Francisco Goya, the American Revolution, and the Fight Against The Synarchist Beast-Man

As in the case of Rabelais, entering the visual language of Francisco Goya takes an effort, something that has become increasingly difficult for the average Baby Boomer. By indicating some of the essential events of Goya’s period and life, I will try to provide you with some of the keys that will enable you to draw the geometry of his soul, and to harmonize the rhythm of your heart with his.

Francisco Goya y Lucientes was born in 1746, and was 13 years old when Carlos III became King of Spain in 1759. Carlos, who was dedicated to the transformation of Spain out of Hapsburg backwardness through Colbertian policies of economic and scientific development, supported the American Revolution, and fought a pitched battle throughout his reign with the British Empire and reactionary elements within Spain, centered on the Jesuits, whom he expelled; the Spanish Inquisition, whose power he fought to restrict; and the landed feudal aristocracy, who opposed his economic reforms.1

In the 1780’s, Goya was named Court Painter to King Carlos, whose revolutionary spirit he shared. When Carlos died in 1788, however, there was no strong successor, and the Inquisition moved quickly to reassert itself in the aftermath of the British-orchestrated French Revolution (1789).

Despite this political reversal, Goya continued in his role as Court Painter to Carlos III’s successors. He was appointed by Carlos IV in 1789, and then later, after the Napoleonic invasion of Spain in 1808 and the restoration of the Spanish Monarchy in 1814, his appointment was reinstated by King Ferdinand VII.

Fighting against despotism while simultaneously holding a sensitive post as Painter in the service of the latter two kings—and, what’s more, stricken with total deafness at the age of 472—Goya, like all resistance fighters, was well acquainted with the world of secrecy and deception.

Initially treated as a mere talented craftsman, he would spend the first 17 years of his career painting the cartoons for tapestries with fancy bucolic themes, destined to brighten up the dining rooms of the Royals, not to mention some religious, bondieusard frescos in Venetian fashion. He took pleasure in observing the court from behind the scenes, but his ideals were simmering, and he carefully filled his sketchbooks with “inventions,” visual notes for the development of ironical ideas. These sketchbooks would be the ever-flowing...
American Revolution,

‘Goya, you deserve not only death, but the gallows.
If we forgive you, it is because we admire you.’

King Ferdinand VII of Spain, 1814

Figure 1. Francisco Goya y Lucientes, “Self-Portrait,” 1815. Goya’s self-portrait at the age of 69, through its forward-leaning pose, creates a shocking contrast between an off-balance composition, and the great determination speaking from the eyes, which invites us to share his vision of freeing mankind from what he called “the common prejudices and deceitful practices which custom, ignorance, or self-interest have made usual.”

A Warning

By narrowing the perception of the work of the great artist Francisco Goya to a small series of paintings deemed to be mere illustrations of literary works dealing with witchcraft, whose imagery pops up in the “Caprichos” and prevails in the “Pinturas negras,” the Romantic counter-revolution has succeeded in tarnishing the image of this powerful revolutionary artist.

Goya’s social satire, driven by an Erasmian sense of irony that earned him the title “the Spanish Rabelais,” together with his profound sense of the Sublime, have been systematically presented as the expression of a grotesque and bizarre art, as the monstrous fruit of a sick mind.

Spain’s monarchist restoration of 1814, of which Francoism is the most recent echo, willfully retarded serious research on the master. Lawfully, the core of fruitful research has been achieved outside the sphere of Spain itself.

We are obviously dealing with the slanders by which the oligarchy denigrates the geniuses of mankind, especially when confronted by an artist lampooning the foundation of the oligarchy itself: the poison of mediocrity.

In brief: If Goya is an unknown artist with a well-known name, it is essentially the result of a classic black propaganda campaign, identical to those run against many others, notably Hieronymus Bosch and Edgar Allan Poe in the past, or Lyndon LaRouche today.
They were the groundwork for his social and philosophical satire, the *Caprichos* (*Follies*), a series of 80 etchings inspired by the art of cartooning, highly developed in England (Hogarth, Gilmore, *et al*.), and the “Scherzi” of Tiepolo, the Venetian rococo master active in Spain. For example, beneath the drawing prepared for the sixth engraving of the series, Goya wrote: “The world is a masquerade: face, costume, and voice, everything is false. All want to appear what they are not, all cheat and nobody knows himself” [see Figure 2].

Goya invites himself to the masked ball of his day, but he is not duped by the fake noses for which he is to become the itching powder. His work recalls Mozart’s contemporaneous *Don Giovanni*: It mocks the clownishness of the fancy “petimètres” (from the French “petit-maître,” the fops dressed in the Venetian fashion typical of the Court of Versailles), and reveals how, behind this giant Commedia del Arte of gallant manners, there stand the brutal intrigues settled with slashing stiletto and lethal poison, so familiar to the degenerate nobility, let alone to those poor fellows who, perhaps even worse, tried to imitate them.

To end this vast Venetian Carnivale, Goya envisioned a society that dropped the masks, offering truth—often represented as a beautiful woman—to raise and enlighten the world with the light of its reason, so that a different history for mankind could be written [see Figure 3, and inside back cover, this issue].

February 6, 1799 was one of these moments. On that day, more than a decade after the death of Carlos III, Goya put on sale 300 sets (yes, that is 300 × 80 prints, or a total of 24,000 prints!) of the “Caprichos: universal language, drawn and engraved by Francisco de Goya,” as he wrote on the title page, although the printed version was to drop “universal language.” The books were sold at the perfume shop below Goya’s apartment, because no bookseller was willing to risk doing so. That same day, Goya announced the sale in the local
newspaper, the Diario de Madrid, with the following advertisement:

The author is convinced that it is as proper for painting to criticize human error and vice, as for poetry and prose to do so, although criticism is usually taken to be exclusively the business of literature. He has selected from amongst the innumerable foibles and follies to be found in any civilized society, and from the common prejudices and deceitful practices which custom, ignorance, or self-interest have made usual, those subjects which he feels to be the more suitable material for satire, and which, at the same time, stimulate the artist’s imagination.

Since most of the subjects depicted in this work are not real, it is not unreasonable to hope that connoisseurs will readily overlook their defects.

. . . The public is not so ignorant of the Fine Arts, that it needs to be told that the author has intended no satire of the personal defects of any specific individual in any of his compositions. Such specific satire imposes undue limitations on the artist’s talents, and also mistakes the way in which perfection is to be achieved through imitation in art. [Emphasis added]

If we have some difficulty today in getting all the references in it, that was not the case in Goya’s time. The tremendous impact of the first 27 of the sets sold was immediate, and in response to threats from “la Santa” (Holy Inquisition), Goya felt obliged to halt the sale after barely ten days.

But Goya’s love for the beauty of truth—even when it troubles or incites you—would be the heart of a long (82 years), exceptionally productive life: over 700 paintings, two cycles of large wall frescos, 900 drawings, and nearly 300 prints.

When, in 1824, at the age of 78, Goya arrived in Bordeaux, France, he explored and became a master of the new technique of lithography, giving us a drawing of a man walking with sticks, with the caption, “I’m still learning” [SEE Figure 4].

The Giant

To appreciate in a more direct way the political and artistic genius of Goya, and to get a sense of his powerful sense of world-historical identity, let’s look at the “Colos-sus” [SEE Figure 5, and front cover, this issue], undoubtedly one of the most representative paintings of his outlook, whose original name was “The Giant.”

Below a muscular giant who towers in a sky filled with clouds bearing a thousand thunders, an indescribable hubbub captivates our eye. Herds of cattle break apart, horses throw their cavaliers to the ground, and caravans speed off in every direction. Lost in this eerie landscape, children cry, while women and men are on the run. Panic has taken over.

