



WestminsterResearch

<http://www.wmin.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>

The battlefield in text and image: remains and relics in the work of Cozette de Charmoy

Debra Kelly

School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Languages

This is a pre-copy-editing, author-produced PDF of an article accepted for publication in the Forum for Modern Language Studies following peer review. The definitive publisher-authenticated in Modern Language Studies, 42 (1). pp. 51-79, January 2006, is available online at:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/fmls/cqi035>

The WestminsterResearch online digital archive at the University of Westminster aims to make the research output of the University available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the authors and/or copyright owners. Users are permitted to download and/or print one copy for non-commercial private study or research. Further distribution and any use of material from within this archive for profit-making enterprises or for commercial gain is strictly forbidden.

Whilst further distribution of specific materials from within this archive is forbidden, you may freely distribute the URL of the University of Westminster Eprints (<http://www.wmin.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>).

In case of abuse or copyright appearing without permission e-mail wattsn@wmin.ac.uk.

THE BATTLEFIELD IN TEXT AND IMAGE: REMAINS AND RELICS IN THE WORK OF COZETTE DE CHARMOY

IN HER INTRODUCTION to *Warworks. Women, Photography and the Iconography of War*, Val Williams raises a number of issues concerning the representation of modern war in Western culture that will be important throughout this article:

Few of us have any real experience of the war zone. Our comprehension of war comes instead from what we have read and what we have seen in photographs transmitted by photojournalists from distant places or on the television screen. What we make of war emerges from our memories of words and images constructed for us by a hugely diverse collection of journalists, photographers, filmmakers and artists.¹

These images are however, a carefully shaped visual experience, leading for the consumer of media images in Western society to a conflation between “seeing” and “knowing”.² This insistence on the importance of the nature of images of war transmitted into our everyday experience by the contemporary media, and on the place of both public and private memories in our individual perceptions of the nature of war, are apparent in the work of the writer and artist Cozette de Charmoy for whom the battlefield has been a central preoccupation in both textual and visual representations since the 1970s.

There are a number of current theoretical frameworks with which to analyse the image and reality of the battlefield. These include gender studies (with reference, for example, to Joshua Goldstein's interdisciplinary analysis of how gender norms shape men, women and children to the needs of what he defines as the 'war system' of societies) and recent work on concepts of the body. This often takes the male body and constructions of masculinity as a focus, for example in the studies by Joanna Bourke on men's bodies, Britain and the Great War and by Christina Jarvis on the male body at war with reference to America and the Second World War.³ The main focus of this article, however, is to trace how and why a female artist and writer makes the battlefield one of the recurring images of her work over an extended period of time. While drawing to some extent on the theoretical frameworks described, the artistic process of "making", or what Elaine Scarry has called: "the passage of what is only imagined into a material form" will remain central to the analysis here.⁴

Val Williams' focus on women photographers whose work challenges the paradox created by the constant presence of war on our television and film screens, that of simultaneously making omnipresent and distancing those events from our lives. These are photographers who confront: "some of the fictions and fantasies engendered by war, who have looked at war as game-playing, as media product, as a vehicle for

dream and desire.”⁵ When considering the agency of women photographers specifically, gender issues concerning the experience and representation of war are unavoidable, even though recent critics have sought to go beyond a dualistic approach which pervades various types of war studies and tends to conceptualise war as a set of opposing experiences and sites: home front/battle front; soldier/civilian; soldier/nurse, etc. Williams acknowledges that originally she set a gender divide for her own analysis, although she is careful also to emphasise that the work selected does not merely provide an “alternative” to a “mainstream, traditionalist” and indeed masculine view of the war experience; it is chosen because of its “directive and innovative quality.”⁶

As she writes:

It is a common supposition that women work only in opposition to the received, but many women war photographers work according to the same rules as men and produce the same kinds of photographs. The women whose work we are considering here have, in the main abandoned or subverted establishment parameters. But their work has been made, not just to present an alternative to a conventional history, nor merely to dispute the truth of photoreportage. They have looked at war and at the social catastrophe it produces in order to present what they see as important truths about society, and also to seek out the many different

meanings which the photographic image can convey, the multiple ways in which it can be used.⁷

