

www.essayandscience.com

Histories of the Two Spains

Santos Juliá

Translated by Robert Dewey

CHAPTER X:

THE MORAL ROOTS OF POLITICAL DISSIDENCE: INTELLECTUALS, MARXISM, AND THE LANGUAGE OF RECONCILIATION.

A little more than 13 years after Aranguren and Calvo Serer had stated that in Spain, all intellectuals were Catholic, Jorge Semprún announced as a new discovery, set to have profound consequences: “the rise of a Marxist intelligentsia over the course of the past decade.” The importance of such a sudden appearance can be easily understood, but not leaving any room for doubt, Semprún repeats it several times in just two pages. There lay the possibility of a fusion, in modern terms, between theory and the workers’ movement. True, it was only a possibility—which could either materialize or vanish—but its importance lay in its novelty as a historically original trait of the communist movement in Spain. Camilo José Cela would have to agree with this observation, since just three years earlier—compelled by his deeply-rooted status of confidant—he had indicated to Manuel Fraga, the Minister of Information, that of the 102 intellectuals that signed a recent letter sent to Fraga, a “union leader” had let him know that 42 belonged to the Communist Party.¹

A strong nucleus of Marxist intellectuals, to the point of constituting an entire intelligentsia, was something never before seen in the Spanish political panorama. Communist intellectuals had existed in Spain, and some of considerable stature, which Semprún indicates without getting specific. But a strong nucleus—an intelligentsia—was something radically new, and surprisingly it had arisen spontaneously. Semprún, for his part, doesn’t get caught up in analyzing origins, sources, and itineraries, but if Aranguren and Calvo’s assertions for 1953 were correct, and if Cela and Semprún’s assertions for the 1960s were also correct, then one must admit that the Marxist intelligentsia arose either from the Catholic intelligentsia through a rapid process of conversion or

from the Falangist intelligentsia after the collapse of youthful enthusiasm. In the shelter of the Allied victory, attempts to reconstruct university opposition organizations free from such links, like the Federación Universitaria Escolar (University School Federation) in Madrid, or the Front Universitari de Catalunya (University Front of Catalonia) in Barcelona, resulted in the arrest and condemnation by a council of war of Nicolás Sánchez-Albornoz, Manuel Lamana, and Ignacio Faure, in the case of the former, and the dissolution of the organization after two years of relative growth, in the case of the latter.² Thus, there remained no options other than being Catholic or being Falangist, or the unique mixture of both that characterized that tough period of international isolation.

Nevertheless, after 1948 the Catholics showed themselves to be divided between the already familiar factions of the exclusives and the comprehensives. Among the former the growth of anything that could possibly nourish a nucleus of Marxist intellectuals was impossible. These exclusives consisted of those that had adopted the ideal of sanctity in the world, equipping themselves with a solid institutional apparatus, including residences, cultural and academic societies, publishing houses, magazines and summer courses. They had succeeded in building a political and religious subculture and they brought along with them in their saddle-bags a project to rationalize the administration of the State in support of a policy of economic modernization—a policy that would see the remains of autocracy liquidated and would introduce Spain into the world market. They formed a power elite, no longer emerging, but ascendant, in conquest mode. With an eye to the future—wrote Pérez Embid in 1956—it was no longer a question of resisting, but of occupying outright the manager's role that corresponds to a Christian in a collective life. With an ideal to be applied to life, with institutions directed to opening all types of possibilities for their members, with a political project, and with a conquest mentality, it was impossible to allow for crisis and change of direction. The future belonged to them and they were convinced they possessed the necessary elements to dominate it.

There was the other faction, the comprehensives—or better described, that of the youth, still suckling at breasts—who remained a possible quarry from which astute Marxist stonemasons might extract material to fortify their weak positions. If in 1966 one could speak of a Marxist intelligentsia, fifteen years earlier the prospects for communists looked bleak. One could only explain the “rise of a Marxist intelligentsia” through a massive defection of those youths upon whom their “big brothers”—half Catholics, half Falangists—had projected their own cultural politics. This moved Semprún so much that he saw within it the great historical possibility of revolution through the fusion of theory and praxis, the enduring fantasy of Marxist intellectuals, convinced that a good theory, a correct theory, is a necessary and sufficient condition for the adherence of the masses. Was it dissidence or perhaps the convergence of Christians and Marxists? Was it defection or was it rather the interpretation of the Gospels and the experience of faith in such a way so as to actually compel the Christian believer to embrace the recent language of totality as spoken by the communist militants? Or perhaps

Alberto Ullastres was right when—startled by the advances of “progressive Catholicism” and a few days after Franco had denounced the infiltration of Catholic organizations by Marxists—he lamented the excessive preoccupation with social concerns, which had driven so many Catholics over to the Marxist enemy’s camp.³

