwing rose petals into an excrement-filled sewer, and argues that "the most ideal flower will rapidly be reduced to tatters on an aerial *dung-heap*" (qtd. in Adamowicz n. pag.). Adamowicz notes that, "Breton, on the contrary, sublimates the rose in an essentializing movement –'the rose, deprived of its petals, is still a rose'– thus keeping rose and *dungheap* rigorously separate" (n. pag.). (Emphasis added in both quotations.)

Among the "montón de recuerdos" –the many ('scatological') souvenirs, jewels or memories– 're-collected' in "el estercolero del *Guernica*," then, are Picasso's earlier, base materialist stool-painting and the textual appropriations of his art to suit the doxa of one surrealist faction or the other.[35] Furthermore, in "The Notion of Expenditure," Bataille notes that in psychoanalytical theory jewellery and gifts ("recuerdos") in fact symbolise excretion, which is "itself linked to death, in conformity with the fundamental connection between anal eroticism and sadism" (363, 366). In drawing in Bataille's discussion of excrement as wholly other and its relationship to the non-productive expenditure of jewels, and also to the holy other of religious sacrifice, Saura's "'montón de recuerdos' del ester-colero" can be read as pertaining also to Gernika, (again) recalling the excessive sadism and sacrifice of Basque lives by supposedly Christian crusaders. In what we might oxymoronically term a de-sublimatory 'transposition' of the codes of painting and political history, Saura thus again 'does Bataille' with Franco's insurrectionary forces.

Goya's introductory plate to his *Desastres de la guerra*, *Tristes pensamientos de lo que ha de acontecer* (1863), provided a different, yet related, kind of base material to be remembered in *Guernica*. For Robert Hughes, the emaciated man in this etching is

34 Saura's description of the *Guernica* bull's tail as a feathery (or camp) "fly-swat" in the utterance, "[d]etesto el plumero espantamoscas del búfalo del Guernica" (*Libelo* 25), also draws on the Bataille-Breton polemic: Breton argued that "Mr. Bataille loves flies. Not we . . ." (qtd. in Bois, "Figure" 85); Breton only imagined "shiny," "new" flies in order to provoke his adversary and to sublimate and transpose Picasso's excrement-painting (Bois, "Figure" 85-86). "Espanta-moscas" thus recalls Breton's aversion to the Bataillean real, and suggests that Picasso's bull is more appropriable to the Bretonian camp – it is in fact largely discussed as a symbolic element rather than a representation of the reality of the atrocity. Iván –"de espátula muy libre"– Mosca, Saura's co-exhibitor in "Arte fantástico" (1953) (Saura, *Escritura* 36) may also leave a trace in this line, as may the (camp) *gran bufo* Alfred Jarry: given that Picasso acknowledged the influence of the "old turd" ("L'ETRON") Jarry in relation to the *Sueño y mentira de Franco* (qtd. in Nash 16), he may be an intertext in the "plumero espantamoscas del búfalo [as opposed to bull] del Guernica."

35 The critic Michael Ayton claimed Picasso's war-time pictures were "uniformally dung-colored" (qtd. in Nash 29): a further scatological "recuerdo."

> Job on the *dunghill* of Spain; he is also taken from the familiar pose of Christ . . . kneeling to beseech God the Father to . . . spare him the torments of crucifixion. . . . Like the rebel in the white shirt facing the French muskets in the *Third of May*, he is the Spanish people battered but not broken, face to face with a disastrous and heroic future that will be revealed in the plates to come. [emphasis added] (*Goya* 273-75)

As noted previously, Goya's *fusilado* is a much cited source for *Guernica*; the future revealed in Goya's etchings may be considered to extend to twentieth-century Spain, and to Basque 'Jobs' – 'sacrifoecal' victims on the Biblical "dunghill," or rather "ashes" (Job 2:8), of Gernika.[36]

Further 'scatological' memories recalled in Saura's utterance include the base words of the Roman theologian Venancio Carro, written in a slanderous attack on the inhabitants of Gernika. In a pamphlet defending the Nationalist position on the Civil War, Carro alleged that "[t]he Casa de Juntas, far from being a venerated shrine for the Basques, was in reality being used as a dung heap when the Nationalists arrived" (qtd. in Southworth 155). Again, then, Saura 'does Bataille' not only with the instigators of the atrocity, but also with their international supporters. His black humour draws on a 'heap of memories' of the 'elimination' and abjection of Gernika's populace, readily accessible to most adult Spaniards, overlaying these with the theoretical debates informing and appropriating *Guernica* known better to the (also 'othered') arts-educated members of Spanish society. Finally, I suggest that Saura's recall of such texts may have been incited by José María Ucelay's description of *Guernica*, reported in *El País* 22 November 1981, as "7 x 3 metres of pornography, shiting on Gernika, on Euskadi, on everything" (qtd. in Van Hensbergen 244).

In this chapter, I have argued that Saura's utterances orchestrate a 'return of the real' both in relation to Spanish Civil War history and to Picasso's painting. By 're-citing' a litany of what had historically been said and done in Francoist Spain, and also by 're-sighting' the traumatic reality of the Gernika atrocity, Saura heeds Bataille's call for desublimation, not to excuse the kind of atrocity committed by the insurrectionary Rebels and their German allies at Gernika as 'natural,' but rather to refuse the 're-pressions' of such events for political expedience, even or especially during the vulnerable transition to democracy. Saura likewise 're-views' *Guernica*, locating Picasso's painting in relation to the Breton-Bataille polemic, re-citing/sighting the Bataillean, de-sublimatory aspects of its

36 Whilst Job is popularly referred to as being on the "dungheap," the Bible places him among the ashes of the waste burned outside his town's perimeter. From 200 BCE, this site outside Jerusalem gave rise to the Christian notion of hell (personal correspondence from Alison Molineux), such that "el estercolero del Gernika" may be read as a Biblical metaphor for hell.

(sur)realist aesthetic, and re-siting their traumatic affect as oppositional, to resist (the) painting's appropriation to current political ends and also in satire of the many commentators who have doubted *Guernica*'s oppositional power. Saura's 're-viewing' of *Guernica*'s idiom is again discussed in the following chapter, where it is addressed in (the) terms of his own painterly praxis.

Painting as a 'Campo de Bataille'

Saura's visual art and his art theory can also be 'read' in relation to George Bataille's desublimatory operations and his 'weapons' of base materialism and the *informe*. From 1955, Saura departed from his initial post-surrealist, abstract-informalist language to turn, for political reasons, to figuration (Gauthier 26-27), a (re)turn which, I now wish to argue, also involved a 'return of the real'; a painterly 'manner' of 'doing Bataille' with Franco.[1] While Saura's visual art "has been seen as one of the most forceful protests against the Franco regime" (Chilvers 423), this protest is not expressed through any explicit political content in Saura's paintings, but rather in the violent gestures which (de)compose his human figures. These expressionistic and rapidly 'executed' figures are manifestations of "La belleza obscena" and "La mirada cruel," championed in the artist's essays, or manifestos, collected under these (and further) titles in *Fijeza* (1999), and insinuated in *Contra el Guernica*.

Saura's introductory essay in *Fijeza*, "Espacio y gesto," represents (vicariously) the genealogy of his own painterly praxis. Here, Saura argues that the pioneers of *art informel*, Jean Fautrier, Jean Dubuffet and Wols (pseudonym of Alfred Otto Wolfgang Schulze), "abrieron paso a una nueva posibilidad pictórica, . . . la utilización desmesurada de la materia como protagonista –fundamento y fin del cuadro– y la investigación de todas sus posibilidades expresivas" (10). While, Saura suggests, "[p]artir de esa originaria 'materia informe'[2] . . . es para muchos pintores un pretexto de academicismo," more revolutionary informalist art evidences "la voluntad de destrucción de la forma y de los conceptos espaciales y estructurales anteriores," and thus constitutes "un verdadero replanteamiento del cuadro . . . que propone . . . el reflejo de un ansia de una realidad absoluta" (10 n2, 13, 15).

1 In the dominant discourse of modernism, which privileged abstraction as the path of progress, to 'return' to figuration was a backwards step. Of Saura's move to figuration, Paule Gauthier writes:

> Saura has, in several interviews, explained his switch. Choice is and always has been a means of protest, abstraction is protest if it is implicated in a context where it is not fully accepted. Therefore, non-figuration is a way of denying the art of icons. A fashion for freeing oneself of one's obsessions, art of interiority or revolution, the backlash of political crimes will transform it. The death and imprisonment of friends, as early as 1957, led him to a more demonstrative art. To an organic counter-image, rendered extremely percusive [sic] by the extraordinary mastery of this painter. (24-26)

Saura in fact produced his first figurative paintings in 1954 ("Obras" 40).

2 Saura applauds the accuracy of this term, proposed by Michel Tapié in *Un art autre* (1952), for the art of Fautrier, Dubuffet and Wols (*Fijeza* 10 n2). Yve-Alain Bois, however, distinguishes between *art informel*, or informalism, and the *informe*, arguing that the former is the art of informing, insistent on the emergence of the human figure, whereas the *informe* should not call up figurative associations but is "anti-representation, the assimilation of everything to form" ("No" 140-41). Nevertheless, he notes that while Fautrier and Dubuffet were against the term *informel* (Wols had already died), part of their production does put Bataille's *informe* operations into play. He also notes that Fautrier and Bataille were friends (140), and that because of his figural conception of art, Bataille himself "did not conceive of a more ambitious aesthetic violation than that of launching a low blow against human form" ("Threshole" 186). Saura likewise launches a blow against the human form in his informalist (dis)figuration.

Among the revolutionary developments of informalism Saura cites abstract expressionism, in which genre he includes the use of the figure as an armature for the artist's gestures:

> [E]n el expresionismo abstracto, bien sea figurativo o no, las formas, o los esquemas estructurales previos, son destrozados para ser luego nuevamente organizados en un complejo rítmico, obedeciendo a una geometría orgánica,[3] inconsciente, que pretende la unificación de todo el torrente del cuadro (en su flujo y reflujo) en una sola pulsión biológica. La imagen, o una nueva estructuración no figurativa, queda recompuesta bajo imperativos expresivos y estructurales en los cuales el motivo o el esquema originario ha sido traspuesto [sic] apasionadamente. De esta manera los cuadros de algunos pintores pueden ser observados indistintamente desde dos enfoques diferentes, el abstracto o el de su imagen figurativa. . . . La nueva postura no consistirá en una vuelta a la imagen . . . sino en una forma inédita de enfocar la realidad. (12-13)

Saura argues that such (dis)figurative informalism contrasts with both traditional figuration and geometric abstraction: "En su éxtasis o en su paroxismo, la pintura informalista, con sus presencias torturadas o vaporizadas ofrece un tremendo contraste con la concreción de la pintura figurativa (ajena a toda preocupación actual) y con la pureza estática del abstraccionismo geométrico" (17). Indeed, for Saura, informalism runs counter to all the major developments in early twentieth-century art: "Contra el excesivo decoratismo y funcionalidad arquitectónica . . . de Mondrian y Malevich, contra el utópico arte colectivo que propugnaba el neoplasticismo, contra un realismo socialista sin justificación estética posible,[4] contra los paraísos artificiales de los surrealistas" (17). Saura also insists that informalist painting, including that which takes the human form as an *esquema*, or armature, constitutes an art of social/political protest:

> [O]frece un testimonio de nuestra época, una protesta y una denuncia de su angustia e inestabilidad. . . . Ella puede ser todavía la expresión de una protesta desgarrada, un acto de nihilismo, un flujo violento del subconsciente colectivo, incluso un simple grito. . . . Nadie podía tachar a estos artistas de vivir en su castillo de cristal, de permanecer al margen de los problemas acuciantes de nuestra época. (18-19)

Having introduced the informalist genealogy (and sociopolitical underpinning) of Saura's visual art/theory, I will now locate his (dis)figurative paintings, which take the portrait

3 We might read "las geométricas y polvorientas babas del Guernica" (*Libelo* 34) in this light.

4 We therefore recognise the irony in Saura's utterance, "[d]etesto al Guernica porque no cayó en la trampa del realismo socialista y no trató de 'fotografiar la guerra, sino de hacerla desde la propia pintura'" (*Libelo* 13). Socialist realism was well represented at the Spanish Pavilion; however, had Picasso worked in this style, *Guernica* would not be the canonical work it is today, but would have fallen from view. This utterance also draws into dialogue the Picasso statement: "I have not painted the war, because I'm not the kind of painter who goes out like a photographer for something to depict" (qtd. in Oppler 348). His further statement, as recorded by Juan Larrea –"Picasso confiesa que maneja los pinceles como los milicianos el fusil" (qtd. in Gurney 57)– is 're-cited' in the utterance, "[d]etesto al pretencioso maestro que tras afirmar 'manejo los pinceles como los milicianos manejan el fusil' prefirió quedarse pontificando en el Café de Flore una vez perdida la batalla del Guernica" (*Libelo* 35).

and the crucifixion as *esquemas* for his expressive gestures ("Obras" 40; "Crucifixiones" 63), in relation to Bataille's philosophy, and to *Contra el Guernica. Libelo*. Firstly, I would note their relation to Bataille's weapons of the *informe* and base materialism. Francisco Calvo Serraller writes of Saura's earliest series of figurative paintings, *Damas* (1955-), as an "encuentro con la 'grosería' de la pintura como materia . . . con toda su expresividad excrementicia de embadurnamiento" ("Entre damas" 13), thus invoking the 'excrement-philosopher's' concept of base materialism. In conversation with Saura, Julián Ríos likens these first *Damas* to "arañas" (46), to which Saura replies: "Hay una proliferación de signos, que muchas veces obedecen a motivos puramente plásticos de ocupación de la tela, y esa motivación acaba por provocar una serie de excrecencias anómalas en la figura central" (Ríos 46). Bataille's reference to spiders in his "dictionary" definition of the *informe* perhaps inflects Ríos's choice of the word "arañas" to describe Saura's *Damas*, while the artist's championing of "motivos puramente plásticos" and the resultant "excrecencias anómalas" would seem to proclaim his debt to Bataille's (art-)philosophy, specifically his non-transpositional base materialism and the 'bad form' of his *informe*: these anomalous growths –foreign to the bodies which 'excrete' such unassimilable waste or irrecuperable matter– are neither sublimat(ed/ory) nor symbolical.[5] Interestingly, Saura cites/sights precisely such anomalous or abnormal excrescence in *Guernica*:

> Odio el cuerpo extraño del Guernica en la atípica anomalía que protege la anormal excrecencia de su cadáver congelado (27).

The phrase, "el cuerpo extraño del Guernica" –the strange, alien or 'foreign body' of *Guernica*/Gernika– cites/sights the "wholly/holy other" whose scotomisation is critiqued in Bataille's "scatology" or "heterology" (Bois, "*Abattoir*" 46; "Base" 52). As an intertext in this utterance, Bataillean codes inflect both the Nationalist abjection of 'the other(ed) Spain,' and also non-sublimatory elements in Picasso's painting: if, in relation to Gernika, "la anormal excrecencia de su cadáver congelado" invokes the 'de-formed,' decomposing body of the sacrificed "holy other" of Gernika, in relation to *Guernica*, it suggests Picasso's "wholly other" painterly excrescences and his 'decomposition' of forms. Further transposing the codes of the painting and the atrocity, the Nazi/Nationalist bombardment is

5 Saura himself relates "excrecencias" to surrealism: "Cuando desfallece cierta región del cuadro, cierta estructura donde no se puede encontrar una solución inmediata, basta recurrir a la deformación, a la excrecencia, a la monstruosidad, con la libertad que te otorgaba justamente el surrealismo. . . . Es una actitud surrealista, yo creo, o por lo menos una consecuencia del surrealismo" (Ríos 50-51). I suggest their qualification as surrealist *à la* Bataille, given Saura's stated antipathy to "los paraísos artificiales de los surrealistas," evocative of André Breton, and their relation to the *informe*.

inflected with Picasso's violent treatment of the human form; reciprocally, the abjected bodies of the Gernika victims are claimed to be re-presented to the viewer in a (regrettably non-sublimated) Nazi/Nationalist 'manner' in *Guernica*. It is thus Picasso's refusal of scotomisation (rather than his symbolism) that brings the atrocity before the gaze, just as it is in Saura's own text, and painting, insinuated through the ekphrastic attribution to *Guernica* of the same qualities claimed or noted in Saura's own (dis)figurative work. Indeed, speaking of Saura's first series of *Damas*, Calvo Serraller notes that Saura "trató al informalismo como un cadáver" ("Entre Damas" 12), such that the phrase "cadáver congelado" invokes not just *Guernica*'s/Gernika's (Bataillean) 'de-composition' of human forms –and the surrealists' "exquisite cadaver"[6]– but also Saura's (Bataillean) informalism.

The "atypical anomaly" regarding the protection/patronage of the abnormal excrescences of both painting and atrocity victims resides in a further reading of "el cuerpo extraño del Gernika" as the German and Italian troops –*el cuerpo de ejército extranjero*– at the Nationalists' disposal in the war in the north. In this semantic layer, the anomalous desire to protect the mortifying evidence afforded by *Guernica* is attributed to the contemporary Nationalist(ic) patrons of the previously abjected painting, and the abject mortification that it, and now Saura, 're-members.' However, reading this utterance in relation to *Guernica* alone, the "atypical anomaly" regarding the "protection" of abnormal painterly excrescences would (once more) seem to suggest a qualification of, or limit to, Picasso's transgressive, non-sublimatory, Bataillean 'manner.'

