Artpeace: Validating Power, Mobilising Resistance, and Imagining Emancipation

Oliver P. Richmond, *Department of Politics, University of Manchester, and School of Law and Government, Dublin City University*

Abstract

Art has apparently followed political power for much of history, while avoiding representations of social, subaltern, and political resistance, or experimentation with new approaches to emancipation. Less obviously, however, this article outlines how a creative synthesis of critique, politics, and representation has led to an evolving form of 'artpeace'. This concept appears to have been related to power and was thus limited and Eurocentric in the past, but more importantly it has also provided a platform for critical agency, resistance, and experimentation, with implications for the politics of peacemaking. This article outlines what this means for various strands of artpeace and their possible conceptual implications.

> *'Pax optima rerum'* **(**Peace is the greatest good)
>
> *'Pax optima rerum quas homini nouisse datum est, pax una triumphis innumeris potior…'* (peace is the best of things which it is given to man to know, a single peace is more powerful than countless triumphs). Silius Italicus*, Punica,* (25-101 AD)

Introduction

This critical-historical exploration outlines the early and visible symbiosis of art, power, peace, agency, and resistance. Art has followed political power for much of history, while erasing or marginalising representations of social, subaltern, and political resistance and experimentation with new approaches to emancipation. Yet, as this article outlines, the creative synthesis of critique, politics, and representation has led to an evolving form of 'artpeace'. It has been related to power and thus limited and Eurocentric in the past, but more importantly it has emerged from critical agency, resistance, and

experimentation with implications for the politics of peacemaking. This is why the symbiosis of aesthetics, resistant and critical agency, reform, and political changes lends substantial potential for peacemaking (Kerr, 2020).

The growing momentum of critical methodological innovation, which uncovers more detailed and complex understandings of emancipation, means that social agency and resistance has become more visible in the connection between art, peace, and order in conflict-affected societies. However, it remains marginal, rarely uncovered, preserved brought to the point of curation, or added to external collections, and still risks being erased by power. Yet, the critical convergence that the concept of artpeace represents has become consolidated, and is clearly meaningful to its proponents, even if its impact on peacemaking remains heavily constrained. There is clearly less erasure or marginalisation of artpeace over time, which indicates the critical potential for more development.

In the contemporary era, artistic engagements with peacemaking have become more common (Mitchell, Vincett, Hawksley and Culbertson 2020), as they began to debate and contest issues of social agency, ethics, and justice (Adorno, 2020; Rancière, 2006). The visual and performative 'spectacle' in peacemaking and political reform (Debord, 1994) has shifted from hegemony and the restoration of an unjust status quo (imperialism and authoritarianism, for example) to more substantive, critical and emancipatory contributions (Richmond, 2022). Visual, creative, and artistic performances, processes, artifacts, and dynamics have become associated with social mobilisation, and resistance, being open, dynamic, networked, insightful, wide-ranging, and less conditioned by disciplinary institutions and traditions. This hints at a dialogic engagement with the 'moral imagination' (Lederach, 2005) via artpeace. Its consideration offers the potential to enhance the ethical standing and legitimacy of peacemaking.

This article outlines, with reference to a number of arts-based sources (presented in footnotes via website links),[1] a general evolution and development in the aesthetico-political engagement with, and representation of, peace. It examines the connection of social and ethical claims for peace with artistic representation, and resistance to injustice and hegemony. What emerges from the marriage of arts and peace, represents a radical and emancipatory synthesis for artpeace. Firstly, this article outlines some

[1] I have used this method, rather than direct illustrations in the text, because copyright costs for most are prohibitive.

key dynamics in the obscure history of peace art, offering an exploratory conceptual framework for its evolution and symbiotic relationship with critical agency, resistance, and emancipatory thinking (despite its concurrent harnessing by state and elite power). It then outlines the concept of artpeace as a basis for critical engagement in contemporary peace and conflict studies and examines its evolution and implications.

Discernible Dynamics in the Relationship Between Peace, Politics, and Art

Battles, Monarchs, Tradition, Victory, and Atrocities

Understandings of the development of world history, of politics, society, and economy, are all informed by crucial moments in history—often battles or wars won or lost. Violence also dominates media, aesthetics, and everyday representations, emphasising the value of sacrifice, the potential of war, as well as its costs, normally from an elite, state, or imperial perspective (Bevan, 2015). The state or empire has often harnessed the arts for propaganda purposes with respect to war (Adorno and Horkheimer, 2002: Groys, 2008). World War I and II memorials are common in city centres, churches, and shrines around the world (King, 1998). Most capitals have a 'tomb of the unknown soldier', an eternal flame, and tributes for the heroes who laid down their lives in order to found or save their country, to fight for justice and equality, against (but sometimes supporting) imperialism, fascism, totalitarianism, predation, nationalism, and discrimination. Often, in such contexts it is argued that wars were fought for peace. War cemeteries, from long forgotten wars and battles are common around the world, even in the most isolated places: they often contain the bodies of people from far away, who often fought in wars that were relatively distant to their own everyday lives and contexts. Rarely are there memorials to those more indirectly caught up in wars and violence, principally women and children, directly or indirectly (though this has become a growing trend more recently). Even less likely are commemorations of peace treaties, processes, peacekeeping, or peacebuilding.

Peace in an ethico-political sense has thus been rarely celebrated, noted, or described, except in passing, or in juxtaposition with geopolitical, elite, or state violence, a celebration of glory, or as a depiction of the horrors of violence. Depictions of the higher dynamics of peace—in parallel to those of

often repeated virtues of war—are rarely referred to. The everyday, state, and international dimensions of peace have proven difficult to capture, or artists find it uninteresting, undepictable, or even unpopular: more plausibly, such representations are easily erased by power actors and their narratives. On the one hand it is clear that aesthetic representations of peace, and the support of peace, have been a recurrent interest for some artists, although on the other hand many surviving representations have followed predictable and relatively limited themes which have supported power, militarism, empires, and states.

Yet, peace has been documented as a key part of human history, politics and relations from very early on, as the early Kadesh peace treaty illustrates, as an important part of power-relations.[2] Its early stages indicated a limited artistic and creative record and may have reflected a disinterest on the part of elites in general in peace as distinct from war, or the elusive, empathetic qualities of a social peace. Elites may also have represented an attempt to reduce and censor the wider significance of peace from view to preserve the status quo—and the utility of war—and its associated power relations.

Memorials often underline how violence is always tragic, yet more creative, critical, and radical representations challenge systems of politics and representation. They tend to intimate that wars can never really be 'won' without immense sacrifice at best, especially in the relational sense of international relations, or in the everyday sense of the local context. Social and cultural reactions to the tragedy of World War I are a case in point, even as elite actors battled over achieving victory (Winter, 2014). Peace has been elusive and tragic, as Keynes famously warned (Keynes, 1919), based upon new waves of domination, boundary setting, establishing new hegemonies, even if it is significant in its everyday senses. An unnuanced 'victor's peace' (Richmond, 2005) has all too often been celebrated aesthetically.

Resistance, Rights, Empathy, and Subaltern Contributions

From Hiroshima to the Somme, from the Killing Fields of Cambodia to the genocide church in Ntarama, Rwanda, artistic and stylised, visual representations and memorials that question and resist war and conflict are increasingly commonplace (Bourke, 2017). They have become part of our

[2] *Kadesh Treaty* (1269 BC). Istanbul Archaeological Museum, Turkey.

everyday lived environment. They enable us to navigate around the seminal crises that mark the history of empire, and later, ideology and the state, as well as the development of social agency, resistance, critique, civil society (Bevan, 2015; Richmond, 2011b). They have provided a platform, space, and creative or critical modes for dealing with issues ranging from marginalisation and injustice, to reconciliation, disarmament, identity, and commemoration (Mitchell et al, 2020), as well as governance (local and global), regardless of how little formal power participants or its exponents may have. The arts have perhaps been conducive to such critical dynamics because they have connected 'subaltern' resistance and agency (Chandra, 2015) (critical agency that is generally marginalised by identity, gender, class, and nationality) to a wider social and global consciousness. This points to civil or perhaps global civil society, which is mostly anti-war and supports the wide proscription of violence in its multiple forms.

The imprint on global consciousness of artpeace as a resistance mode to broad forms of violence has been significant given that the more formal history of the state and international relations is mainly focussed on war, conquest, hegemony, and governmentality. However, in recent times the association between peace and the arts has emphasised more subaltern modes of critique partly because of the rejection of the liberal/neoliberal peace framework more widely (Lipschutz, 1998: 5), and because of the recent return of multi-polarity at the geopolitical level (Mearsheimer, 2019: 7), and the rise of populism and authoritarianism. These new modes are engaging with complex and very entrenched, often hidden power structures in specific localities (such as Colombia, the Balkans, Syria, DRC, or Sri Lanka)[3] and localised issues. They may point to issues only indirectly associated with violence (for example, authoritarianism, quasi-liberal states, capitalism, social class, and related stratifications) as well as highlighting matters related to identity, environmentalism, historical and distributive justice, such as colonialism, land appropriation, and slavery.