ON THEIR SHOULDERS, THE WEIGHT OF SPAIN

All of this occurred in these fifteen years, along with something more: in the second half of the 1940s the first cohorts of university students who had not gone to war began to emerge. Instead of fighting the war, they had lived it, “as 8, 9, or 10 year-olds, and from that tragedy they received a disconcerting and quite definitive experience.” They were children of war, as Josefina Rodríguez—herself a child of war—had baptized them.⁴ These children entered their first phase of youth when, after the defeat of the Fascists and the triumph of the Allies, the *Acción Católica* (Catholic Action) began to replace the Falange at the front lines of the political scene. The regime was over-Catholicized to the same extent as it was de-Fascistized. Not that Franco agreed to disband the Falange, as Ramón Serrano Suñer had recommended to him in a very moderate letter: “We did what was in the interest of Spain during the German domination of Europe, and if the Axis had triumphed, Spain would have had a role to play in the world, due to our presence in the Power”, he wrote. But that was the past. Now, in September of 1945, the new situation demanded that no pretext be given for an Allied intervention in Spain, that the “totalitarian appearance of the regime” be erased, and that the Falange be honorably discharged, “with the awareness of having served Spain in its moment.” Always more astute than his brother-in-law, Franco followed this advice with regards to diffusing the signs of totalitarianism but he was very careful about disbanding the Falange. He also wanted nothing to do with a national government representing “all of non-red Spain,” from the extreme right to intellectual politicians like Ortega or Marañón, whom his brother-in-law had proposed.⁵ What he did was subtler. He strengthened the power of the Church in all areas concerning the public presence of the regime which allowed the latter to redefine itself from potentially totalitarian to Catholic and traditional, while in no way dissolving the Falange.

While the Church took control of the public space, stirring up the streets with popular missions, dawn rosaries and processions—culminating (in 1962!) with a great pilgrimage, in which the preserved arm of Saint Teresa of Jesus was featured—it also controlled private consciences through priests and spiritual directors, large-scale spiritual retreats (both open and closed), censorship of books and movies, and religious talks given by legions of priest-announcers over dozens of radio-pulpits. Meanwhile many Falangists “folded up their flags and hid away the uniform or blue shirt they had shown off in days past,” as Antonio Tovar would denounce years later. In the days of 1945, when no one would salute the Falangists and all regarded them with horror—Tovar remembers—it was the Falange that saved the State from a catastrophic end, thanks to its discipline and stalwart behavior at the service of the Caudillo’s slogans. Perhaps the Falange had

gone through years “of silence, of doubt, of dejection,” but it never dissolved the organizations that served to provide discipline to peasants, workers and students, nor did it abandon the civilian governments. Maybe the State owed much to the Falange, as Tovar affirmed in a final episode of rhetoric for the pending revolution, but the Falange owed everything, its very existence, to the State, and very personally to its Leader.⁶ The result of such a peculiar situation, unique in the world, was that the Catholic element, having dominated the spotlight, overcame the Falangist substratum that was sustained in the lower and middle spheres of the regime: those dealing with a miserable daily life, food supplies, housing, social assistance, the thousands of precincts, village governments, local leaderships and unions, in which a barrage of people enlisted in the National Movement either found a place or actually thrived.

From there they reemerged when the continuity of the regime was out of danger: once France—with an eye towards the good business the United Kingdom and, above all, the United States was conducting with Spain—opened up the border, which had been closed for two years (March, 1946-February, 1948). Expectations were reborn. One only has to look at the first edition of the magazine *Alferez*—which appears to us today as an expression of “a certain diffuse Falangism dressed up with a strong liberal and ‘anti-conciliatory’ Catholic component”⁷—in order to understand the nature of this hodgepodge Falangist vision of the world bathed in the blessed water of triumphant Catholicism. *Alferez* was the magazine of the Colegio Mayor Jiménez de Cisneros, promoted by a group of young intellectuals of Falangist and Catholic origin. Ángel Álvarez de Miranda, Rodrigo Fernández-Carvajal, José María de Labra, Ángel-Antonio Lago Carballo, Juan A. de Luis Cambor, Miguel Sánchez-Mazas, Juan Ignacio Tena, and José María Valverde were its founders, soon to be joined by José Ángel Valente, Carlos Robles Piquer, and Carlos Castro Cubells. The last two letters of the magazine’s name are traversed by a banner posing the disturbing question *Quis ut Deus?*—the translation from Hebrew of the name of the beautiful archangel who shines with his sword on the first page. *Alferez* or *Quis ut Deus?* (Who is Like God?) is presented under the patronage of Saint Michael, suggesting the fusion of the warmth of angelic nature with the grand constituent principles of life: militia and logic, force and intelligence. Once again, but in a different sphere, we see a program of fusion: the dream of an “intellectual order,” now both Catholic and universal, of which Spain would be the standard bearer. “Spain and Spanish culture are, today, upon the threshold of the fifth decade of the twentieth century, treading upon the threshold of a great future.” Once again, upon arriving at the middle of the century, images of the dawn and the threshold are evoked, although now definitively Catholic, even if still surrounded by darkness. It didn’t matter; the editors of *Alferez* fed their enthusiasm with a faith that glorified the renewal of old imperial projects: our path towards order, being Spaniards, runs through the Hispanic world, whose very marrow is “Catholic culture.”⁸ It’s the same program of the group that dreamed of Spain on the banks of the river Arlanzón except that it is devoid of totalitarian rhetoric: the unifying agent, the foundation of the future greatness, is the Catholic culture. All that had once been said,

directed to the totalitarian State, all the imperial Spanish fantasy, had been infused with a longing for faith.