In relation to his extensive series of *Crucifixiones*, begun in1957, Saura writes of the figure of Christ crucified as an "estructura matrix donde la presencia de una forma fundamental es receptáculo para el encerramiento de fuerzas y tensiones determinadas," that is, as an *esquema* for his painterly gestures. As with his *Damas*, we note the appearance of anomalous, or "monstruous," form: "[A]parece el espantapájaros, la monstruosa concreción del chafado y polimorfo sapo de la libertad obedeciendo fatalmente a la dictadura de la orgánica construcción más que a la irreverente venganza o al alertado humor" ("Crucifixiones" 63-64). While Saura privileges purely plastic reasons over irreverent revenge or wary humour as motivating the emergence of such "monstrous concretions" as the "scarecrow" and the "crushed, polymorphic toad" –recalling the earthworms and spiders which get themselves crushed in Bataille's operation of the *informe*– his turn of

6 Saura's phrase draws in the "exquisite corpse" –the collective name for surrealist games of chance intended to outwit the rational mind and to gain to access the unconscious– and also André Breton's representation as "Un Cadavre" by disaffected surrealists (Krauss, "Cadaver" 63-65).

phrase is nevertheless suggestive of freedom as 'bad form,' crushed in fatal obeisance to the 'organicist' dictatorship of General Franco as well as to the dictatorship of organic construction of Saura's painterly process. Another interpretation pits the Saurian dictatorship against the Francoist.[7] Saura's political resistance would thus seem to appear 'informally' in both his art writing and practice. I suggest that it is a Bataillean/Saurian (as well as a Clarkian/Kemenovian/Steerian) scarecrow, 'crushed' by both artistic and political regimes, that makes an 'informal' appearance in the "espantapájaros gris y negro del Guernica" (*Libelo* 8).

Bataille's base materialism, or the operation of the *informe*, also 'informs' Saura's painterly "toad spittle," impeded from adorning *Guernica* by its protective glass case:

> Odio los cristales que impedirán adornar el Guernica con mis esputos de sapo. (12)

However, in an earlier utterance these visceral painterly qualities are attributed to *Guernica* itself:

> Odio al Guernica porque a pesar de su quirófano aseptizado seguirá escupiendo a la cara de los asesinos de la cultura. (11)

Here, "su quirófano aseptizado" –the steril(e/ising) "Operación Guernica" and/or contemporary 'operations' intended to neutralise the painting's oppositional power– now conversely fail to shield "los asesinos [fascistas/nacionalistas] de la cultura" from Picasso's visceral, 'spitting' art. In both utterances, this (toad) spittle is a desublimatory weapon, just as Bataille's *informe*, exemplified by spittle, was conceived as a weapon against Breton's sublimations.[8] In the latter quoted utterance, in spite of *Guernica*'s "quirófano aseptizado" (or, ironically, because of it: Picasso's surgical dissection of form is also championed by Saura, as we shall see shortly), the painting remains visceral, dissenting art. In this pair of utterances Saura again characterises Picasso's art in the same way that he characterises his own: as (at least partially) 'informed' by Bataille's desublimatory base materialism and as a painterly weapon against the Nationalist project.

7 Picasso suggested that there "ought be an absolute dictatorship . . . a dictatorship of painters ("Conversation" 510).

8 An interpretation of Saura's "esputos de sapo" as art-as-weapon (of the people) is corroborated by the surrounding utterances. These name simple, rustic weapons inflected with art-historical particularities: "[M]i maja pistola" (12) invokes Goya's *Majas*, which Saura cites as examples of *la belleza obscena* (*Fijeza* 202-03); "mi navaja serrana" (*Libelo* 12) may invoke the knife of *El Paso* sculptor, Pablo Serrano, and also Picasso's words: "I want my paintings to be able to defend themselves, to resist the invader, just as though there were razor blades on all surfaces so no one could touch them without cutting his hands" (qtd. in Van Hensbergen 214). "Mi frutabomba" (12) perhaps alludes to the painting of Francisco Bores, "partidario de la 'pintura-fruta'" (Bonet 14), and a friend of Picasso (Van Hensbergen 244).

Calvo Serraller locates the base materiality of Saura's *Damas* in relation to a primitivist vein in his discourse of *la belleza obscena*, suggesting that "[e]l artista obsceno es regresivo porque celebra su vuelta a la matriz engendradora, a esa ignota cueva donde la materia informe lo formó," and that "Saura denominó a esa regresión el origen, tratando del tema de las Damas, *Magma mater*, vuelta a la licuación primigenia" ("Entre Damas" 11). Saura's citing of the "Venus primigenias," and 'primitive' art generally, as important precursors of both *la belleza obscena* and *la mirada cruel* –each characterised by the destruction-construction of form (*Fijeza* 160-63)[9]– also corresponds with Bataille's philosophy of art: "Bataille toma el arte primitivo como arranque de su idea de que todo arte es destrucción; 'el arte, desde que incontestablemente es arte, procede por sucesivas destrucciones. En tanto en cuanto libera instintos, éstos son sádicos'" (Combalia 80). Saura's privileging of the 'primitive' can therefore be understood to resist, or 'do Bataille' with, fascist tastes in art: in 1937, the year *Guernica* was painted, Nazi attacks on modernist art culminated in the now infamous exhibition of "Entartete Kunst," or "degenerate art" (Lipton 322). In particular, the Nazis condemned modernisms that

> connected the cultural other and the unconscious . . . the arts of "the primitive," the child, and the insane, in order to deploy the disruptive alterity of these alien figures. An ideal to the surrealists, this primitive fantasm threatened the Nazi subject, who also associated it with Jews and Communists, for this fantasm represented the degenerate forces that endangered its armored identity, . . . if the surrealists embraced the primitive, the fascists abjected it, aggressed against it. (Foster, *Return* 213)

This fascist position is satirised in the phrase "la obra del pintor degenerado" (*Libelo* 18). Given Saura's esteem for so-called primitive art, this 'criticism' of Picasso's work must be read *al revés*: as homage to Picasso's 'degenerate' taste for the primitive, and as Saura's 'black-humoured' distaste for the fascist abjection of the 'degenerate' 'other.'

Furthermore, Calvo Serraller notes that "esta regresión magmática es situado por Saura, en el arte contemporáneo, en el binomio Picasso-Pollock," thus providing "la clave estética y artística de las *Damas* de Saura, el cual quiere fundir la violencia destructora de Picasso con el fluido chorro eyaculativo de Jackson Pollock. Recomposición cruel –alteración– de la figura, objeto del deseo y descarga gestual, que la inunda" ("Entre Damas" 11-12). Again I would suggest that Bataille's philosophy 'informs' both Saura's regard for

9 Saura cites the art of "culturas primitivas" and the "Venus esteatopigias, primigenias" or "Venus del paleolítico y del neolítico, . . . repletas de excrecencias, . . . labradas con hachazos" as precursors of *la belleza obscena* (*Fijeza* 199, 216); likewise, "el arte de la prehistoria . . . Venus primigenias, diosas madres de cuerpos torturados o estilizados, . . . [y el] 'arte primitivo'" are cited as precursors of *la mirada cruel* (163).

Picasso's cruel "alteration"[10] of the human form and his (albeit standard) description of Pollock's work as "ejaculatory." As we have read, for Bataille, "the search for that which most ruptures elevation, and for a blinding brilliance, has a share in the elaboration or decomposition of forms . . . only noticeable in the paintings of Picasso" (qtd. in Bois, "Figure" 81-82); for Saura too, "[e]l único pintor . . . donde los signos del rostro son cambiados de lugar, reconstruidos, transformados, alterados, en función de una necesidad de violentar la naturaleza, de un cierto sadismo frente a la realidad, como motivo de afirmación personal, es Picasso" (qtd. in Ríos 52). Likewise, Saura's validation of Pollock's "pintura eyaculativa" (*Fijeza* 216)[11] echoes Bataille's identification of revolutionary art with the scrutinised *soleil pourri* and thus "with a mental ejaculation, foam on the lips, and an epileptic crisis" (Bataille, qtd. in Bois, "Dialectic" 70). While Bataille speaks of a mental rather than a physical ejaculation, this reading is corroborated by Saura's use also of Bataille's metaphor of the epileptic seizure, cited in the utterance:

> Odio los protagonistas del Guernica revolcándose
> en un ataque epiléptico, un día de febrero, en su
> cámara polvorienta repleta de trastos viejos. (*Libelo* 25)

Saura thus characterises the political protagonists of Gernika, newly implicated in the attempted *coup d'état* of 23 February 1981, as scrutinising Bataille's *soleil pourri*, while the painterly protagonists of *Guernica* are described as 'informed' by Bataille's conceptualisation of revolutionary aesthetics. Also drawn into this utterance is Saura's own, related discussion of *la belleza obscena* as evidenced in, among others, Picasso's, Pollock's and Francis Bacon's art. Regarding Bacon's painting, Saura writes: "[O]bservaremos cómo aparece . . . la obsesión masturbatoria acrecentada, en su epilepsia, por el encerramiento de sus mejores figuras en una cámara neumática, siendo la apariencia terrorífica y angustiosa definición de un estado cataléptico del placer" (*Fijeza* 215). Ríos speaks to Saura of his *Crucifixión* (1979) in the same terms: "[P]arece como un Cristo epiléptico" (91). We therefore recognise both Bataille's thought and Saura's art/theory in this utterance.[12] If, in a

10 For Bataille, "alteration" was the goal of psychoanalysis; he valorised the "reduction of repression" as an alteration toward the base, arguing that "[a] return to reality does not imply any new acceptances, but means that one is seduced in a base manner, without transposition" (qtd. in Bois, "Base" 50). He argued that "the term *alteration* has the double interest of expressing a partial decomposition analogous to that of corpses and at the same time the passage to a perfectly heterogeneous state corresponding to . . . the *wholly other*, which is to say, the sacred, realized by example in a ghost" (qtd. in Bois, "Base" 50). Saura may reference Bataille's thinking when he speaks of alteration in this context.

11 In "La mirada cruel," Saura again writes of Pollock's ejaculatory painting: "[E]l sexo-pincel eyacula conformaciones aproximativas que el azar de la expansión se encarga de acentuar o confundir en su fantasma copulatorio" (*Fijeza* 168). Regarding Saura's *Damas*, Calvo Serraller likewise notes the "éxtasis eyaculativo que hace incorporar al artista al ritmo fluido de la naturaleza" ("Entre Damas" 13).

12 Freud's repertory of the "uncanny" –which maps the same terrain as Roland Barthes's "punctum" and Lacan's "tuché": the traumatic encounter with a non-symbolisable 'real'– also includes epileptic fits (Krauss, "Uncanny" 193-94), and may thus be a source for both Bataille and Saura.

political reading, the "cámara polvorienta repleta de trastos viejos" refers to the dusty legislative chamber filled with out-worn Neo-Francoist politicians –or rather 'occupied' in their defence by Tejero's reactionary old troops, 'fitted out' in nineteenth-century uniforms and moustaches– in an aesthetic reading we recognise Picasso's time-worn visual tropes: the (sublimatory) symbolism and references to antiquity which inhabit *Guernica*'s 'dusty' interior space, and indeed its protagonists, in turn convulsed by more revolutionary, 'obscenely beautiful,' (dis)figurative distortions.

In "La belleza obscena," Saura constitutes the painterly praxis of "la cópula" as a new genre (*Fijeza* 199) in which it is less the content than the convulsive process, forms and overall affect of the painting that is sexualised:

> La verdadera obscenidad aparece cuando se manifiesta a través del "monstruo artístico", entendiendo por tal concepto no solamente la convulsión o alteración de las formas, sino el propio y monstruoso resultado del conjunto. El verdadero arte obsceno es drama de cumplido incumplimiento frente a un ansia que puede resumirse en la imposibilidad de poseer todos los cuerpos vivos del universo, para alcanzar el orgasmo eterno que se cumple sin satisfacerte a fin de continuar su búsqueda hasta la muerte. (215)

I suggest that this "monstrous" representation –or rather manifestation–[13] of "*ateísmo sexual*" (221), inflected with the death drive, is more 'real' than the surreptitious sexuality of the genre it desublimates, the classical Western nude, which, as Saura notes, is generally transposed into religious, moral or mythical narratives (201). Saura's discourse of *la belleza obscena* therefore also resonates with Bataille's call for a non-sublimated relation to art and with his implicit call for a non-transpositional form of fetishism (Bois, "Base" 55). Saura in fact twice cites Bataille's texts in, and in relation to, "La belleza obscena": "Cuando [Hans] Bellmer ilustra los textos de Bataille . . . logra mantener sin traición una obsesiva fantasmagoría que a él sólo le pertenece. Si las obras de Bellmer han guardado su poder turbador con el paso de los años, es precisamente, al igual que sucede en Bataille, por la latencia de lo sagrado-ateo" (*Fijeza* 210). Nearing the conclusion of this text, Saura again cites Bataille: "[P]ues si bien el mal 'en la medida en que traduce la atracción hacia la muerte, ante la cual es un desafío como lo es en todas las formas del erotismo', para la mirada del pintor cruel, destruir aquello que se ama no es más que resolver tal dilema en su propia y tiránica obecación" (219).

Claiming Picasso as a key exponent of *la belleza obscena*, Saura argues that only Picasso "transgrede el 'desnudo ideal' para convertirse su pintura en desnudamiento del

13 Informalist figuration, understood as *dis*figuration or *trans*figuration, is non-representational of its human models.

deseo que no precisa de la belleza convencional para ser imagen del deseo en sí misma" (216) While, for Saura, of all Picasso's works, *Les Demoiselles d'Avignon* (1907) and his war-time portraits of Dora Maar best exemplify *la belleza obscena* (217), in *Contra el Guernica*, I suggest that Saura also sights/cites *la cópula plástica*, or *la plástica obscena*, in "el 'partouze' . . . del Guernica" (25) and in the "aquelarre obsceno del Guernica y su carbonería poblada de pasionarias de muerte y fétidas Meninas copulando con las bestias" (23), discussed previously.

Saura's discourse of *la mirada cruel* is also linked to Bataille (and to *la belleza obscena*). In "La mirada cruel. La crueldad sublime y lo monstruoso," Saura discusses the characteristics of painting which might be understood as "maldad," defined firstly as "las cosas 'que son malas' porque dañan, hacen padecer, o son contrarias a la moral establecida o al precepto religioso," and subsequently as "heterodoxia, perversidad, obsesión o carácter desmesurado, patentización de lo sexual y de lo satánico" (*Fijeza* 158, 159). As in his discourse of *la belleza obscena*, this "badness" or "evilness" is evidenced less in transgressive subject matter than in plastic transgressions:

> [E]n la perversión del lenguaje; en la crueldad interna que fuerza, violenta las formas, conduciéndolas a un fin predestinado e irremediable; en conceptos antinómicos de destrucción-construcción de la imagen o estructura; en la evidencia de su desnudamiento grafológico; en su necesidad de alterar, degradar, deformar, para alcanzar, en procesos de reconstrucción azarosa, una realidad por fin poseedora de su propia maldad, abrupta en su esencia y blasfema de su origen. (160)

It is the artist's (and later the spectators') *mirada cruel* that 'informs' and registers such painterly transgressions. Indeed, *la mirada cruel* is the instrument for both practising and measuring "cruelty" or "monstrousness" in "great" or "intense" art:

> "[L]as grandes artes . . . deben contar con lo cruel y lo monstruoso, ambos repugnantes en principio, pero al ser combinados con el sueño de la razón y el avispero de la inteligencia, producen la imposible maravilla y el susto de la mirada." [14] Frente a un ideal de perfección se opondrá el equilibrio milagroso de aquello que se degrada, se corroe, se transforma o conforma, en un acto irremediable, irrecuperable, de una luminosa corrupción. Tales condiciones tienen, para el observador atento, el mejor instrumento de medida: el sismógrafo de la "mirada cruel". En sí misma, la práctica de la mirada cruel constituye uno de los sustentos esenciales del arte del mal. (158-59)

As we have read, Saura sights/cites *la mirada cruel* in *Guernica*: "El mal, en este caso . . . se halla en la intensidad de la mirada cruel de su artífice que lo transforma en fenóme-

[14] Saura cites himself, and also Goya's *El sueño de la razón produce monstruos* (1796-97), in this passage.

no pictórico, en latigazo visual percibido en un instante" (164-65); again though, it is more manifest in Picasso's analytical cubism and in his Dora Maar portraits. The latter belong to

> el panorama más sobrecogedor del amor y de la destrucción en el arte conjuntados, pues si bien el mal "en la medida en que traduce la atracción hacia la muerte, ante la cual es un desafío como lo es en todas las formas del erotismo", para la mirada del pintor cruel, destruir aquello que se ama no es más que resolver tal dilema en su propia y tiránica obecación. (167)

The quotation in this paragraph is of course the same Bataille quotation cited above;[15] Saura thus also draws on this philosopher in his discourse of *la mirada cruel*. On the relationship of Picasso's Dora Maar portraits to Saura's *mirada cruel*, Calvo Serraller notes:

> Como muy sagazmente subrayó Saura, lo asombroso de estas mujeres monstruosas . . . no fue debido a una exacerbación expresionista de los rasgos, sino a la "fría" desfiguración a las que fueron sometidas, que, a mi juicio, es inseparable de la experiencia cubista, . . . a cuya violencia retornó el pintor malagueño no sólo como reacción frente al academicismo neoclasicista de la vanguardia, sino ante la orientación abstracta, por vía del automatismo, del primer surrealismo. En cierta manera, Picasso retomó la técnica de disección cubista de la figura como una forma de entrar la violencia de su mirada cruel. ("Entre Damas" 12)

The return of Picasso's cubist dissection of the human form in his surrealist-inflected war-time painting is drawn into *Contra el Guernica* in the utterance:

> Odio la bombilla divina que preside la sala de disección del hospital de las señoritas de Aviñón del Guernica. (33)

Here, Saura himself posits the reappearance of Picasso's dissecting *mirada cruel*, first evidenced in *Les Demoiselles d'Avignon* –the painting considered to herald Picasso's cubist phase– in a further war-time painting: *Guernica*. In Saura's utterance, the dissecting room is presided over by the "bombilla divina," interpolating Guillaume Apollinaire: named the "Pope" of cubism by Picasso (Penrose 187), Apollinaire is divine; as Apollo, he is again divine and also light. In *Les Peintures cubistes* (1913), Apollinaire positively observed: "[Picasso] studies an object as a surgeon dissects a corpse" (qtd. in Penrose 193), such that the idealist Apollinaire and the base-materialist Bataille in fact share a regard for Picasso's dissection/decomposition of forms. More importantly, since this is the kind of art that Saura expressly advocates –Saura too "llevó el automatismo [surrealista] a la mesa de disección" (Calvo Serraller 119)– we again recognise the irony, and thus the need for an inverse reading of his invective (and a claiming of Picasso for Saura's alternative genealo-

15 The quotation is from Bataille's "Emily Brontë," *La littérature et le mal* (Saura, *Fijeza* 167 n2).

gy of modern art). Through the transposition of the codes of aesthetics and historiography, the 'small' and 'divinely directed' bombs of National Catholicism are also invoked and desublimated here; their effect more brutally characterised as 'dissecting' the young women on the real and metaphorical operating/dissecting tables of Gernika's hospital.