Critical currents in the arts tend to be more reflective, creative, emotionally sensitive, and culturally and socially attuned, and forward looking (Mitchell et al, 2020). In other words, they are able to identity inequality and injustice from below, hidden by the political structures of

[3] See the AHRC research project, *The Art of Peace*, University of Manchester, 2018-2022: https://sites.manchester.ac.uk/the-art-of-peace/home/about/research/

society, the state, and the international system. The arts detect undercurrents and perhaps communicate them, though less tangibly than formal systems of codification (Premaratna and Bleiker, 2016). For example, Hans Holbein's painting, *The Ambassadors* (1533), clearly depicts the power and mastery of diplomacy. Yet it also more obliquely suggests it was linked with death rather than peace through the presence of an anamorphic skull, which can only be seen from an oblique perspective (Constantinou, 1994).[4] Thus, often the arts in relation to war and peace point to the limitations of political frameworks of agency based on power-relations, which effectively preserve war as a tool, structural violence, and inequality. However, artistic endeavour often hints at an alternative, critical vanguard of peace development from a social perspective, even if its engagement is sparse and simplistic in aesthetic terms compared to war.

The more critical undercurrents in artpeace initially foregrounded the beauty, as well as loss, sorrow, and horror—the contradictions of peace and war—across multiple dimensions, yet rarely saw peacemaking as a process that engendered mobilised resistant and critical, marginalised agency. Rather than glorifying power, this latter strategy—when it emerged—promised to open up emotional, relational, and solidarity elements. It often idealised the endpoint of peace and ignored the processes of peacemaking. However, it may point to cooperation and higher levels of co-existence, and highlights the longer-term political, social, and cultural dramas related to war and peace in IR, rather than merely the brutish immediacy of violence and power (Bleiker, 2017).

This is especially so given the role of critique and emancipatory thinking in political and social commentary and in representing and imagining better modes of being for societies in general (Jakopovich, 2019). The harder aesthetics of war often captured popular imagination, historically at least, and so have seemingly been more successfully translated into power than the aesthetics of peace. The latter often seem ethically correct from a critical perspective that focuses on the positionality of the weak, hidden, and marginalised and the subsequent of emancipatory agency, and related tactics and strategies of resistance (Scott, 1990: Richmond, 2011a; Vinthagen, 2015; Lilja, 2022). Consequently, such critical agency (Richmond, 2011b) is also thoroughly suppressed and marginalised (Sharp, 1973), although there has been a strong movement to valourise the 'higher' ethics and

[4] Hans Holbein (1533). *The Ambassadors*. National Gallery, London.

aesthetics of war and heroism throughout history, as with just war theory (Walzer, 1977). The latter amounts to micro blockages or more substantial strategic blockages to radical imaginaries and their relationship with creative critical agency, social movements, and emancipatory knowledge (Pogodda, Richmond and Visoka, 2022).

Yet the critical, radical undercurrents and imaginaries of peace sometimes present in aesthetic representations now appear to have more social traction in the long term than the oft repeated cul-de-sacs of imperialism, nationalism, and fascism (however 'heroic' they may initially appear). They reflect the age-old struggle between disciplinary power and governmentality, emancipatory agency and resistance, and knowledge (Foucault, 1997: 82). The advances that have been made in translating subaltern claims for security, freedom, rights, justice, and sustainability—step by step across a range of historical artifacts—into practical political life in the modern world, were thus often imagined first, created, and then reinforced across society (and the global order) through the arts, following undercurrents, resistance, and innovation in society (Beales, 1931; Spivak, 2000). Through various media, such aesthetic thinking reached communities widely and deeply, often through undercurrents that may have represented more political legitimacy than more obvious narratives about and exercises of unequal power.

Such chinks or breakthroughs allowed more critical challenges, revolutionary learning, and creative responses to emerge in several stages of the development of a relationship between peace and art (see Table 1 below). These often subaltern-style interventions have had world changing impacts over the very long term, perhaps because of the emotive and cultural power and weight they represent, even if they carry little direct, structural, or governmental forms of power. Many such breakthroughs emerged from social, creative, and radical movements at grass roots levels (Apostolopoulou et al, 2022: 146). They have influenced how the arts reflect and interpret the world, how history is memorialised, how political order is legitimated formally and within society (more to the point within excluded groups), and how peace is maintained, stabilised, rebuilt, and developed further (Mitchell et al, 2020).

The Historical Evolution of Artpeace

As indicated in the previous section and as the following examples endeavour to illustrate, the arts have offered a range of openings for peace: contesting

and resisting the consolidation of arbitrary power in mass consciousness, and the development of radical, creative, and experimental, ideas through media designed to resist and bypass hegemonic power. As artpeace developed, it offered the possibility of: first, highlighting violence and injustice; second, appealing to human emotions for solidarity, empathy, cooperation, and to commemorate; third, advocating with and educating different audiences on matters of rights, justice, sustainability across generations and across borders or locations as a precursor to resistance, mobilisation, and the construction of wider networks of critical agency; fourth, using a common language of aesthetic sensibilities to support reconciliation and pluralism (i.e. in later stages).

Thus, the emergent concept of artpeace is flexible, wide-ranging, creative, and critical, mobile, and often emerges from underground or subaltern groups and their networks, which can build long term community links and consensus. It has historically been networked and has paradoxically been available to powerful actors when they needed symbolic capital for peacemaking or propaganda. Artpeace may cut across boundaries via a common language which is non-verbal. It may offer new narratives for mobilisation, calm for reflection, group safety, conflict avoidance, accessibility for the marginal to develop platforms for growth, as well as the potential for elites to understand the experiences of the marginal (depending on the nature of the arts in question). It offers critical social legitimacy through relationality that politics often emulates in its contracts, but often cannot reach because elites are more power-driven than consensus based (Bailey, n.d).[5]

Underlying this progressive path are the more reductive uses that states, empires, and elites have put the arts to in early stages, which have echoed onwards throughout contemporary eras, acting as both a foundation of political order and stability, and obstacles to progress and political change. Indeed, the overwhelming capacity of discursive and state power, when united, can bend critical and challenging representations for peace, justice, and emancipation, backwards towards founding narratives associated with nationalism, the state, and empire (as with Delacroix's work, mentioned below).[6]

---

[5] See various outcomes of the Art of Peace, AHRC research project at the University of Manchester (2018-2021) amongst others.

[6] Eugene Delacroix (1830). *Liberty Leading the People*. Louvre, Paris.

The Early Stages of Artpeace: The Imperial, Nationalist, and Conservative Phase

Building an aesthetics of peace into political and economic systems and settlements has long been an implausible task, given that they have mostly all been founded through clashes of power, war, domination, extraction, and hegemony: in its earliest stages, the arts were deployed as validating baubles, if at all. Yet it was also the first step towards making such systems socially responsive and accountable in the later stages. However, historical sources show that very small steps towards peace often utilised, or even depended upon, critical and subaltern modes of representation that communicated such needs deeply with their audiences.

For example, the Kadesh Treaty represented a classic stage one type of example of politics and arts. It ended the Battle of Kadesh between Ramesses II's Egypt and the Hittites of Muwatalli II in around 1274 BC. This battle is thought to be the largest chariot battle ever fought, involving perhaps 5,000 chariots. The peace was made via a treaty in around 1258 BC. A clay copy of the written treaty—itself now an artifact—survives in the Istanbul Archaeological Museum. A replica is on display at the headquarters of the United Nations, and an Egyptian version survives on papyrus. It has become one of a few global symbols of peace.

Early forms of peace, as evidenced by this treaty, were determined by war, power, and elite interests, rather than justice or rights at this early stage; they were shaped by violence more than anything else. Yet, peace also required documenting and communicating to allcomers, preserved for eternity on stone, to capture the valuable moment that peace was made and to inscribe and guarantee the new political order and its boundaries. Such political orders were generally built on hegemony and coercion, colonialism, and imperialism, even if they removed overt violence and communicated from a platform of power and domination to 'lower' social orders. Representing peace in concrete and also emotive ways governed the experience of peace amongst the population, allowing leaders to add to its permanence through forms of communication that worked upon multiple levels, beyond the diplomatic table where powerful and elite signatories of any treaty had once gathered (i.e. drawn on, or written in stone, literally). This elite-dominated, instrumentalised form of the arts, placing it at the service of power, represented perhaps the longest stage in the history of the relationship between peace and the arts, and it continues to form the

bedrock of later stages of what has become a substantial international peace architecture (Richmond, 2022).

The extent of the prevalence of indirect and direct violence in the history of international, domestic, political, social, and economic relations and systems was rarely comprehended by their victims until it was too late. It was and often remains widely accepted that peace is 'all other times, except war' to quote Thomas Hobbes (1642, 1651). The overwhelming dominance of different forms of media, expression, and aesthetics by depictions of violence and their aftermath represents a self-fulfilling drama—and a censorship of the possibilities for peace. It might be useful to consider how such a dominant 'print capitalism' (Anderson, 1991: 224) associated with violent imperial and state mythologies emerged. The result was the elevation of war and power in thought, politics, society, and aesthetics, over peace to achieve that which Augustine called the 'tranquillity of order' (Augustine, 1993: 690-691). This might be seen in the framework of riot control, pacification, and therapeutic politics, however (Pugh, 2005). This compromise is reflected in the lack of nuanced politico-aesthetic reflection in the early stages of artpeace.