Most evidently, this drunken, blind blacksmith of hell incarnates none other than Napoleon Bonaparte, the “Beast-Man” placed in the saddle by great financier interests to bring to a halt the winds of republican enthusiasm blowing over the world, and to drown the European continent in rivers of blood from never-ending wars.

If the visionary Goya points to the evil to come, he does not show any sympathy for those who—be they great or small—submit to the delusory “fatality” of events. When we look more closely at the painting, we discover, slightly on the left in the foreground, a donkey, tranquilly satisfied with his own existence, and pretending to...
be outside the torments of history [see Figure 6].

Although Renaissance humanists like Brueghel traditionally represented Aristotelians as donkeys, the fact that the King of Spain, Carlos III, in a public event, had called his son, the Prince of Asturias and future King Carlos IV, “a donkey,” gives a particularly charming twist to the painting.

But beyond this anecdote, the animal expresses here the stubborn “common prejudices and deceitful practices which custom, ignorance, or self-interest have made usual,” which Goya and his republican “ilustrado” friends wanted to take on.

“Donkeyness”—a state of emotional blocking that is a caricature of animal-species fixedness—would joyfully bring life, as a mirror for human stupidity, to many “Caprichos,” where one sees, for instance, who the real donkeys are: those who, with full consent, carry other donkeys on their backs [see Figure 7]. These are the “Leporellos” carrying the “Don Giovannis,” and without these servile valets, no oligarch could manage to get his bestial whims shoved down people’s throats. No slave masters without slaves!

The American Century

Goya’s century was a century where enlightened elites, with Benjamin Franklin’s friendship societies as their
epicenter, were conspiring to convince the peoples to throw off the yoke of a bankrupt, moribund feudal system [see Figure 8].

While it is true that the British victory in the Seven Years’ War (1756-1763) had brought about the domination of the Anglo-Venetian British Empire, it can also be proven that what some called “the revenge” of the Franco-Spanish-Italian Bourbon family compact, offered the decisive help required to erect on the other side of the Atlantic, an adversary representing very quickly the only real challenge to the British Empire: the American Republic.

Louis XVI (1754-1793) and his Spanish cousin Carlos III (1716-1788) each provided the sum of a million pounds, in order to facilitate an agent of the French secret intelligence service, Pierre Augustin Caron de Beaumarchais (1732-1793) [see Figure 9], to create a fake trading company with the name of “Rodrigue, Hortalez et Cie,” whose unique purpose was to channel money, credits, weapons, ammunition, uniforms, and engineers, together with an impressive number of experienced military commanders—including von Steuben, Lafayette, De Kalb, Bédaulx, Kosciusko, Pulaski, and so forth—to America, to secure the ultimate victory of the insurgents. For his part, Carlos III, in response to a proposal by Benjamin Franklin, ordered military action by Bernardo de Gálvez to seize Pensacola, Florida and Mobile, Alabama from the British, and to expel them from the Gulf of Mexico and the banks of the Mississippi.

As the fruit of that several years’ long, nearly daily collaboration in Paris between the elder scientist Franklin and the insolent French intelligence officer Beaumarchais, the American victory made France appear in the eyes of the world as the key center for world-liberating republicanism.

That was the France that Goya and other Spanish patriots loved. It would be against this France, and its sympathizers in Spain, that, after sabotaging the revolutionary process, the Congress of Vienna would impose, in 1815, on the ruins of the Napoleonic wars, the return of monarchical absolutism: the restoration of Louis XVIII in France, and the despotic regime of Ferdinand VII in Spain.

Because Goya was part of the Spanish “ilustrado” faction—he was, in fact, a spokesman and sort of cultural ambassador for it—it is not surprising to see him being directly attacked by the evil Count...

**Figure 8.** Portrait of Benjamin Franklin, who spearheaded the international movement to establish republican government.

**Figure 9.** Jean-Marc Nattier, “Portrait of Beaumarchais,” 1755.
Joseph de Maistre (1753-1821) [See Figure 10], one of the conceptual architects of modern Synarchism, a counter-revolutionary project designed to eradicate republicanism from the globe. De Maistre, the man who fathered the conception of the “Beast-Man,” as he developed it in his description of the executioner—this apologist for human sacrifice and passionate admirer of the Inquisition—struck out at Goya’s Caprichos, remarking that a book of English-style caricatures, published in Madrid, had passed through his hands, in which “one ridicules the Queen in the most forceful manner possible, and the allegory is so transparent that even a child could see it.”

Goya, according to his friends, compared painting to bullfighting. A beautiful self-portrait shows the master with palette and brushes in front of an easel [See Figure 11]. He wears a bullfighter’s jacket and a hat equipped with candleholders, an invention of Leonardo da Vinci that allegedly was used by Michelangelo to work at night.

But the bull of Goya “the toreador,” was not a physical one—it was mental. It was the concept of the Synarchist Beast-Man that he wanted to hunt down in the arena!

**Goya and the ‘Ilustrados’**

Goya was born in 1746, the son of a gilder who worked in Saragossa, the capital of Aragon. Although the young Carlos had been king of the two Sicilies (Naples and Sicily) beginning 1734, he became Carlos III of Spain in 1759. Now in power in Spain, Carlos introduced economic and education reforms to promote the General Welfare of the Spanish people, in opposition to the interests of the feudal oligarchy and its Inquisition. To accomplish this revolutionary purpose, he selected as his advisors a number of key individuals, some Italian and French and others Spanish, who were in the intellectual tradition of Jean Baptiste Colbert and G.W. Leibniz.

The central figure of this history was
Pedro Rodríguez de Campomanes, the leading figure of the Spanish current of physical economy and organizer of the renowned “soirées de Campomanes,” rendezvous obligé where many Spanish “ilustrados,” including Goya as early as 1780, entered into a kind of permanent dialogue.

Here, one found in attendance:

- **Pedro Rodríguez de Campomanes** (1723-1803) [SEE Figure 12]: Economist, literateur, and a precocious Hellenist, he spoke Greek, Latin, and Arabic. As an adolescent, he went out to teach literature to poor children. Awarded a law degree at the age of 19, he would be admitted to the Academy of History, and would later reform the Spanish postal services. Carlos III, who realized that Spain needed a reformer, was impressed by his knowledge, his eloquence, and his talents as an administrator, and nominated him to be “fiscal of the Council of Castile” (Finance Ministry) in 1763, a post he would hold for more than 20 years. As reported by one biographer: “Campomanes immediately attacked the abuses that were ruining the country. By adroit measures, he reduced the number of monks, suppressed a great number of monasteries that lacked sufficient income and whose members could not live except throughbeggary, and increased the inadequate stipend of many priests, while simultaneously demanding from them more instruction and morality.”

- **Gaspar Melchior de Jovellanos** (1744-1811) [SEE Figure 14]: Inspired by Campomanes, this poet, economist, and statesman Imperial College, later San Isidro Library. Benjamin Franklin made him a member of the Philosophical Society of Philadelphia.

Campomanes listened carefully to farmers, entrepreneurs, and craftsmen, and opened government posts for them, which until then had been limited to the nobility. One day, he declared, not without humor, that the sewing needle was “more important than all the syllogisms of Aristotle”!