For Saura, "la mirada cruel supone a un tiempo la desnudez y la permanencia de las huellas de la acción –fulgor de pincelada, arrepentimiento, superposición e inacabamiento– tanto como la evidencia de la estructura que la sostiene o la pasión por la fantasma que la nutre" (*Fijeza* 174). Precisely this evidence of Picasso's *mirada cruel* –the traces of the painter's struggle photographically 'fixed' by Dora Maar– is 'detested' in the utterance:

> Detesto a Dora Maar porque al fijar el proceso
> de realización del Guernica ofrece con demasiada
> evidencia las tripas de la metamorfosis, la lucha
> con la imagen que desenmascara la presunción
> del cartelón. (18)

Here, Saura suggests that the "evidencia [de] las tripas de la metamorfosis, [y de] la lucha con la imagen" revealed by Dora Maar's photographs of *Guernica* –and, in a further semantic layer, revealed in Picasso's paintings of her– demonstrates Picasso's aspiration to something other than a mere *cartelón*. Indeed, Saura argues that the desired "transgresión plástica" of *la mirada cruel* is necessarily limited by the needs of the "panfleto plástico" (*Fijeza* 160); its evidence in *Guernica* thus undermines criticism of this painting as mere propaganda art, evidencing instead, I suggest, its Bataillean/Saurian "traumatic realism."[16]

While Saura himself suggests that *la mirada cruel* differs from "sadismo visual" (159), Guy Scarpeta locates in Saura's *Crucifixiones* "el punto de vista del verdugo" (56). Here, Scarpeta draws on Bataille's comments regarding concentration camps:

> No podemos ser *humanos* sin haber sentido en nosotros la posibilidad del sufrimiento, y también la abyección. No somos sólo posibles víctimas del verdugo: el verdugo es nuestro semejante. . . . Nuestra posibilidad no es, pues, solamente el dolor, si no que comprende también la rabia de torturar. (Qtd. in Scarpeta 52)

Scarpeta argues that Saura's approach to the subject of the crucifixion differs from previous artists' in that his alone expresses the "inexpiable gozo intrínseco a un acto cruel" (51). He suggests that the profanation of Saura's *Crucifixiones* resides "en la evocación de la intensidad del goce escandaloso que consiste en cebarse en la imagen piadosa, sacra" (56). Scarpeta finds evidence of this gaze in Saura's gestures, which serve to "[d]estripar,

16 Noting that Lacan's definition of the real was informed by surrealism, Foster speaks of a "traumatic realism" in (pop as well as) surrealist art (*Return* 132), a definition that I suggest is also valid for Saura's post-surrealist (dis)figuration.

despiezar, dislocar, lacerar, escarbar, invertir, derretir, abofetear, zaherir, machacar, forzar, mancillar, agujerear, comprimir, raspar" his Christic figures, and in "el cuerpo [que] parece ramificarse. Los brazos brotan directamente del torso, multiplicándose, el rostro invade el tronco, las carnes se abren desplomándose, los dedos-penes esconden y propulsan la sangre a borbotones" (52).

Saura himself sights/cites evidence of such painterly-inquisitorial/wartime tortures in "los oídos trepanados y los pezones-tornillos de las damas del Guernica," "las patas escayoladas de los elefantes del Guernica," and "la vagina del caballo del Guernica" (*Libelo* 25). These tortures are committed by "Pablo el destripador, carnicero del Guernica" (37), also cited as the "desfigurador de facciones como una tortura casi policíaca" (Jorge Guillén, qtd. in *Libelo* 32).[17] I suggest that we can interpret such painterly tortures or 'disfigurations' as evidence/acts of abjection. Hal Foster argues that so-called abject art has tended in two directions: identification with the abject in order "to probe the wound of trauma, to touch the obscene object-gaze of the real" or, alternatively, representation of the "condition of abjection in order to provoke its operation – catch it in the act, make it reflexive, repellent in its own right" (*Return* 157). The first category evinces a Lacanian 'return of the real' as trauma; the second decries the operation of abjection. In relation to Saura's visual art, I suggest the former 'reading' is more applicable,[18] while, in relation to *Contra el Guernica*, both readings would seem to be valid. More importantly, both 'manners' 'do Bataille' with Fascist/Nationalist 'repressions' and acts of abjection.

For Scarpeta, Saura's painting is still more violent in his later *Crucifixiones*: "[E]l tono se hace más vehemente, más tumultoso: la carne está al borde de la desintegración," such that these works correspond to his non-religious *Retratos imaginarios* in which "la dimen-

17 As always, further political and art-historical references layer Saura's utterance. The "carnicero del Guernica" perhaps draws into dialogue the bullfight paintings of Antonio Carnicero, discussed in *Fijeza* (227), and also André Masson's *Carcas Cutter* (1928) and Eli Lotar's abattoir photographs, both discussed in relation to Bataille's *informe* in Bois ("*Abattoir*" 43-46). We might also think of "el Choricero," Carlos IV's minister Manuel Godoy. "Los oídos trepanados" recall that Georges Braque (the co-inventor of Cubism) and Guillaume Apollinaire, the "Pope of Cubism," were both trepanned during the First World War (Penrose 213; Franck 234). The phrase, "las patas escayoladas de los elefantes del Guernica," recalls both war-torn limbs in plaster casts and Picasso's own earlier elephantine style and childhood memories. Wilhelm Boeck notes that "the oversized limbs of the figures at the lower ends of the canvas [*Guernica*] are reminiscent of the elephantine forms of the period between 1920 and 1923" (226). Penrose notes that the young Picasso "used to crawl under the dinner-table to look in awe at the monstrously swollen legs that appeared from under the skirts of one of his aunts. This childish fascination with elephantine proportions impresses him still" (245). The phrase, "la vagina del caballo del Guernica," draws in both Richard C. Trexler's discussion of Christ's wound as vagina (109) and Frank D. Russell's discussion of the horse as a Christ figure (26, 43). Finally, I suggest that "la tortura casi policíaca" cites the police torture of Basque prisoners in the last years of the Franco dictatorship (Payne 248).

18 Following Lacan, Foster argues that to see without the image screen –the conventions of art, the codes of visual culture, the schemata of representation– "would be to be blinded by the gaze or touched by the real" (*Return* 140), and that an attack on the image screen, and thus the symbolic order, was the vocation of the *avant-garde* (157). Interestingly, a parallel exists between being "blinded by the gaze or touched by the real" and Bataille's desublimatory 'regard' for the *soleil pourri* (although in the former the gaze belongs to the object not the subject). Likewise, parallels exist between the "obscene object-gaze of the real" and Saura's discourses of *la mirada cruel* and *la belleza obscena.*

sión blásfema desvanece. O, mejor dicho, es como si lo blasfemo ha pasado al interior, al acto de pintar, y no solamente a la figura agredida" (56). Saura's *Retratos imaginarios* are represented in *Contra el Guernica* by a *Retrato imaginario de Brigitte Bardot*: "Odio a Brigitte Bardot bañándose en el Júcar del Guernica" (37). At least one *Retrato imaginario de Brigitte Bardot* (1958) hangs in the Cuenca Museum, situated in the hanging houses above the rivers Júcar and Huecar. Here, then, we have a direct reference to Saura's own oeuvre in *Contra el Guernica*, readable, I suggest, as homage to Picasso: Saura's *Brigitte Bardot* is claimed to be steeped in Picasso's violently fluid aesthetic (while, in a political reading, the Gernika victim bathes her tortured, scalded body in Gernika's river).

Scarpeta sheds light on a further Saurian utterance when he suggests that, in these later *Crucifixiones*, we see "la reaparición de una antigua meditación sobre los tormentos físicos de la Pasión, de la cual dan testimonio, por ejemplo, numerosas poemas del período barroco, y cuya vibración y palpitación nos restituye la música de entonces (las 'Lecciónes de Tinieblas')" (56, 61). The communist poet Rafael Alberti likewise says of Saura's art: "He aquí un oficio de tinieblas" ("Saura Poeta" 105), a phrase that also appears in the utterance:

> Desprecio al Guernica porque a pesar de las balas
> y las bombas su imagen de luto y oficio de
> tinieblas podrá perpetuarse. (7)

In one semantic layer (others are discussed in the final chapter), Saura truly despises the perpetuation of the "oficio de tinieblas" of Gernika –Nazi/Nationalist-inflicted physical torments– only ironically slighting Picasso's artistic "oficio de tinieblas" or 'tormenting' of the human form.[19] Saura in fact champions the featureless black background of Velázquez's *Crucifixión* (1631) as the theatrical setting of the "oficio de tinieblas":

> Osadía de la parcial ocultación del rostro, pero sobre todo, la presencia del negro intemporal, pues no siendo estatua la figura amarillecida por el barniz, ni paisaje el ausente decorado de oficio de tinieblas, la transpiración del cuadro de Velázquez nos habla de una convulsión escondida. ("Crucifixiones" 61)

Saura thus links Picasso's *Guernica* with Velázquez's *Cristo*, to which he attributes the power of the *Saeta* (61). Indeed, in the same text, and context, Saura invokes "la madre del *Guernica* de Picasso" (63).[20] However, while it is Velázquez's communication of a hidden

19 "Oficio de Tinieblas" is the name given to the complete Liturgy of the Hours: "La Liturgia de las Horas (invitatorio, laudes, vísperas y completas) es un rezo que normalmente se hace todos los días por la mañana, tarde y noche, pero sobre todo lo hacen los Sacerdotes. Para el Jueves y Viernes Santo, estas oraciones se unifican en un rezo que se realiza el Miércoles Santo al caer la tarde, al cual le llamamos Oficio de Tinieblas" (Molina n. pag.). Also cited is Picasso's skill at tenebrism –etymologically related to *tinieblas*, and to Tenebrae, another name for the Liturgy of the Hours– and thus his *encadenamiento* with 17th Century Spanish and Neapolitan *tenebristas* – followers of Caravaggio.

20 In this text, and context, Saura also cites Robert Capa's black and white photographs, Goya's *fusilado*, and the first handprints on cave walls, or "dedos penes" (60), all of which are also cited in *Contra el Guernica. Libelo* (18, 17, 15).

convulsion, effected by the blacked-out ground and concealing hair of his serene *Cristo*, that Saura deems powerful, of his own *Crucifixiones* he states:

> He procurado, al contrario del Cristo de Velázquez, convulsionar una imagen y cargarla con un viento de protesta. . . . En la imagen de un crucificado he reflejado quizás mi situación de hombre a solas en un universo amenazador frente al cual cabe la posibilidad de un grito. . . . (62-63)

Saura's convulsion of the classical 'good form' of Velázquez's Christ (Garín Llombart 11) is charged with the artist's *grito*. Interestingly, Bois notes that, for Bataille, the similarly convulsive operation of the *informe* likewise resembles (a) shriek:

> "the movement of the *informe*" is declared to be shaking things up "once the 'human face' is decomposed and resembles 'shriek'"; the *informe* is presented as a "rhythmic condition of form"; the "concrete" matter so dear to Bataille becomes "concrete, which is to say *figural*." (Bataille, qtd. in Bois, "Figure" 80)

Bataille's notion of matter becoming concrete through the (dis)figurative operations of the *informe* thus corresponds with Saura's "monstrous concretions," as in "la monstruosa concreción del chafado y polimorfo sapo," noted above. Furthermore, for Bataille, base materialism produces only unique monsters; there are no deviants in nature, because there is nothing but deviation (Bois, "Base" 55). Again, then, in the appearance of the monster in Saurian art we note a further link between Bataille and the author of *Contra el Guernica*.

In conclusion, I therefore suggest that when Saura speaks of the canvas as a "campo de batalla" (*Escritura* 41; *Fijeza* 221) we might transcribe this phrase as a "campo de Bataille": the concretion of a (dis)figurative monster –resembling 'shriek,' or charged with a *grito*– may be understood as a Bataillean painterly *pronunciamiento*: an 'informal' 'manner' of (de)crying the 'real' violence and trauma of the Franco regime.[21] By describing aspects of *Guernica* in the same terms that he uses to explain his own artistic praxis, Saura claims a 'return of the real' in this painting, partially appropriating Picasso to an alternative modernist genealogy influenced by Bataille's philosophy, and situating his own art as linked with Picasso's. However, while Saura 'enchains' himself with Picasso, and clearly sides more closely with the *Documents* group's (sur)realist philosophy than that of the idealist surrealists, in relation to *Guernica* he generally locates this painting at their point of contention. Furthermore, Saura's art-critical 're-view,' or, in Foucauldian terms,

21 "Declaración: El campo de batalla" is a brief Saurian manifesto of painting originally published in 1958. Its political content is limited to equating painting to a *grito*:

> Por emplear, emplearía cualquiera (corrientemente el blanco y el negro –luz y tinieblas– para evitar otros problemas [echoed in the utterance: "Detesto el Guernica pintado solamente con dos colores para evitar otros problemas" (*Libelo* 17)]), o cualquier otra materia, de la misma forma que si no pudiera pintar emplearía cualquier otro medio para expresarme; por ejemplo: apuñular los muros, o gritar simplemente, o masticar *chewing gum*. (*Escritura* 41-42)

commentary on Picasso's (visual) text, serves to locate his own informalist painting as a more adequate 'manner' in which to make manifest the Spanish socio-political situation.

Within two years of writing *Contra el Guernica*, Saura continued this commentary in paint, taking one of Picasso's Dora Maar paintings, *Femme au chapeau bleu* (1939), as the *esquema* for his own series, *Dora Maar visitada* (1983) (Ríos 159). Writing about this series, Victoria Combalia again compares Saura's painting to Bataille's thought: "La idea de Bataille de que ninguna intensidad es ajena a la crueldad nos hace pensar en la intensidad de los cuadros de Saura, en su acción descuartizadora y aniquiladora de la integridad física y moral" (80). As with *Guernica*, Picasso's Dora Maar portraits are frequently interpreted as the artist's response to the Spanish Civil War (see, for example, Nash 18), such that, at a semiotic level, Saura's future 'visitations' also recall the cruelty of this period in Spanish history. In this way, Saura's titles re-admit the content that his painterly process refuses; he thus does battle with the Franco regime through the return of real world referents as well as 'doing Bataille' through the 'return of the real' as *informe* or trauma on the canvas itself, just as he does in *Contra el Guernica. Libelo*.[22]

The following, final chapter turns from Saura's theories of art-making to his theories of the making of modernist masters and masterpieces, and also returns to the borrowed iconography of Goya and the Beatus of Liebana. However, this borrowing will be discussed not in terms of its ideological content, but as ideological *per se*.

22 Saura's titles in fact 'riddle' *Contra el Guernica. Libelo*: *Rompecabezas* series (1972-), "rompecabezas" (9); *Mentira y sueño* (1962), "sueño y mentira" (12); *Cabezas* series (1956-), "cabeza" (15); *Retrato imaginario de Felipe II* series (1984-), "Felipe II" (16); *Metamorfosis* (1972; 1975), "metamorfosis" (18); *Supermarket* (1960), "Supermercado" (21); *Menina I*; *Menina II* (1989), "fétidas Meninas" (23); *Desnudos-Paisajes* series (1953-) "el campo de nudistas del Guernica" (24); *La cámara ardiente o los amores célebres* (1977), "capilla ardiente" (26); *Tentaciones de San Antonio* (1964), "las tentaciones de San Antonio" (29); "Sudarios" (1958), "sudario" (31); *Al natural* (*Sauromaquia* series) (1958), "la cornada del natural en la verónica" (31); *Retrato imaginario de Brigitte Bardot* series (1958), "Brigitte Bardot" (37); *Mujer-Sillón* series (1966-), "un sillón en donde sentarse" (41).

Encadenamiento versus *beatificación*

The 'enlightened' Carlos III despised the bullfight, believing it depraved the spectators (Hughes, *Goya* 131); Gaspar Melchor de Jovellanos, *ilustrado*, politician, writer and *contertulio* of Goya (Saura, *Fijeza* 244), wished to ban "aquel bárbaro divertimiento," and, in 1805, the French-educated Godoy "se creerá terminado con 'las corridas de toros y novillos de muerte.'" The family of Carlos IV, however, "asist[ió] en pleno a las corridas de toros" and the reactionary Fernando VII reinstated the *fiesta nacional* (Rojas, *El Valle* 12, 103). I will now suggest, therefore, that Goya's *fusilado*, as *torero*, also encodes this hostility of the *afrancesados* to the bullfight –of which Goya, unlike many liberal, enlightened Spaniards, was an *aficionado*– and thus the artist's identification, on this level, with the Spanish *pueblo*, or *populacho*. Robert Hughes notes that, to his friends, Goya

> went so far as to compare painting to bullfighting –a trope that, after Hemingway's writings popularized bullfighting among Americans in the twentieth century, was to become an irritating feature of the rhetoric of modernist "risk" culture, but was not a cliché in Goya's time– and he had no doubt that the *lidiador* (bullfighter) was practicing a real and valuable art: an idea that had found painted form some years earlier in his celebrated self-portrait of 1794-95, wearing a torero's embroidered jacket while working at the easel. (*Goya* 351)

Following Goya, Picasso, his friends and his critics have indeed drawn parallels between painting and the bullfight. In a photographic portrait by Man Ray (1924), Picasso is likewise dressed in the *traje de luces* (FitzGerald 133-34), as he would for many costume parties. In "Le Toréador de la peinture" (1932), the art critic Ramón Gómez de la Serna wrote: "In Malaga his native town, I found an explanation . . . of what Picasso is and I understood to what degree he is a *toreador* –gipsies are the best toreadors– and how, whatever he may do, it is in reality bullfighting" (qtd. in Penrose 16). In his biography of Picasso, Roland Penrose states: "Like a matador who must judge the right moment and the correct movement for his pass, Picasso said, to explain his method: 'In modern painting each touch has become a task of precision'" (387-88). Luis Miguel Dominguín also recalls that his friend "se ha definido como un taurómaco impenitente," concurring that he is indeed "un torero en el fondo" (5). For Dominguín, "[l]o mismo que el torero grande se da a conocer por la forma de dominar al toro, mostrando a los espectadores las condiciones de éste, así, recíprocamente, conocemos a Picasso y a sus personajes por la psicología de éstos, plasmada en el lienzo del artista" (5).