When further conceptual evolution emerged, however, it advanced relatively rapidly, taking in the scope of emancipatory thinking from the Classics to contemporary times. This process of development seemed to increasingly hope for the power of the state and international political economy to become more aligned with the anti-war and anti-violence sentiments of more radical peace representations, often drawing on the early classical lineage of Plato, Aristotle, Thucydides, Cicero, or Augustine, as with much else in the wider remit of the Humanities (Boucher and Kelly, 2003; Brown, Nardin, and Rengger, 2002).

Representations of a desire for something more than war—or a form of peace—were becoming clearer. Thus, contra Henry Maine, peace was not a 'modern invention' but an evolving concept in the history of world politics, mirroring new ethical and scientific advances (Maine, 1888: 8; Kustermans, 2018: 57-88). Peace representations received growing attention in a world dominated by imperial and extractive rationalities, and later one dominated by fascism, nationalism, and capitalism. Yet, apart from a few pacifist communities (Fabbro, 1978: 67-83), or countries with demilitarised constitutional orders (such as modern Germany, Japan, or Costa Rica), the rationality of post-war politics was predicated on the controlled use violence, related to territoriality and sovereignty, the related search for domination,

profit, leadership, and heroism, and to reward sacrifice. The tragic, cathartic Realist drama of the twentieth century led inevitably to peace becoming all the more complex, requiring a broader range of disciplinary engagements.

Towards a More Enlighted Engagement: Cosmopolitan Discovery and Awakening

The Enlightenment helped develop platforms for the earliest clearly political representations of peace to incorporate both a higher thematic symbolism as well as more everyday depictions. For example, Lorenzetti, a Renaissance artist, painted a series of frescoes on the walls of the Hall of the Peace[7] (Sala della Pace) in the Palazzo Pubblico of Siena from 1338-40. *The Effects of Good Government on Town and Country* represented a rare and early characterisation of what peace may mean beyond non-violence, reiterating the classical lineage of the relationship between certain forms of 'good' government, and peace, order, and justice (i.e., the good life). His work set the scene for a significant break with early stages. It proclaimed the importance and benefits of peace by depicting life in a well-ordered and prosperous city, while in a related picture, *Allegory of Bad Government*, the horrors of destruction and disease caused by war were portrayed in the same town by way of comparison. This was not merely an ethical commentary on immediate acts of war, or a representation of a victor's peace, but constituted a substantial politico-ethical reflection upon the relationship between peace and war with the longer-term nature of political order.

A Rubens piece, *Minerva Protects Pax from Mars* (1629-30),[8] illustrated a further dimension to this aesthetic-political and diplomatic evolution. This painting illustrated Rubens' hopes for peace between England and Spain even as war loomed, which he, in his role as envoy to Philip IV of Spain, was attempting through negotiation to prevent. The painting depicted the sublime and elevated nature of the gods' relation to peace, as well as symbols of the more mundane everyday aspects of peace. It also became a mechanism for peacemaking itself. Pax (peace) was represented by the goddess of the earth, who was sharing her resources while Minerva, goddess of wisdom,

---

[7] Lorenzetti (1338-40). *Allegory of Good Government: Effects of Good Government in the City*,. Frescos. Palazzo Publico, Siena, Italy.

[8] Peter Paul Rubens (1629-30). *Minerva protects Pax from Mars* ('Peace and War'), National Gallery, London.

drove away Mars, the god of war. The picture was presented to Charles I of England as a gift to advocate for peace. It consolidated the idea that leaders had a responsibility to both god and the state not to follow naked self-interest and to deploy the mechanisms of war, but to follow the wisdom of cooperation and trust.

The Lorenzetti and the Rubens paintings revolved around the juxtaposition of peace and war, illustrating peace's higher and everyday qualities, both advocating for peace and warning against war. Both hoped to have a diplomatic and political effect following the interests of elites, nobles, church, as well as—to some extent more than had been usual at this time—representing the views of society, intellectuals, and artists. They were engaging with the possibility of exercising agency to prevent war, save lives, and achieve political change. Both also illustrated the difficulties of depicting peace in the flamboyant or emotive manner that wars are often represented by. After a ceasefire or the signing of an agreement, peace tended to be banal and everyday, and hard to detect, though its processes were now coming to be seen as depending on elite agency, government, as well as on social activism. Even in these attempts at its depiction, the threat of war or violence becomes their main method through which peace gains its aesthetico-political life, through the mechanism of contrast. Both paintings ultimately provided different avenues (divinity or more earthly politics) towards the social and elite proscription of violence, pointing to the role of social and cultural platforms, new dynamics of agency and mobilisation, and new methods of resistance. There was an early sense of the possibility in peacemaking as opposed to the determinism of war.

The repetition of the stereotypes of horror and bravery associated with glory and power, versus such more marginal possibilities, meant that violence or a victor's peace remained the dominant motif during stage three. It had by now gained a new life that translated into the exceptionalism of empire and the state, summed up in Weber's famous dictum about the state's monopoly over violence (Weber, 2015). From this understanding, peace continued to be shorn of its wider, aesthetic, emotional, and ethical potential, remaining a narrowly conceived artefact or rarity, an outcome of power-backed war, formed by force relations rather than the emancipatory imagination harnessed to human potential. Art that turned in the direction of power was rapidly discredited, however, for wider society, opening the way for more radical ethic, which depended on an emerging cosmopolitan, social justice-oriented, critical, and resistant forms of agency. These were soon to

become inherent in artpeace, and indeed it was becoming clearer that the journey from war to peace required resistance—raising the issue of in what form?

The efforts of Lorenzetti and Rubens to offer peace as an elite aesthetico-political agenda may have also opened the way for subaltern advocacy and for further explorations of the socio-political potential of peace. This was set against the broader foil of the failings of power. In other words, power had shaped rather than followed society, art, and aesthetics, although there was also growing evidence that power, state, and empire were socially constructed, even at the grand scale indicated in such depictions. This realisation gave substantial agency to artpeace approaches and social actors, and a hitherto little understood capacity to shape politics. The next two centuries were to host an epic aesthetic-political battle over the forces of imperialism, fascism, nationalism, and the state (which ultimately was to lead to a nuclear standoff during the Cold War), on view in many state art galleries around the world. In this context, subaltern critical agency began to cohere around the expansion of rights and related issues like disarmament (notably brought together by the Greenham Common campaign of the 1980s) and began to develop new methods of resistance (Roberts and Garton Ash, 2009).

Into the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries: Revolution, Resistance, and Rethinking

Artpeace was often represented by horror and emotion, and an assumption that it meant the opposite of death, destruction, injustice, and arbitrariness (see for example, *The Apotheosis of War* by Vasily Vereshchagin, also mentioned below).[9] In the high imperial, and the later fascist phases, of the 19th and 20th centuries, the focus tended to be on the horror of violence for a radical audience, or the glory and honour that war may represent for a conservative audience more taken with motifs of power, nationalism, heroism, stratification, restoration and counter-revolution. Artpeace was still generally connected to Augustinian notions of 'just war' as early stages inferred, where war was justified to protect a 'higher' political order (empire, state, and elites) and to further its ambitions for itself against others (Guthrie and Quinlan, 2007). More sophisticated depictions of peace remained something of a rarity, and the workings of the processes by which peace (even as a limited negative peace inherent in the balance of power) was arrived at

[9] Vasily Vereshchagin (1871). *The Apotheosis of War.* Tretyakov Gallery, Moscow.

were difficult to depict. The ease in depicting war placed its representations in the general terrain of propaganda: to glorify its relationship with individual heroism or to celebrate or disguise imperialism and nationalism. References to peace were often exploited to try to legitimate war in such guises, as with De Neuville's *Defence of Rorke's Drift*, which heroized the British defence of their colonial garrison against enormous numbers of Zulus, during the Anglo-Zulu War of 1879.[10]

There was now a turning point, however, where new forms of resistance became possible and consequently artpeace expanded its range. This fork in the road was evident in Delacroix's *Liberty Leading the People*, which celebrated the goals of the French Revolution and its aim of liberty, but also illustrated the sacrifices it entailed.[11] This painting commemorated the July Revolution of 1830, which toppled Charles X. Liberty, represented by a woman holding the *tricolore* flag and a gun and leading the people forward, echoing the French Revolution of 1879 and its goals. Using what has also nationalist iconography, revolutionary violence was offered as a legitimate mechanism to achieve liberty and a resurgent nation. This was to be an area of contestation for peace throughout this period, whether through just war, revolution and resistance to oppression, or later forms of humanitarian intervention. This argument illustrated that peace was subject to power, but that it was also determined by rights claims made by the masses, as well as their experimentations with political agency and goals. It connected peace to a larger project aimed at liberty, equality, and justice, though social justice was corralled into a reformed state project: nationalism would become something of a contradiction during the 20th Century.