Part of Cozette de Charmoy's own work is photographic, although the battlefield images on which I will focus here are do not belong to this medium. Three points made by Williams in the quotation above provide an initial framework for the analysis that follows, in addition to the issues of the omnipresence of war in the media and the role of memory already indicated, and concern gender, strategies of subversion in creative practice and forms of knowledge brought about by the war experience. Firstly, caution is urged with the notion of gender and the relationship to war, although the recurring presence of the image of the battlefield in the work of woman writer and artist certainly needs further consideration. As John Keegan has written:

The 'battle piece', as a historical construction, is as old as Herodotus; as a subject of myth and saga it is even more antique. It is an everyday theme of modern journalistic reportage and it presents a literary challenge which some of the world's masters have taken up.⁸

The "masters" he cites are Stendhal, Thackeray, Hugo on the battle of Waterloo, Tolstoy on the battle of Borodino; later considering literature created in response to the First World War.⁹ A cursory look at anthologies of 'war stories' confirms the predominance of male writers, the exceptional presence of a very few women writers only confirming

the rule.¹⁰ Indeed, again as Keegan points out, the language of the “battle piece” has so often become cliché, both in novel form and in military accounts.¹¹

Secondly, there are strategies of subversion at work in all of de Charmoy’s poetic and visual production. This questioning of conventional histories and of all forms of received wisdom is essential for an understanding of her project as a whole, which in many ways is encapsulated in the title of her 1974 text/image work, *The Colossal Lie*.¹² Thirdly, the nature of war, the “social catastrophe” it provokes and the ways in which a meditation on these might lead us to “important truths about society”, and indeed to an understanding of humanity, are intrinsic to her project. As de Charmoy herself says, her attention to the battlefield has the aim of communicating a “universal” meaning, “to convey the horror of all wars”.¹³ Artistic creation is a form of “knowing” rather than “seeing”.

War and the workings of memory

Cozette de Charmoy has lived in Britain, Canada, Switzerland and France, and is currently residing and working in Paris. Her work in the visual arts testifies to an interest in an extremely wide variety of artistic production including paintings on canvas, drawings, prints, posters, postcards, artists’ books, lithographs, collages and photographic work. Concurrently with this diverse visual production, she is a writer,

essentially of poetic texts, writing in both French and English, sometimes combining the two languages. She is also the co-editor of Ottezec editions founded in 1972 that publishes, for example, artists' books, poetry, often in bilingual editions, and photographic portfolios. As a publisher therefore the crossing of boundaries, including linguistic as well as artistic ones, is celebrated as much as in her own text and image work. Visual and verbal modes of representation are often used together in her creations both in the visual arts and textual form, not as illustrations of one or the other, but rather the visual and the verbal are juxtaposed to generate the multiplicity of meaning that her work invites. Multiplicity and diversity both conceptually and materially are key factors in this creative universe, a "univers polymorphe" created by the artist/writer's "mains pensantes" as one critic has expressed it.¹⁴

Yet as essential as this proliferating and multiform activity, is a consistency in certain fundamental references that take the form of a number of recurrent figures in her work, sometimes shape-shifting, but always recognisable as those same, often disquieting, companions that both haunt and 'feed' de Charmoy's creative imagination: the Bear-Hunters who have accompanied her since her time in Canada; the Shaman in his necessarily changing forms; and, the focus here, Men in Armour who eventually become the soldiers (or at least what remains of them) on her visual and verbal battlefields. Nick Wadley has also stressed

the “coherent iconography”, particularly in her paintings, and identifies the mask as further bringing together these recurrent figures:

From the tragic-heroic hunters of the 1960s, to the soldier-victims and shamanic images of more recent years, there emerges a coherent iconography, masked images touching on universal truths.¹⁵

Although he goes on to stress the complexity and ambiguity of her graphic work, Nick Wadley also notes another recurrent figure in de Charmoy’s work, Sweeney Todd, anti-hero of Victorian melodrama, partly a legacy of a London childhood, partly the embodiment of the supreme social subversive, subject of her most critically acclaimed work, a character that appears and re-appears sometimes under a pseudonym: “As a brilliant dispassionate dissembler, capable of endless permutations in the pursuit of his art, he epitomises what Cozette de Charmoy demands from her media.”¹⁶ Transformation is, therefore, an underlying dynamic of all her work and Sweeney can be seen, on one hand therefore, as ingenious artist. He is equally the embodiment of industrial society taken to its extreme logic, at work in a material world, and also given the nature of the material on which he works, human corpses, an example of what Julia Kristeva has theorised as “the abject”. I will return to the concepts of the material and of the abject in considering the battlefields in Cozette de Charmoy’s work.