Saura likewise characterises the art of 'great' painting as "la fiesta por dentro," attributing to Goya's *Desgracias acaecidas en el tendido de la plaza de Madrid, y muerte del*

Alcalde de Torrejón (1816), the honour of being the first example of painting (or etching) not merely *of*, but *as* bullfighting, and singling out Picasso's *Les Demoiselles d'Avignon* as exemplary of this art (*Fijeza* 70-72).[1] In elaboration of his theory, Saura writes:

> Bastaría al observador contemplar al pintor calificado de violento, y su famoso "toque bravo", para comprobar que su bravura, antes que violencia, viene condicionada al fulgor majestuoso del instante privilegiado y que un impulso ideal de violencia o rapidez, imposible de nutrir permanentemente, no es más que ofrenda de mantenida y latente intensidad que únicamente se practica, como las buenas faenas, en los momentos propicios que el artista persigue. El atropello en un desarrollo orgánico provoca desajustes en el fluido proceso, un descoyuntamiento de las estructuras y de los códigos a los que el torero, como el pintor, se somete para llevar a cabo su hilazón de breves acontecimientos. (76)

I will now argue that, in Saura's polysemic utterances, Goya's threefold 'loan' to Picasso of his *fusilado* –in the form of an icon, in the conflation of the codes of the *corrida* and the crucifixion, and also in the "toque bravo" of the painter-cum-bullfighter– is ideological in a further sense. Not only is Goya's *fusilado* the reproducible cannon fodder of history painting, but also Picasso has become 'canon fodder' in official Western art history in part through Goya's generous iconographic, thematic and painterly 'loans.' The official model of modernism, in which "a multiplicity of breaks [is] reinscribed (by the artist/ critic) into a synthetic line of formal innovations" (Foster, *Anti-Aesthetic* 205), in effect denies the experiments and 'loans' which led to Picasso's 'breaks,' and thus, in Saura's theory, to his *encadenamiento* with innumerable other artists, not least among them Goya. The following utterance will serve as a starting point for this discussion:

> Detesto al Guernica porque sin ser un cuadro de
> historia es tristemente una de las composiciones
> más extraordinarias de la historia del arte. (7)

For centuries, history painting was the highest-ranking genre in the Western tradition; in culturally 'backward' Spain, this style prospered into the 1920s (Tusell 182). However, we will recall that as early as the 1860s, modernists such as Manet, seeking presence rather than discourse in painting, rejected or subverted this genre on account of its narrative underpinning. By drawing in to his pamphlet the phrase "sin ser un cuadro de historia," Saura at once invokes elitist, anti-modernist and modernist discourses of art. For the social voices of the old guard, *Guernica* is not a proper history painting, yet, "sadly," it is counted among the great paintings in the history of art. Yet again, as the voices of modernist art his-

1 However, ungenerously for the uninitiated, both artists and their works are unnamed at this point. *Les Demoiselles* is instead identified as "la más hermosa y feroz cuadrilla de señoritas toreras jamás pintada" (Saura, *Fijeza* 72) and may thus be recognised in Saura's utterance: "Odio … las señoritas toreras del Guernica" (*Libelo* 25).

torians interject, Picasso's *Guernica* is in fact "the most important history painting of the twentieth century" (Chipp 172; Reinhold Hohl, qtd. in Oppler 313), even though in style it rejects the traditional realism of this genre and in content likewise shuns the glorification of victory, instead ("sadly") depicting the suffering of the victims (Chipp vii). Indeed, were it not for these innovations, it could not be the canonical modernist work that it is claimed to be: "[U]na de las composiciones más extraordinarias de la historia del arte." Javier Tusell, for example, writes of "la trascendencia del cuadro en la Historia del Arte" (245).

In relation to *Guernica*, history painting, the history of art and *Contra el Guernica. Libelo*, Saura himself commented to Julián Ríos

> que es casi imposible hacer un cuadro realmente politizado. Los ejemplos en nuestro siglo de cuadros realmente politizados son contadísimos. El mejor es el *Guernica*. Y aun en el *Guernica* hay una ambigüedad enorme en el mensaje, en el proceso de su realización, que pretendí reflejar en esa letanía, ¿no? Esa ambigüedad del cuadro convertido en símbolo que fue en principio un arreglo de cuentas de Picasso consigo mismo, y con la Historia. Y después creo que hacer un cuadro de Historia, es también muy difícil, pero que es posible. Aunque los ejemplos sean contadísimos. (Ríos 179)

Here, Saura notes the ambiguity of Picasso's message and process in relation to *Guernica*. While upholding *Guernica* as the best twentieth-century example of a genuinely politicised painting, he claims that Picasso was engaged in a personal and historical settling of accounts; that is to say, concerned both with a summation of his work to date and with its/his place in the history of art. Regarding the 'official' history of art, Saura argues:

> La Historia está mal escrita por escritores dogmáticos, sobre todo la historia del arte moderno que obedecen a una especie de manía y obsesión clasificatoria. Todo queda clasificado, todo queda fijado en un momento determinado sin tener en cuenta el antes y el después y las cosas que están entremezcladas, . . . nunca ha habido en la Historia realmente, invenciones radicales y cortes radicales, . . . todo es encadenamiento y hay que revisar la Historia en función del encadenamiento y no en función de la aparición de conceptos novedosos, que aparecen dentro de un encadenamiento, como hitos; pero hay un continuo que es fundamental para mí. (Ríos 162)

As noted previously, Goya's loan is one of five quoted consecutively by Saura. These are listed in descending chronological order, such that we recognise the systematising and taxonomical operations of the great master narratives which first defined traditional art, and then modernist art, by postulating a chronology of innovations, or "invenciones radicales," through which the evolution of art might be mapped and artists canonised: "[T]he linear genealogy of which art criticism is so fond, always ready, consciously or not, to follow the requirements of the market" (Bois, "Mourning" 328-29):

> Desprecio al Beato de Liébana que prestó un cadáver para el Guernica.
>
> Desprecio a Caravaggio que prestó un caballo y una figura yacente para el Guernica.
>
> Desprecio a Guido Reni que prestó para el Guernica un perfil de mujer con boca abierta y cabello triangular.
>
> Desprecio a Rubens y a Goya que prestaron para el Guernica sus figuras alzadas con las manos en alto.
>
> Desprecio a Van Gogh que prestó una bombilla para el Guernica. (17)

However, on closer inspection, we realise that Saura's list constitutes a vastly expanded chronology, beginning, as we have already noted, in the eighth century with the Beatus of Liebana, hence, in Bois's terminology, "reinvest[ing] the analysis of painting with a type of historicity which, under pressure of the market, has been neglected – the history of the *longue durée*" ("Mourning" 329). Indeed, the "'Hegelian history' . . . [of] the official model of modern art . . . generally situates Picasso in the modernist canon of abstraction achieved by analytic reduction within the patriarchal line: Manet … [sic] Cezanne … [sic] Picasso: of the Western tradition" (Foster, "The 'Primitive' Unconscious" 205). Saura's chronology does not in fact follow this shorter, selective and exclusionary line leading inexorably to Picasso and cubism, but rather each painter cited contributes something, or things, directly, across time, to *Guernica.* Saura thus critiques the positioning of Picasso in the official model of modernist historiography, instead situating the artist both in relation to the *longue durée* and, I argue, to his own theory of *encadenamiento*. Even Saura's use of the verb *prestar* would seem to imply an art-fraternal generosity in opposition to the more commonly evoked competition between artists to create the next break, school or 'ism' in modern art, and thus a place in the canon. In this sense, Saura's art historiography is itself ideological, positing a more 'communistic' or 'collectivistic' alternative to the dominant, capitalist form of modernist historiography.

In this regard, Picasso himself claimed: "The several manners I have used in my art must not be considered as an evolution, or as a step towards an unknown ideal of painting" ("Picasso speaks" 5), such that his recorded "response to the succession of styles that defines the common conception of *avant-garde* art before World War I was not to claim

discovery of 'the next step' but to accept a situation characterized by multiplicity, where the past as well as the present and the imagined future could be explored" (FitzGerald 130). Picasso's own statements on the evolution of art are therefore not out of step with those of Saura; hence it is reasonable to suggest that the latter primarily critiques the official modernist art historiography that Picasso is 'framed' within, but not in accordance with. Nevertheless, Picasso *was* highly competitive in relation to the leadership of the modern movement; his rivalry with Henri Matisse is legendary (60). Michael C. FitzGerald documents Picasso's engagement with collectors, dealers, critics and curators in the development of the market for modernist painting, and also the evolution of his styles in order to maintain his vanguard position and thus to achieve financial success (11-13, 28, 141). I suggest that Saura's response to Picasso's competition with other artists and his acceptance of art as a commercial instrument is deliberately left ambiguous in his *Libelo*, which should otherwise be read as "un homenaje a Picasso y una composición pictórica extraordinaria . . . una prueba de amor más de repulsa" (Saura, *Fijeza* 149 n2).

We will now return to the first of the five 'loans' to Picasso explicitly listed by Saura to throw some light on this question:

> Desprecio al Beato de Liébana que prestó un ca-
> dáver para el Guernica. (17)

As the source of Picasso's most immediate acquaintance with *The Flood* from the *Apocalypse of Saint-Sever*, Ruth Kaufmann posits the 1929 issue of *Documents* in which Georges Bataille reproduced five illustrations from the French manuscript (557). Juan Larrea, however, after drawing the reader's attention to the many similarities between the *The Flood* and *Guernica*, denies Picasso's having been directly inspired by this painting: "Ni por un momento puede admitirse que Picasso se haya inspirado en este diseño medieval. . . . No, la semejanza viene par [sic] el lado profundo de la naturaleza y del sentimiento humanos" (qtd. in Gurney 59). Robert Gurney suggests that "[p]ara Larrea estas dos obras son producto del inconsciente colectivo, que él cree está gobernado por una voluntad e inteligencia divinas" (59). While indicating the various ways in which Picasso must surely have been familiar with the work in question, Gurney notes the likelihood of Larrea's having influenced the apocalyptic tone of *Guernica* as well as Picasso's political commitment (60). Larrea, an apocalyptic "poeta profeta," was a key figure in Picasso's life in 1937, acting as the link between the artist and the Spanish Republic, and one of those directly responsible for Picasso's commission. Picasso also entrusted Larrea with the printing and sale of *Sueño y mentira de Franco*, and with monies raised through the sale of

a number of paintings, both sums intended specifically for the Republican cause (51-52). That Saura is aware of Larrea's text is beyond doubt. It appears in *Pablo Picasso, Guernica* (1977; English edition 1947), the first book to be published on *Guernica* within Spain. Saura is demonstrably well 'versed' in every aspect of *Guernica*, and the poet appears explicitly in his *Libelo* in an utterance that would seem to relate to this context:

> Detesto a Juan Larrea, 'impostor o profeta', ven-
> dedor del Guernica. (14)

Larrea's representation of Picasso (paraphrased by Gurney) as "gobernado por una voluntad e inteligencia divinas" is, I suggest, part of the modernist discourse of the artist as a God or solitary genius, documented by Eunice Lipton in Picasso art criticism, and in early twentieth-century art history more generally: "[A] discipline which has traditionally clung to aestheticism and the cult of genius" (4). This discourse, which serves the pecuniary and status-based interests of artists, critics, collectors, curators and dealers in the art market, is repeatedly drawn into dialogue in *Contra el Guernica*:[2]

> Detesto el milagro de la multiplicación de los pa-
> nes y de los peces del Guernica. (7)

Here, the Sermon on the Mount is conflated with the 'miracle' of cubism – "la multiplicación facetaria" (Saura, *Fijeza* 57) of the cafe-table still-lifes explored in analytical cubism and revisited, along with other developments in Picasso's artistic vocabulary, in *Guernica*. Thus we recognise the intertextual entry of the discourse of Picasso as a creator with a capital 'C' –the Son of God, and worker of miracles– into Saura's *Libelo*. In his own sermon, "El sermón de La Habana," Saura critiques this discourse as unjust, selective, market-driven and mythologising: "[A] través de un proceso de eliminación selectiva –y no siempre justa– que conlleva la propia inflación del mercado del arte, . . . los movimientos artísticos pasajeros acaban invariablemente por ser sustituidos por el mito del artista como un solitario taumaturgo, sintetizador de una tendencia e incluso de toda una época" (*Fijeza* 23).[3] Revisiting this theme in a later chapter, Saura bemoans

2 While in the utterance, "[o]dio el 'Pablo nuestro de cada día' del Guernica" (*Libelo* 40), we hear echoes of the saying "ser el pan nuestro de cada día," suggesting that what one suffers daily is the incessant discourse of Pablo Picasso and *Guernica*, we also hear the discourse of Picasso as God, or at least as that which is supplied by God for our spiritual/ material needs, in that "danos hoy nuestro pan de cada día" forms part of the *Padrenuestro*, or *Lord's Prayer*. This discourse is also heard in "San Pablo Nepumoceno" (26).

3 An opposing reading of the Sermon on the Mount as an intertext in this utterance locates *Guernica* as a socialist tract: Étienne Cabot considered the Sermon on the Mount a radical tract that, if literally applied, "would have unseated every king and bigwig who ruled men in the name of Christ, insisting that 'there is no gulf between the social teachings of the Gospels and those of socialism'" (Hughes, *Barcelona* 262).

> la injusticia de la historia para quienes manifestaron espíritu de sacrificio, pasión y dedicación a una ideología revolucionaria, y también, en este caso, en el interior de los movimientos artísticos unitarios en los que acaban por perdurar solamente sus personajes emblemáticos; cómo los abandonados de la historia, y no sólo los compañeros de ruta, caen en el olvido tras el cruel barrido de la historia, precisamente aquellos que hicieron posible, por su entrega y fidelidad a un ideal, la afirmación del genio dominador y que raramente serán recuperados en el futuro. (64)

In precisely the context in which this paragraph is written –Saura's interpretation of Max Aub's forgotten (imaginary) cubist painter– Picasso is the "genio dominador" of cubism, for which the artist is granted a place in the modernist canon. As Lipton notes: "By the 1920's [sic] books were being written about his singular genius . . . and his role in the creation of cubism" (1). The term "genius" is in fact ubiquitous in writing on Picasso: "[T]he solitude of genius"; "the genius of the creator of Cubism" (Penrose 215, 227); "[l]ong live the genius" (André Breton, qtd. in FitzGerald 140); "the magnificently fecund genius of Picasso" (Alfred Barr, qtd. in FitzGerald 249); "this artist of such rare stature that the term 'genius' belongs to him" (Michel Leiris, qtd. in Penrose 460); "unique genius" (Boeck 71). Larrea adjudges *Guernica* "una obra genial" (237), as does Francisco Calvo Serraller ("La obra del maestro, la actitud del genio" iv). In several of Saura's utterances, the ideological notion of Picasso's genius is heard in the language or individual voices of (art) writers:

> Odio la "manifestation du genie de la France" del Guernica. (9)

> Detesto a Jean Cassou, quien en un prehistórico texto sobre el Guernica termina diciendo: "El genio ha hablado." (21)

The quotation, "El genio ha hablado," is from the "prehistórico texto" "Le Témoignage de Picasso," published in the aforementioned issue of *Cahiers d'Art*. Here, Cassou wrote that "Goya is brought back to life as Picasso . . . Genius has spoken" (qtd. in Oppler 209). While here we hear the ideological term genius, throughout Saura's *Libelo* this ideology is drawn into dialogue with the oppositional ideology of *encadenamiento*. Is Picasso like Goya because he is another solitary genius, another God who has spoken? Or is his painting 'enchained' with that of Goya? As we have read, Saura suggests that Goya's aesthetic is that of *modernidad*. Goya's painterly experiments pave the way for, or are linked with, later artistic innovations, including Picasso's. I suggest a key to the difference separating the ideology of the artist as solitary genius and that of artistic *encadenamiento* is that, in the former discourse, the influenced borrower is a derivative follower of another's experi-

ments, whereas, in the latter, influence is embraced as the artistic norm. As noted, this latter position is Saura's own: "[T]odo es traducción, reescritura, parodia, versión o perversión. . . . Cuánto les cuesta a muchos admitir que el arte sale del arte" (Ríos 161-63). Speaking of Saura's own acknowledged debt to Picasso, Ríos therefore places the notion of influence in inverted commas to distinguish between the two schools of thought on this subject: "[N]o me refería a que hubiese, digamoslo [sic] así, la 'influencia' entre comillas, no . . . " (52). On this view, then, the ideology of the individual artist might be ascertained by his or her acknowledgement or denial of the artistic loan.