On the model of the Real Sociedad Baonganada de los Amigos del Pais (Basque Royal Society of the Friends of the Country), Campomanes founded similar societies in Madrid in 1775 [SEE Figure 13], and in numerous other regions of Spain. He developed the university curricula, focusing on mathematics, physics, the natural sciences, and languages, which were until then neglected. After Carlos III expelled the Jesuits from Spain in 1767, Campomanes had the books included amongst their possessions distributed to the libraries of the kingdom, and later opened the library of the
would become the most important and noble figure of the “ilustrados,” and a personal friend of Goya. As Benjamin Franklin did at Versailles, he provoked a scandal by appearing in court without his lawyer’s wig, which tells you something about that century. In opposition to the Inquisition and the Jesuits, he demanded that higher education be conducted in the vernacular, not Latin. He called for the elimination of torture. Falsely accused of being a follower of the Enlightenment atheist Voltaire, this Catholic stated that his spiritual brother was Thomas à Kempis, the author of the *Imitation of the Christ* and one of the founders of the Brothers of the Common Life, the teaching order that trained Nicolaus of Cusa and Erasmus of Rotterdam. In 1797, Emmanuel de Godoy, the favorite of Queen Maria-Luisa of Parma, nominated him to be Minister of Justice and Religion. Under extreme pressure from the Inquisition, Jovellanos was exiled in 1801, to rot away in prison in Majorca, deprived of pen, ink, and paper. Only when the French invaded Spain in 1808, would he be set free, to become the émigrant of the Junta Central of the Spanish patriots’ resistance based in Seville.

- **José Monino, Count of Floridablanca** (1728-1808) [see Figure 15]. Originally a modest lawmaker, he became the principal minister of Carlos III. He sent money to the American revolutionaries. He was particularly committed to creating and modernizing, through great public works, the economic infrastructure that had once been so advanced under the Arab caliphs of Andalusia. He worked closely with Ramon de Pignatelli (1734-1793), the canon of the Cathedral of Zaragoza, who had protected the young Goya during his early education. Co-founder of the Aragonese Economic Society of the Friends of the Country, it was Pignatelli who, in a manner similar to Franklin Roosevelt’s TVA in the Twentieth century, created a development corridor, bringing communication and irrigation to Aragon by building a gigantic canal linking the Atlantic to the Mediterranean.
• Francisco (François) de Cabarrus (1752-1810) [see Figure 16] was a political economist and financier of French extraction, born in Bayonne. In 1783, with the support of Carlos III’s finance minister Miguel de Muzquiz (1719-1785) and Floridablanca, he created the Banco de San Carlos, a state credit institution, seven years before Alexander Hamilton created the first National Bank of the United States on the same principles. The capital of the bank came mainly from Spanish, but also from Dutch and French sources. Goya himself was a shareholder, and did portraits of most of the bank’s directors. Cabarrus’s secretary was Léandro Fernandez de Moratin (1760-1828) [see Figure 17], a poet, dramatist, and intimate friend of Goya, who, like him, died in exile in France.

In addition, there were other individuals close to Goya who were connected to or responsible for the Economic Societies of the Friends of the Country, including Martin Zapater (1746-1803) and one of his protectors, the Duchess of Osuna (1752-1834). Although most of these individuals would react in different ways to the earth-shaking political crisis that erupted with the fall of the Bourbons in France, there was an early, far-reaching consensus concerning the nature of the economic depression, and the remedies to be mobilized. Here are the essentials:

1. On the social and economic level, Spain had “lost two centuries,” the dramatic consequence of the expulsion of the Jews (commerce) and the Moors (craftsmen) by Torquemada’s Inquisition, which tragically aborted the potential of Queen Isabella the Catholic to transform Spain into a sovereign nation-state along the lines of the France of her protector Louis XI. In Goya’s time, a large part of the Spanish population (clergy, nobility, hidalgos, army, etc.) occupied itself in non-productive activities. Spain had 200,000 monks, nuns, and priests—twice the number of Italy, and three times that of France. Moreover, there were 500,000 noblemen, more than France, whose population was twice that of Spain. According to the social criteria of the country, the nobility
and the hidalgos (impoverished nobility, of whom Don Quixote is a caricature), were forbidden to work, on pain of renouncing their titles! But, since the country lacked an effective middle class of independent entrepreneurs, merchants, and craftsmen, the time had come to reestablish the values associated with production, by putting everybody to work. War on idleness!

2. Campomanes’s outlook was a combination of Colbertian voluntarism (protectionism, manufacturing, and infrastructure development), Leibnizian scientific mobilization (Academy of Sciences), land reform as envisioned by Thomas More in his *Utopia* (redistribution of idle land, favor grain production over sheep raising), and philosophical optimism about human nature (educa-

---

**Goya’s Paintings: Imitate Life**

**By Forms, Not Lines**

Goya lived at a time when the late rococo style was being superseded by the new, neo-classical fashion outlined by the German theoretician Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717-1768). In his “Reflections on the Imitation of the Greeks in Sculpture and Painting” (1755), Winckelmann defined the self-contradictory task that resulted from the fact that “the only means we have at our disposal to gain greatness, even to become inimitable (unnachahmlich), is through the imitation (nachahmung) of the ancients,” for which he praised Raphael, Michelangelo, and Poussin.

Winkelmann’s collaborator in Rome, with the now nearly forgotten name of Anton Raphael Mengs (1728-1779), was at that time considered the greatest genius of all time, and was invited by Carlos III to Spain to become painter to his Court. Failure to admire him was considered an attack against State and Church, and Mengs ruled as a dictator at the Royal Academy of Madrid, where he imposed strict academic training based exclusively on the imitation of Greek sculpture, which was supposedly the secret of the artists Raphael, Correggio, and Titian.

As a spokesman for those who opposed the cold, neo-classical “Empire” style that Napoleon would later make mandatory in France and the countries he occupied,* Goya repeatedly claimed that his three masters were “Nature, Velazquez, and Rembrandt.”

Here Goya echoed Leonardo da Vinci’s precept on imitation,

no painter should imitate the manner of another painter, since that would make him merely the nephew and not the son of nature,

and his advice on how to train painters,

The youth should first learn perspective. Then he may copy from some good master, to accustom himself to fine forms. Then from nature, to confirm by practice the rules he has learnt. Then see for a time the works of various masters. Then getting the habit of putting his art into practice and work.

[Ash. I, 18a]

So, for Goya, as for Velazquez, whose paintings he copied in a series of etchings in 1778, and also for Rembrandt, whose sketches he studied in Saragossa even before going to study in Rome, nature had to be imitated, not as a template, but as an intention that appeared through what Goya called the “magic of the ambience.” There is no recipe for a true creative exchange between the artist and nature. All the rest is the “oppression” of “tired styles” that leads to “nothing good in painting.”

In 1792, 13 years after Mengs’ death, in a report to the Royal Academy on the subject of teaching art, Goya wrote:

What a scandal to hear nature depreciated in comparison to Greek statues, by one who knows neither one nor the other without acknowledging that the smallest part of nature confounds and amazes those who know most! What statue or cast might there be, that is not copied from divine nature? As excellent as the artist may be who copied it, can he not but proclaim that when placed at
tion, equitable justice, personal freedom, and abolition of the Inquisition).

3. As early as 1771, and after a long inquiry, Campomanes and Floridablanca proposed, in the name of the “General Interest” (Common Good), to redistribute idle farmland belonging to the nobility and the religious orders. People from Germany and France were encouraged to emigrate to Spain, to repopulate entire regions that had become depopulated. Taxes unjustly crushing the lower classes were progressively transferred to the aristocracy and the clergy, who were until then free of any form of imposition. As in France, these urgent land reforms, and the demand of just fiscal treatment, were some of the key

its side, one is the work of God, and the other of our miserable hands? He who wishes to distance himself, to correct [nature] without seeking the best of it, can he help but fall into a reprehensible and monotonous manner, of paintings, of plaster models?...

... [T]here are no rules in painting, and... the oppression, or servile obligation, of making all study follow the same path, is a great impediment for the young who profess this very difficult art that approaches the divine more than the other.

An early biography recalls a conversation overheard when the old Goya was in exile in Bordeaux, claiming that what the academics wanted and encouraged in their young charges, was the abstraction of “always lines, never forms.”