Finally, in this brief introduction to her work, and to return to the notion of memory evoked at the beginning of this article, the cultural, historical and personal heritage that de Charmoy is working with should be considered. In her graphic work and notably in her collages and in her interest in the human body, the European artistic legacy of Dada and of Surrealism is evident. The legacy of Lettrism is also apparent in prints and posters, as is that of concrete and sound poetry in her text and image work. In one way, therefore, de Charmoy can be seen as both contemporary artist and inheritor of European avant-garde movements. In another, she remains outside any 'movement' and the recurrent figures and themes in her work can be seen very much as the product of her own artistic vocabulary¹⁷ and her art: "bears the imprint of a total outsider."¹⁸

Amongst the "colossal lies" that Cozette de Charmoy seeks to expose, with the many others of human civilisation, is that of war. Memories of the Second World War, both on an individual and a collective level, are an important dynamic for all her work, and memories of a childhood spent in war-time London recur in recent work. Taking Philippe Soupault's poem "Ode à Londres bombardée" as a reference point with the quote "Tout à coup le silence et l'angoisse du silence", the final part of her *Silence Silenzio et conversations avec Beethoven* (1998) evokes visually and verbally the experience of aerial bombing.¹⁹ Entitled "Partition d'un bombardement" (see Fig. 1), the skyline of London

appears against a black sky out of which comes first the serial wail of sirens across several pages, then silence and blackness as the city waits for the bombs to drop (a completely black page), followed by the chaos of the exploding bombs. The sirens sound the all-clear, silence follows, as does the discovery of the devastation in the wake of the bombing, followed by further “SILENCE”. As such, *Silence Silenzio* brings together both the artistic/literary and the personal/collective heritage of de Charmoy. In her text and image work, the experimental visual poetry of the early twentieth century avant-garde is clear.²⁰ Like Soupault, de Charmoy uses the canonic image of London suffering and surviving bombing, an image in which personal memory and a sacrosanct public memory meld as a poetic expression of survival and resistance. In this work, the ‘battlefield’ is the city, and the victims, civilians. In portraying this, de Charmoy represents a vital aspect of the experience of war in the twentieth century – the experience of civilians in wars in which the traditional lines of battle have been destroyed. As Cozette de Charmoy expresses it: “Looting, raping, killing has always been a result of war. But the attack on civilian populations as part of the technique of war is peculiar to our time.”²¹ The artistic depiction of such an experience may evoke, for example, Picasso’s *Guernica* (1937) which has become an essential cultural reference point for European art and European experience of war in the twentieth century. This is not however, a central

reference for the artist herself. It is rather both an earlier depiction of the “disasters” of war and contemporary media that she finds more compelling: “Goya is more important to me in the depiction of horrors of war than Picasso [...] Various war artists have never conveyed much. They are too intent on making a painting.”²² Of twentieth century depictions of war and the consequences of war, it is Otto Dix who remains potent for her, Dix whose canvases portray both soldiers and soldiers returned (maimed) to civilian life, the male body in its heroic and “abject” forms. In de Charmoy’s visual texts “Battlefieldlist” and “Champdebataille”, the remains of both soldiers and civilians are to found as she collapses together another dualistic structure of the traditional interpretation of war experience.

In the paintings, however, we are returned to the more traditional site of the soldier’s battlefield. The battlefield takes as a reference another recurring figure in de Charmoy’s visual and verbal vocabulary: the figure of Micheletto da Cotignola in Uccello’s *Battle of San Romano III, The Counterattack of Micheletto da Cotignola*.²³ Micheletto da Cotignola makes his appearance in *Silence Silenzio* just before the sirens herald the bombing of London and the self-referencing of her own “Champdebataille”, “ma litanie” as it described there:
Silence intérieur lorsqu’on attend l’ordre de l’attaque
un moment avant la bataille

sur le champ de bataille de San Romano on attend l'ordre de l'attaque et
c'est lui

Micheletto da Cotignola qui va donner cet ordre

[...]