With this distinction in mind, I return briefly to Goya's (and Peter Paul Rubens's) explicitly cited contributions to *Guernica* to suggest that Saura creates ambiguity as to whether in fact these figures were openly borrowed, or 'lifted' under duress:

> Desprecio a Rubens y a Goya que *prestaron* para el Guernica sus *figuras alzadas con las manos en alto* [emphasis added]. (17)

While Picasso's art is plainly erected within the archive, he apparently did not admit to Larrea, a daily visitor while he worked on *Guernica*, his knowledge of the manuscript of the Beatus (Gurney 57). At one semantic level, then, Picasso is critiqued for showing a certain "desprecio" for the loans of Goya, Rubens and the Beatus to his 'creation.'

Indeed, through association, the Picasso *aficionado* may hear echoes of the artist's similar pretence in relation to his most important work, *Les Demoiselles d'Avignon*. At this time, the idea that a 'primitive' tendency was being produced from within modern art had important implications for the artist's status, as this was a paramount distinguishing feature of the modern. Anxious to be seen not as copying from African masks and fetishes, but rather to be producing a more intuitive form of primitivism, Picasso claimed to have painted *Les Demoiselles* before having visited the ethnographical collection of the Musée d'Ethnographie du Trocadéro. However, Picasso scholars have suggested that it was the artist's discovery of *art nègre* in the collections of Matisse, Maurice de Vlaminck and André Derain in 1906, as well as at the Trocadéro in the summer of 1907, that triggered the final alterations in *Les Demoiselles*.[4] Vlaminck's reaction to Picasso's appropriation is re-cited –and re-sited– in the utterance:

> Detesto al pintor Maurice Vlaminck porque tras calificar a Picasso de "simiesco imitador" no solamente fue incapaz de domar la fiera, sino que

4 For this discussion, see Charles Harrison, Francis Frascina and Gill Perry, *Primitivism, Cubism, Abstraction: The Early Twentieth Century*.

> acabó contagiándose del terrible mal para retro-
> ceder a su vez en la escala zoológica. (32)

In an interesting parallel, then, Picasso, and/or his prophet-dealer, now also denies his knowledge of the 'primitive' French manuscript. However, in an ambiguous critique of Vlaminck as much as of Picasso, the above utterance also draws in other art-historical and partisan political voices, from two different decades. In the early years of the twentieth century, both Vlaminck and Picasso were sympathetic to the anarchist cause (Franck 32, 68). They were also both leading vanguard artists. When, in 1905, Matisse, Vlaminck, Derain, Albert Marquet and Georges Roualt exhibited their vividly, non-naturalistically coloured canvases in a single room at the third *Salon d'Automne,* Louis Vauxcelles, "popular with conventional thinkers and totally hostile to modern art," pejoratively described this room as the "wild beasts' cage" (67). However, the vanguard leadership of the "Fauves," as these artists would henceforth be known, would soon be ceded to the Cubists, led by Picasso and Georges Braque. Hence the 'wild beast' Vlaminck would neither "domar la fiera" within, nor "la fiera" without: Picasso, (self-)identified with the bull. Furthermore, not only would Vlaminck decry Picasso as a "simiesco imitador," but during the Nazi occupation of Paris, when Picasso was forbidden to show his work in public, the most serious attacks on him "came not directly from the Nazis but from those collaborationist critics who under the new régime found places of authority and ample encouragement for their reactionary thoughts. . . . The attacks on Picasso came notably from the painter Vlaminck in an article in *Comoedia* 6 June 1942 . . ." (Penrose 342 n8). Thus Saura satirises both the reactionary critic's description of fauvist painting as a step backwards in the evolution of modern art, and also Vlaminck's more personal slide down the human evolutionary scale from anarchist to Nazi collaborator: "[A]cabó contagiándose del terrible mal" of the Nazi "beast." Saura also conflates "el terrible mal" of fascism with that of imitation. Throwing the words "simiesco imitador" back at these critics, the art of imitation becomes the art of realistic representation, rejected in modernism but demanded by the Nazis and Spanish Nationalists, for whom Picasso's non-representational art was "degenerate" (Nash 14, 25).

Nevertheless, Saura's interest in the art-historiographical issue of Picasso's habit of 'theft' is revisited in the following utterance:

> Odio al historiador Picasso, hijo de todos, asesino
> del arte, iniciador de poco y término de nada. (40)

Behind the words "historiador Picasso, hijo de todos" lurk the accusations of widespread illegitimate borrowing attested to by Roland Penrose: "It has often been said, not without

malice, that Picasso steals anything from anyone if it intrigues him sufficiently. There are those who claim that during his close collaboration with Braque he would hurry home after a visit to his friend's studio to exploit ideas suggested by the work he had just seen" (211). Penrose himself suggests that Picasso's "learning from others was a secret process" (129). However, in a further utterance, Saura describes his own debt to Picasso, and that of his colleague, Antoni Tàpies, in similar terms to those in which Picasso is criticised above:

> Desprecio a los dos Antonios del arte español,
> Tapies y Saura, tísicos de origen, compañeros de
> viaje, hijos bastardos de Picasso y pintamonas
> en ejercicio de fama. (22)

In the phrase "hijos bastardos de Picasso y pintamonas en ejercicio de fama," we recognise the same ideology of 'influence' and illegitimate borrowings, here purportedly resorted to by second-rate painters in search of fame, and therefore a certain self-deprecating humour on Saura's part.[5] Yet, in coming out of his own mouth, these words can also be understood as an affirmation of *encadenamiento*. Likewise, in the words "compañeros de viaje," we hear Saura's 'communistic' discourse of "los compañeros de ruta" mentioned above. In this way, Saura does perhaps make a distinction between himself and Picasso.[6]

Most importantly, by subjecting himself to the same discourses as Picasso, Saura distances himself from the transcendental voice of a self-appointed guardian of standards, ideals and truth; the producer of a moral-didactic, closed, authorial monologue, and therefore a reading of this litany of invective as purely his own, unproblematised, rather than, as I have argued, "polyphonic" and heterogeneous "rejoinders" in a pre-existent dialogue (Bakhtin 274). In this way, Saura's utterances 're-cite' the debates in politics and the arts

5 We also recall Roland Penrose's observation: "To this day no one can claim to be the pupil of Picasso; he has never had the time or the patience to teach systematically, but such is his capacity to set others thinking by his work, by his chance remarks in conversation, by his writings and by his way of living, that he has become one of the greatest teachers of our time" (249). Wilhelm Boeck likewise suggested that "while many painters imitate him, only a few understand him . . . Picasso cannot pass his discoveries on to his disciples, and hence cannot find true successors as a painter" (346).

6 In a further semantic layer, Walter Benjamin's criticism of *proletkult* artists and writers as mere "fellow travellers" is drawn into dialogue. Hal Foster notes that, in "The Author as Producer" (1934), Benjamin proposed a third term between form and content, or the aesthetic quality of autonomous art and the political reference of social(ist) realism, calling for 'productivism,' or solidarity with the proletariat in terms of material practice, not merely in artistic theme or political attitude. For Benjamin, the rival *proletkult* movement in the early Soviet Union was the art of the "mere fellow traveller of the worker not because of any essential difference in identity but because identification with the worker alienates the worker, confirms rather than closes the gap between the two through a reductive, idealistic, or otherwise misbegotten representation" (*Return* 171). In this regard, Caravaggio's 'loan' to *Guernica* is of interest: "Desprecio a Caravaggio que prestó un caballo y una figura yacente para el Guernica" (*Libelo* 17). Following Dustin Rice, Joseph Masheck writes of the pictorial and symbolic relationship between the horse and the fallen warrior in *Guernica* and similar figures in Caravaggio's baroque painting, the *Conversion of St. Paul* (1600-1601), suggesting an analogy between Picasso's conversion to Communism and the conversion of Saul to Paul and to Christianity: "'Pablo,' of course, is 'Paul,' and Picasso made the first sketches for *Guernica* on May Day" (qtd. in Oppler 305). In 1937, Picasso was but a fellow traveller: he would not become a card-carrying Communist until after the liberation of Paris in 1944. Saura thus draws in Picasso's politics, Benjamin's theory of aesthetics, and also the anti-Communist discourses of the *vencedores*: "Odio al Guernica porque fue pintado por un comunista" (*Libelo* 20). Picasso also 'borrowed' Caravaggio's tenebrism and *chiaroscuro*.

which had been stifled in Spain. Indeed, in characterising himself (and Tàpies) as "tísicos de origen," we are reminded of Saura's discovery of modernist art in 1943, when, at the age of thirteen, he contracted tuberculosis and was bed-ridden for a number of years. It was then that a copy of the Nazi magazine, *Signal*, which parodied the 'degenerate' work of Picasso, Paul Klee, Marc Chagall, Max Ernst and Piet Mondrian, fell into Saura's hands, "[y] así . . . emp[ezó] realmente y con z el *nazimiento* de [s]u pintura" (Ríos 25-26). The expression "tísicos" recalls the Francoist/fascist ideology of cultural and political *limpieza*, and the demonising of the worthless, foreign, disease-ridden Other: Republicans, separatists, democrats, liberals, the working classes. In this discourse, "tísico" was an insult, as if tuberculosis were a deserved affliction, whereas of course those with the economic means –predominantly the *vencedores*– would better survive this disease.[7] Thus, in locating his artistic inspiration in the context of his illness, Saura 're-members' the links between so-called degenerate art and degenerate, disease-ridden people, both to be expelled from national identity and destiny.

Likewise, then, when Saura inveighs against the "historiador Picasso, hijo de todos, asesino del arte, iniciador de poco y término de nada" (*Libelo* 40), I suggest he inveighs mostly against the discourses conducted around the artist and *Guernica*, specifically the notion of 'influence' within 'official' modernist art historiography. I will now turn to the latter part of this utterance to contextualise the former. The words of the art critic, Ricardo Gutiérrez Abascal, uttered in the 1930s, serve to demonstrate the ideological link between "hijo de todos" and the phrase "iniciador de poco." This "más abierto" of Madrid's art critics considered Picasso "'en ningún caso un precursor de tiempos nuevos' o 'un abridor de nuevos caminos', sino tan sólo un hábil y ecléctico reproductor de modas: 'Picasso lo sabe todo y todo lo imita y lo reproduce'" (Tusell 246). That is, Picasso the imitator does not make the canonical break. Yet, through Saura's *ironía asociativa*, Gutiérrez Abascal may also be heard to enter into dialogue with, say, Otto J. Brendel, who in 1962 conversely wrote that *Guernica* "seemed from the outset destined to epitomize the end of an era, while at the same time signalizing the beginning of a new one" (qtd. in Oppler 291) – the

7 As a result of the Francoist ideology of cultural autarky and the subjugation of the defeated, diptheria, typhoid, tuberculosis and rickets were rampant among the *vencidos* in the 1940s (Preston 46, 136; Richards 173-81). Victorita's mother in Camilo José Cela's *La Colmena* (1951) personifies this Francoist discourse when she describes Victorita's boyfriend as "ese tísico" (222). Conversely, in Picasso's days in Barcelona, "[p]overty was by no means unusual but disease was a commonplace and was suffered proudly, particularly when it took the form of tuberculosis or venereal diseases, which carried with them a romantic aura. They were all the more likely to be contracted by those who were determined to live passionately with little consideration for the consequences, and who accepted such doubtful rewards with pride" (Penrose 51). Here, then, Saura also 'enchains' himself with Picasso's artistic passion, although the latter fell prey to scarlet fever, not tuberculosis.

opposite of "iniciador de poco y término de nada." The crux of the debate lies in the contests over Picasso's contribution to modernism, itself frequently described as inhering the death of painting. For Picasso's detractors, he is an "asesino del arte" in a pejorative sense; for his promoters, he is a canonical player in what Bois terms modernism's "task of mourning":

> [T]he whole enterprise of modernism, especially of abstract painting, which can be taken as its emblem, could not have functioned without an apocalyptic myth. Freed from all extrinsic conventions, abstract painting was meant to bring forth the pure *parousia* of its own essence, to tell the final truth and thereby terminate its course, . . . however, . . . this discourse [also] centres around the appearance of photography, and of mass production, both of which were understood as causing the end of painting. . . . [P]ainting had to redefine its status, to reclaim a specific domain. . . . Mourning has been the activity of painting throughout this century. (Bois, "Mourning" 327-29)

In relation to this apocalyptic myth, Saura himself suggests that "Mondrian y Malevich serían quienes culminarían, con su canto de cisne, la progresiva solidificación de Cézanne y los cubistas, el fin de una era donde la razón era todopoderosa" (*Fijeza* 13). For Saura, not the cubists –and thus not Picasso– but Mondrian and Malevich 'ended' abstract painting in the apocalyptic quest for 'the end of art.' For Saura, too, Picasso is "[el] término de nada." However, I reiterate, Saura rails less against Picasso than against the discourses surrounding his painting; here, against the apocalyptic discourse of 'the end of art' and its ramifications in modernist art historiography.[8] This discourse is cited in two further utterances:

> Desprecio el Oficio de Difuntos del Guernica. (23)

> Desprecio al Guernica porque a pesar de las balas
> y las bombas su imagen de luto y oficio de
> tinieblas podrá perpetuarse. (7)

One available reading of both "el Oficio de Difuntos del Guernica" and "su imagen de luto y oficio de tinieblas" is of *Guernica* as a canonical representation of the discourse of mourning in modernist painting: Picasso's Death Notice, Picasso's image of mourning, Picasso's Liturgy of the Hours, recited for the death of painting, will be able to be perpetuated in art historiography.[9] In the complicating phrase, "a pesar de las balas y las bombas," we hear traces of Michel Leiris's claim on Picasso as a realist rather than surrealist

8 See, for example, Arthur C. Danto, *After the End of Art: Contemporary Art and the Pale of History*, and Hans Belting, *Art History After Modernism*.

9 Speaking of Picasso's 1941-1942 still-life compositions, "pervaded by somber grays" (as is *Guernica*), Maurice Raynal suggested that Picasso's palette "ha[d] put on mourning" (qtd. in Boeck 240): another intertext in this utterance.

painter. Leiris –also cited in the former utterance[10]– argued that Picasso knew "the exact weight of things, the measure of their value, their materiality" (qtd. in Bois, "Figure" 81). In this reading, *Guernica*'s ongoing ability to mourn the dead of Gernika is attributed to Picasso's 'measure of realism' regarding the atrocity. A more political reading suggests that, in spite of its destruction by bombs, Gernika is remembered and mourned in *Guernica*. We also hear the regret of some that *Guernica* itself survived the bombs, and can thus continue to re-present the atrocity. However, we also hear the complaint that *Guernica*'s self-perpetuation is in 'spite' of, or at the (weighty) expense of, these bullets and bombs as a primary signified. Here, then, two important themes of Saura's multilayered and labyrinthine text are united. Firstly, with respect to *Guernica*'s iconography and idiom, Picasso was critiqued by some Marxist critics as having privileged his bid for the leadership of the (mourning) modernist movement over political compromise, thereby compromising *Guernica*'s political purpose: supporting the Republic and protesting Gernika. Secondly, Picasso and *his* mourning, modernist painting, stylistically and iconographically enchained with both earlier and contemporary art, have been canonised, while some of Picasso's equally important "fellow travellers" remain beyond the pale of official art history. Saura in fact insists that *Contra el Guernica* is "sobre todo un arreglo de cuentas también contra la mitificación excesiva de un cuadro, contra la beatificación que ese cuadro provoca" (Ríos 179). While Saura recognises the sharing of intellectual property as both 'legitimate' and 'natural' to the artistic process, he rejects the manoeuvring for status and pecuniary advantage implicit in Picasso's (occasional) denial of that sharing, and, most importantly, the art historiography, or hagiography, that 'beatifies' the nominated geniuses of modernism and their 'miraculous' creations.

In his essay, "La muerte del arte," Saura relates the discourse of the end of art precisely to the manoeuvring for market share among the neo-vanguards, whom he archly accuses not only of artistic impotence, but also of practising art against the original, revulsive grain of modernism; of a dearth of idealism and of collusion with the market in its constant demands for the 'death' of one style to make way for the birth and consumption of the next ephemeral phase (*Fijeza* 363-65) – and thus the next canonisation or *beatificación*. For Saura, this problem lies in practices derived from Marcel Duchamp's "ready-mades,"

10 Here, Saura cites Leiris's article "Faire-part," published in the earlier-mentioned volume of *Cahiers d'Art*: "Picasso nos envía nuestra esquela de defunción [o Oficio de Difuntos]: todo lo que amamos va a morir, y por eso era hasta ese punto necesario que todo lo que amamos se resumiese, como la efusión de los grandes adioses, en algo inolvidablemente hermoso" (qtd. in Alix Trueba 83). Further available readings of "Oficio de Difuntos" are of the death notices/funeral services for the Gernika dead; we may also recall the ideological *Guernica: The Official Report* (1938).

originally “una forma iconoclasta de confundir lo que distingue al arte de cuanto el hombre produce . . . un gesto nihilista ciertamente turbador, juego y provocación,” but which “más tarde dio paso a la aceptación de su impotencia creadora” (358):

> Como consecuencia de la facilidad otorgada –pérdida de valores, cinismo o hundimiento ético, podríamos decir– surgen miles de artistas sin arte, y la terrible duda de que al ser “todo posible”, el arte no es nada. “A la gente se le puede tragar cualquier cosa”, afirmó cínicamente Duchamp a propósito de uno de sus *ready-made* más conocido [sic], el urinario de 1917 titulado *Fountain*. Me parece que en esta confesión horrible, que es a un tiempo lúcida moraleja, está la clave del problema. (359)

Duchamp’s *Fountain* is obliquely cited, and basely contextualised, in the utterance:

> Detesto la sucursal del Prado, el prostíbulo del Prado, el apéndice del Prado, la alcantarilla del Prado, el anexo de las galerías del Prado, la taberna del Prado, el urinario del Prado, el escupidera climatizada del Prado, donde fantoches babeantes y borrachos celebran diariamente la misa negra del Guernica. (23)

However, rather than a critique of Picasso’s creative impotence –*Guernica*, the *Fountain* of the Prado, is no “*neo-ready-made*” (*Fijeza* 360)– I suggest that this utterance serves to locate Picasso’s painting within the more revolutionary Duchampian operation to ‘lower’ art, and the institution of art, towards the base; indeed, we again detect a Bataillean trace.