Any painter working through large fresco cycles has been forced to overcome this paradox. How many lines of a fresco decorating the inside of a cupola, do you still see while standing far below on the ground? Goya here intelligently assimilated the great breakthroughs of Leonardo, Caravaggio, de la Tour, and Rembrandt, contributions that appear in Velazquez’s early illusionistic style, based on dramatic lightning, strong modeling, and sharp contrast.

So, Goya continued:

Where do they find these lines in nature? Personally, I see only forms that are lit up and forms that are not, planes that advance and planes that recede, relief and depth. My eye never sees outlines of particular features or details. I do not count the hairs in the beard of the man who passes by any more than the buttonholes on his jacket attract my notice. My brush should not see better than I do.

That creative, “modern” insight, based on freedom rather than formal rules, made aquatint etching a far more attractive medium for Goya than simple line etching, where tones can only be generated by increasingly dense hatched lines.

As Caprichos, Plate 32 (“Because she was susceptible”), demonstrates: If Goya didn’t feel the need to use lines, he simply left them out, allowing the subject matter to define the technical means of expression, and not the other way around!

—KV

* By a monumental use of sober decorative patterns derived from the ancients, the “Empire” style would revive the cold aesthetics of Spartan and Roman civilization. At the suggestion of his wife Joséphine de Beauharnais (whose boudoir still survives intact as the essence of the “Style Empire,” incidentally), Napoleon favored the architects Charles Percier and Pierre-François Fontaine. Their standardized style of “archeological neoclassicism” gave birth not only to palaces in France (such as Fontainebleau, Compiègne, Rambouillet, and the Elysée), but was imposed on the subjugated countries (Turin, Florence, Laeken, Antwerp, Amsterdam, Utrecht, Haarlem, Aranjuez, etc.).

While in sculpture this style is identified with the works of Antonio Canova (1757-1822), whose works blend frigidity with voluptuous pleasure, and grace with languor, the realistic paintings of Jacques-Louis David (1748-1825) display the fascist, pessimistic rationalism so typical of the Roman grandeur cherished by Napoleon.
questions to be solved to enable society to progress.

4. As a consequence, all Spaniards were encouraged to educate themselves, and to have a productive life, which is the glue of the social cohesion of the nation. To cycle the nobility into something productive, Campomanes encouraged them to get materially and actively involved in scientific research, through the creation of laboratories, centers intended to become open to all. He created jobs for the military, vagabonds, beggars, and prisoners. Industries that created jobs for women were in particular supported. The Inquisition, whose powers were sharply reduced, was asked to fight heresy with education, not with repression.

As would be expected, such far-reaching humanistic reforms provoked “structural” opposition, in particular from the nobility and the clergy, a real ancien régime, whose power and privileges were directly challenged by the new policy. The hard core of that resistance to progress was the Spanish Inquisition, and as such it became the legitimate target of the Christian humanism of Goya and his friends [see Appendix, page 44].

The Spanish Inquisition

The Inquisition was first called for in 1213 by Pope Innocent III, and instituted by Pope Gregory IX in 1231 to fight the Cathar heresy, and witchcraft in general. In

Why Goya Is a Great Classical Artist

Nowadays, Goya, if not called a Romantic, is often—and wrongly—identified as the founder or precursor of modernism, surrealism, impressionism, and the other modern “isms.” Proof is provided by the out-of-context presentation of his quote that “there are no rules in painting” [see Box, page 30]. Even those academics who have tried to counter this, have classified him as a “late Spanish rococo” painter, since he definitely is light-years away from the rising neo-classicist style of his time (e.g., Mengs, Winckelmann).

Let us begin by recalling Lyndon LaRouche’s definition of Classical art, as opposed to what is taught in present-day textbooks, which in general propagate the myth that it was what is called academic “classicism”—supposedly the eternal imitation of the cold canons of proportion discovered by the “pure” Greeks, and standardized by the pragmatic Romans—that was the outcome of Europe’s Fifteenth and Sixteenth centuries’ Golden Renaissance. LaRouche, answering a question at an International Cadre School in May 2003, said:

Classical art is not something that somebody invented. Classical art is actually a sort of secretion of the human being, a natural secretion. Any paradox in life, whether a paradox of sense perception—where you find that, in some moment, things don’t work the way you would have thought they would from habit, and you realize there’s something out there, besides what your sense perception tells you. At that point, you suddenly have a sense of irony—metaphor, or irony. Now, the most important experiences in life are of this type: Things that evoke a sense of irony and metaphor, that the world is not what habit instructs you to believe it was. That’s the message you find important to communicate.
1478, the Dominican monk Tomás de Torquemada (1420-1498), the Queen’s confesser, convinced Isabella and Ferdinand to establish the emergency laws instituting the medieval Inquisition in Spain. Torquemada became the all-powerful Grand Inquisitor who executed heretics and blasphemers. But his main quarry were the atheists, the converted Jews (“conversos” or “morros,” the latter word meaning “pigs”), and the Moors (“moriscos”). On his personal account: nearly 100,000 trials, 8,800 executions at the stake, 90,000 condemned to diverse forms of repentance, and over 1 million people who fled the country!

The Inquisition continued after Torquemada’s death; in Spain alone, between 1481 and 1808, some 35,000 people were burned at the stake [see Figure 18]. The insatiable cupidity of the Spanish clergy, dominated by the mendicant orders, led to the arrest of the Jews and the confiscation of their money, goods, and belongings, as had been the case earlier in the fight against the Cathars. Fighting heresy and witchcraft became the most profitable business on Earth!

On March 31, 1492, the Jews were expelled from the kingdom of Spain, and the Inquisition equally attacked converted Moors and mystics, the label “allumbrados” (illuminati) being universally applied to all those who minimized the importance of the Catholic rites. Later, the target would become the followers of the Protestant or Erasmian reform movement, labelled without distinction “lutheranos.”

These things are called ideas—genuine ideas; artistic ideas.

So, man tries to develop ways of communicating things which obviously are important to society, and to the individual, and to others. Out of this comes art. It comes in the form of Classical poetry, which is an evolution of a combination of the natural qualities of the human speaking/singing voice, which has natural peculiarities, which are used, as a way of communicating, in composing poetry. This is true in music. It’s true also in painting, great painting, great art.

Goya was deeply inspired by Rembrandt’s great art of the portrait. Superseding the superficial, “physical” splendor of neoclassical perfection, exemplified here by the court painter Anton Raphael Mengs’ portrait of Princess Maria-Luisa of Parma (1765) (left), Goya’s love for truth and mankind enabled him to paint in the mind of the viewer a different kind of beauty, an “inner, moral (i.e., creative) beauty,” reflecting the living substance of a person’s soul. His portrait of the young actress Antonia Zárate (1811), shown above, demonstrates this unique quality of Rembrandtian “interiority.”

Goya clearly opposed both the idea that art is a mere formal representation or imitation of pleasing, even beautiful, forms and colors (“mannerism”), and also the barbaric fantasy that one can sacrifice the visual domain, for the sake of the pseudo-spontaneous exteriorization of some emotion or other (“Romanticism,” “modernism”).

His art, through the use of paradoxical metaphors, energizes those specific creative powers of the mind LaRouche identifies. By making images of the preconscious available to conscious thought processes, and by making these ironies subjects of “truthful human communication of ideas, true or false” (LaRouche), man, through a social process, is freed of the slavery of “the common prejudices and deceitful practices which custom, ignorance, or self-interest have made usual,” as Goya stated in his advertisement for the Caprichos. That uplifting (sublime) experience, powerfully increases man’s willful mastery of the domain of self-conscious creativity, a quality that defines precisely the difference between creative man and the lower species.