What was significant by this stage in the development of what is now more clearly 'artpeace' was that peace was now something that could be claimed through the exercise of emancipatory agency by subaltern actors, from below. These very actors, previously ignored, were now driving history, often through small-scale and non-violent forms of resistance (but also increasingly via the mechanism of revolutionary violence) (Ackerman and DuVall, 2000; Jakopovich, 2019; Roberts and Garton Ash, 2009) across a range of terrains of human activities: from politics to the arts. Suddenly, the powerless (in Delacroix's context, the Third Estate) had representational, if

[10] Adolph Alphonse de Neuville, (1880). *Defence of Rorke's Drift*. New South Wales Art Gallery.

[11] Eugene Delacroix (1830). *Liberty Leading the People*, Louvre, Paris.

not practical, leverage in the fundamental terrain of politics and international relations, about the nature of political order. The contested, age-old pairing of peace with war driven by elite power relations and cemented by the state and empire was weakening, and social agency was now being depicted in the context of struggles against the mechanisms of war and power, even if they were again soon deflected into nationalistic or imperial enterprises. This trend also revived the age-old problem of whether violence was justified in the name of peace if there was a just cause (and who determined any such causes)? There were increasingly subtle and emotive references to explicit justifications for such agency, lying in opposition to violence and war, discrimination, racism, and imperialism, and in support of more complex forms of justice. Revolutionary or emancipatory violence lurked in the background of such claims, just as violence lurked in the foreground of imperialism, the authoritarian state, and other forms of oppressive hegemony.

Vasily Vereshchagin's painting, *The Apotheosis of War,* is thought to be one of the earliest explicitly pacifist paintings.[12] It adopted the typical strategy of graphically displaying the horrors of violence pioneered by the likes of Goya, rather than depicting the pleasures of peace as with Lorenzetti, or offering liberty as a peace worth fighting for as with Delacroix. This painting was inspired by the horrors associated with the Russo-Turkish War from 1877-78. In this desolate picture there is no hint of hope or of a cause that justifies the violence portrayed or any attempt to produce empathy for its subjects (portrayed merely as objects). Its pacifist message is simply that there cannot be a limited form of peace derived from violence. Peace art had until this point avoided such a stark rejection of violence, but the expanded platform that was now emerging allowed for more radical, non-violent demands to arise. These were being disseminated in an increasingly connected world as fundamental critiques of the way politics had previously been organised.

Artpeace still lacked a constructive vision for the most part, however. When it did endeavour to go beyond war, it often had an unexpectedly large impact, as was the case with Goya's *Execution* or later, Picasso's *Guernica*.[13] Depicting the horror of violence was increasingly being seen as a subversive

[12] Vasily Vereshchagin, *Op. Cit.*

[13] See https://www.pablopicasso.org/guernica.jsp:https://www.khanacademy.org/humanities/becoming-modern/romanticism/romanticism-in-spain/a/goya-third-of-may-1808

protest against stratified political power and a foil for subsequent, though still vague, calls for peace (as with works by Goya, and later Picasso or Kollowitz).[14] The more graphic the depiction of violence, of futility and loss, the more it pointed to perhaps unspoken alternatives with consequences for the nation, the state, and humanity in general. This reflected the growing swell of public opinion and its heightened capacity to influence politics at 'ripe' moments since the start of the 19th Century (and to be completely ignored when geopolitics dominated, such as in 1914).

Indeed, artpeace still appeared, even in this more sophisticated stage, to depend on the sponsorship of, or influences on, the artist: thus it balanced towards power, glory, and honour. However, it was also more clearly beginning to represent and preserve a humanist, critical commentary. As in Goya's piece, *The Third of May,* victimhood, even potential innocence, may be used as a mechanism to underline the injustice of violence and war. So, while the arts may represent and disseminate the architecture of power and the state of exception that allows the monopoly of violence (Agamben, 2005), artpeace was now directly challenging hegemony as underground movements became aware of a path towards rights and democracy as a standard by which to judge power and violence. The arts were more clearly challenging violence from a subaltern perspective, echoing and amplifying historical undercurrents pertaining to the proscription of violence and the expectation or right for a good life, which required the reimagining of political order. This impulse travelled along the networks that disseminated arts and rights thinking, which were also expanded during industrialisation and the imperial era, from letter writing and small, local meetings, workshops, displays, and exhibitions, to large-scale conferences and international campaigning as well as mechanisms of social and political resistance (Randle, 1994). These dynamics perhaps were to culminate (at least before the contemporary digital era) with Picasso's *Guernica*, and its 20th Century travels and travails (Hensbergen, 2005).

Radical Steps

Increasingly, shocking viewers into confronting the dangers of using violence was increasingly problematic if it only supported a political system or form

[14] Francisco de Goya (1814). *The Third of May, 1808: The Execution of the Defenders of Madrid,* Museo del Prado, Madrid, Spain: Kathe Kollwittz (1924). *Never Again War,* Käthe Kollwitz Museum, Köln: Pablo Picasso (1937). *Guernica*, 1937, Museo Reina Sofía, Madrid.

of peace settlement acceptable to power. Until this stage, art had normally been coopted into imperial or nationalist projects of war, rather than emancipatory collective action and resistance; it had constantly flirted with powerful propaganda, or artists had been dependent on power, or unaware of their own underlying assumptions. Representation was dominated by power, with only small corners left available for critical challenges. By this point, however, peace was also slowly mobilised by art at a more residual level, compared to the elite academic texts of the Enlightenment, or the grandiose paintings of Rubens. By the early Twentieth Century, the connections between art, protest against war, the exposure of war's relationship with iniquitous forms of power, and advocacy for peace, as well as intimations of its potential complexity, had been consolidated. A more substantial stage was emerging, which foregrounded subaltern agency in the marriage between art, politics, agency, resistance, and peace.

This explosive convergence was present in one of the most famous art movements of the early twentieth century. Dadaism cannot but be seen as a key moment, and emerged at a time of great stress and change in the period during and after World War One. It began in Zürich—'the peaceful dead centre of the war' as Hans Richter, a leading exponent wrote—at the Cabaret Voltaire and spread to Paris, Berlin, and New York (Richter, 1965: 7). Members of this avowedly anti-war movement were appalled by WWI. Dadaism was an aesthetic and anarchistic representation of the human and political challenge, not just of rebuilding Europe after WWI, but also of constructing a peace that would be self-sustaining and not reliant on the violence that was materially or aesthetically built into custom, institutions, and conservative representation of 'naturalistic' political orders such as monarchy, authoritarianism, militarism, or the global political order (Richter, 1965).

It also consolidated the radical, creative energy and insight that the arts offered for a form of peace that was relevant to society, rather than merely celebrating yet another elite victory. For example, Hannah Hoch's collage from 1919, *Cut with the Kitchen Knife Through the First Epoch of the Weimar Beer-Belly Culture*,[15] portrayed war as self-destructive chaos that would debase humanity, rather than creating peace. However, the methodology of

[15] See https://www.khanacademy.org/humanities/art-1010/dada-and-surrealism/dada2/a/hannah-hoch-cut-with-the-kitchen-knife-dada-through-the-last-weimar-beer-belly-cultural-epoch-of-germany

such work suggested an awareness of the potential of transversal networks, relationality, and of social power, which connected to peace formation from below as well to social resistance (Richmond, 2011a, 2016), which were by then growing amongst populations more aware of their status and rights (Cortright, 2008: 25-44).

However, this and similar developments in artpeace represented a sharp break with the previous, conservative, and complacent sense that war and the 'higher' representational ethics of arts were comfortably aligned. Art was now challenging power and disseminating scientific thought about progress and the need for radical social and political change. A revolution was required, and it would not be denied. Tentative engagements with the social conditions of peace and justice could no longer be acceptable if the arts were to represent more than a tool of power, push back boundaries and hierarchies, promote solidarity, empathy, and new networks of political creativity.

Artpeace Radicalism and WWII

Though emancipatory notions of politics were coming to the fore in artpeace, artists still normally eschewed dangerous confrontation for more empathic and subtle modes of engagement that were perhaps less risky, during this period of heightened ideology. Those associated with peace movements, or at least with resistance to war, also often portrayed a sensitivity to issues such as identity, discrimination, property, and gender inequality as representing negative stratifications (as opposed to historical, conservative arguments which tended to see them as important frameworks for a social Darwinist world). For example, Kathe Kollwittz, a Polish artist who dealt in particular with women as subjects for her art, illustrated the impact of war on women but in particular their agency against war in her image, *Never Again War.*[16]

Similarly, the level of sectarianism, discrimination, and racism often evident in war was represented in the painting by a German Jewish artist in the period leading up to WWII. Felix Nussbaum was killed at Auschwitz in 1944, and his painting *The Pearls* is widely regarded as one of his most important.[17] It shows a Madonna and Child image super-imposed over a battle scene, offering a complex anti-war protest working on several different

[16] See https://www.kollwitz.de/en/never-again-war-kn-205

[17] Felix Nussbaum (1938). *The Pearls*: http://www.painting-analysis.com/pearls.htm

levels (especially if the viewer knows anything about the painter's biographical details and context).