A second “ready-made,” Duchamp’s *L.H.O.O.Q.*, is cited in the utterance “[d]etesto los bigotes de la Gioconda del Guernica” (*Libelo* 13). Leonardo da Vinci’s *La Gioconda*, or *Mona Lisa*, is *the* sign for art. Duchamp famously defaced a cheap reproduction of this painting with the addition of a moustache –“los bigotes”– beard, and the obscene inscription “L.H.O.O.Q” (*elle a chaud au cul*). Again, then, an artistic lowering, or iconoclasm, is ironically ‘detested’ in this utterance. Indeed, a similarly iconoclastic operation occurs in Saura’s own painting: “Reírse de la autoridad, garabatear el modelo, impugnar a los inquisidores, ensuciar, manchar, orinar, eyacular sobre lo impoluto, lo perfecto, lo inalcanzable por su nítidez y su armonía. Borrón, graffiti de los urinarios públicos, anuncio obsceno, navajazo contra la tela canónica, pedrada a la Monalisa, quema del templo de Éfeso” (Sarduy 44). We might therefore read this utterance as homage to the iconoclasm of *Guernica*; to its positive relationship with the initially transgressive power of Duchamp.

Nevertheless, at a further semantic level, a settling of accounts is perhaps implied: Saura acknowledges Picasso’s talent and fame –*Guernica* is another *Mona Lisa*– yet gently ribs Picasso, and more savagely satirises the art historians of the end of art, or “arte sin

arte." Is Picasso quite/just as important as Duchamp? As Ríos comments to Saura, "los dos pintores que marcan nuestra época son Duchamp y Picasso" (65); the competition for the leadership of the modernist movement is between these 'gods.' For many contemporary art critics, Duchamp is the most important figure in twentieth-century Western art history:

> Antes e incluso después de Marcel Duchamp no parece haber existido nada para algunos críticos y artistas defensores de semejante reduccionismo cultural, de la misma forma que sólo algunos privilegiados de nuestro siglo, hoy provisoriamente mitificados, serán dignos de ser tendidos en cuenta como verdaderos héroes del arte sin arte. (Saura, *Fijeza* 366)

While Saura critiques the art historiography that inflates Picasso's role in modernism, he also challenges the alternative, Duchampian genealogy.

Furthermore, as in all Saura's utterances, contesting voices leave traces in still further semantic layers. In an article written by Manuel Blanco Tobio in 1981, published in the newspaper *ABC*, and cited by Saura in three consecutive utterances, we note a different, more resentful take on *Guernica*'s relationship to the famous *Mona Lisa*:[11]

> Quiero decir que a nadie se le ha ocurrido decorar fuentes o tarteras con cuadros de Picasso, como se ha hecho con algún cuadro de Millet, o de Corot. Ni se han gastado bromas con ellos, como tantas veces han hecho con "La Gioconda", a la que pintarle un bigote parece una compulsión, para muchos. Y, sin embargo, Picasso en Nueva York atrajo gentíos que sólo podría reunir un partido de pelota de base entre "Yankees" y "Mets." (n. pag.)

No one cares to deface *Guernica*, yet they flock to see it in hordes, Blanco Tobio appears to complain. Blanco Tobio's rhetoric, in turn, would seem to be a 'target' for Saura.

Also as usual, these art-historical, art-critical and popular discourses are simultaneously overlaid with historical/political discourses. In 1967, four hundred artists and writers petitioned Picasso to withdraw *Guernica* from MoMA while US intervention in Vietnam continued. Picasso did not respond. On 13 March 1970, the Art Workers Coalition, together with Artists and Writers Protest, wrote a second open letter to Picasso, requesting he remove *Guernica* from MoMA in protest of US atrocities in Vietnam:

> The continuous housing of *Guernica* in The Museum of Modern Art, New York, implies that our establishment has the moral right to be indignant about the crimes of others – and ignore our own crimes. . . . Tell the directors and trustees . . . that *Guernica* cannot remain on public view as long as American troops are committing genocide in Vietnam. Renew the outcry of *Guernica* by telling those who remain silent in the face of Mylai that you remove from them the moral trust as guardians of your painting. (Qtd in Oppler 240)

11 Blanco Tobio's article is satirised in the utterance: "Detesto la merluza, propiedad de Manuel Blanco Tobio, que, sin vacilar, se negó a dejarse envolver en la reproducción a doble página del 'ABC' del Guernica" (*Libelo* 36). The previous two utterances contain uncited quotations from Blanco Tobio's article.

On 28 February 1974, in further protest against the Vietnam War, Toni Shafrazi, a young Iranian artist, defaced *Guernica* by spraying the words "KILL LIES ALL" in red paint across its surface. Jean Toche, the conceptual leader of the Guerilla Art Action Group, wrote a letter to the director of MoMA, Richard Oldenburg, describing Shafrazi as joining Picasso in a collaborative work called "Guernica/Mylai" (Oppler 236, 243, 244). Duchamp's defacement of Leonardo's *La Gioconda* can thus also be linked with the defacement of Picasso's *Guernica*; through Shafrazi's actions and Saura's *ironía asociativa* the atrocities committed by the United States in Vietnam are linked with the Nazi/Spanish Nationalist atrocity at Gernika.

In a further utterance, MoMA's role as the Cold War cultural arm of the Central Intelligence Agency and US multinational corporations and interests (Cockcroft 39-41) is drawn into dialogue with the institution's forty-two-year patronage and marketing of *Guernica*, productive of its fame as a modernist (rather than politically dissident) icon:

> Odio a los Estados Unidos porque a pesar de continuar lanzando plagas dejó partir el Guernica
> después de cuarenta y dos años de prisión. (9)

Through forty-two years in "prison" –reminiscent of of Josep Renau's critique of the Prado as a "veritable jail"– *Guernica* had become re-signified as *the* sign for modern art, the corollary of this re-signification being that *Guernica* ceased to signify the atrocity of Gernika: it was therefore now 'safe' to release the (de-)commissioned 'history painting.' As Joseph Masheck suggested in 1967,

> for *Guernica* to have taken on even the antiquarian dignity of a history painting is hardly inappropriate. As a result, however, we may fail to acknowledge the true historicism, however radical, of the work itself. We can be so ready to concede to *Guernica* traditional rank and glory that we overlook its active revision of tradition, whether or not such a categorical superstructure can still justify artistic merit. More plainly, this is an overexposed image: *Guernica*, the modern *Mona Lisa*, is used as *the* stock artistic illustration of modern culture. (Qtd. in Oppler 305-06)

In the last group of utterances discussed, Saura cites/sites the pecuniary and status-based ends of the apocalyptic discourse of the "end of art" as practised in the (neo-) vanguards, and also the pecuniary and political ends of the highly influential New York MoMA, in relation to *Guernica*'s original aesthetic and political transgressivity. However, partisan political discourses have largely been subsumed in this chapter in order to follow the threads of Saura's art-theoretical themes in *Contra el Guernica*, which, in one semantic layer, serves as a manifesto of the artist's theories not only of modernist art-making, but

also of the making of modernist 'masters' and 'masterpieces.' In relation to the former, I have introduced Saura's further characterisation (following Picasso's and Goya's) of 'great' or 'intense' painting as "la fiesta por dentro," drawn into dialogue through Goya's *fusilado*, and also through the 'riddling' *jerga taurina* of the "[pase] natural en la verónica," "las señoritas toreras del Guernica," and the "final de la transición sellada artísticamente por la puntilla y descabello del Guernica," discussed in earlier chapters. More importantly, I have argued that Saura's 'communistic' philosophy of *encadenamiento* contests the dominant capitalist model of modernist art historiography, the hagiography which reproduces the ideological discourse of the artist as a solitary genius, and the subsequent canonisation, or beatification, of Picasso and *Guernica*. In a political and artistic counterpractice, Saura's utterances relentlessly enchain *Guernica* with previous, contemporary and future artists' works, and with different phases of Picasso's and his own oeuvre, precisely to contest these ideologies.

Conclusion

This explicative thesis of *Contra el Guernica. Libelo* has re-framed Antonio Saura's seemingly 'critical review' of Picasso's *Guernica* as a rigorous 're-viewing' of this important painting, and a revisionist (art) history of the painting and the atrocity it commemorates. It has shown that, through this process, Saura's pamphlet also constitutes a roll-call of the protagonists of *Guernica* (plastic and human) and Gernika, and their sometimes mutual commentators; a 're-collection' of key debates in aesthetics and museology; a didactic exposition of how to read (Picasso's) painting; a homage to this influential artist; a manifesto of Saura's own art theories, and an elaboration of the power relations of representation.

This semantic virtuosity, achieved through the political, (art-)historical and art-theoretical intertexts which 'riddle' Saura's text, has led me to characterise *Contra el Guernica: Libelo* as a "rompecabezas," and to suggest its appropriateness to the aesthetic of one "Guernica" and to the aftermath (and, in a further semantic layer, to the brute reality of) the other(ed). The identification of these intertexts –the pieces of Saura's "rompecabezas" understood as a puzzle– represents the foundation of my research. In interpreting their functions in Saura's text, I have been guided by the author's own comments that, in relation to Picasso's painting, *Contra el Guernica* is "una prueba de amor más de repulsa," hence the need to "leerlo al revés," while mindful that "ciertos equívocos se mantendrían." Saura's "erudición transformada en esperpento," "regusto por la ironía asociativa" and "humor negro" are similarly acknowledged in this thesis.

I have drawn on Mikhail M. Bakhtin's articulation of the dialogical text, discussing Saura's epigrams as "utterances": rejoinders in a pre-existent dialogue, shot through with the countless "alien voices" and ideologies inserted into *Contra el Guernica* for the (frequently simultaneous) "orchestration" of his various themes. Likewise, Julia Kristeva's notion of the transposition of the numerous discourses and codes traversing a text has contributed to my interpretation of Saura's *Libelo*, in which *Guernica* and Gernika are inflected with (each others') historical, political, ethical and aesthetic codes. So too has the simpler concept of the double (or triple) entendre, whereby the object of the invective itself is multiple.

Finally, "historiographical metafiction," the genre name coined by Linda Hutcheon for texts which play on the paradox of the reality of the past but its accessibility to us solely through its textualised traces, has refined my theoretical frame for interpreting Saura's

overtly intertextual pamphlet. While this postmodern genre is less concerned with telling the truth than questioning whose truth gets told, one of its persistent themes is that of 'lying.' As Saura's text engages with the problematic notions of the 'truth' and 'reality' of both art and history and their textual –visual and written– representations, I have also on occasion prefixed Hutcheon's term to broaden her concept to "(art-)historiographical metafiction."

Indeed, I have argued that the principal themes of Saura's pamphlet are that the discourses conducted incessantly around *Guernica* had distanced this art object both from its 'plastic reality' and from a key referent –the Gernika atrocity– and that the dominant political discourses conducted around this historical event had likewise 're-pressed' *its* reality. A third, related theme is that of the (partial) success of Picasso's painting in making manifest, as distinct from representing through symbolism and allegory, precisely this traumatic reality. This last theme has been demonstrated to insinuate Saura's own painterly praxis through the ekphrastic attribution to *Guernica* of the terms of his (Bataillean) discourse of painting. I have also argued that Saura orchestrates his redress – his restoration of each "Guernica" to a 'true' frame– by 'rehearsing' others' li(n)es and through an operation which I have termed 'the return of the real.'

Contra el Guernica comprises an exhaustive litany of the sources and discourses pertinent to *Guernica*. In other(s') words, Saura 're-cites' the art-historical 'influences' in Picasso's work, and also the political and aesthetic discourses constitutive of both the subjectivity of the artist –modernism, *hispanismo* and Marxism– and of his painting at different nodal points in its cultural trajectory: the Spanish Civil War, the *dictadura*, the *dictablanda* and the Transition. While it would be inaccurate to describe the constitution of Picasso and his painting in art-critical, art-theoretical, art-historical and political discourses as 'lies,' I have argued that Saura's text contests the 'truth' of many representations of the artist and (re-)significations of his painting through the/his reproduction of these discursive 'lines.' Reciprocally, Saura's 're-citation' of the "tournaments of value" conducted over *Guernica* by, among others, the architects of "Operación Guernica," MoMA, the transitional Spanish State, the Basques and the citizens of Gernika for the sign values it might bestow 'in return,' satirises such attempts to appropriate this modernist icon and fetishised political symbol, and impugns its ability to re-signify Spain as politically and culturally modern.

Moreover, through *double entendres* and knowing transpositions of the codes of aesthetics, (art) history and politics, Saura 're-cites' the propagandistic and sublimatory

're-pressions' of the Gernika atrocity. Thus (pro-/Neo-)Francoist accounts of the bombardment of Gernika frequently share the 'lines' of Picasso scholars, hagiographers and critics, such that the term 'lies' is valid enough in this latter context. Through Saura's 're-citation' to excess of all these pre-existent texts, and the equal (when not same) space –and thus weight– given to each of them, each of their 'truths' is problematised, shown to be contingent and ideological. If, in one sense, *Guernica*'s ability to signify at all is impugned, in a further sense, the 'truths' of *Guernica* and Gernika can be understood to be 'approximated' by stripping back accretions of textual representations. Again, I have suggested that it is precisely the discursive (re-)signification of *Guernica* and Gernika, rather than the painting and its creator, that Saura satirises in his *Libelo*.

Nevertheless, while Saura's 're-citation' 're-hearses' certain political and art-theoretical ideas, it simultaneously re(in)states others. In relation to (Picasso's) painting, *Contra el Guernica* may be read both as problematising interpretation and as a didactic tract on how to read a work of art. This ambiguity is evidenced, for example, in the visual intertexts in Saura's pamphlet, or rather the ekphrastic representations of visual representations inserted into this text. If, in one semantic layer, Saura's 're-citation' of the multiple interpretations of *Guernica*'s borrowed iconography proposed by art historians contests the validity of interpretation, these 're-cited' sightings simultaneously re(in)state the signifieds –ideological and hermetic– of these intertexts in Picasso's painting. As 're-cited' and re-sited in Saura's utterances, the historical, ideological and sometimes psychoanalytic codes that 'saturate' such visual signs as the flood victim 'lent' by the Beatus of Liebana, Velázquez's *Meninas* and the cast of Goya's *Aquelarre*(s) (are demonstrated to) de-sublimate (pro-/Neo-)Nationalist rhetoric, ideology and actions. Long deceased voices and the discourses productive of the Civil War period are thus (shown to be) drawn into dialogue.

Contra el Guernica is also subversive in that it reintroduces a plurality of contemporary voices, including those silenced under the Francoist and Neo-Francoist regimes. I have argued that Saura's utterances both 're-cite' and (sometimes simultaneously) (in)cite resistance to (pro-)Nationalist re-significations of *Guernica* and Gernika. These latter voices 'in fact' provide the 'pre-texts' for a 'return of the referent' –that which could not be (honestly) referred to in Francoist Spain– and thus a return, if not of the real itself, at least of reference to it. The visual, cinematic and literary texts of *Equipo Crónica*, Luis Buñuel, Fernando Arrabal and Carlos Rojas, for example, are drawn into *Contra el*

Guernica in part for the 're-call' of the Gernika atrocity, understood as real, even if accessible only through such textualised traces.

In addition to these textualised traces of the real, it is the traumatic, 'real' experience of Gernika's victims, psychoanalytically speaking, that I have suggested Saura would also (have us) 're-view.' If, theoretically, such a 'return of the real' may not be 'orchestrated' in art or literature –for the (Lacanian) unconscious is not at the "transparent disposal" of artists and writers; expression is never unmediated (Foster, *Recodings* 62)– Saura nevertheless de-sublimates the violence of the Nazi/Nationalist bombardment of Gernika and the abjection of 'the other(ed) Spain' through his Bataillean 're-view' of Picasso's painting. Or, at least, the textualised traces of George Bataille's philosophy recall the determination of artists to induce a traumatic affect in the viewer when, having freed themselves from the requirement to represent the visible world, they found themselves faced with a socio-political reality they wished to contest in some other 'manner.'

While, on one hand, the problematising of the categorisation of *Guernica* as purely surrealist *à la* Breton or (im)purely (sur)realist *à la* Bataille merely 're-hearses' one more art-historical debate, on the other, the success of *Guernica* in manifesting the abject reality of Gernika, as distinct from representing this atrocity through symbolical content, has been discussed as a major focus, and equivocation, in Saura's commentary on this painting. If Saura's black humour mocks Franco (and perhaps Bataille) through his linking of the fascist "Cara al Sol" with this philosopher's 'regard' for the *soleil pourri*, in further semantic layers a Bataillean, (non/de)-sublimatory approach to painting is championed while the expression of such destructive drives in the 'real' world is an unequivocal target of Saura's invective, and, I have suggested, of his visual art. *Contra el Guernica. Libelo* may thus also be read as a Saurian art manifesto.

Indeed, I have contended that Picasso's response to this nascent debate 'informs' Saura's own art (counter)practice, and that the terms of Bataille's base materialism and the *informe* are drawn into *Contra el Guernica* also to orchestrate this theme. The intertextual presence of Goya's *Aquelarres* and Velázquez's *Las meninas* has also been considered in relation to their introduction of Saura's own (Bataillean) art-theoretical discourses of *la mirada cruel* and *la belleza obscena*, whose manifestations are sighted by Saura in Picasso's *Guernica*, and cited in *Contra el Guernica. Libelo*. Goya's *fusilado* has likewise been discussed not only in relation to the codes of the parallel art histories of *El tres de mayo* and *Guernica*, as elaborated in Rojas's *El Valle de Los Caídos*, but also to Saura's characterisation –following Goya and Picasso– of great or intense painting as *la fiesta por*

dentro. Saura's titles have also been noted as intertexts; evidence both of this artist's homage to Picasso and of his art-historiographical concept of artistic *encadenamiento*.