Along with this fascinating project, those youngsters received a strong moral message that was distilled from a victory legitimized by the blood of martyrs and a generous youth who knew how to face the ultimate sacrifice—their very lives—which would bear fruit by creating a better world: a world of social justice, a world of fraternity. The months of April and June always returned to their consciences as a “blessed and inalienable imperative,” as the “moment in which Spain longed to find her truth, an impulse that, rooted in the dead, is a mandate for the youth.”⁹ One’s sense of life was pervaded by a reiterated and permanent funeral celebration of which the Church was not only the unparalleled leader, but also the exclusive owner—February 9, day of the fallen student, November 20, the day José Antonio taught the most gallant and Christian of all lessons: free and decorous resignation in the face of death.¹⁰ The dead commanded: one had to stay loyal to those tens of thousands of martyrs who had been murdered or had fallen in combat during the civil war, loyal to that “implausible list of dead university students” in the Blue Division, loyal to those young officers who irrigated the fields of Spain with their blood, generously giving up their own lives, without reservations, for the mission assigned to them: the recovery and redemption of the fatherland, as announced by the Falange; the reign of God upon Earth, as promised by the Church. There was no contradiction at all between the two, for one was an announcement of the other, and from 1945 onwards, it was impossible to think of the fatherland without thinking of religion. No doubt, among Falangists there was always some impatient voice bemoaning the overwhelming presence of the clerics, but no one was now in a position to demand that the empire conform to the New World Order its masters had dreamed of years before. The empire was now definitively spiritual, and it referred just as much to the mastery of one’s self and body—the conquering of the impulses of avarice and complacency to which Spanish society had succumbed—as it did to the promulgation of a message of salvation, which would always reach its highest glory with the reign of Christ upon Earth. We shall seek out true pain, in the mortification of our body, we shall meditate on the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, we shall journey through asceticism before reaching mysticism, through patience before reaching heroism—so Rafael Sánchez Ferlosio urged his young readers.¹¹

It was an encapsulated mental world, cut off from history and isolated from external forces. No one ever suggested to university students of the 1940s that they elevate their gaze beyond February 9, 1934. It is significant to note the complete absence of reflection and historical knowledge—even concerning the most recent events—that characterizes the magazines of the SEU (Sindicato Español Universitario - Spanish University Union) and the SEU-leaning magazines of the day. There is not even an echo of the tones that had previously dominated the intellectual magazines of the past: the liberal revolution, the nineteenth century, the restored monarchy, the Republic. It had all disappeared. If, from time to time, attention was paid to the “quantity and quality” of those in

exile, one was reminded, “there could always be found—among those politicians lacking any conscience—traitors to the homeland, common criminals”: men tarnished by the stains of murder, rape, and treachery.¹² History began on a certain July 18, a day that “a wind knocked down mediocre Spain, across both Spanish zones, and the youth took great pains to elevate her.” The New Spain that arose from this day on “was the effort of youth, and the first stones in the building were the youths’ flesh and blood.” And when that effort reached its culmination on a certain April 1, one idea was present in the minds of all Spaniards: “we are witnessing the birth of a New Spain.”¹³ Everything that youth received in terms of the most recent cultural traditions passed first through the grinder of their “elder brothers,” who had completely purged this legacy of any trace of liberal, republican, or socialist politics, labeling them as spurious and anti-Spanish. Cut off from the past, they found themselves with nothing to anchor them to a unique and personal view of the world and of their position in society and politics. They were fresh from a victory that had cost the blood of martyrs in the face of red barbarism. Their task was to be true to this overpowering heritage and make it flourish; that and nothing more.