Picasso's *Guernica* famously attempted to combine many of the motifs of peace art, including Dadaist confrontation. It was painted for the 1937 Exposition held in Paris,[18] and portrayed the suffering of the small Basque town of Guernica which was attacked by the Luftwaffe in April 1937. Its focus on suffering in its ordinary, everyday context, caused by a cynical, surprise air attack against innocent civilians, was underpinned by allusions to long standing Spanish myths of survival and power. It brought together radical epistemic-aesthetic innovations in modernity: artistic experimentalism with radical political challenges to fascism and the violence it valourised, as all as emotional, social appeals for solidarity and empathy. It became a powerful symbol of the international and transnational peace movement during and after WWII, becoming associated with a number of different anti-war campaigns, including against the Vietnam War.

The remarkable transversality of these movements—ordinary, powerless, global networks of people opposing total war as a political tool, along with all the power it engendered, and proposing various alternatives—were to become perhaps defining features of the post-war world. This was the basis for another step in the artpeace evolution. *Guernica* spent most of its life at the Museum of Modern Art in New York before it was returned to a newly democratic Spain in the 1980s, in accordance with the wishes expressed by Picasso in his will. Basques have been calling for its relocation from Madrid to Bilbao ever since, as a symbol of the suffering the Basque country has endured and the peace it now hopes for.

Picasso also produced the most well-known emblem for contemporary peace movements, drawing on a common historical metaphor. His *Dove* from 1949 is now widely recognised in many different guises.[19] It made no reference to violence but offered a globally resonant symbol through an allusion to a more environmental, 'commons' perspective of peace at a time in the Cold War when social movements were beginning to mobilise in the East and the West (Goedde, 2019: 43-4). He also composed several other peace images that focussed on symbolising peace independently.[20] Also

[18] Pablo Picasso (1937).

[19] Pablo Picasso (1949). *Dove*, https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/picasso-dove-p11366

[20] Picasso, *The Face of Peace,* date unknown (possibly 1950): Picasso, *The Dove*

around this time, his creation *War and Peace* was painted onto the walls of a chapel in Vallauris in France during a period sometimes referred to as "the summer of War and Peace". It depicted "war" as a tank and a figure with a bloody sword, a basket of bacteria, and a sack of skulls. These were opposed by a 'peace fighter' carrying a shield with a dove on it, and by a child ploughing the sea, drawn by a winged horse.[21] His support and recognition of peace movements both endorsed and heightened the transnational and transversal 'rights' revolution that emerged after WWII, which challenged war and uncovered structural forms of violence (Moyn, 2019).

New possibilities

The evolving depiction of artpeace and its relationship variously with power, hegemony, domination, imperialism, totalitarianism, authoritarianism, territory, heroism, tragedy, and inequality, as well as with balance, justice, and sustainability, was now gathering pace in a variety of different media. Late in the century the sophistication of the message was perhaps eclipsed by the possibilities inherent in global mobilisation and advocacy, especially when subaltern artpeace connected with like-minded international or transnational actors and formed cross-cutting alliances (assuming these were not formed for superficial purposes on either side). The arts provided a common grammar that was now becoming more widespread.

Soon after WWI, and after it had destroyed the fabric constructed over previous generations, there emerged the phenomena of 'peace museums'. There are now many of these around the world. Probably the most famous is the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum.[22] This museum is sited on the original 'ground zero', where the US atomic weapon, absurdly named 'Little Boy', was detonated. This location is marked by the remains of a building in Hiroshima Peace Park called 'Genbacku'. It is the sole architectural reminder of the damage and death caused at 8.15 in the morning of the 6th of August 1945. About 70,000 individuals were killed instantly, and many more in the

---

of Peace (May 1962). Poster for the Congress of the National Movement for Peace.

[21] Picasso (1952). *War and Peace,*: https://www.tate.org.uk/whats-on/tate-liverpool/exhibition/picasso-peace-and-freedom/picasso-peace-and-freedom-explore-3

[22] Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum, http://hpmmuseum.jp/?lang=eng

period afterwards. The city of Hiroshima is now closely associated with civil resistance to nuclear weapons.

The use of the A-bomb was commonly justified by western scholars and policymakers on the grounds that the 140,000 deaths it caused were significantly less than the many possible deaths a land invasion of Japan would have caused, given the complete militarisation of Japanese society at the time. A politico-aesthetic, humanities-influenced approach would underline this philosophical ethical dilemma, probably making it extremely difficult to justify the level of violence applied. Such issues are not referred to in the rather anodyne museum. Instead, it focuses on cataloguing the events of the day and the suffering the bombing caused in an understated manner, perhaps because of acute political sensitivities over the admittance of Japanese or western guilt. However, the museum's presence speaks for itself: a terrible catalogue and a warning, as well as place of memorialisation, tranquillity, and reflection about how to avoid such catastrophes in the future. Its reflectiveness points the observer to sophisticated concerns about radical alternatives from the subaltern perspective.

The preservation of widespread war damage and its use in public monuments or symbols became common after WWII. This practice reconnected the post-war epoch with the pre-war period, travelling over the rupture that war represented. This was the case with Marienkirche in Lübeck in Germany. This church, dating from 1250, was badly damaged in Allied bombing of civilian areas during WWII. Its church bells, in what is now a UNESCO listed church, fell from their tower in Allied bombing, and have since been left as a reminder on the floor of the rebuilt tower.[23] This dramatic, thought-provoking scene operates on several different levels, again pointing towards complex concerns.

Cartoons in newspapers have also been widely used to critique the incompetence and hypocrisy of war leaders, war, and inconsistent peace settlement processes**.** For example, J.N Ding Darling drew a series of cartoons opposing war during WWI, WWII, and after. These relied on the shock factor of futility, atrocity, or tragedy, and represented peace as a necessary alternative. Others incorporated an element of satire, humour, and irony (Koss, 2004).[24] Cartoons continue to be used to critical effect in

[23] https://st-marien-luebeck.de/: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/St._Mary%27s_Church,_L%C3%BCbeck

[24] See for example, "We Have Gained 200 Yards of the Enemy Trenches—

contemporary media to highlight a popular desire for peace and a resistance to war, particularly during the Iraq War from 2003, for example in the work of Steve Bell.[25]

As noted above, peace art has become a part of public architecture (though mainly decorative rather than structural),[26] whether through the concurrent glorification of war and a victor's peace, through the vilification of war and its mechanisms, the celebration of peacemaking, peacekeeping, peace treaties, the UN, peacemakers, civil society actors, or more marginally the attempted depiction of peace as a form in itself. For example, representing the common peace, disarmament, and development theme of the early post-war era, of converting the implements of war into those of peace, one public sculpture at the UN headquarters in New York depicts a figure holding a hammer aloft in one hand, and a sword in the other, which he is making into a ploughshare.[27]

Also at the UN Secretariat building in New York is Marc Chagall's stained-glass window in the Public Lobby. It was a gift from UN staff and Chagall in memory of Dag Hammarskjold, the second Secretary-General of the UN. He and fifteen other people died with him in a plane crash while on a peace mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo in 1961. The window contains several well-known symbols of peace.[28] Indeed, the UN's family of organisations has been active in documenting peace within its own institutional terms, in the context of its work in the areas of international security, refugees, development, and health, via an extensive archive of historical photographs and posters. Many of them highlight the cooperative, legal and institutional, as well as the human stories of peace and war, though many also point to the fact that states remain the pre-eminent actors in

---

Dispatch from the Front—1916", "Sign Him Up Before He Gets Over His Headache", "*Waiting for the Sword to Fall", "Eventually, Why Not Now?".*

[25] See for example the many cartoons of Steve Bell in *The Guardian* on President GW Bush's conduct during the Iraq War: https://www.theguardian.com/Iraq/cartoons/0,,912730,00.html

[26] Thanks to Stefanie Kappler for this important point.

[27] *Let Us Beat Our Swords into Ploughshares*, Evgeny Buchetich, (1959). (A Gift to the UN from the Soviet Union), New York.

[28] *Chagall's Stained Glass Window* (1964). UN Headquarters, New York.

international relations (Marks & Burke, 2000).[29] Again, these images span the later, more sophisticated stages of artpeace development, but do so via a rather traditional aesthetic form.

Another well-known piece at UN Headquarters is *Non-Violence*, by Carl Fredrik Reutersward, again at the UN Headquarters in New York.[30] This portrays a giant revolver with its barrel twisted into a knot, making the gun useless (ironically, this sculpture became less public after the security perimeter of the building was expanded after 9/11).

Ambivalent references to peace through violence, threat, or force remain common. The ambiguity of war and peace art remained visible in post-Good Friday Agreement (1998) murals long after the agreement was struck on house walls in Belfast. These murals became a tourist attraction and though some are still expressions of militantism, many have been repainted with less ambiguous messages about the benefits of the peace process. Walls, with their fluid aesthetic, that once glorified violence now reflect more optimistic messages illustrating how representation itself is renewed after war (even if aimed at tourists) (Hocking, 2012). Murals tend to be repainted repeatedly, representing the changing environment, and shifting politico-aesthetic responses to the dynamics of the post-Good Friday Agreement (1998) period. They were originally quite traditional representations of artpeace, but increasingly have shifted towards more critical, radical, and resistance-oriented forms.