Dans son doux regard est toute l'horreur la tristesse du monde

À cet instant-là il voit la futilité le chagrin et la perte

dans toutes les guerres jusqu'à l'infinité ²⁴

It is Cotignola's expression of "pity, regret, sorrow, horror" and indeed the "knowingness also of the horse" in this painting that haunts her imagination.²⁵ Essential for the construction of her own battlefields, this is an image set both in time and out of time, as in her own work where the fifteenth century battle is juxtaposed with the Second World War to create a universal experience.

Men in armour (or what remains of them)

The origins of de Charmoy's battlefield on canvas produced in the late 1980s can be traced back to drawings of armour and paintings of helmets in the early 1960s, images that were to be produced alongside the multiple drawings and paintings of hunters previously alluded to as recurrent figures in her work. This interest in armour is generated by a fascination for images of medieval European and early Japanese armour, and for medieval texts recounting the legends of Charlemagne and Roland, together with Viking, Norse and Celtic mythology and Arthurian

legend.²⁶ The timelessness of certain figures and myths, and the juxtaposition of ancient and modern warfare are essential for this personal iconography.²⁷

It is also the construction of the armour that is a source of fascination, and the composition and construction of de Charmoy's main battlefield canvas will now be considered. Although in the quotation above the artist herself stressed the human emotion evident for her in the expression of Uccello's Micheletto da Cotignola, critics have noted the "geometry" and the "mathematical development of shapes" in the composition.²⁸ While the sense of "commotion" in the army is represented, the chaos so frequently described in battlefield scenes in both text and image is given a "rhythm". In the Uccello panels therefore, the artist imposes order on chaos, and in doing so arrives at an abstraction yet retains human experience. This is essential, for again as John Keegan has noted, the visualisation of "battle pieces" risks cliché as much as does prose, writing of Agincourt: "Visually it is pre-Raphaelite, perhaps better a Medici gallery print battle – a composition of strong verticals and horizontals and a conflict of rich dark reds and Lincoln greens against fishscale greys and arctic blues (...) It is also a story of slaughter-yard behaviour and outright atrocity."²⁹

In de Charmoy's drawing and painting of the battlefield, the armoured men have largely lost their protective carapace (a helmet is still

apparent here and there). The drawing is filled with the bodies of men, and this mass of bodies is both dense forest suggesting a natural force surging forth, and abstract machine, man-made and divorced from the natural world, moving relentlessly forward towards the viewer; and then stopped in its tracks by the sheer amount of slaughter. The space of the painting (see Fig. 2) is filled with body parts, laid out in every direction, the whole taking on an abstract dimension. Individuality is replaced by what at first seems to be an anonymous mass, but then each face regains an expression, all that is left of the individual experience. The viewer is the witness of the aftermath of battle, and of the battlefield as enormous slaughterhouse. The male body is dismembered, literally torn limb from limb, but what remains is nonetheless intensely human. The artist seeks to restore some order, infuse with meaning the potentially meaningless in an image that transcends time and place. This battlefield is all battlefields; the site of the universal act of war. Here, the male body, as Joanna Bourke has written, is: “dismembered on the battlefields, re-membered in peacetime.”³⁰

Naming the aftermath of war

The creative process can therefore connect us to a place out of time that conveys universal truths concerning the human condition. As far as everyday experience is concerned, de Charmoy reiterates the ways in which we are continually bombarded by media images of war in an

observation that returns us to the experience of war evoked at the beginning of this article by Val Williams and women photographers. We are: “haunted by images of war, past and present, here and far away, real and mythic. It is part of our condition.”³¹ In discussion, Cozette de Charmoy lists multiple of images of war: the Napoleonic Wars, the Spanish Civil War, Vietnam (and particularly, once again, civilian casualties in the form of the students involved in the Kent State massacre). Above all, she stresses the importance of “collective sensibility” for the recollection both of these wars that cannot be accessed through personal but only cultural, collective memory, and for her more personal memories of London and of Vietnam. It has already been established that the idea of images that transcend time are important for the analysis of her battlefield on canvas; this idea is equally important for the rather different representations of the battlefield in verbal texts. In a recent text and image work, *Le Dernier iceberg* (2002), Micheletto da Cotignola reappears as the last iceberg sinks, containing the whole of human civilisation, wars included:

AVEC LES VESTIGES LES SONS LES ECHOS

LES ODEURS LES COULEURS DE TOUTES

LES GUERRES DE CETTE PLANÈTE MAUDITE³²

The proliferation of war and all the terms associated with it that the artist/writer refers to in discussion find their full force in a creative

outpouring (see Fig. 3)³³ The litany continues with specific historical wars: the Thirty Years War, the Hundred Years War, the Wars of the Roses, the Trojan Wars, the Crimean war, the Boer War, the Punic Wars... going on to `types' of war: racial, colonial, just, defensive, local, world, preventative, germ, desert... All these `war words' are enmeshed, English and French tumbling out together, a seemingly never-ending vocabulary that war has engendered: war-craft; war-dance; war babies; war-songs; war-lords; war-mongers; war-paint; war-cries; finally all these "wars of words" finish up in a subversion of the children's rhyme:

MAKE WAR HOT

MAKE WAR COLD

MAKE WAR IN THE POT

NINE DAYS OLD

Going down with this last iceberg is: "all the detritus and all the debris of the world", including the "Battlefieldlist" and "Champdebataille".³⁴

The original English version of "Battlefieldlist" dates from 1970, thus prefiguring the large canvas already discussed, and prints of both this and the French "Champdebataille" were produced in 1995 in Paris by the Éditions Loup.³⁵ These `monumental' visual texts are also given form in sound, in the human voice, when the poet reads them aloud at poetry events, transformed for this purpose into long rolls of paper that are gradually unfurled as the litany progresses. The aim is to communicate

“stress, tension, anguish”, and she attempts a monotonous, staccato (“gun-like”) delivery. Both texts eventually end in SILENCE: “Silence is the sharp contrast to what went on before. It is important to bring back the listener/looker to the beginning which is the end. To reflect. It is the dead, the wounded, the grieving, the wondering why. Yet again on this earth a massacre.”³⁶ The visual texts end in silence, like that after the bombing in *Silence Silenzio* or before the battle in the Uccello canvas. Both in English and in French, these texts were conceived as a naming: “name-calling, like a list of victims, of war dead, of battle won or lost.”³⁷

Despite an apparent initial similarity, the French version appears at first to be a ‘self-translation’, in reality it is another creative experience. The English version is over thirty words longer (the original is in fact physically longer than the French version, although the 1995 prints were produced as the same size by making the typeface slightly smaller). Some “unnecessary” words were thus eliminated on reflection from the second, French version; while: “certain words were essential, unavoidable, nearer the beginning” (see Fig. 4 and Fig. 5).³⁸ In the action of reading aloud, it became clear that sound and rhythm were also important, and the melding of all aspects of the creative process, the verbal and the visual, the sound and the gaze reflect the multiplicity of experience that these visual texts represent.

While the battlefield on canvas is the site of the soldier's dismemberment, these visual texts bring together once again the experience of both soldier and civilian. There is no opposition between 'home' and 'battle' front: the war has come home; and the home is the site of battle. In this, they reflect vividly the experience of twentieth century warfare. The battlefield, for obvious reasons, has traditionally been the privileged site of the soldier's experience in art and in literature (even into the twentieth century, and including cinematic representations of war). However, because of the changing nature of war, it is the body of the dead soldier that now shocks and is censored by the media, not the increasingly numerous deaths of civilians. Indeed, the twenty-first century Western soldier does not expect to be left on the battlefield, either wounded or dead.³⁹

De Charmoy's visual texts mix together the artefacts left behind by both soldiers and civilians: "This is what is left of 'civilisation', a confusion of things, household objects, people's remains, fears, hopes, beliefs. An archaeology. A litany of things left. If corpses aren't interred, things rot, are picked away by vultures, jackals; all that is left are the bones and all the junk and machinery of our so-called civilisation, and yes, it is intensely sad and human."⁴⁰ We might read this in the light of Kristeva's analysis of the abject to which a number of writers on the human body and war have turned. As Christina Jarvis writes:

According to Kristeva, the abject marks the boundaries of subjectivity; it registers the limits of the human universe, demarcating the realm in which humans stray into the territory of the animal, the nonhuman (...)

Certain bodily fluids such as blood, saliva, urine, and faeces, Kristeva argues, can be viewed as the abject because they traverse the boundary of the body. These fluids not only 'collapse the border between [the] inside and outside' of bodies but also, through their culturally marked status as pollutants, threaten the body with illness or death – the end of subjectivity.⁴¹

War produces, as Jarvis notes: "alternative or 'abject' masculinities that exist alongside and in opposition to dominant cultural representations."⁴²

We can take this further using de Charmoy's work as an example.