This break with the past was exacerbated by their isolation from the world around them. The possibility of exposure to foreign authors was limited to a small and restless minority that had shaken off their ecclesiastical tutelage. In the 1940s, Murillo Ferrol remembers, the topic of books was a difficult one for Spanish universities, due to the scarcity of allocation and the material difficulty of purchasing foreign books. There were, of course, small groups that did manage to read certain authors, preferably French. Thus, the *tertulia* (literary circle) was reborn. In Barcelona, El Turia represented “the tertulia of tertulias, and many young writers of diverse ideologies passed through it.” They formed groups that proliferated in bars and apartments, and that read their writings in those places: Ana María Matute, Juan and José Agustín Goytisolo, Lorenzo Gomis, Luis Carandell, and Carlos Barral. In Madrid, a tertulia was held every Saturday at Gambrinus, made up of Francisco Pérez Navarro, Francisco Soler, Luis Quintanilla, Víctor Sánchez de Zabala, Pepín Vidal, Alfonso Sastre, Emilio Lledó. Also there was the one Eva Forest took Luis Martín Santos to; a tertulia in 1948 and 1949 dedicated to reading and commenting on *Nausea* and *Being and Nothingness*, by Sartre. In the universities, however, things went quite differently. On one occasion, already well into the 1950s, an associate professor at Salamanca had to explain French stylistics and couldn’t think of a better approach than to give his students an exercise on *Dirty Hands*, also by Sartre. When two female students approached the Church authorities to request the necessary permission to read it, the bishop became enraged and called the university rector, at that time Antonio Tovar, who gave the audacious professor “a hell of a dressing down.”¹⁴

Reading was, in effect, difficult, and as far as opportunities to travel in Europe were concerned, they were so scarce that the majority of the youth had little idea what was happening there, other than it was plunged into darkness for having betrayed its spiritual values . “Only the new graft of Christian faith, with its

Catholic truth, lived in its full radicalism,” would serve as salvation from the tumultuous collapse of modern culture, warned Carlos París. Spain, Manuel Fraga would write, did not quake in the face of modernisms, and thus remained free from the psychoanalysis that inundates everything, from the ever-abundant mental illness and suicide, free from authentic senile dementia. Spain, true to its lineage, running from Suárez to Saavedra, from Donoso to Maeztu, “leaves outside the insanities of Europe.” For a young man like Miguel Sánchez-Mazas, with such a propensity for emphatic dramatic quality, Europe—defeated Europe—was there, “wounded, but still alive,” and the current Spanish generation facing her had “a different attitude from that of the late nineteenth century.” The times of “the exaggerated prestige of Europe” were over. Now, “the personality of all things Spanish” had been confirmed, to the point that the anguishing spectacle of the philosophical and religious crisis Europe was experiencing was simply “another reason for us to hold even faster to our faith and to pity Europe.” But the motive that justified Spanish superiority and the compassion felt for Europe did not stem from the superior formula for the state that had been constructed here. No one speaks of that state as being made from stone and steel, as the professors of the day liked to say. The motive force was “our faith.” To this Sánchez-Mazas and the “current generation” held fast—to faith. Even Pablo Lucas Verdú, who had the advantage of writing from Bologna, felt that “the democracy that is now extolled”—western democracy—has “too spurious a backdrop to last long (rationalist protestant natural law, impious and anti-ecclesiastical French encyclopedianism, agnostic and relativist liberalism.)” Faced with such a scene, the solution could only lie in “the return to our tradition and our classics. We have no need for foreign copies and replicas.” Better to be at home than in any other place. The tune was: “within the home we have the model.”¹⁵

These shortages of historical reflection, this breed of cultural autarky, explained the new generation’s inability to think in political terms, an inability fostered knowingly by their closest teachers. Of course when speaking of the political language of that period it is essential to remember the all-seeing censorship which erased or changed words, phrases, or paragraphs at will, raised necklines and increased skirt lengths. It also had the support of qualified defenders, such as the Director-General of Cinematography and Film, José María García Escudero, who, in December of 1951, came out in support of the State, faced with the fearful possibility of being gobbled up by society. Every state has its dogmas, said García Escudero on that occasion, “dogmas of every type, including political ones of course.” And therefore, he asked, how can we protect these dogmas if the transgressions, far from being exceptional, become habitual? The answer was censorship, omnipresent censorship of course, whose limits could be discussed, but never its substance.¹⁶ Yet there is something more than just the vigilance of censorship behind this absence of political thought. There is the radical impossibility of questioning the State. After noting the “singular perplexity” that affected “current Spanish youth” as they meditated on their collective political responsibility, *Alfárez* affirmed that twelve years earlier in Spain, certain principles of order were proclaimed, which had been served by a heroic war and by the state that arose from it. Naturally, if so many young officers had met their

death in defense of it, the principles upon which such a state was built “remained valid” and the work of the younger generation could only be “to serve these principles and deepen them.” Therefore, this generation must understand itself as a generation that, for the first time, finds no validity in the old dichotomies: right or left, classic or romantic, devout or lunatic. They were, “with this firm Spanish nature and substantial Christianity that we carry inside, monuments to the order created on July 18 and protected by Franco.” The only thing to be done in the political arena, with such a point of departure, was to remain loyal to the leadership and not allow this order to become scarce and dry up: to inject it with “our vitality.” Thus the task that awaited them, due to biological necessity, was that of “guiding” this order, for which one only needed to “acquire and cultivate certain fundamental political virtues.”¹⁷