Overall, during recent times, the artistic representations of peace have diversified substantially, as seen with arts that were deployed in the CND resistance movement around Greenham Common since 1981,[31] or as mentioned above in Northern Ireland. One of the most poignant tragedies of the early post-Cold War era, until the massive civilian losses that occurred in the Iraq war after 9/11 or the Rwandan Genocide in 1994, was the siege of Sarajevo during the breakup of Yugoslavia during the early 1990s. This drawn-out conflict was the scene of many poignant reminders of the hubris of the claims that peace had arrived after the Cold War, when set into relief by the political claims for justice, economic assistance, restitution, reparations, as well as a sustainable political order, that conflict-affected populations were

[29] See the wide variety of UN posters spanning the end of WWII to the contemporary era.

[30] *Non-Violence*, Carl Fredrik Reutersward (1988), UN, New York

[31] See https://www.theartworks.org.uk/our-greenham

now raising. Many Sarajevans remember the U2 rock concert of 1997 as a realisation that the war was over,[32] and the constant bombing and sniping that the city had endured for around 1000 days from 1992-1995 would not return. The strange process behind the realisation of this unlikely concert was related in a quirky book, which may also be said to offer a more literary dimension to artpeace (Carter, 2005). Of course, this book stands in a long but relatively recent line of examples in the literary peace genre, spanning Leo Tolstoy in the 19th century to Ernest Hemmingway, George Orwell, and beyond (Tolstoy, 2007; Hemmingway, 1940; Orwell, 1949).

Another creative example could once be found in the divided capital of Cyprus, Nicosia, Lefkosia, or Lefkosha. From the late 1950s until 2003, an impassable so-called 'green-line' divided the city's Greek and Turkish Cypriot inhabitants. One General Young marked the line on a Nicosia map to establish a buffer zone between the two communities. This was a strategy of divide and rule or divide and pacify, particularly after the city became the scene of intercommunal riots in December 1963. After a war in 1974, the green line became part of an island wide buffer zone, patrolled by a UN peacekeeping force. In 2005, a painted pink line also appeared in the city, which was supposed to transgress the green line's patriarchal demarcations, categorisations, and divisions.[33] In a sophisticated challenge to the related dynamics of war, division, nationalism and patriarchy, the pink line implied that war and division in Cyprus could be blamed on such traditional categories. There is some truth to this.

More radical and satirical stances on the inadequacies of mainstream politics, as well as the exploration of completely new directions, were developing at pace, and on the way, they scarred the social landscape with violence. They were also more visible to various global audiences than ever before, because of new communication technologies. They partly converged in the work of Banksy, a self-described 'guerrilla graffiti artist' known for his resistance to war and violence in his public, hit and run style art, which has a habit of randomly appearing all around the world. He is associated with anti-capitalist and anti-Establishment pieces of work, as well as opposing various wars and oppressive political systems, including in the Middle East, the Iraq War, and the War on Terror after 9/11, using the popular appeal

---

[32] See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/U2_concert_in_Sarajevo:

[33] Šejla Kamerić (2005). *Pink Line vs Green Line,* Public project; Nicosia, Cyprus: https://sejlakameric.com/works/pink-line-vs-green-line/

of his work to discredit establish modes of order and to raise the issue of what should come next.[34] His painted window view through to a seeming paradise beyond the Israel/ Palestine buffer wall (2005) pointed to radical possibilities of peace, despite conflict and division.[35] His interpretation of the peace dove for Christmas in Bethlehem, in the Westbank in 2007, was also far more complex than Picasso's earlier drawings (mentioned above).[36] Yet, even during artpeace's recent development, it is still common that exhibitions purporting to be about peace generally fell back on campaigning against war (a trend reflected in an exhibition in the Tate Britain in London in 2007, which touched on the Iraq war).[37]

The Evolution of the Relationship Between the Arts and Peace

The diagram below (Table 1) outlines a tentative historical typology of six stages for this relationship. This chronology is not concrete, as these stages overlap and often run forwards to the present, forming a sort of sediment for each other (connecting them to the evolution of the International Peace Architecture that I have outlined in other work) (Richmond, 2022). Many of the artworks alluded to in this essay are not explicitly about peace, but their relevance to peace (and its related elements) as one of the eternal issues in the evolution of political philosophy, political theory, and history, is clear.

Table 1:
The Evolution of the Relationship Between the Arts and Peace

Imperial, Nationalist, and Conservative phase

Stage 1: In ancient times, art was used to delineate territory, to embedded centralised authority, to spread hegemony or law, through or after war. It was used to legitimate and expand authority.

[34] Banksy, *Bombing Middle England* (2006). See http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/entertainment/6340109.stm: http://walledoffhotel.com/index.html:

[35] https://community.atlasobscura.com/t/locations-of-banksy-art/2074/2: https://banksyexplained.com/the-segregation-wall-palestine-2005/

[36] https://www.dailysabah.com/gallery/political-street-art-best-of-banksy/images?gallery_image=undefined#big

[37] See the recreation of peace campaigner Brian Haw's *Parliament Square Protest*, Mark Wallinger (2007).

Stage 2: It was used to memorialise and heroize, through a linkage between art and war, especially as empires grew and were replaced by nationalism and sovereignty, buttressed by conservative thinking on the role of war in the state and empire.

Cosmopolitan discovery and awakening

Stage 3: With the emergence of rights struggles during the last millennia a more critical, subaltern (often underground) wing of the arts became more prominent. It was used to highlight victimhood, arbitrary power, and to evoke an emotional response to injustice within a more cosmopolitan domestic and international framework.

Mainstream arts also continued to valourise empires, the state, battles and heroism, and diplomacy.

Stage 4: After the Enlightenment, the subaltern arts were used to promote tolerance, independence and self-determination, and to campaign against violence as a political tool, creating a more heterogeneous understanding of cosmopolitanism. Disarmament and pacifism became common motifs, as well as labour rights, equality, resistance, and explicit social and transnational empathy.

Mainstream sources continued to valourise empires, the state, battles and heroism, and diplomacy in the context of various ideologies.

Revolution, resistance, and rethinking

Stage 5: By the 19th Century, new wings of the arts, more plausibly able to represent more marginal views and groups from below, because of new formats, were being used as a revolutionary force to mobilise groups and networks across a wide range of rights claims. They targeted power structures deemed to be unjust, to help advocate, mobilise, codify and to incentivise campaigns of resistance, such as those against slavery, imperialism, war, armaments, discrimination, racism, and poverty within both a state-centric and international framework. Disarmament and pacifism remained common motifs, as well as labour rights, equality, an explicit social and transnational empathy. Along with a new experimentalism in media this allowed for more subaltern expressions (as opposed to the 'high arts' epistemology that often valourised war and power).

Mainstream approaches were also being deployed to support war recruitment, intelligence gathering, nationalism, and self-determination struggles simultaneously, along with their traditional pursuits of enabling empires, the state, battles and heroism, and diplomacy. States and empires adopted (or co-opted) such representations and discourses over time because they carried such wide global legitimacy by the 20th Century.

Stage 6: The concept of 'artpeace' is consolidated. More recently it has shifted to a subaltern, bottom-up, grass-roots mode and turned against the state, empire (formal and informal), capitalism and extraction, and began to align themselves with global justice debates (distributive, historical, and environmental). They have used increasingly experimental modes of engagement, mobilisation, networking and resistance across a broadening range of the arts. These modes have been used to satirise power and its corruption, often through intense experimentalism in content and format, as well as to promote and disseminate subaltern and creative thinking about the evolving conditions of peace across multiple dimensions. In particular they unpick the intellectual and practical limitations of centralised power, sovereignty, capitalism, injustice and related and arbitrary reductionism after the Anthropocene, demanding global and environmental justice.
In parallel, it has become increasing implausible to legitimately disseminate the values of old-fashioned empires, the state, valourise battles and heroism, and maintain elitist approaches to diplomacy (unless via propaganda, authoritarianism, and coercion). Indeed, high-level representations as in earlier stages are now often seen to represent hypocrisy or to be anachronistic.

Implications of Stages 1-6

In the selections above, familiar dynamics are illustrated and associated with stages one and two, in which war and violence are glorified and power is delineated in the service of empire, state, or powerful elites. By stages three and four artpeace is being used as a subaltern form of resistance and for advocacy against war. Peace art was openly starting to represent critical resistance to war, often by appealing to emotion, religion, solidarity, and community, or focusing on its tragedy. However, artpeace also openly operates within the parameters of the state or empire, just as much as it may challenge iniquitous and unjust exercises of power. That both dynamics are represented indicates its power and that it is a tool.