I have proposed that *Contra el Guernica*'s relentless enchaining of *Guernica* with historical and contemporary artists and writers and their works subverts the beatification of artists such as Picasso in modernist art historiography. It also orchestrates a roll-call both of these 'creators' and of key contributors to twentieth-century debates in aesthetics and museology –largely suppressed in Franco's Spain– including the influential Spaniards Josep Renau, Ramón Gaya and Rafael Alberti, and the internationally renowned Walter Benjamin, Theodor Adorno, Max Raphael and André Malraux.

Saura's text thus re-presents not only the representations and re-significations of *Guernica* and Gernika in dominant discourses, but also the representations of the unrepresented in Francoist Spain, including the subjugated knowledge of the liberal *afrancesado*, vanquished in the Civil War and forced into exile, frequently for the duration of the *Caudillo*'s life. However, as a result of the erudition of this author, only the arts-educated reader can recognise the discursive contexts of each of his intertexts and consider them in accordance with their recombination and re-signification in the new work.

The multiple 'deaths' of *Guernica* have provided an example of the polysemy and transposition of such erudite intertexts, and also of Saura's "humor negro" and "erudición transformado en esperpento." *Guernica*'s "cadáver" has been argued to be 'shot through' with various 'deadly' codes: those of the apocalyptic discourses of two parallelled 'crusades' –productive of real cadavers– and of modernism's 'task of mourning'; of surrealism and Saura's own post-surrealist (dis)figurative informalism, each productive of artistic cadavers; of Marxist criticism of the dying art of the dying bourgeoisie, and the moribund criticism penned by more reactionary critics; of *museal* mortality, whether in real, royal or imaginary institutions, and of Malraux's devitalised art-work awaiting the revolutionary catalyst; of Picasso-speak, and of dominant Transition discourses.

Saura's pamphlet thus perplexes the general reader, just as *Guernica*'s intertexts are accessible only to "quien los sepa ver." Indeed, I have argued that *Contra el Guernica. Libelo* parallels Picasso's painting in style and content. In the same way that Picasso's visual text transposes elements of his habitual themes –his lover-models, the *corrida*, Mithraic rites and the crucifixion– and constitutes a statement on modern art as much as on the political events of the Civil War, Saura's text includes and transposes each of these elements. *Guernica* contains both surrealist metaphorical transpositions and non-sublimatory, non-symbolic elements; so too does Saura's literary style comprise both

surrealist verse and 'traumatic realism.' *Contra el Guernica* may also be understood, then, not only as an exposition of how to 'read' *Guernica*, but also as "una prueba de amor más de repulsa."

In sum, in a style both true to the semantic virtuosity of Saura's text –such that my own is 'riddled' with back-slashes, parentheses, hyphens, inverted commas and *double entendres*– and to its *grito*, understood both as visceral cry, to which I can only refer, and as the deconstruction of 'an orchestrated litany of li(n)es,' I have argued that Saura's "rompecabezas" not only is true to the painting it 're-views,' but also 'does justice to' the atrocity which inspired this painting. As a sustained outpouring of vitriol and vituperation, it recalls the 'incendiary' saturation bombing of Gernika during the Spanish Civil War. In its erudite representations of others' lines, it reproduces Picasso's own 'drawing' from the archive in *Guernica*. Saura's text likewise 'exhibits' both the polysemy of Picasso's painting and the multiple and self-contradictory accounts penned by the Spanish Nationalists in their self-serving 're-visions' of the circumstances of Gernika's destruction. In its own 'manner,' neither was Picasso's visual 'text' an entirely 'realistic' representation of Gernika; nor did its iconography permit of a singular interpretation. For many critics it therefore failed to signify the Republican cause. The Nazi/Nationalist atrocity and Picasso's painting also share, then, an ambiguity as to intent; this ambiguity as to interpretation, too, is maintained in Saura's pamphlet. However, I understand *Contra el Guernica*. *Libelo*'s 'resistance' to a 'final solution' also to provoke dialogue in both Spanish politics and the arts.

Works Cited

Primary source

Saura, Antonio. *Contra el Guernica. Libelo.* Madrid: Turner, 1982.

Secondary sources

Abellán, José Luis. "El exilio como quiebra constitucional." *Revista de Hispanismo Filosófico* 4 (1999): 5-9.

Adamowicz, Elza. "Exquisite Excrement: The Bataille-Breton Polemic." *Aurifex* Vol. 2 (2002). http://www.goldsmiths.ac.uk/aurifex/issue2/adamowicz.html. N. pag.

Alberti, Rafael. "Los ojos de Picasso." Rome, 1966.

__. *Noche de guerra en el Museo del Prado.* Buenos Aires: Losange, 1956.

__. "Saura Poeta." *Figura y fondo. Antonio Saura.* Eds. Julián Ríos and R. Pinyol Balasch. Barcelona: Ediciones del Mall, 1987. 105-06.

Alix Trueba, Josefina. "*Guernica*, historia de un cuadro." *Poesía* 2.39-40 (1993): 7-131.

Allen, Graham. *Roland Barthes.* London: Routledge, 2003.

Angulo, Javier. "Campaña a favor de la instalación del 'Guernica' en Euskadi." *El País* 28 Sept. 1981, sec. El Cultural. [Pag. illegible].

Aparicio, Frances R. "Entre la guaracha y el bolero: Un ciclo de intertextos en la nueva narrativa puertorriqueña." *Revista Iberoamericana* 59.162-163 (1993): 73-89.

Appadurai, Arjun. "Commodities and the Politics of Value." Introduction. *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective.* Ed. Arjun Appadurai. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997. 3-63.

Areilza, José María de. "La larga marcha a la reconciliación." *La guerra civil española: Una reflexión moral 50 años después.* Ed. Ramón Tamames. Barcelona: Planeta, 1986. 137-52.

Arrabal Terán, Fernando. *Arrabal celebrando la ceremonia de la confusión*. Barcelona: Destino, 1983.

__. "'Ciugrena' (Los desastres de la guerra)." *Teatro de Fernando Arrabal.* Madrid: Taurus, 1968. 89-103.

__. *El entierro de la sardina.* Barcelona: Destino, 1984.

__. *Fando y Lis; Guernica; La bicicleta del condenado*. Madrid: Alianza, 1986.

__. *Le Matin des amours*. Paris: Cristiani, 1988.

__. *L'Odeur de la sainteté*. Ed. Yves Rivière. Paris, 1975.

__. "Saura." *Peintures sur papier*. Cat. ex. Paris: Galerie Stadler, 1969.

Baer, Brigitte. "Where Do They Come from – Those Superb Paintings and Horrid Women of 'Picasso's War'?" *Picasso and the War Years: 1937-1945*. Ed. Steven A. Nash with Robert Rosenblum. New York: Thames and Hudson; [San Francisco]: Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco, 1998. 81-97.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *The Dialogic Imagination.* Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Michael Holquist and Caryl Emerson. Austin: U of Texas P, 1981.

Bannard, Darby. "Cubism, Abstract Expressionism, David Smith." *Artforum* 6 (1968): 24-25.

Barthes, Roland. *Image-Music-Text.* Trans. Stephen Heath. London: Fontana, 1977. 142-48.

Bataille, Georges. "The Notion of Expenditure." *Visions of Excess: Selected Writings, 1927-1939.* Trans. Allan Stoeckl, with C. R. Lovitt and D. M. Leslie. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1985. 116-29. Rpt. in *Deconstruction in Context: Literature and Philosophy*. Ed. Mark C. Taylor. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1986. 360-74.

Belting, Hans. *Art History After Modernism*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2003.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." *Illuminations: Walter Benjamin Essays and Reflections.* Ed. Hannah Arendt. New York: Schocken, 1955. 217-51.

Berenguer, Ángel. "Para conocer a Arrabal." Introduction. *Fernando Arrabal. Teatro completo Volumen 1*. By Fernando Arrabal Terán. Ed. Ángel Berenguer. Madrid: Cupsa, 1979. 9-53.

Blanco Tobio, Manuel. "La devolución del 'Guernica.'" *ABC* 1981. http://www.manuelblancotobio.com/guernica.html. N. pag.

Boeck, Wilhelm, and Jaime Sabartés. *Picasso.* London: Thames and Hudson, 1955.

Boeglin, Michel. "La sociedad democrática: El reto de la modernidad." Section 3 of Contemporary Spanish Civilisation Course. L'Université Montpellier III. http://perso.wanadoo.fr/michel.boeglin/cours/es/es2x2cap3_sdad_dem.htm. N. pag.

Bois, Yve-Alain. "*Abattoir.*" *Formless: A User's Guide*. By Bois, Yve-Alain, and Rosalind E. Krauss. New York: Zone, 1997. 43-51.

__. "Base Materialism." *Formless: A User's Guide*. By Bois, Yve-Alain, and Rosalind E. Krauss. New York: Zone, 1997. 51-62.

__. “Dialectic.” *Formless: A User’s Guide*. By Bois, Yve-Alain, and Rosalind E. Krauss. New York: Zone, 1997. 67-73.

__. “Figure.” *Formless: A User’s Guide*. By Bois, Yve-Alain, and Rosalind E. Krauss. New York: Zone, 1997. 79-86.

__. “No to . . . the *Informel*.” *Formless: A User’s Guide*. By Bois, Yve-Alain, and Rosalind E. Krauss. New York: Zone, 1997. 138-43.

__. “Painting: The Task of Mourning.” *Art in Modern Culture: An Anthology of Critical Texts*. Eds. Francis Frascina and Jonathon Harris. London: Phaidon, 1999. 326-30.

__. “Threshole.” *Formless: A User’s Guide*. By Bois, Yve-Alain, and Rosalind E. Krauss. New York: Zone, 1997. 185-91.

__. “The Use Value of the Formless.” *Formless: A User’s Guide*. By Bois, Yve-Alain, and Rosalind E. Krauss. New York: Zone, 1997. 13-40.

Bois, Yve-Alain, and Rosalind E. Krauss. [Frontispiece]. *Formless: A User’s Guide*. New York: Zone, 1997. N. pag.

Bonet, Juan Manuel. “Un siglo de arte español dentro y fuera de España.” *Antonio Saura, Crucifixiones*. Cat. ex. Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores. [Madrid]: Umbral, [2002]. 12-20.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Alain Darbel. “The Love of Art.” *Art in Modern Culture: An Anthology of Critical Texts.* Eds. Francis Frascina and Jonathon Harris. London: Phaidon, 1999. 174-80.

Brihuega, Jaime, ed. [Introduction]. *La vanguardia y la República*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1982. 11-56.

__, ed. *Manifiestos, proclamas y textos doctrinales (Las vanguardias artísticas en España: 1910-1931).* Madrid: Cátedra, 1979.

Brown, Daniel. “Bataille, Buñuel & the Decay of Vision in Surrealism.” 1997. http://www.utexas.edu/depts/grg/ustudent/gcraft/fall97/brown/brown.html. N. pag.

Burgos, Antonio. “El ‘Guernica’ vuelve a casa por Navidad.” *El Mundo de Andalucía* 29 May 1999. http://www.antonioburgos.commemorias/1999/05memo052999.html. N. pag.

Burgos, Luis. “Grupo El Paso.” *Arte del Siglo XX*. http://www.art20xx.com/art/grupo_elpaso/elpaso_introduccion.htm. N. pag.

Cabrera, José María, and María del Carmen Garrido. “Estudio técnico del Guernica.” *Boletín del Museo del Prado* 11.6 (1981): 147-56.

Calvo Serraller, Francisco. “El ‘Guernica’ como enigma.” *Goya* 164-165 (1981): 114-19.

__. “Entre Damas anda el juego.” *Saura, Damas*. Cat. ex. Palma: Fundación Juan March, 2003. 7-14.

__. “La esgrima pictórica de Antonio Saura.” *Saura, Decenario*. Cat. ex. Diputaciones Provinciales de Huesca, Teruel y Zaragoza, 1991. 19-26.

__. “La obra del maestro, la actitud del genio.” *El País* 24 Oct. 1981, sec. Artes: iv.

Cela, Camilo José. *La colmena*. 1951. Ed. Jorge Urrutia. 12th ed. Madrid: Letras Hispánicas-Cátedra, 2000.

Chilvers, Ian, ed. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Art and Artists*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990.

Chipp, Hirschel B. *Picasso’s Guernica: History, Transformations, Meanings*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1988.

Cockcroft, Eva. “Abstract Expressionism, Weapon of the Cold War.” *Artforum* 15.10 (1974): 39-41.

Combalia, Victoria. “Odio amoroso pintado.” *Saura, Decenario*. Cat. ex. Diputaciones Provinciales de Huesca, Teruel y Zaragoza, 1991. 67-80.

Cone, Michèle C. “Circumventing Picasso: Jean Paulhan and His Artists.” *Picasso and the War Years: 1937-1945*. Ed. Steven A. Nash with Robert Rosenblum. New York: Thames and Hudson; [San Francisco]: Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco, 1998. 99-111.

Cortés, Miguel Ángel. “Presentación.” *Antonio Saura, Crucifixiones*. Cat. ex. Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores. [Madrid]: Umbral, [2002]. 57-64.

Crimp, Douglas. “On the Museum’s Ruins.” *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture*. Ed. Hal Foster. New York: New P, 1998. 49-64.

“Cronología.” *Antonio Saura, Crucifixiones*. Cat. ex. Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores. [Madrid]: Umbral, [2002]. 160-62.

“Cubismo.” *Masdearte.com*. Contributors: Dore Ashton, Victoria Combalia, Gabriel Finaldi, Vicente Jarque, Marga Paz, Miguel Zugaza, F. Calvo Serraller, Fernando Checa, Fernando Huici, Ivo Mesquita, Victor I. Stoichita. http://www.masdearte.com/item_protagonista.cfm?noticiaid=58. N. pag.

Cuddon, J. A. *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. 4th ed. London: Penguin, 1999.

Dahms, Helmuth Günther. *La guerra española de 1936.* Madrid: Rialp, 1966.

Danto, Arthur C. *After the End of Art: Contemporary Art and the Pale of History.* New Jersey: Princeton UP, 1997.

Derrida, Jacques. *The Truth in Painting*. Trans. Geoff Bennington and Ian McLeod. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1987.

Dominguín, Luis Miguel. "Picasso y los toros." *El Nacional* 15 April 1973, sec. Séptimo día: 4-5.

Eisenman, Stephen F. "The Intransigent Artist." *Art in Modern Culture: An Anthology of Critical Texts.* Eds. Francis Frascina and Jonathon Harris. London: Phaidon, 1999. 189-98.

"Erebus 25 years on." *Sunday Star Times* 21 Nov. 2004, sec. C:1.

Fisch, Eberhard. *Guernica by Picasso.* Cranbury, N. J.: Associated UP, 1988.

FitzGerald, Michael C. *Making Modernism: Picasso and the Creation of the Market for Twentieth Century Art.* New York: Farrar, 1995.

Foster, Hal. *Recodings: Art, spectacle, cultural politics.* Port Townsend, Wash.: Bay P, 1985.

__. *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture*. New York: New P, 1998.

__. "The 'Primitive' Unconscious of Modern Art." *Art in Modern Culture: An Anthology of Critical Texts*. Eds. Francis Frascina and Jonathon Harris. London: Phaidon, 1999. 199-209.

__. *The Return of the Real: The Avant-Garde at the End of the Century*. Cambridge, MA: MIT P, 1999.

Foucault, Michel. "Afterword: The Subject and Power." *Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics.* Eds. Hubert Dreyfuss and Paul Rabinow. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1982. 208-26.

__. *The History of Sexuality.* Vol. 1. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Random House, 1978.

__. "Two Lectures." *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings.* Ed. Colin Gordon. New York: New York's Pantheon, 1980. 80-105

Franck, Dan. *Bohemian Paris: Picasso, Modigliani, Matisse, and the Birth of Modernism*. New York: Grove, 2001.

Frascina, Francis, and Jonathon Harris, eds. "Introduction to Part I." *Art in Modern Culture: An Anthology of Critical Texts.* London: Phaidon, 1999. 37-39.

__. "Introduction to Part III." *Art in Modern Culture: An Anthology of Critical Texts.* London: Phaidon, 1999. 171-73.

Fried, Michael. "Art and Objecthood." *ArtForum* 5 (1967): 12-23.

Fusi, Juan Pablo. “El País Vasco durante la guerra.” *La guerra de España (1936-1939).* Ed. Edward Malefakis. Madrid: Santillana-Taurus, 1996. 289-320.

Gamonal Torres, Ángel Miguel. “Arte y propaganda en la guerra civil española.” *Propaganda en guerra.* Ed. Consorcio Salamanca. Salamanca: Consorcio Salamanca, 2002. 71-85.

García de Paredes, José, and José Luis Picardo. “Notas sobre la instalación del ‘Guernica’ y sus bocetos en el Casón del Buen Retiro de Madrid.” *Boletín del Museo del Prado* 11.6 (1981): 157-58.

García Escudero, José María. “La España dividida.” *La guerra civil española: Una reflexión moral 50 años después*. Ed. Ramón Tamames. Barcelona: Planeta, 1986. 115-36.

Garín Llombart, Felipe V. “Presentación.” *Antonio Saura, Crucifixiones*. Cat. ex. Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores. [Madrid]: Umbral, [2002]. 11.

Gasman, Lydia Csatò. “Death Falling from the Sky: Picasso’s Wartime Texts.” *Picasso and the War Years: 1937-1945*. Ed. Steven A. Nash with Robert Rosenblum. New York: Thames and Hudson; [San Francisco]: Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco, 1998. 55-67.

Gauthier, Paule. “The Return of Abstract Artists to Figuration.” *Cimaise* 131-132 (1977): 18-29.

Gaya, Ramón. “Carta de un pintor a un cartelista.” *Hora de España* 1.1 (1937): 54-56.