Therefore, instead of questioning the state, the duty of the young man at mid-century consisted in carrying over to politics the same requirements that ought to guide his personal life as “a Christian man,” that is to say, the cultivation of virtue. Firstly and principally, according to *Alfárez*, we must “clean out the depths of our own dogma” before the ship can set sail upon the open seas. It was an easy dogma to condense into clear and simple articles: affirm the unity of Spain over all forms of territorial or moral separatism; establish a state that superseded liberalism and its latest totalitarian incarnation; rescue eternal political ideas—liberty, personal rights—by “scraping away any liberal adherence” and nourishing them with Catholic sensibility; have direct and daily contact with reality; incorporate Catholic values into Spanish public life without ever erasing the distinction between ecclesiastical and civil authority, and lastly, explain the socio-economic problem outside the dialectic of class struggle. This is the dogma, which an editorial writer would call “our incorruptible and vital base” and “our system of beliefs”—an allusion to Ortega, whose return to Spain had aroused a certain degree of excitement among young students anxious for instruction—that was converted by their professors into the source and origin of a dogmatic vision of the State, the only one in fact that could save Europe. History, in effect, “agrees with us;” politics must have a “dogmatic structure,” although it was paradoxical that “only Spain had learned this lesson.”¹⁸

“We are resolute and we are correct,” said the rector of Salamanca, in a courageous and much applauded lecture that was heavily commented upon and widely distributed among the restless youth. History agrees with us, *Alfárez* affirmed; we are correct, Tovar reiterated. That correctness consisted in having served the State, which had been “born out of our civil war,” while its enemies—not knowing that their defeat in 1939 “had uprooted them from Spain forever”—continued to plot dark conspiracies in order to drag Spain down to the same catastrophic end that the other European nations had suffered in 1945. Upon you, Tovar reminded his loyal audience, rested at the time “our liberty, our religious faith, our tradition, and our honor.” It was a pity that they had not fought that war all by themselves, and that in the end the Falange could not conquer the State but was called to serve it: a personal act by the *Caudillo* had converted the Falange into “a political instrument of the government.” They had no choice but

to respond to the call, but they lost something along the way: the famous point 27, the rejection of pacts and coalitions, the Revolution which was left in the air in hopes of better, brighter days. It was necessary to come to agreements, to hush up certain things, to be silent, but note: “Deeply and fundamentally, we were right,” Tovar insists, “and the ensuing events only confirmed this.” Right for having answered the call from the Caudillo and becoming an instrument of the government? Not exactly: right for having preserved “our social mysticism, the red and black colors, and for calling each other comrade.” That is to say, right for having maintained an incorruptible attitude of service. And that is what Tovar demanded, in 1953, as a member of the “war generation” that had understood how to promote the Founder’s doctrine and transmit it to new generations: that they be courageous enough to follow the path that had been started, for they must realize that the future weighed upon their manly shoulders.”¹⁹

There was no escaping it. Be it the political dogma imparted by the State, or the sense of right that helped convert the Falange into an instrument of the government, what was expected of the youth was an attitude of service in order to better bear the future upon their shoulders. Such an attitude had to be grounded in social mysticism and the cultivation of virtues, in this case, “decency and gallantry,” the former in order to polish up public decorum; the latter referred to a very special individual—José Antonio. “Among us, there is one name, José Antonio,” an identity that Fernández Carvajal infused with meaning when he defined the loyal university student as he who, in the face of life’s many aspects, maintained “an anti-liberal and gallant attitude, exemplified by José Antonio.” Nothing important could be done in Spain without “the measured majesty and intelligent intransigence” of the university student, as one who is loyal because he is both honorable and gallant. And all this—anti-liberalism, decency, gallantry, the evocation of and loyalty to José Antonio had to be placed at the service of the whole, “from the very core of each individual’s personality.” The “core of personality” was an expression that had deep roots in the work of Pedro Laín and was extant among his current followers: a profound unity, made dialectic, and a combined effort to achieve what they had yet to become: a coherent group. It was necessary to create a minority that could immediately serve as “the backbone of Spain.” A minority recruited with the same mix of breadth and severity that the Catholic Kings had used when they selected their elite ruling class. Thus, they addressed and called: “to the minority, always,” a slogan that *La Hora* used to circle the façade of the University of Alcalá with. And with respect to the current hierarchy, there was no doubt: Franco. Any hesitation in service would represent a very grave error, given that, unprecedented in Spain since the times of traditional monarchy, “the leadership of the State was the best representative authority.”²⁰