Peace innovation has thus mainly been dominated, often in reductive ways, by formal political and policy actors and powerful propaganda, at least until recently. This deficit illustrates an ambivalent attitude towards war but often also supports its metastructures via bureaucratic, technocratic, management and stabilisation techniques aimed mainly at propping up an imperfect, negative form of peace and a relatively crude international order. This parallels the paucity of ideas beyond the ideological and mainstream theoretical debates on peace of modern times. Peace and conflict studies

debates have recently focused on descriptive and methodological approaches (such as issues of locality and positionality), partly perhaps because of the regressive dynamics emerging that are pushing back scientific and ethical progress. Yet, the more marginal, critical edge of peace art has continued to develop, pointing peace more broadly to issues of agency, resistance, and global justice (historical, distributive, and environmental) (Reid and Taylor, 2010; Nussbaum, 2015: 68-79; Pogge, 2001: 6–24; Kohn, 2013: 187-200; Gonzalez, 2017; Della Porta, Calle, Combes, Eggert, Giugni, Hadden, Jimenez, and Marchetti, 2007).

The more creative and radical work, especially since Dadaism challenged WWI propaganda, has reinforced norms of non-violence, underlined the hypocrisies of power in emotive and accessible ways, and sought to mobilise and consolidate a collective anti-war and anti-violence understanding in, and across, societies. Artpeace strategies call attention to systems of power, injustice, and inequality, often indirectly and subliminally. They have juxtaposed violence intuitively with imaginaries of calm, artisanship, beauty, connecting non-violence and alternativity with justice and reconciliation. They highlight in compressed ways the historical, cultural, and humanistic information available about the consequences of violence. They have depicted the effects of violence on civilians, on public spaces, and on the innocent. They worked primarily by unsettling, perhaps in much more direct and assertive ways than in the past, common assumptions about violence as heroic, strategic, necessary, increasingly relating personal tragedy with major philosophical and systemic questions as well as creative new possibilities. It has increasingly expressed emotive and subaltern issues against the run of dominant state-centric, military-industrial, autocratic, and neoliberal rationalities of power. It imagines responses and alternatives in intuitive sketches.

From stages four to six, artpeace thus invites a broad social and subaltern consideration of the philosophical, ethical considerations of war as a political tool or historical event. While earlier stages left open the question of what must be done for there to be a good peace for the long term, later stages have clarified the imaginary of a peace with global justice (UN, 2018). As media and platforms for networked production and representation proliferate, the subaltern perspective is for the first time also much more accessible across, rather than enclosed by, international boundaries of empire, state, region, gender, race, and class.

However, while more accessible it also still represents a substantial lacuna when compared with mainstream representations of victor's peace or peace that follow power. It reiterates the question of why technical and aesthetic representations of peace remain so limited, widely scattered, and in such a low volume (despite some acceleration over time)? Censorship and the erasure of emancipatory political arguments have been historically common in imperial and state history, as well as in ideological terms, and the same appears to be true for artpeace, even in a digital age (where disinformation and propaganda can muddy the waters so easily) (Zuboff, 2019). There can be little other explanation for the paucity of historical exemplars, which mainly exist today in state-backed art collections, or the fact that ethnographic methodologies are required to recover deeper historical and contemporary evidence for artpeace. Aesthetico-political projects also mirror power-relations in their survival and influence. Ultimately, much artistic peace work challenges war through broad brush emotions, or associates peace with elite and northern power or ideas, challenging, perhaps, the direct use of violence but less frequently the political systems that mobilise it. The arts underline social forms of resistance to violence and injustice, and mobilisation against it, but only offer hints of a subsequent political order. Yet, until recently, many creative endeavours connected to everyday life throughout history have left little in the way of direct traces. Their recovery, as well as the preservation of contemporary sources, would be significant. A more substantive critique of power has led to innovations in social agency, for which artpeace has always offered hints, sometimes across the whole international geography.

One such critique involves a comparison between Abraham Ortelius' illustration for Thomas Moore's text 'Utopia' (c.1595)[38] and Satomi Matoba's work depicting *Utopia* (1998).[39] They both represent the contradictions of peace and war. Moore's Utopia represents a set of impossible geographic and social features and rests upon a totalitarian form of peace many today would find unacceptable (which even Moore himself may not have been comfortable with). Matoba's remapping of the political world in this instance sees Hiroshima and Pearl Habour imagined as geographical neighbours in the same detailed cartography, normally deployed to emphasise territorial sovereignty and separate political and cultural spaces, but instead now

[38] See https://orteliusmaps.com/book/ort234.html

[39] See https://www.englandgallery.com/artists/artist_work/?mainId=129&groupId=non&_p=3&_gnum=&media=Prints

signifying a cosmopolitan but diverse cartography of peace after the extremes of violence.

Conclusion

Translating all of the above into a valuable contribution for future emancipatory paths offers an overall conceptual framework for artpeace. This represents a confluence and a synthesis of historical political and creative forces to make peace, one often overlooked or blocked for disciplinary reasons or by power. The grammars of humanities, social sciences, and the arts merge in this conceptual framing, often despite powerful interests and opposition. The arts have historically offered a platform of creativity for political innovation and alternative perspectives on violence not easily identifiable from a Eurocentric rationality, as well as creating alternative frameworks for a peaceful solution. They suggested them centuries before they became social, state, and international practice in many cases, rehearsing the emancipatory and non-violent potential of social imaginaries when fed into reformed political systems.

This suggests that in a contemporary setting, artpeace—as a platform for imagining emancipatory reform in political systems that rest on violence and war—could offer new methods that would help solve power deadlocks, build legitimacy, reconciliation, justice, and contribute to peace formation processes. It would reimagine the nature of the state, good life, and international political order—by promoting positive forms of peace, highlighting unseen violence, and supporting the proscription of violence across the different scales of analysis from local to global. Its synthesis would be a source of practical reform in the longer term. It offers a grounded, resonant, alternative grammar of representation, that utilises transnational and transversal networks for peace-oriented communication, advocacy, reciliation, justice, reform, and non-violence.

Artpeace thus represents an overall conceptual framing of the synergy between arts and peace, as well as a methodological strategy for addressing conflict through the arts. Its impact is hard to measure but also difficult to ignore, and it provides useful platforms for further creative, subaltern networks and synergies to be rediscovered or to emerge.

References

Ackerman, Peter and Jack DuVall (2000) *A Force More Powerful: A Century of Nonviolent Conflict*. New York: Palgrave.

Adorno, Theodor W. and Max Horkheimer (2002) "The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception." In *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments,* Stanford, CA: University of Stanford Press, pp.94–136.

Adorno, Theodor, Walter Benjamin, Ernst Bloch, Bertolt Brecht, and Georg Lukacs (2020) *Aesthetics and Politics*, London: Verso.

Agamben, Giorgio (2005) *State of Exception*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Anderson, Benedict (1991) *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*, London: Verso.

Apostolopoulou , E , Bormpoudakis , D , Chatzipavlidis , A , Cortés Vázquez , J J , Florea , I , Gearey , M , Levy , J , Loginova , J , Ordner , J , Partridge , T , Pizarro Choy , A , Rhoades , H , Symons , K , Veríssimo , C, and Wahby , N. (2022) "Radical social innovations and the spatialities of grassroots activism : navigating pathways for tackling inequality and reinventing the commons", *Journal of Political Ecology*, vol. 29 , no. 1 , pp. 144–188

Augustine (1993) *The City of God*. New York: Random House.

Bailey, Alison (undated) *The Art of Peace*, British Council.

Banksy (2006) *Bombing Middle England*.

Beales, ACF (1931) *The History of Peace: A Short Account of the Organized Movements for International Peace*. New York: The Dial Press, 1931.

Bell, Steve in *The Guardian* on President GW Bush's conduct during the Iraq War: https://www.theguardian.com/Iraq/cartoons/0,,912730,00.html

Bevan, Sara (2015) *Art from Contemporary Conflict*, Imperial War Museum.

Bleiker, Roland (2017) "In Search of Thinking Space: Reflections on the Aesthetic Turn in International Political Theory." *Millennium*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 258–264.

Boucher, David, and Paul Kelly (eds.) (2003) *Political Thinkers from Socrates to the Present,* OUP.

Bourke, Joanna, (ed.) (2017) *War and Art: A Visual History of Modern Conflict*. Reaktion Books.

Brown, Chris, Terry Nardin, and Nicholas Rengger (eds.) (2002) *International Relations in Political Thought.* Cambridge.

Buchetich, Evgeny (1959) *Let Us Beat Our Swords into Ploughshares*, New York, UN.

Carter, Bill (2005) *Fools Rush In*. New York: Wenner Books.

Chagall's Stained Glass (1964) *Window*, UN Headquarters, New York.

Chandra, Uday (2015) Rethinking Subaltern Resistance, *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 45:4, 563-573.

Constantinou, Costas (1994) "Diplomatic Representations...or Who Framed the Ambassadors?" *Millennium*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 1–23.

Cortright, D. (2008) The first peace societies. In *Peace: A History of Movements and Ideas*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Darling, Ding, (2004) "We Have Gained 200 Yards of the Enemy Trenches—Dispatch from the Front—1916", "Sign Him Up Before He Gets Over His Headache", "*Waiting for the Sword to Fall", "Eventually, Why Not Now?"* in Christopher D. Koss (ed.) *A Sampler: The Editorial Cartoons of Jay N. Darling*, Christopher Koss.

de Goya, Francisco (1814) *The Third of May, 1808: The Execution of the Defenders of Madrid,* Museo del Prado, Madrid, Spain

de Neuville, Adolph Alphonse (1880) *Defence of Rorke's Drift*, New South Wales Art Gallery.