Aware that pretty appearances can hide the ugliness of intentions, Goya seems to share the vision of the poet John Keats (1795-1821), who wrote in his “Ode on a Grecian Urn” that, “Beauty is truth, truth beauty,—that is all / Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know.” In that sense, Goya’s art is often neither pretty nor pleasing, but Classically and truly beautiful, precisely for its truthfulness. —KV
Around 1480, Spain reached the highest degree of symbolic unity between Church and State, by consecrating the cult of “limpieza de sangre” (purity of the blood), somewhat akin to the Nazis of a later period. Henceforth, the Inquisition, being prosecutor, judge, and jury all rolled into one, would make rulings on these two issues: purity of blood, and loyalty to the Church.

Although torture was formally prohibited as a form of execution, it was considered necessary to obtain information and confessions. Besides many other public humiliations, the three most common methods of torture were the “garrucha” (strangulation), “la toca” (shoving a piece of wet cloth down the throat, to create the effect of drowning), and the “potro” (tightening ropes around the body). But, in Goya’s time, most victims were executed by strangulation in public, a method wrongly supposed to be less painful than burning at the stake [see Figure 19]. Goya left us several drawings and paintings describing the sinister human sacrifices organized by “the Santa” (Holy Tribunal) as popular entertainment, which they used as a means of ruling over the masses with death, fire, and terror, while at the same time encouraging debauchery and superstition in secret. The systematic denunciations, fuelled by sheer cupidity, would plunge Spain into a permanent climate of mutual suspicion, and would ruin the spirit of scientific inquiry and create a definite distrust of progress. The atrocities of the civil wars that ravaged Spain later, as well as the brutal massacres of native populations in the Americas, have their origins here.
Schiller’s play *Don Carlos*, completed in 1787—the year the United States adopted its beautiful Constitution, and the year Goya tried to learn some French—contained a forceful message for Spain: Unless you take on the Inquisition, your country is doomed. Carlos III, who as early as 1737 had invited the Jews (who had been expelled by Emperor Charles V) to return to the Kingdom of Naples, and had prevented the establishment of an Inquisition in that kingdom, had later, as King of Spain, expelled the Jesuits from both Spain and New Spain, and severely restricted the power of the Inquisition. But he did not have the political power to abolish it. When Carlos IV succeeded his father in 1788, the Franco-Spanish pressure cooker was about to explode. In Spain, the Inquisition began to reassert its power in alliance with the British, who would orchestrate both the anti-republican Revolution in France, and its later Napoleonic Synarchist reaction.

The Shock of 1789

Carlos IV, a donkey in the center of historical torment, decided that hunting was far more interesting than ruling, and left the daily management of state affairs to his wife, Maria-Luisa of Bourbon Parma (1765-1819) [see Figure 20, and inside back cover, this issue]. A superficial spouse, Maria-Luisa hated her despicable son, the future Ferdinand VII (1784-1833), and took her favorite, her young bodyguard Emmanuel de Godoy (1767-1851), to run the country [see Figure 21]; in 1792, Carlos IV appointed Godoy Prime Minister.

The reform movement created by Carlos III, which had been given institutional expression, was still sufficiently strong after nearly 30 years of rule by Carlos III, that it could not be fully broken initially. Carlos had taken care to stipulate the policies which his successors should implement, in a 1787 “Confidential Memorandum” to the State Council drafted for him by Florida-blanca. Although Maria-Luisa and Godoy were both instruments of the Inquisition after the French Revolution, which targeted the pro-American intellectual elite in that country for execution or imprisonment, they did not yet have the power to destroy the pro-American elite in Spain.

Thus, even though Godoy was their enemy, he was forced initially to continue to defend Campomanes’ “Friends of the Country” societies, to encourage the industrialization of Spain, and to upgrade basic education, including the introduction of the advanced pedagogical model of the Swiss Johann Pestalozzi (1746-1827), a collaborator of Wilhelm von Humboldt.21

Godoy commissioned Goya, who was the Court Painter, to paint four tondos, depicting allegories of the economic values

![Figure 20. Francisco Goya y Lucientes, “Family of Carlos IV,” 1800. Goya demonstrates in this vast canvas all the science he had learned from the great masters. From Velázquez’s “Meninas,” he takes the “mirror” effect: all the figures, and especially Queen Maria-Luisa, who is standing at the geometrical center of the composition (and the monarchy), are posing as if admiring themselves in front of a mirror. And, as Velázquez did in his painting, Goya also includes himself, in the left, shadowy part of the wide canvas, standing behind the royals. As in Rembrandt’s “Night Watch,” and violating every formal rule of “classicism,” Goya dares to present a figure clothed in black (King Carlos IV) at the very front. While their degenerate nature speaks for itself today, the royals were immensely charmed with these truthful representations. Blinded by their own vanity, they saw only the glittering garments of the Queen, and the triumph of royal decorum. Belonging to the oligarchical caste prevented them from seeing the evident moral ugliness of their own appearance, or the powerful shadow that creeps in from the left and announces their coming doom. Hence, Goya indeed immortalized their foolish mortality.](Erich Lessing/Art Resource, NY)
Maria-Luisa became increasingly the puppet of the Inquisition, which was out to turn her against Floridablanca, Cabarrus, and Jovellanos. In 1789, Maria-Luisa, panicked by the events in France—where Louis XVI, after the storming of the Bastille, made it known he might take refuge in Spain with his first cousin—wants to stop “the ideas” of the Revolution. The Inquisition is reinforced, and redoubles its efforts. Floridablanca, unable to conceive of a creative solution, installs a ferocious censorship. Not a word appears in the Spanish press on the events that are shaking up France. It never happened. If we don’t talk about it, it might disappear on its own. Alas, too late! Unable to stop “the ideas,” one arrests those who think them. It must be these damn “ilustrados”!

On June 25, 1790, for no stated reason, François Cabarrus, one of the masterminds of the Banco de San Carlos, is arrested and thrown in jail. Campomanes refuses to defend him. Jovellanos is advised to leave Madrid and go study “the extraction of coal in the Asturias”; Goya, without having requested it, receives a pass to go and “breathe the maritime air of Valencia.”

Then, in 1792, a “U-turn”: After the arrest of Louis XVI, war between France and Spain seems inevitable. The acceleration of history traps the humanists in a pincers movement. The fates of France and Spain are inextricably linked together. Either some form of revolution becomes successful, or it will bring about the loss of everything. Godoy manipulates the “ilustrados,” who are being accused of being agents of a foreign power, “afrancesados” (“Frenchies”). Cabarrus is called upon and sent to France, where he pleads in defense of Louis XVI. According to some, his secret mission is to spirit the French king out of the country.

On Jan. 21, 1793, Louis XVI’s head falls into the basket of the guillotine. Carlos IV, in a surreal act, declares war on France, and France declares war on Spain. This is when Goya might have been poisoned, or gotten the wrong medical treatment, and he leaves Madrid to live with friends in Cadiz. The daughter of Cabarrus, Teresa, is the wife of the Frenchman Tallien, one of the organizers of Thermidor, the attempted counter-coup that would send Robespierre to the guillotine.

Godoy arranges a peace agreement with France. The Spanish Bourbons are allowed to stay on the throne, but “ilustrados” Jovellanos and Francisco de Saavedra (1746-1819) are put in as ministers. Within months, the Inquisition, that meeting place of clergy and...
nobility, orders them out. For Goya, that capitulation is the equivalent of treason, and he counter-attacks by tearing off the masks.

‘Los Caprichos: Universal Language’

We now know enough of the political and economic context, to bring in Goya as he starts lobbing shells into the headquarters of the enemy general staff.

Los Caprichos: idioma universal will be composed as a Socratic dialogue of the same type as Erasmus’s Colloquies [see Figure 23, selected Plates]. Beneath the surface of every one of these little histories, there is a well-directed, delicious irony, lampooning very precise political figures, who were otherwise unassailable. But the primary target of Goya’s attack was not the royals per se, but rather the false axiomatic assumptions of the popular culture, which sustained their oligarchical misrule. In the Caprichos, Goya takes social commentary to new heights, where human figures are distorted by appetites and passions; he exposes the sources of folly, but is confident that mankind can rise above them.