This was basically what, in the post-war years culminating in 1953, restless university students received from their professors in terms of political thought, if in fact such dogma is deserving of the name. Devoid of valid historical references, obstructed from even the possibility of questioning the State, “the current generation” was crammed with appeals to virtue, or something that passed itself

off as such. And on this point, on the moral terrain, the priests had no competition. Among them, one in particular, José María de Llanos, better known as Father Llanos, shone for many years with an inner light. He was “skinny, with a sallow and tormented face,” a tireless preacher, a hardened writer with an extreme case of verbal incontinence, and who, without slacking off in his “articles for Christ” sent to *Arriba*, punctually attended to his duties at the sectional reviews of the SEU and its neighbors, savagely attacking sins, casting blame, appealing for virtue in the shape of generously surrendering one's life to the ideal, encouraging the “boys,” spreading joy and enthusiasm, tirelessly handing out waves of spiritual exercises, and mixing childishness with fervor in a singularly successful fusion of Falange and the Society of Jesus. In the end, he always came back to the hero's vocation, the exaltation of the minority, the young officers: men who translated “with their hopeful words and magnificent attitude of bravery, the cold slogans of leadership” so that the “university masses, with good hearts and splendid—albeit not very cultivated—values” would work well and end up on the right path. The future of Spain, as they well knew, rested upon their shoulders.²¹

FACE TO FACE WITH REALITY

Indoctrinated into a system of autarky, the only possible exits were, in the first place, to journey within: to travel to the depths of a redeemed Spain to feel with one's hands those ripened fruits, of the war, of the martyr's blood, of the victory. Thus they went about, “discovering the poor, who are being reduced to a working class,” as one Oviedo local—who had channeled his political activity down the “path of Falangism”—told José María Maravall. The other option was to leave the country: to let oneself get caught up in that “intense centripetal force” that, according to Juan Benet, Madrid—really, all of Spain—was producing circa 1950; to take advantage of any opportunity to cross the Pyrenees and go deep into Europe, to the point of personally verifying the state of confusion into which post-war Europe had fallen.²² These were, in truth, the two rite-of-passage journeys for those individuals, especially those who seriously believed that Spain was destined to become a beacon for the world, those who had lit up all the problems that still lay before them—misery, illiteracy, hunger, the exploitation of labor—with a demanding moral view that gnawed at them from the inside. And it was because of these journeys to the heart of the nation and abroad that all that vacuous dogma and that vestry and baroque church morality came crashing down to the ground, that so many “things began falling like paper walls”²³ and in their place there was nothing but a perplexity that resulted in massive dissent, which took various forms, from cynicism to compromise, according to personal preference.

The Falangist-Catholic rhetoric and the moral overload this generation suffered, quickly led to what José Bugeda, deputy director of *La Hora*²⁴, designated a “reunion with the people” in an article that, according to Jesús Ibáñez, “would be a knock on the door that resulted in a wake-up call for scores of youth.” It's always Halloween in Spain, Bugeda wrote, as a result of a trip he took one fall

afternoon in 1950. He had discovered them, the People, stuck to the brown earth, in the figure of a hunched over peasant and of the men who climbed with their slow mules, while in the casino the local bureaucracy arose with eyes drooping from lechery, upon the entrance of Don Ismael, the local landowner. He also found it in the industrial city, with sad expressions of resignation, submerged in a dense silence when someone began to speak of politics, knowing that things had gone wrong, were going wrong, would continue to go wrong. “He has died and left you”, he writes, “the only one who would have known how to be your master, José Antonio.” “And thus you find yourself, ridiculed,” a conclusion that Medardo Fraile would agree with when he decided to “load the word slum with human meaning.” He traveled there one Sunday—“Oh how wonderful it would surely be, the two co-workers mused to each other as they began their march to the legendary shanties!”—and they found old and flattened houses—“Are those the shanties?, Don Pedro asked [...] Those?, Amador replied. No, those are houses”—filth in the streets, cold on the faces, rashes on the skin, chest, or stomach, large pits filled with garbage, voices of women caught up in fights, staving off hunger by yelling. Shocked, after a visit to the parish priest, he wanted to cry out “*slum* is not a word for Sundays only, but rather our urgent word for every single day.” A trip to the slums became part of the University Work Service program (Servicio Universitario de Trabajo or SUT), an initiative promoted by José María de Llanos, who took hundreds of volunteers to the slums and the labor fields. They returned transformed by the experience of entering shanties or sharing in the experience working together with exploited field laborers who were paid a subsistence wage. The SUT was, in effect, a salutary lesson for those that participated in it, as Jesús Ibáñez remembers, “the so-called generation of 56—such as Pradera or Tamames—woke up to reality on the job.”²⁵