Abjection disturbs not only physical and cultural constructions of male identity, it disturbs other culturally constructed systems of order. As Kristeva concludes, abject knowledge prepares the demystification of Power, lays bare the: "the cunning, orderly surface of civilisations, the nurturing horror that they attend to pushing aside by purifying, systematising, thinking; the horror that they seize on in order to build themselves up and function."⁴³ Kristeva is writing about the knowledge of the psychoanalyst, but she also insists on what she calls literature's: "sacred power of horror". As she writes: "literature may also involve not an ultimate resistance to but an unveiling of the abject; an elaboration, a

discharge, and a hollowing out of abjection through the Crisis of the Word.”⁴⁴

The canvas, as we have seen, is filled with body parts. The detritus and discharge of bodies punctuates the visual texts – “torn flesh”, “cadavers”, “putrified legs”, “dismembered breasts”, “entrails”, “spilled brains”, “rotted testicles”, “dried blood”, “dried urine”, etc. Yet these are far outweighed numerically by objects whether evoking military, political, institutional or family life, work, leisure, religion, childhood, adulthood, femininity, masculinity, food, art. In the title of the English version the ‘list’ is stressed, and we might expect the text to be a list of names standing in for missing bodies as on First World War memorials. Such lists however, sanitise the actual experience, just as statues of heroic soldiers show: “no mud, no lice, no blood”.⁴⁵ In the slightly different French title the battlefield itself is the focus, emphasising the physical landscape of war.

In de Charmoy’s visual texts, however, objects, and indeed words as objects, stand in for the bodies of the dead. The objects that remain take on the human tragedy. While there is insistence certainly on the universal experience of war and suffering, unlike the canvas and drawings, these objects that dominate the space are those of twentieth century life; and more particularly of post-industrial revolution, consumerist, materialist life. The presence of the human body that made,

used or owned the artefact remains within that object.⁴⁶ Human bodily power and weaknesses are projected into external objects, and these objects become the projection of the human body. Body parts have their equivalents in the external world (eye/camera; skin/bandages; phallus/rockets, etc.)⁴⁷; as do emotions (love/birthday and anniversary cards, for example); as do life (birth certificates) and death (death certificates). The object becomes, in every sense, a relic.

Elaine Scarry has demonstrated that the “structure of war” and what she terms the “structure of unmaking” is one subject. It is obvious that torture and war are acts of destruction and “entail the suspension of civilisation (and are somehow the opposite of that civilisation)”; less obvious is that:

[...] they are, in the most literal and concrete way possible, an appropriation, aping, and reversing of the action of creation itself. Once the structures of torture and war have been exposed and compared, it becomes clear that the human action of making entails two distinct phases – making-up (mental imagination) and making-real (endowing the mental object with a material or verbal form) – and that the appropriation and deconstruction of making occur sometimes at the first and sometimes at the second of these two sites.⁴⁸

War unmakes and the artist makes. In the “Battlefieldlist”, human experience is “made real”. As manifestations of battlefields the canvas

and the visual texts are apparently very different. What links them however, is the reality that in the act of war, the human is destroyed, but what remains is nonetheless intensely human. As Scarry suggests: “we make ourselves visible to each other through verbal and material artefacts”, but the: “derealisation of artefacts may assist in taking away another person’s visibility.”⁴⁹ The poet/artist ensures that the human remains visible through making available a shared experience: “objectified in language and material objects” which are the marks of human experience.⁵⁰

In official discourse or monuments, death and destruction, “unmaking”, are only symbolically evoked; they do not explore modern war’s impact on the body.⁵¹ Cozette de Charmoy’s re-inscribes the original site of the wound, the body.⁵² More than this, her work on the image of the battlefield seeks to subvert the system that ensures not only the continuation of war, but the roles we are forced to play in that system.⁵³

DEBRA KELLY

University of Westminster

School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Languages

309 Regent Street

London W1B 2UW

United Kingdom

NOTES

¹ V. Williams, Introduction, “From the Private to the Public: Photography, and the Iconography of War”, in: *Warworks. Women, Photography and the Iconography of War*, (London, 1994), p. 9.

² I am indebted to Shaun Bertram for these ideas raised in her research seminar (University of Westminster, 16 June 2004) paper given as a methodological introduction to the Group for War and Culture Studies conference “The Body at War” (25/26 June 2004).