Giménez Caballero, E[rnesto]. “El Arte y el Estado.” *Acción Española* Feb. 1935. Rpt. in *La Vanguardia y la República*. Ed. Jaime Brihuega. Madrid: Cátedra, 1982. 383-93.

Gleizes, Albert. “Rompecabezas cubista.” *El Mundo* 4 April 2001, sec. El Cultural: 34-35.

Gómez López-Quiñones, Antonio. “Identidad y memoria colectiva en *Los niños de Rusia*.” *Colorado Review of Hispanic Studies* 1.1 (2003): 129-57.

Greenberg, Clement. “Modernist Painting.” *Forum Lectures* (Voice of America). Washington D. C., 1960. Rpt. in *Art in Theory 1900-2000: An Anthology of Changing Ideas.* Eds. Charles Harrison and Paul Wood. Malden: Blackwell, 2003. 773-85.

Guernica: Being the Official Report of a Commission Appointed by the Spanish Nationalist Government to Investigate the Causes of the Destruction of Guernica on April 26-28, 1937. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1938.

Guigon, Emmanuel. “Los procesos imaginarios de Antonio Saura.” *Antonio Saura, Crucifixiones*. Cat. ex. Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores. [Madrid]: Umbral, [2002]. 25-41.

Gurney, Robert. “Juan Larrea y *El Guernica*. El caballo, el toro y el apocalipsis (reflexiones en torno al libro *Juan Larrea. Vida y poesía*, de María-Fernanda Iglesia Lesteiro).” *Las literaturas del exilio republicano de 1939.* Actas del II Congreso Internacional (Bellaterra, 1999) (Vol. 2). Ed. Manuel Aznar Soler. Sant Cugat del Vallès: GEXEL, 2000. 49-62.

Harrison, Charles, Francis Frascina, and Gill Perry. *Primitivism, Cubism, Abstraction: The Early Twentieth Century*. New Haven: Yale UP; Open U, 1993.

Holquist, Michael. Glossary. *The Dialogic Imagination.* By Mikhael Bakhtin. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Michael Holquist and Caryl Emerson. Austin: U of Texas P, 1981. 423-34.

Hughes, Robert. *Barcelona*. New York: Knopf, 1992.

__. *Goya*. London: Harvill, 2003.

Huidobro, Vicente. “Altazor.” *Antología de la poesía hispanoamericana contemporánea 1914-1987*. Ed. José Olivio Jiménez. Madrid: Alianza, 1988. 131-44.

Hutcheon, Linda. *A Poetics of Postmodernism. History*, *Theory*, *Fiction.* 9th ed. London: Routledge, 2000.

“Illuminating the Tower.” The Official Site of the Eiffel Tower. http://www.tour-eiffel.fr/teiffel/uk/documentation/dossiers/page/illuminations.html. N. pag.

Jiménez, José Olivio, ed. *Antología crítica de la poesía modernista hispanoamericana*. Madrid: Hiperión, 1989.

Jones, Bonesy. “George Bataille: Biography, Bibliography and Links.” 21 July 2003. *Popsubculture(dot)com’s The Biography Project.* http://www.popsubculture.com/pop/bio_project/georges_bataille.html. N. pag.

Juliá, Santos. “La larga marcha de don Juan Carlos.” *25 años de monarquía*. http://www.elpais.es/especiales/200/rey/rey03a.htm. N. pag.

__. “Prólogo a la presente edición.” *Guerra y vicisitudes de los españoles*. By Julián Zugazagoitia. Barcelona: Tusquets, 2001. i-xxxi.

Kaufmann, Ruth. “Picasso’s Crucifixion of 1930.” *Burlington Magazine* 111 (1969): 553-61.

Kemenov, Vladimir. “Aspects of Two Cultures.” *VOKS Bulletin*. Moscow: Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, 1947. 20-36. Rpt. in *Art in Theory 1900-2000: An Anthology of Changing Ideas.* Eds. Charles Wood and Paul Harrison. Malden: Blackwell, 2003. 656-58.

Krauss, Rosalind. “Cadaver.” *Formless: A User’s Guide*. By Bois, Yve-Alain, and Rosalind E. Krauss. New York: Zone, 1997. 63-67.

__. “In the Name of Picasso.” *Art in Modern Culture: An Anthology of Critical Texts.* Eds. Francis Frascina and Jonathon Harris. London: Phaidon, 1999. 210-21.

__. *The Originality of the Avant Garde and Other Modernist Myths*. Cambridge, MA: MIT P, 1985.

__. “Pulse. ” *Formless: A User’s Guide*. By Bois, Yve-Alain, and Rosalind E. Krauss. New York: Zone, 1997. 161-65.

__. “Uncanny.” *Formless: A User’s Guide*. By Bois, Yve-Alain, and Rosalind E. Krauss. New York: Zone, 1997. 192-97.

Kristeva, Julia. *Revolution in Poetic Language*. Trans. Margaret Waller. New York: Columbia UP, 1984.

Kurlansky, Mark. *The Basque History of the World.* London: Vintage, 2000.

Larrea, Juan. “Toma del ‘Guernica’ y liberación del arte de la pintura.” *Cuadernos Americanos* 38 (1948): 235-57.

The Legacy Project. New York. 2001. http://www.legacy-project.org/events/display.html?ID=15. N. pag.

Lipton, Eunice. “Picasso Criticism 1901-1939: The Making of an Artist Hero.” Diss. New York U, 1975. New York: Garland, 1976.

López Mozo, Jerónimo. “Guernica (Happening).” *Estreno* 1 (1975): 19-31.

López Torres, Domingo. “Aureola y estigma del surrealismo.” *Gaceta de Arte* Sept. 1933. Rpt. in *La vanguardia y la República.* Ed. Jaime Brihuega. Madrid: Cátedra, 1982. 180-83.

__. “Surrealismo y revolución.” *Gaceta de Arte* Oct. 1932. Rpt. in *La vanguardia y la República.* Ed. Jaime Brihuega. Madrid: Cátedra, 1982. 314-16.

Makaryk, Irena R., ed. *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory: Approaches, Scholars, Terms.* Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1997.

Malefakis, Edward. “Aspectos históricos y teóricos de la guerra.” *La guerra de España 1936-1939.* Ed. Edward Malefakis. Madrid: Santillana-Taurus, 1996. 11-47.

Malraux, André. *Le Musée imaginaire*. Paris: Gallimard, 1947.

Manguel, Alberto. *Reading Pictures.* New York: Random House, 2002.

Markham, James M. “Spain Says Bienvenida to Picasso’s ‘Guernica.’” *New York Times* 11 Sept. 1981. [Pag. illegible.]

Martin, Russell. *Picasso's War: The Extraordinary Story of an Artist, an Atrocity – and a Painting that Shook the World.* London: Simon and Schuster, 2003.

Mateos, Francisco. "Fin de la pintura burguesa." *Tierra* [Madrid] 10 Nov. 1931. Rpt. in *La vanguardia y la República*. Ed. Jaime Brihuega. Madrid: Cátedra, 1982. 287-88.

Mejias-Rentas, Antonio. "Picasso: Lágrimas de mujer." *La Opinión* 24 May 1998. http://ask.elibrary.com/printdoc.asp?querydocid+53007996@urn:bigchalk:US;Lib&dt. N. pag.

Mills, Sara. *Michel Foucault.* Ed. Robert Eaglestone. London: Critical Thinkers Series-Routledge, 2003.

Mitchell, W. J. T. *Picture Theory*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1995.

Molina, Luis. "Oficio de Tinieblas." http://www.geocities.com/iafobi/semana/tinieblas.html. N. pag.

Moncrieff, A. R. Hope. *Classical Mythology*. London: Gresham, 1994.

Moore, Henrietta L. *A Passion for Difference*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1994.

Morris, C. Brian. *Son of Andalusia: The Lyrical Landscapes of Federico García Lorca*. Nashville: Vanderbilt UP, 1997.

Nash, Steven A. "Picasso, War, and Art." Introduction. *Picasso and the War Years: 1937-1945.* Ed. Steven A. Nash with Robert Rosenblum. New York: Thames and Hudson; [San Francisco]: Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco, 1998. 13-37.

Nechvatal, Joseph. "Formless: A User's Guide." 27 Oct. 1996. Rev. of exhibition curated by Rosalind Krauss and Yve-Alain Bois. Centre Georges Pompidou. 22 May–26 Aug. 1996. *ThingReviews NYC.* http://old.thing.net/ttreview/septrev.05.html. N. pag.

The New International Interlinear Hebrew-English Old Testament. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1987.

Oppler, Ellen C., ed. "Introductory Essay: Guernica – its Creation, Artistic and Political Implications, and Later History." *Picasso's Guernica*. New York: Critical Studies in Art History-Norton, 1988. 45-136.

Payne, Stanley. *Basque Nationalism*. Reno, Nevada: U of Nevada P, 1975.

Paz, Octavio. *Convergences: Essays on Art and Literature.* San Diego: Harcourt, 1987.

Pemán, José María. *Comentarios a mil imágenes de la guerra civil española*. Barcelona: AHR, 1967.

Penrose, Roland. *Picasso: His Life and Work.* Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971.

Pérez, Carlos. “La estética gráfica de Cuadernos de Ruedo Ibérico en el contexto del arte español de los años sesenta.” http://www.ruedoiberico.org/articulos/index.php?id=31. N. pag.

Pérez Mink, Domingo. “Diálogo con nueva cultura.” *Gaceta de Arte* March 1936. Rpt. in *La vanguardia y la República*. Ed. Jaime Brihuega. Madrid: Cátedra, 1982. 393-99.

Picasso, Pablo. “Conversation with Picasso.” *Art in Theory 1900-2000: An Anthology of Changing Ideas.* Eds. Charles Wood and Paul Harrison. Malden: Blackwell, 2003. 507-10. Rpt. of “Conversation avec Picasso.” *Cahiers d’Art* 10. 7-10 (1935): 173-78.

__. “Picasso Speaks.” *The Arts*. New York. May 1923. Rpt. in Dore Ashton, ed. *Picasso on Art: A Selection of Views*. New York: Da Capo, 1972. 3-6.

__. “Sueño y mentira de Franco.” *Picasso: écrits.* Trans. Albert Bensoussan. Paris: Réunion des musées nationaux; Gallimard, 1989. 166-68.

Preston, Paul. *The Politics of Revenge: Fascism and the military in twentieth-century Spain.* London: Unwin Hyman, 1990.

Preziosi, Donald. *Rethinking Art History: Meditations on a Coy Science*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1989.

Queipo de Llano, Genoveva. “Culturas en guerra.” *La Guerra Civil: Una nueva visión del conflicto que dividió España.* Eds. Stanley Payne and Javier Tusell. Madrid: Temas de Hoy, 1996. 609-34.

Raento, Pauliina, and Cameron J. Watson. “Gernika, Guernica, *Guernica*? Contested Meanings of a Basque Place.” *Political Geography* 19.6 (2000): 707-36. http://80-www.sciencedirect.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/science?_ob=ArticleURL&….
N. pag.

Rankin, Nicholas. *Telegram from Guernica: The Extraordinary Life of George Steer, War Correspondent.* London: Faber and Faber, 2003.

Read, Herbert. “What Is Revolutionary Art?” *Five on Revolutionary Art*. Ed. B. Rea. London, 1935. 12-17. Rpt. in *Art in Theory 1900-2000: An Anthology of Changing Ideas.* Eds. Charles Harrison and Paul Wood. Malden: Blackwell, 2003. 510-14.

Renau Berenguer, Josep. [José Renau] *Arte en peligro 1936-39.* Ayuntamiento de Valencia, 1980.

__. “Contestación a Ramón Gaya.” *Hora de España* 1.2 (1937): 138-39.

Reverdy, Pierre. *Le Chant des morts*. Paris: Tériade, 1948.

Richards, Mike. "'Terror and Progress': Industrialization, Modernity, and the Making of Francoism." *Spanish Cultural Studies: An Introduction*. Eds. Helen Graham and Jo Labanyi. New York: Oxford UP, 1995. 173-82.

Richardson, John. *Sacred Monsters, Sacred Masters.* London: Pimlico, 2000.

Ríos, Julián. *Las tentaciones de Antonio Saura.* Madrid: Mondadori, 1991.

Rojas, Carlos. *Diálogos para otra España.* Barcelona: Ariel, 1966.

__. *El Valle de Los Caídos.* Barcelona: Destino, 1978.

Rollins, William. "*Bilderverbot* for Historians? Photography vs. Narrative in *Hitler's Willing Executioners*." Writing Europe's Pasts. Proceedings of the Thirteenth Biennial Conference of the Australasian Association for European History (Auckland, New Zealand, July 2001). Eds. Christian Leitz and Joseph Zizek. Unley: Australian Humanities P, 2003. 207-25.

Rosenblum, Robert. "Picasso's Disasters of War: The Art of Blasphemy." *Picasso and the War Years: 1937-1945*. Ed. Steven A. Nash with Robert Rosenblum. New York: Thames and Hudson; [San Francisco]: Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco, 1998. 39-53.

Ross, Christopher J. *Spain 1812-1966: Modern History for Modern Languages.* New York: Oxford UP; London: Hodder, 2000.

Rubin, William S. *Dada and Surrealist Art*. New York: Abrams, 1968.

Russell, Frank D. *Picasso's Guernica: The Labyrinth of Narrative and Vision*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1980.

Santos, Grau. "Tres españoles piensan en España." *El Mundo* 4 April 2001, sec. El Cultural: 6-14.

Sarduy, Severo. "Saura o el pincel púrpura." *Figura y fondo: Antonio Saura.* Eds. Julián Ríos and R. Pinyol Balasch. Barcelona: Ediciones del Mall, 1987. 43-51.

Saura, Antonio. "Crucifixiones." *Antonio Saura, Crucifixiones*. Cat. ex. Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores. [Madrid]: Umbral, [2002]. 57-64.

__. *Escritura como pintura: Sobre la experiencia pictórica.* Barcelona: Círculo de lectores-Galaxia Gutenberg, 2003.

__. *Fijeza.* Barcelona: Círculo de lectores-Galaxia Gutenberg, 1999.

__. "La imagen pintada." *Figura y Fondo: Antonio Saura*. Eds. Julián Ríos and R. Pinyol Balasch. Barcelona: Ediciones del Mall, 1987. 169-81.

__. "Obras. Textos seleccionados de escritos de Antonio Saura." *Saura, Damas*. Cat. ex. Palma: Fundación Juan March, 2003. 16+.

__. “Para salvar el Guernica.” http://www.terra.es/personal/asg00003/artsaura.html. N. pag.

Scarpeta, Guy. “Crucificciones.” *Saura, Decenario.* Cat. ex. Diputaciones Provinciales de Huesca, Teruel y Zaragoza, 1991. 51-61.

Schopf, Federico. “Introducción a Vicente Huidobro.” http://www.vicentehuidobro.uchile.cl.ensayo_federico_schopf.htm. N. pag.

Seco Serrano, Carlos. *Historia de España. Gran historia general de los pueblos hispanos*. Vol. 6. Barcelona: Gallach, 1962.

Sierra, Rafael. “Antonio Saura reúne en Zaragoza la obra de los artistas que fijaron su mirada sobre Goya.” *El Mundo* 19 Nov. 1996: 50.

Simonis, Damien *et al*. *Spain.* 2nd ed. Melbourne: Lonely Planet, 1999.

Solé i Sabaté, Josep Maria. “Las represiones.” *La Guerra Civil: Una nueva visión del conflicto que dividió España.* Eds. Stanley Payne and Javier Tusell. Madrid: Temas de Hoy, 1996. 585-607.

Solé Tura, Jordi. “La monarquía y la izquierda.” *25 años de monarquía.* http://www.elpais.es/especiales/2000/rey/rey06a.htm. N. pag.

Solomon, Maynard. *Marxism and Art: Essays Classic and Contemporary*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1986.

Sontag, Susan. “Against Interpretation.” *Evergreen Review*. 1964. Rpt. in *Art History and its Methods: A Critical Anthology*. Ed. Eric Fernie. London: Phaidon, 2002. 216-22.

Southworth, Herbert. *Guernica! Guernica! A Study of Journalism, Diplomacy, Propaganda, and History.* Berkeley: U of California P, 1977.

Tamames, Ramón. “La senda histórica a la tragedia del 36.” *La guerra civil española: Una reflexión moral 50 años después*. Ed. Ramón Tamames. Barcelona: Planeta, 1986. 13-28.

Tankard, Alice Doumanian. *Picasso’s Guernica after Rubens’ Horrors of War*. Philadelphia: Art Alliance, 1984.

Thomas, Hugh. *The Spanish Civil War*. 4th ed. London: Penguin, 1989.

Trevelyan, Raleigh. *Shades of the Alhambra*. London: Folio Society, 1984.

Trexler, Richard C. “Gendering Jesus Crucified.” *Iconography at the Crossroads.* Ed. B. Cassidy. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1993. 107-20.

Tusell, Javier. *Arte, historia y política en España (1890-1939).* Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 1999.

Van Hensbergen, Gijs. *Guernica: The Biography of a Twentieth-Century Icon.* London: Bloomsbury, 2004.

Vilar, Pierre. "The Value of a 'Naïve' Return to Textual Criticism." Foreword. *Guernica! Guernica! A Study of Journalism, Diplomacy, Propaganda, and History*. By Herbert Southworth. Berkeley: U of California P, 1977. ix-xvii.

Viñas, Ángel. "Intervención y no intervención extranjeras." *La guerra de España 1936-1939.* Ed. Edward Malefakis. Madrid: Santillana-Taurus, 1996. 265-88.

Wingeate Pike, David. *Conjecture, Propaganda, and Deceit and the Spanish Civil War: The International Crisis over Spain, 1936-1939, as Seen in the French Press.* Stanford: California Institute of International Studies, 1968.

Žižek, Slavoj. *The Sublime Object of Ideology (Phronesis).* London: Verso, 1989.

Zugazagoitia, Julián. *Guerra y vicisitudes de los españoles*. Barcelona: Tusquets, 2001.