However, coming face to face with reality did not immediately cause them to reject the moral-dogmatic message that they had received from their elders. Free us, oh Lord, from disillusionment and bitterness, wrote Marcelo Arroita-Juaregui on the very significant day of April 1. Instead of despairing, the young Falangist or Catholic should rededicate himself to his decision to transform reality. From the very moment that the drunkenness of their triumph had worn off, there arose before their eyes a distressing landscape that begged for solutions, better still, that expected the solution, unique and unprecedented, that only these new men, equipped with revolutionary doctrine, could supply: a solution, as Arroita would write, rooted in the tradition and the reality of Spain, and propped up by the unity of men and of all the land, and by the fortitude of the State. Ah, but that unity had been disrupted, the economy was reestablished upon the same capitalist bases as before and conservative political interests slipped into the State unannounced.²⁶ The youth didn’t have much to celebrate that first day of April in 1949, yet this was no reason to give up. The blood of the dead commanded them, the first fruit of the redemption of Spain, in the national unity of her territories, in the social unity of her classes, as recited in “the Prayer for the fallen” which *La Hora* published on every anniversary of February 9—one day out of the year that the youth of Spain faced the lesson of death, from which should arise a message for life with which they would carry on the “work of

raising up this Physical Spain to the Exact Spain that God has dreamt of.” Giving up was not an option: “Let us not allow ourselves a single stop on our journey of fidelity to death,” the eternal sleep of the dead commanded it.²⁷

The more difficult the reality, the more resolute the determination to advance the ideal. In the end, this was the essence of the great story of resurrection by way of death that the church told with such mastery and that impregnated everything. However, in a calendar so full of funeral celebrations, announcements of new life also proliferated. Jaime Suárez, director of *La Hora*, presented himself as a member of a new Spanish generation, of which they were the minority: a generation who believed themselves to be part of a gigantic and complete Spanish transformation. They believed that everything would grow equally at the same pace as their own growth as a generation. But, “it wasn’t that way, it hadn’t been that way, and it was tough realizing it and waking up.” Well, at the very least they had already awoken, they had realized that “the story of our historic awakening was that we became aware of an absolute deception: nothing was as we had dreamed, although a great deal of it was good and surely better than before.” The faith within which they had been educated was total, a revolutionary faith, capable of erecting a radically new Spain. And when they awoke, they found a Spain that was hove to, was lowering her sails, was weathering the storms. Having gone beyond their framework, finding no one to pick up the slack, to mobilize their energies, they had no idea what to do; there was no exemplary voice that was raised to express the yearning that was burning inside them. They would be called the generation whose neglect was only matched by the faith they had placed in their ideals, and by the moral standard that they derived from it. They looked around, and found no one. Yet this did not mean they no longer heeded the words of José Antonio, always whispering in their ears, three duties: stand with the university, stand with Spain, stand with the Falange— a duty of unity, of common conscience, a revolutionary attitude, a combative eagerness. José Antonio was ever present, ever living. Or truer still, José Antonio must continue to be “relived,” as Ridruejo relived him: always thinking of him, thinking as he thought and of the directions he gave—for the “masterful lines of thought, the principle opinions, the deepest intuitions from the mind of José Antonio are not only valid still, but are even clearer than before.” The unfinished and necessary Revolution; it forms the touchstone of a philosophy whose complete re-creation manifests as life itself. The same unfinished revolution that the same Ridruejo would define at the end of 1953 as “giving Spain a State;” a “State for all.”²⁸

The revolution, always unfinished, came to be defined as the moral requirement to transform reality based on strong religious belief. As Javier Herrero remembers: “Our revolution is one of spirit against matter, José Antonio tells us,” a revolution that “in opposition to the great modern movements” attempts not to implement this idea through the “brute force of matter, with weapons of hate and resentment, but rather by elevating justice through the Christian love of its divine beauty.” Our action shall be made up of revolutionary canon, wrote Carlos París. Even Manuel Fraga, who at the time was deeply engrossed in an academic career

as a platform for rapid political ascension, put in his revolutionary two cents, proclaiming: against the restoration was the revolution, but let there be no doubt about it, this was “the revolution preached by José Antonio Primo de Rivera and others, the one that carried young men off to battle on July 18 and after.” Of course, if the revolution was to remain unfinished, it necessarily followed that it had not “been completed,” that it could only be said to have been “initially carried out.” But they were not able to derive from this idea any political strategy with which to conquer the State. The State was already conquered, and the revolution was not “fundamentally a political fight but rather a social one,” wrote París; it was about the fusion of philosophy and life, therefore, no program was needed,” says Herrero. For him the really important thing was the forging of conscience, of habits in keeping with the personality of the ever-living José Antonio. Really what had failed in Spain was not the State, but society. More specifically, what had failed was the Spaniard who had “allowed himself to be corrupted by routine, laziness and bribery when he reached a place of responsibility.” And at this juncture, what is most needed is a “vigorous shaking-up of Spanish society, down to its most authentic and effective components: work, family, local and civil life.” Only a revolutionary morality, a tension of the highest priorities would fix such a lamentable situation. It’s not a matter of reaching power through violence, because from power “nothing can be done if society and we ourselves are corrupt.” Only the formation of the new man, the new graft of Christian faith, with its Catholic truth, lived in its fullest radicalism, would result in salvation, Carlos París concluded in his lecture on revolutionary theory and morality.²⁹