³ See J. S. Goldstein, *War and Gender*, (Cambridge, 2001); J. Bourke, *Dismembering the Male. Men’s Bodies, Britain and the Great War*, (London, 1996); C. S. Jarvis, *The Male Body at War. American Masculinity during World War II*, (Illinois, 2004). All note that despite the increasing interest in ‘body studies’ in various disciplines, the body at war has remained virtually absent. See also E. Scarry, *The Body in Pain. The Making and Unmaking of the World*, (Oxford, 1985).

⁴ E. Scarry, op. cit., p. (vi).

⁵ V. Williams, “It’s a Man’s World: Photography, Fantasy and Fetish in the 1990s”, in: *Warworks*, op. cit., p. 78. In this chapter Williams discusses the following photo series by women photographers: Barbara Alper, *Gulf Channel*; Moira McIver, *Men in Uniform*; Anna Fox, *Friendly Fire*. J. Goldstein also notes this “home consumption” of “violent and voyeuristic pornography” (op. cit., p. 355).

⁶ V. Williams, Introduction, *Warworks*, op. cit., p. 14.

⁷ V. Williams, “It’s a Man’s World”, *Warworks*, op. cit., pp. 78-79.

⁸ J. Keegan, *The Face of Battle. A Study of Agincourt, Waterloo and the Somme* (London, 1976; latest edition, 2003), p. 30.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 281.

¹⁰ See for example: ed. J.E. Lewis, *The Mammoth Book of True War Stories*, (London 1992; 1999); eds. S. Faulkes and J. Hensgen, *The Vintage Book of War Stories* (London, 1999). There are of course accounts by women of battlefields, usually in the form of nurses’ memoirs. A famous painting of Waterloo is *Scotland for Ever* (1881) depicting the charge of the Scots Greys by Lady Butler (sister of the poet Alice Meynell, and wife of a general).

¹¹ J. Keegan deconstructs classic “battle pieces”, op. cit., pp. 36-46, showing how these function in a tradition that purports to show how men behave in battle.

¹² C. de Charmoy, *The Colossal Lie/Le Colossal Mensonge* (Paris, 1974): “*The Colossal Lie* is her most ambitious fable inasmuch as it seeks to call the bluff of civilisation at large [...] it is the blueprint for a monument which exposes the modern world as an accumulation of hoaxes.” N. Wadley, “Poetic Displacement” in: *Cozette de Charmoy*, (Catalogue), ed. A. Hémerly, (Alès, 1995), p. 21.

¹³ Written questions to/interview with Cozette de Charmoy, May/June 2004

¹⁴ M.-P. Peronnet, “Cozette de Charmoy. Une vie faite oeuvre. Incursions dans l’univers polymorphe des livres graphiques de Cozette de Charmoy”, *Arts et Métiers du Livre*, No. 210, 13-17.

¹⁵ N. Wadley, “Poetic Displacement”, op. cit., p. 20.

¹⁶ Ibid. The reference is to Cozette de Charmoy, *The True Life of Sweeney Todd* (London, 1973).

¹⁷ M.-P. Peronnet, “Cozette de Charmoy. Une vie faite oeuvre”, op. cit., p. 14.

¹⁸ N. Wadley, “Poetic Displacement”, op. cit., p. 21.

¹⁹ C. de Charmoy, *Silence Silenzio et conversations avec Beethoven*, (Strasbourg, 1998). P. Soupault, “Ode à Londres bombardée” (Paris, 1946), written in captivity in Tunis under Vichy, published first in *Fontaine* (1943); a bilingual version (1944) was dropped by the RAF as part of the Allies’ propaganda campaign. The silence before the bombs drop in *Silence Silenzio* suggests this is the second wave of bombing by V1 and V2 missiles in Summer 1944 and Spring 1945, not the Blitz of 1940-1941 which Soupault uses. War-time London is made explicit in a recent text, an on-going project for de Charmoy: “Bourlinguer (Silence... work in progress)”, *Triages*, no. 12 (Paris, 2000), 42-47, partly evoking childhood memories of the Free French in London.

²⁰ Apollinaire's poetry during the First World War, for example, combining text and image.

²¹ Written questions/interview with C. de Charmoy, as before.

²² Ibid.