Plate 4, “Nanny’s boy,” is probably a portrayal of Queen Maria-Luisa, who was known for an incessant struggle to master her maladjusted false teeth. A laborer pulls a weight towards the right, while the brat, hands in mouth, blocks his passage.

Plate 5, “Two of a kind” (“What resembles, assembles”): Marriage for mutual benefit: is this Godoy and the Queen?

Plate 8: A tragic philosophical reality intervenes: “They carried her off!” Two phantomial figures—clergymen, or noblemen?—carry off a young woman, destroying the future.
To understand how the power of ideas inhabits this fantasy world of social and political satire, it is indispensable to be able to compare the captions and legends on the original drawings, drawn directly from Goya’s hand and mind, with the ones that appear on the final engravings, which he softened and made purposely obscure, in an act of self-censorship probably suggested by friends (Jovellanos, Moratin) who were concerned to avoid more trouble for Goya, who was clearly playing with matches on the pyre.

Take, as an example, Plate 13, showing monks eating a hot dinner with spoons. On the engraved version it reads “They are hot.” But, on the original drawing, the handwritten text is far more explicit: “Here are the men who are devouring us” (anticipating the theme of “Saturn devouring one
of his sons”). We find these monks feasting again in Plate 79, “No one has seen us,” and also at the very end of the series, Plate 80, where they are hysterically screaming, and it says, “It’s time.” The famous print, “The sleep of reason produces monsters,” (now Plate 43, approximately half way through the series, introducing the theme of superstition taking over if reason falls asleep), was initially conceived as Plate 1, the opening statement, and would have made clear the full significance of the last plate, i.e., “‘It’s time’ for Reason to wake up!”

One of the monsters that pops up often in the Caprichos is the owl. In Spanish popular culture at the time of Goya, as it was in Flanders during Hieronymus Bosch’s lifetime, this bird of night was a metaphor for sin, able to see and operate in darkness. Also, in the very common practice of bird hunting, an owl was attached with a little string to a tree. The owl’s screeching attracted other birds, who then fell in the nets or got stuck on the branches of the tree covered with glue by the hunter. Plate 19, “All will fall,” shows that stratagem, with a bird-woman as the bait on the tree, and the man-birds being castrated in the foreground.

With Plate 55, we’re back at the royal palace: “Until death” features Maria-Luisa, flaccid and withered, trying desperately to restore her looks with make-up in front of a mirror (a theme developed in the painting, “Time and the Old Ladies” [see Figure 24, and inside back cover, this issue]).

The most explicitly political cartoon of the series is without doubt Plate 56, “To rise and to fall.” In addition to the title’s reference to Godoy’s sexual performances, one sees him being lifted up by a giant satyr (bestial force). Godoy is depicted with
flames and smoke—an image of the Inquisition—pouring forth from his head, and in his rise, two figures are thrown aside: Jovellanos and Saavedra, the two “ilustrados” he threw out of the government.

The theme of marriage for convenience, status, or money appears in a satirical poem by Jovellanos, “A Arnesto,”

Without invoking reason, nor weighing
In their hearts the merits of the groom,
They say yes and give their hand
To the first comer,

which opens the Caprichos [see Figure 23, Plate 2], and will be treated in prose in Moratin’s masterpiece, the “Si de las ninas” of 1806, which was banned by the Inquisition. Without ignoring macho behavior, Goya goes after the tradition of Spanish women’s self-degrading behavior as sex objects, often encouraged by their mothers acting as bawds or procurresses, which got innocent young girls “into the game” (a theme that had become popular with Fernando de Rojas “Celestina” (“Procuress”) in 1499) [see Figure 25]. But the painting “Majas on the Balcony” [see Figure 26] shows clearly the “men in the shadows,” behind their backs. The Inquisition, and the police of the king, were probably running large chunks of organized prostitution, a traditional tool of information-gathering for most intelligence services.

The ‘Ilustrados’ and Republican Popular Culture

Goya and his friend Léandro Fernandez de Moratin rejected the idea of a culture reserved exclusively for the elites and the salons, as did the most enlightened of the nobility. Through the theater, in particular, Moratin tried to take up the great challenge of changing the cultural environment, a necessity in terms of both day-to-day political fights, and long-term human potential. How many intrigues and palace coups were settled in the streets of Madrid by the manipulation of a whipped-up “populacho” (rabble)? Not only in Spain, but elsewhere? A population desensitized through bullfighting and public executions of “heretics,”
and further debased by theater productions aimed at appealing to the lowest instincts (similar to today’s soap operas), was a grave threat to the republican spirit of government “of, by, and for the people.”

Moratin expressed his convictions in a 1791 letter to Godoy, criticizing the works of Ramon de la Cruz (1731-1794), the most popular playwright of his day, whose productions did nothing but reflect the life and customs of the most miserable rabble: the tavern keepers, chestnut sellers, pickpockets, imbeciles, rag sellers, blackguards, jailbirds, and, all in all, the disgusting doings of the Madrid slums: such are the characters of these pieces. The cigar, the gambling house, the dagger, drunkenness, dissipation, abandonment, all the vices of such pieces rolled together, are painted in seductive colors . . . . If theater is the school of behavior, how can one correct vice, error, and absurdity, when the same people who ought to be amending them are propagating them?

Moratin argued that the Hollywood-style repertoire of some 450 de la Cruz “sainetes” (25-minute, one-act sketches), were becoming popular among “the highest levels of society.” To which de la Cruz responded, that he was not a degenerate, merely a realist, who wrote of the real life one could live in Madrid.

Moratin passed the year 1787 in Paris, where he entered into an ongoing dialogue with Carlo Goldoni (1707-1793), a playwright and reformer of the Italian theater in exile in France, who was the Italian language teacher to the Court of Louis XV. In 1786, Moratin had already written his first comedy, “El viejo y la nina” (“The Old Man and the Girl”) and the year before, he had published, anonymously, a pamphlet, the “Derrota de los pedants” (“Rout of the Pedants”), mocking bad poets and authors. To ridicule the surrounding anti-culture, Moratin even founded a burlesque society with his friends, with the name of the “acalophiles” (“lovers of ugliness,” from the Greek a-kalos), of which Goya might have been a member.
The Beast-Man and the
‘Pinturas negras’

It would be impossible to comment on every one of Goya’s works, and their interaction with his revolutionary time. But, having discussed at least some aspects above, I will now try to go to the essence of his work, by underlining his very special, unique contribution.

Having participated in the revolutionary regime of Carlos III, and then having experienced its overthrow by the very oligarchy Carlos III had combatted, Goya had an acute comprehension of the difference between man’s true humanity, his cognitive nature in the image of the Creator, and the Beast-Man phenomenon—an understanding he mobilized to provoke a universal awakening of conscience capable of stopping it.

There remains the question of what can lead men to become Neros, Torquemadas, Napoleons, or Hitlers; what can bring them to commit such horrible crimes, that they can justly be called Satanists, in the sense of depriving mankind, and men, of their dignity as human beings.

Goya points the finger, and it required enormous courage to do so, at the egoism of the ancien régime, a generation so preoccupied with itself, that it was prepared to devour its own offspring, rather than be deprived of its own pleasure, privilege, and comfort.

This is Goya’s enduring “heavy idea,” which appears towards the end of the Disasters of War, a series of etchings produced during the French occupation of Spain [see Figure 27, selected Plates].

That war was for France what today’s Iraq war is for the United States. Projected to require less than six days, Napoleon’s Grande Armée would stay for six years, because every Spanish corpse that fell to the ground became a new barricade. Immortalized by Goya’s paintings, the “Dos” and “Tres de Mayos” [see Appendix, Figure A, page 44], the war would see the birth of the “guerrilla” (“little war”).