Debord, G. (1994) *The Society of the Spectacle*, New York: Zone Books.

Delacroix, Eugene (1830) *Liberty Leading the People*, Louvre, Paris.

Della Porta, D, & Andretta M, Calle A, Combes H, Eggert N, Giugni MG, Hadden J, Jimenez M, and Marchetti R. (2007) *Global Justice Movements: Cross-national and Transnational Perspectives*. London: Routledge, 2007.

Fabbro, D. (1978) "Peaceful Societies: An Introduction". *Journal of Peace Research,* Vol. 15, No. 1, pp.67-83.

Foucault, M. (1997) *Society must be defended: lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–1976*. London: Penguin.

Goedde, Petra (2019) *The Politics of Peace*, Oxford University Press, pp.43-4.

Gonzalez C.G. (2017) "Global Justice in the Anthropocene", In: Kotze L (ed). *Environmental Law and Governance for the Anthropocene* New York: Hart Publishing Seattle University School of Law Research Paper No. 17-06 https://ssrn.com/abstract=2929042

Groys, Boris (2008) *Art Power*. Cambridge, MA: MIT.

Guthrie C, and M Quinlan (2007) "The Structure of the Tradition". *Just War: The Just War Tradition: Ethics in Modern Warfare*. London: Bloomsbury.

Hemmingway, Ernest (1940) *For Whom the Bell Tolls,* NY: Scribner.

Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum, http://hpmmuseum.jp/?lang=eng

Hobbes, Thomas (2013) *De Cive*, CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform

Hobbes, Thomas (1996). *Leviathan*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hocking, Bryanna T. (2012) "Beautiful Barriers: Art and Identity along a Belfast 'Peace'.

Holbein, Hans (1533) *The Ambassadors.* National Gallery, London.

Jakopovich, Daniel (2019) *Revolutionary Peacemaking: Writings for a Culture of Peace and Nonviolence*. Zagreb, Croatia: Democratic Thought.

Kadesh Treaty (1269 BC) Istanbul Archaeological Museum, Turkey.

Kamerić, Šejla (2005) *Pink Line vs Green Line,* Public project; Nicosia, Cyprus: https://sejlakameric.com/works/pink-line-vs-green-line/

Kerr, R. (2020) "Art, Aesthetics, Justice, and Reconciliation: What can art do?" *AJIL Unbound,* 114, 123-127.

Keynes, John Maynard (1919) *The Economic Consequences of the Peace*, London: Macmillan.

King, Alex (1998) *Memorials of the Great War in Britain: The Symbolism and Politics of Remembrance*, Berg Publishers.

Kohn, M. (2013) "Postcolonialism and global justice", *Journal of Global Ethics*. Vol. 9, No. 2, pp.187-200.

Kollwittz, Kathe (1924) *Never Again War.* Kathe Kollwittz (1924). Käthe Kollwitz Museum, Köln.

Koss (ed.), Christopher D. (2004) *A Ding Darling Sampler: The Editorial Cartoons of Jay N. Darling*. New York: Maecenas Press.

Kustermans, J (2018) "Henry Maine and the Modern Invention of Peace", *Journal of the History of International Law / Revue d'histoire du droit international*, Vol. 20, No.1, pp.57-88.

Lederach, JP (2005) *The Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Building Peace,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lilja, Mona (2022) "The definition of resistance". *Journal of Political Power*, Vol 15, No. 2, pp. 202-220.

Lipschutz, Ronnie D. (1998) "Beyond the Neoliberal Peace: From Conflict Resolution to Social Reconciliation", *Social Justice*, vol. 25, no. 4 (74), pp. 5–19.

Lorenzetti (1338-40). *Allegory of Good Government: Effects of Good Government in the City*, Frescos. Palazzo Publico, Siena, Italy.

Maine, Henry Sumner (1888) *International Law: A Series of Lectures Delivered Before the University of Cambridge,* London: John Murray.

Marks, Edward B., and Katie Burke, (2000) *For a Better World: Posters from the United Nations*, Pomegranate Europe.

Matoba, Satomi (1998). *Utopia* (1998): https://www.englandgallery.com/artists/artist_work/?mainId=129&groupId=

Mearsheimer, John J. (2019) "Bound to Fail: The Rise and Fall of the Liberal International Order", *International Security*, Vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 7–50.

Mitchell, Jolyon, Giselle Vincett, Theodora Hawksley, and Hal Culbertson (2020), *Peacebuilding and the Arts*, Palgrave Macmillan.

Moore, Thomas (c.1595) 'Utopia': https://orteliusmaps.com/book/ort234.html

Moyn, S (2019) *Not Enough: Human Rights in an Unequal World,* Harvard University Press.

Nussbaum M.C. (2015) "Political liberalism and global justice", *Journal of Global Ethics* Vol, 11, No1., pp. 68-79.

Nussbaum, Felix (1938) *The Pearls*: http://www.painting-analysis.com/pearls.htm

Orwell, George (1949) *1984*, Secker & Warburg.

Premaratna, N., and Bleiker, R. (2016) "Arts and Theatre for Peacebuilding". In: Richmond, O.P., Pogodda, S., and Ramović, J. (eds) *The Palgrave Handbook of Disciplinary and Regional Approaches to Peace*. Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Picasso, Pablo (1949) *Dove*, https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/picasso-dove-p11366

Picasso, Pablo (1937) *Guernica*, Madrid. Museo Reina Sofía, Madrid.

Picasso, Pablo *(*1952) *War and Peace*: https://www.tate.org.uk/whats-on/tate-liverpool/exhibition/picasso-peace-and-freedom/picasso-peace-and-freedom-explore-3

Picasso, Pablo, (date unknown possibly 1952). *The Face of Peace.*

Picasso, Pablo, (1962) *The Dove of Peace,* poster for the Congress of the National Movement for Peace, Picasso**.**

Pogge, Thomas (2001) "Priorities of Global Justice". *Metaphilosophy.* Vol. 32, No.1/2, pp.6–24.

Pogodda, Sandra Oliver P Richmond, and Gezim Visoka (2022). "Counter-peace: From Isolated Blockages in Peace Processes to Systemic Patterns", *Review of International Studies*.

Marks, Edward B., and Katie Burke (2000) *For a Better World: Posters from the United Nations*, Pomegranate Europe.

Michael Pugh (2005) "The Political Economy of Peacebuilding: A Critical theory Perspective," *International Journal of Peace Studies,* Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 23–42.

Rancière, Jacques (2006) "The Ethical Turn of Aesthetics and Politics". *Critical Horizons*, Vol. 7, no. 1, pp.1-20.

Randle, Michael (1994) *Civil Resistance*. Fontana.

Reid, H., and B Taylor (2010) *Recovering the commons: democracy, place, and global justice*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Reutersward, Carl Fredrik (1988) *Non-Violence*, UN, New York.

Oliver P (2005) *The Transformation of Peace*, London: Routledge.

Richmond, Oliver P. (2011a) *A Post-Liberal Peace*, Routledge.

Richmond, Oliver P. *(2011b). "Critical agency, resistance and a post-colonial civil society." Cooperation and Conflict, Vol. 46, pp. 419 - 440.*

Richmond, Oliver P. (2016). *Peace Formation and Political Order*, Oxford University Press.

Richmond, Oliver P. (2022). *The Grand Design*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Richter, Hans (1965) *Dada: Art and Anti-Art,* London: Thames and Hudson.

Rubens, Peter Paul, (1629-30) *Minerva protects Pax from Mars* ('Peace and War'), National Gallery, London.

Roberts, Adam, and Timothy Garton Ash (eds), (2009) *Civil Resistance and Power Politics: The Experience of Non-violent Action from Gandhi to the Present*, Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Scott, James C. (1990) *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. Yale University Press, 1990.

Sharp, G. (1973) *The politics of nonviolent action*. Boston, MA: Porter Sargent Publishers.

Spivak, G. C. (2000) "Translation as Culture", *Parallax*. Vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 13-24.

Tolstoy, Leo. (2007) *War and Peace*, Penguin.

UN General Assembly and Security Council (2018) "Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace", *Report of the UN Secretary General*, A/72/707-S/2018/43, 18th January.

Van Hensbergen (2005) *G Guernica*: The *Biography of a Twentieth-Century Icon*, London: Bloomsbury.

Vasily Vereshchagin (1871) *The Apotheosis of War.* Tretyakov Gallery, Moscow.

Vinthagen, S. (2015) *A Theory of nonviolent action: how civil resistance works*. London: ZED Books.

Wallinger, M (2007) *Brian Haw's Parliament Square Protest.* Tate Britain, London.

Walzer, Michael (1977) *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations*, Basic Books.

Weber, Max (2015) *Weber's Rationalism and Modern Society*, (trans. and edited by Tony Waters and Dagmar Waters). New York: Palgrave Books.

Winter, Jay (2014) *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War In European Cultural History,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zuboff, Shoshana (2019) *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*, Profile Books.