²³ Uccello, *The Battle of San Romano*, c.1435-60, tempera on poplar. The subject is a Florentine victory over the Venetians at San Romano in 1432 and the theme of three panels: one now in the Uffizi in Florence; one in the National Gallery, London; and the one referred to here, in the Louvre, Paris. The Louvre panel was painted c.1455; H 1.82m; W 3.17m.

²⁴ C. de Charmoy, *Silence Silenzio*, op. cit., non-paginated.

²⁵ Written questions/interview as before. The suffering of animals, especially horses, is rarely taken into account by writers, although J. Keegan does consider this with reference to accounts of Waterloo (op. cit., p. 202-202).

²⁶ Written questions/interview as before.

²⁷ Ibid. Nick Wadley has previously noted the importance of the mask in linking this iconography.

²⁸ See the Louvre website at: www.louvre.fr; the National Gallery website at: www.nationalgallery.org.uk Also:

www.guardian.co.uk/arts/portrait/story/0,11109,924814,00.html

All accessed on 30/07/03.

²⁹ J.Keegan, op.cit., p. 79.

³⁰ J. Bourke, op. cit., p. 210.

³¹ Written Questions/Interview as before.

³² C. de Charmoy, *Le Dernier iceberg*, (Metz, 2002), p. 47.

³³ Ibid., p. 48.

³⁴ Ibid., pp. 66-70.

³⁵ C. de Charmoy, “Battlefieldlist”; “Champdebataille”, sériographies sur Velin d’Arches, 88 x 61 cm, (Paris, 1995).

³⁶ The original 1970 English version did not end with “Silence”, but “Death Certificates”. It was after producing the French version, while at the same time working on *Silence Silenzio*, that the English ending was changed. It appears in the catalogue *Cozette de Charmoy*, without “Silence”, op. cit., p.75.

³⁷ Written questions/interview as before.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ See J.Keegan, op. cit., p. 269. I am again indebted to a research seminar discussion for these ideas (see note 2).

⁴⁰ Written questions/interview as before.

⁴¹ C. Jarvis, op. cit., pp. 88-89 referring to J. Kristeva, *Powers of Horror. An Essay on Abjection*, (New York, 1982; translated from *Pouvoirs de l’horreur*, Paris, 1980). Compare also, for example, the section on “The Wounded” of each battle in J.Keegan (op. cit., pp. 112-113; pp. 197-203;

pp. 263-269); and the documented horror of death in the Great War compared to popular imagery in J. Bourke (op. cit., pp. 214-215).

⁴² C. Jarvis, op. cit., p. 88.

⁴³ J. Kristeva, op. cit., p. 210.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 208. Her main literary reference is Céline.

⁴⁵ See S. Audoin-Rouzeau and A. Becker, *1914-1918 Understanding the Great War* (London, 2002; translated from *14-18, Retrouver la Guerre*, Paris, 2000), p.190. They note the difference in the English term “war memorial” and the French “monuments aux morts”, the former emphasising the war, the latter, the dead (p. 187). E. Scarry suggests that the roll call of death should be as in Homer where the weapon and the nature of the wound accompany the name (op. cit., p. 123).

⁴⁶ There is a difficult philosophical problem here concerning our changing relationship to the object. E. Scarry analyses this within a Marxist framework: nineteenth century industrialised society departs from Marx’s idealised model of man’s link to his tools. We now buy, not make. We might however read de Charmoy’s work also as undermining: “the large all-embracing artefact, the capitalist economic system” (op. cit., p. 259), and compare previous remarks on *The True Life of Sweeney Todd* and *The Colossal Lie*.

⁴⁷ E. Scarry, op. cit., p. 282; p. 323.

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 21.

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 22.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 255. See also p. 61 on the idea that when, for example a city is bombed, the objects that are destroyed are not only “cultural”, but also “human”. Note also J.Keegan’s remark that what all battles have in common, finally, is that they are “human” (op. cit., p. 297).

⁵¹ C. Jarvis calls for an “embodied account” of war, op. cit., p. 191. J. Goldstein, op. cit., p. 306.

⁵² E. Scarry, op. cit., p. 63

⁵³ She also undermines women’s traditional roles as witness to men’s “militarised masculinity” (as nurses, prostitutes, mothers, lovers...). See, for example, J. Goldstein, op. cit., p. 306.

Keywords:

French/English

Twentieth/Twenty-First Century

Literary and Cultural Studies

Poetry

Visual Culture

War

The Body

Gender