We have no more need for the Inquisition (abolished by Joseph Bonaparte), says Goya in the Disasters. Denunciations, torture, strangulation, bodies chopped into pieces—it is now all done by the people themselves, bestialized by an unjust and absurd war!

Goya’s horror recalls the declaration of Abraham Lincoln’s General Sherman, who said, to the graduating class of the Military Academy of Michigan in 1879: “It is only those who have neither fired a shot, nor heard the shrieks and groans of the wounded, who cry aloud for blood, more vengeance, and more desolation. War is hell.”

After having reconstructed and engraved innumerable, unbearable deeds of Frenchmen (and Polish officers) against Spaniards, acts of men against women, of humans against humans, all behaving inhumanly, Goya tries to advance some kind of answer to the question, “Why?” He gives his answer in Plate 71, which has the caption, “Against the common good,” below a portrait of some
sort of Grand Inquisitor with bat-wings for ears! What does this have to do with the war? Plate 72, “The consequences,” shows a monster devouring the corpse of a man who resembles the figure in Plate 1 [See Appendix, Figure C, page 45]. The Beast-Man of Plate 71, becomes a total beast in Plate 72. This theme is restated in Plate 81, the “Fierce Monster,” where an ogre eats/vomits its human corpses. It is possible that some of these plates were done for the Caprichos, but removed because of their virulence; they certainly form a bridge to that series.

Is it war, then, that is the ultimate folly of the sleep of reason? That this “monstrous” subject—which is much more than a mere “subject,” as it encompasses the future of humanity—haunted Goya, is not a sign of mental illness, but the contrary!

In 1823, angered by the crushing, by the French Army under orders of the Congress of Vienna, of the last attempt to adopt the 1812 Constitution of Cadiz, Goya covers the beautiful landscapes and dancing giants he painted on the walls of the “Quinta dels Sordo,” his house in the outskirts of Madrid, with his “Pinturas negras” (“Black paintings”). Along with some 12,000 families of Spanish “ilustrados,” Goya went into exile in France.

His “Saturn devouring one of his sons”—Saturn being the Roman (Latin) name for the Greek Titan Cronos, associated with time (chronos)—expresses the ultimate outcome of the extreme logic of the oligarchy: Since we refuse to create a future for the coming generations, let’s prevent them from existing! [see Figure 28]

Conscious of that monstrosity, Goya told his friend Zapatar in a letter: “I’m not afraid of witches, hobgoblins, apparitions, boastful giants, knaves, or varlets, etc., nor indeed of any kind of beings, except of human beings” (February 1784).

It was this monster that haunted Goya, and which he fought; neither as a Don Quixote, nor as a Sancho Panza, but as a republican enlightened by the sources of Renaissance Christian humanism. It is up to us to honor his life and works, by putting the last Beast-Men of our time in the requisite cages!
Appendix

Goya and Christianity

Let us underline here, that if Goya had trouble with the Inquisition, it was precisely because he was a Christian humanist, as was the great Cervantes. In total opposition to his reputation as virulent religion-hater, many elements prove the fact that Goya, like his friend Jovellanos and other “ilustrados,” was a wholehearted Christian. According to some sources, Goya even started each letter he wrote with a cross.

For a long time, attentive observers

Figure A. Francisco Goya y Lucientes, “Tres de Mayo,” 1814. Napoleon grew more hated by the Spanish people every day he occupied Spain, but he faced no organized opposition. This changed when his troops picked people off the streets of Madrid at random for an all-night orgy of executions. Although his forces had been able to march into Spain almost without firing a shot, Napoleon now faced hand-to-hand combat with men, women, and even children. Goya is careful to show almost every type of emotion on the faces of the victims, but the executioners are faceless, anonymous, machine-like.

Figure B. Miguel Gamborino, engraving, 1813.
have identified the similarity of pose, arms in the air, of the standing man of the “Tres de Mayos” [SEE Figure A], a painting done in 1814 to commemorate the martyrs of 1808, and the pose of Christ on the cross. Here, it is the martyr, a simple citizen in a white shirt, who unobtrusively displays the stigmata on his hands. There is no longer any doubt that the composition is based on an engraving by Miguel Gamborino, done in 1813, of the execution of several clergymen in the Murviedro quarter of Madrid [SEE Figure B], Goya discreetly doing some honor to the priests and monks who fought for the nation. Others have identified the kneeling man of the introductory etching of the Disasters of War series, with the image of the Christ at Golgotha, the “secular version of the theme of the praying Christ in the garden of Gesthemane,” as the critic Hans Seldmayr puts it [SEE Figure C].

After all, Goya and his friend Martin Zapater, got their early education at the “Escuelas Pías,” religious schools founded by a courageous priest from Aragon, José de Calasanz (1557-1648).

Recall that Spain was one of the countries that had seen the most translations and editions of the works of Erasmus before they were banned by the Council of Trent in 1559. Cervantes himself was a pupil of the Erasmian Lopez de Hoyos, and Goya did two drawings after Erasmus’s portraits. Thus, it is not astonishing that there appeared in Spain a man like Calasanz, who, despite much opposition from the Vatican, battled for free public education for all, given in the vernacular—a real revolution in that period, when schooling took place exclusively in Latin.

Calasanz was a contemporary of Tommaso Campanella (1568-1639), author of the City of the Sun, who spent 20 years in jail for his opposition to the Inquisition. Calasanz and a certain number of religious schools took a stand in defense of Campanella’s friend Galileo against the Inquisition, without endorsing Galileo’s empiricist method, however. Goya, trained by the “piarists,” did a drawing of an unidentified bound man, with the caption, “for having discovered the movement of the Earth,” a clear reference to Galileo’s refusal to recant on the Earth’s movement—a physical principle first enunciated for the Renaissance by Cardinal Nicolaus of Cusa [SEE Figure D].

This might explain the great love for mankind that animated so many “ilustrados.” The enthusiastic initiative of Campomanes to teach literature to poor children when an adolescent himself, or the battle of Jovellanos to establish higher education in the Spanish language—all of this comes as an echo of the flame of this Christian humanism, slowly penetrating into the
Spanish church.

There is also that exceptional portrait, done by Goya, of Juan Antonio Llorente (1756-1823) [see Figure E], the former Secretary General of the Inquisition who denounced its evil practices in his *History of the Spanish Inquisition*, published when he was in exile in France in 1815, and against which Joseph de Maistre (1753-1821) seems to have written, as a response, his *Letters to a Russian Gentleman on the Spanish Inquisition* that same year. In any case, Goya retained a fond memory for his teacher “padre Joaquin,” and in 1819, he would paint the beautiful “Last Communion of San José de Calasanz” [see Figure F].

While drawing his famous etching in the *Caprichos*, “The sleep of reason produces monsters,” Goya may well have been thinking of a little saying of Calasanz, who liked to remark that, “the dissipated ecclesiastic is the joy of the devil.”

—KV

**FIGURE E.** Francisco Goya y Lucientes, “Portrait of Juan Antonio Llorente,” 1810-1812 (detail).

**FIGURE F.** Francisco Goya y Lucientes, “The Last Communion of José de Calasanz,” 1819. Commissioned by the Escolapians in Madrid, the painting commemorates the moment Calasanz, some 90 years old and close to death, insisted on rising from his deathbed to take Holy Communion before an audience of his pupils. For Calasanz, the “dissipated ecclesiastic is the joy of the devil.”
NOTES

1. For a full treatment of this subject, see William F. Wertz, Jr. and Cruz del Carmen Moreno de Cota, “Spain’s Carlos III and the American System,” Fidelio, Summer 2004 (Vol. XIII, No. 1-2).

2. After being paralyzed for six months, Goya became irretrievably deaf in 1793. Although symptoms of spatial-temporal dysfunction were observed beginning 1776, the thesis of poisoning cannot be dismissed, as it was very common at that time. Even the future king, Ferdinand VII, was accused of preparing the poisoning of his own mother, to gain the throne. In this period, other sympathizers of the American Revolution developed strange health problems: the untimely death of Mozart (1791), and the deafness of Beethoven (beginning 1798), are two such cases. On the other hand, both meningitis and toxification caused by intensive exposure to the white lead in oil painting, are not to be excluded. Yet another poison that killed many patients was bad doctors: Goya represented them as donkeys, as in Plate 40 of the Caprichos, “Of what evil will he die?”

3. Among the modern existentialists, for example, Charles Baudelaire shamelessly said that, “The great merit of Goya is the creation of a plausible unnatural [monstrousness],” while he considered his work, “a nightmare of unknown things, of fetuses boiled at the center of sabbaths, of old people in front of mirrors, and naked children”; André Malraux, more inspired on the subject, thought that Goya was mainly sensitive “in a nearly brutal fashion, to the demons and the terror within each of us”; Aldous Huxley expressed his morbid fascination, stating that, “Many engravings of Goya refer to strictly private events that take place at the obscure levels of the mind and their creator”, Théophile Gautier: “There exists especially a really fantastic engraving that is the most awful nightmare that we have dreamed: his title, ‘They are not yet leaving.’ It is terrifying, and Dante himself does not arrive at this level of suffocating terror; imagine a naked gloomy field above which hangs a cloud with the strange shape of a disembowelled crocodile, and then a big stone, a tombstone that a suffering meagre figure tries to uplift . . . .”

4. Paul Mantz, writing the article on “Goya” in an 1859 dictionary, says: “Goya painted as in a feverish delirium. He often treats the form with absolute disdain; this master, who seems happy with ugliness, cultivated a strong sentiment for female grace and the piquant attitudes of the beautiful girls of Spain. Whatever can be said, Goya, so errant, so crazy, so incomplete in his paintings, left behind a series of caricatures of great value.”


6. The only polemical drawings published during his lifetime were the Caprichos, printed in a dependency of the French Embassy in Madrid in 1799.


8. It is fairly well documented that pressure was placed on Louis XVI by the inner core of Louis XV’s private secret service (Le secret du Roi), and Lafayette’s immediate liaison officer Charles-François de Broglie (1719-1781) in particular. Gilles Perrault, Le secret du Roi (see Recommended Reading for publication information).

9. If von Steuben was crucial to the military training at Valley Forge, so too did the receipt of the money equivalent of five million pounds of war materiel help Washington win the decisive Battle of Saratoga in 1777. Half the funds came from the French and Spanish Bourbon kings, while the rest came from French and European sympathizers of the American cause. The ships of Rodrigue, Hortalez et Cie (Beaumarchais) sailed from Bordeaux, Le Havre, and Marseilles. In August 1779, some 2,000 Spanish troops under the command of Bernardo de Gálvez open a flank against the British in Louisiana. In 1781, at Yorktown, 6,000 insurgents led by Washington, supported by the French volunteers of Lafayette, faced 8,000 British troops under the direction of Cornwallis, until the arrival of the 5,000-man French expeditionary force of Rochambeau gave the victory to the Continental Army. The victory at Saratoga prepared the way for the later diplomatic recognition of the United States by France in 1783.

10. De Maistre letter from Moscow to Chevalier de Rossi, 1808, quoted in Evan S. Connell, Goya, A Life (New York: Counterpoint, 2004), p. 126. For more on de Maistre and the “Beast-Man,” see Children of Satan (Washington, D.C.: LaRouche in 2004, 2004). Nor is it astonishing that another Satanist, the English Pre-Raphaelite John Ruskin, allegedly the greatest art critic of his day, in a fit of moral hysteria, burned an entire set of Goya’s Caprichos in his fireplace, as a gesture against what he conceived to be Goya’s intellectual and moral ignobility.


15. It would be interesting in this regard to inquire into the visit of Beaumarchais to Spain in 1764. While in Madrid, Beaumarchais represented the important banking family Paris-Duverney, the financiers of Louis XV and Mme. de Pompadour. He met José Clavijo y Fajar, the science minister of Carlos III who worked with Alexander von Humboldt. His stay in Spain provided Beaumarchais with the material for the *Barber of Seville*, used by Rossini in his opera of the same name.

16. Goya owned 25 shares of the Banco de San Carlos. His presence at one of the meetings of the stockholders in February 1788 is documented.

17. Martin Zapater was treasurer and a member of the Aragonese Economic Society of Friends of the Country. The Duchess of Osuna directed the “Damas Junta,” women’s council, of the Economic Society of Friends of the Country in Madrid, and organized her own “tertulas” (intellectual soirées). She and the Duke of Osuna were Goya’s first patrons, and the Duke personally intervened to save Goya’s life when the circulation of the *Caprichos* was ordered stopped. The Osunas had a mansion in the suburb of Madrid called “El Capricho,” where literary and musical soirées were organized. For six years, the Duchess employed Joseph Haydn (1732-1809) to write music for her. It was she who commissioned Goya to paint a series of paintings illustrating literature dealing with witchcraft. One of them, now lost, featured the famous stone *Commendatore* Mozart used in his *Don Giovanni*. She also fought to stop the degradation of women in Spanish society, which put her in direct opposition to the Duchess of Alba. It is believed by some that it was during a visit to the home of the Alba family in southern Spain during December of 1792 that Goya may have been poisoned.

18. See Wertz and Moreno de Cota, *op. cit.*

19. Anti-Jewish legislation was first called for in the Fourth Lateran Council at Rome in 1215. Such legislation was never fully enforced in Spain because of powerful Jewish opposition, but the Cortes of Castile did approve of it in 1371, and later in 1405. The question erupted in 1391, in the worst series of massacres ever suffered by Jews in the peninsula. Over 4,000 were murdered in Seville alone; pogroms occurred in all the largest cities of Spain; the ghettos of Seville, Barcelona, Valencia, and Toledo were totally wiped out. Those who were not murdered, were compelled to accept baptism. Thus did the “conversos,” or “New Christians,” come into existence. They soon came to be distrusted even more than the Jews, as they were considered to be a fifth column within the body of the Church. From Henry Kamen, *The Spanish Inquisition* (New York: New American Library, 1965).–KK

20. The activity of the Inquisition was not always so intense. The last great ceremonial demonstration of its power was the immense “auto-da-fé” (“act of faith”) in the Plaza Mayor in Madrid in 1680. To open a celebration of his wedding, King Carlos II personally lit the stakes of 27 “judaisers” (“conversos” suspected of secretly practicing Judaism). Abolished by Joseph Bonaparte during the 1808-1814 interval of the French occupation, it was reestablished by Ferdinand VII, and later abolished for good in 1834.

21. A description of Pestalozzi’s educational reforms, which were championed by Wilhelm von Humboldt, can be found in Marianna Wertz, “Education and Character: The Classical Curriculum of Wilhelm von Humboldt,” *Fidelio*, Summer 1996 (Vol. V, No. 2). One of the geniuses to come out of these schools was the celebrated German geometer Jacob Steiner (1796-1863), father of synthetic geometry, and teacher of Bernhard Riemann.

22. See footnote 7.

23. Recent x-ray analysis of paintings now in the Prado in Madrid, as well as stratigraphic examinations, have shown that, with one exception, what is now visible are over-paints. Maurice and Jacqueline Guillaud mention joyous figures and landscapes painted over by Goya, or eventually by someone else. For example, underneath “Saturn,” stands a giant dancer with a leg raised, while Lacaçada, Goya’s young love, reposes her arm on a chimney. “The dog,” of which only the head is visible today, might have been one of the few details Goya refused to cover.

**Recommended Reading**