So the discovery of reality did not provoke resistance to the regime, even less did it provoke a rebellious movement against its values and political foundations. Quite the opposite, it reinforced in those youngsters the very substance of the moral-dogmatic discourse they had received: if the problem lay in the fact that society had let itself fall victim to routine, laziness, and corruption, then the solution must be to agitate it, to shake it up. And being university students or young writers, this could only mean one thing to them: they must maintain their revolutionary enthusiasm. This was a conclusion that made their elders very happy: that “the boys” should be restless and generous, that they would not let themselves be deterred by routine or prosperity, but that they would maintain their enthusiasm and their hunger for revolution. And one maintains enthusiasm, they well knew, by encouraging group life, get-togethers, networks of friends, complicity. We participated in common causes, we met up at the magazine office, Carlos París remembers. *La Hora* was what united us, says Bugada, and it united a considerable number of “representatives of our generation, regardless of how they thought.” A mass of different people with different ideologies expressed their concerns in magazines, in tertulias, and in film clubs sponsored by the SEU. There, at *La Hora*, 44 Alacalá Street—“that building with its great yoke, whose arrows almost spanned the whole façade”—among the thirty or forty people that met there every week for massive writing workshops, were Tomás Ducay, Alfonso Sastre, Odón Alonso, Ignacio Aldecoa, José María de Quinto, Miguel Sánchez-Mazas, Rafael Sánchez Ferlosio, Carlos Alonso del Real, Carlos París, Marcelo Arroita-Jáuregui, Antonio Lago, José Luis Rubio, and Jaime Suárez. They were

all in agreement about one's attitude in life, though they came from different backgrounds and would follow different paths. José María Moreno Galván, who has outlined an excellent picture of them, adds a few names: Fraga, José M. Valverde, Rodrigo Fernández Carvajal, Carlos Robles Piquer, José Luis Rubio, Torcuato Fernández Miranda, José Manuel Caballero Bonald, Carlos Pascual de Lara, Jaime Ferrán, Carlos Edmundo de Ory, Manuel Mampaso, Ismael Medina, Carlos Talamás, Jaime Campmany, and Miguel Ángel Castiella: all speaking the same language of vocation, destiny, and generation. "Above all they adored generation . . . they considered Catholicism a mission, the Hispanic world a destiny, politics as morality, and they believed they had been summoned for the regeneration of Spain." They wanted to be the heroes of something. But he could have included himself in this generation, or mentioned Bardem or Berlanga, whom David Jato placed in the Falange of San Sebastián and the Blue Division, respectively. In any case, what mattered was their restlessness pierced by authenticity, which identified them as a new or current generation, as a minority summoned for great missions. "To the minority, always," was the slogan of *La Hora*. In restlessness and authenticity they were all equals, although some would add that they not only knew a thing or two about existentialism, but that they themselves "were existentialists," as Ferrán-Gómez remembered of the group that frequented the Grand Café of Gijón.³⁰

Perhaps the distance that later never stopped growing between them, moves those who recall their moments of youth and friendship to exclude themselves from those enthusiasms, or to reduce it all to a moral attitude: revolutionary passion, rebellion in the face of injustice, the feeling of camaraderie, existentialism. But there was more. There was their membership in the SEU in positions of responsibility, the love of writing, the easy access to magazine editing, the collaboration with cultural programs at Radio Nacional,³¹ the discussions, the expectations, the preparation for competitive exams, the literary tertulia, the first short stories, the first poems, stumbling upon the present and rejecting any doubt about the past, the phrasing of everything in political language which inevitably had at its core Fascist and Catholic rhetoric. In no project was this more apparent than in the Theater of Social Agitation of Sastre and De Quinto: avant-garde, with style, direction, combat, criminal class warfare, groups of protest and punishment, redemption, evangelical scenes.³² In truth, when one looks back on the accumulated experience of what occurred, one tends to downplay the link, the deep bond, that united those individuals who frequented the magazine offices of the SEU. They were not there because they ascribed to a strategy of participation *avant la lettre*, as if they were Marxists or Leninists. They were there because it was hard to be authentic and generous and not belong to the SEU, the Falange, or Catholic Action. They were there because they shared a vision of the world and the objective of using writing as a weapon of the unfinished revolution in order to resolve the contradiction between the moral message they had received and the reality that they faced everyday.

Around 1950, what older university students and young writers were trying to do was to use writing to bring themselves closer to the reality that had been

discovered, motivated by the moral incitement that hastened the day of the unfinished revolution. They had not all come from the Falange, and they were not all Catholic, nor did they all believe that just by articulating reality they could change the world. What, in every case, kept them together as a group was the profound discrepancy, which came to them as a revelation, between the principles their professors had tried to instill in them and the reality that smacked them in the face. This is what was behind the return to reality and the appearance of what some “insisted on calling social realism, and others, less vaguely, called objective realism,” as Jesús Fernández Santos says when he recalls the tertulias at the campus bar and the friendship of several people who hung out there “studying poorly and writing better,” including Ignacio Aldecoa, whom he met on campus one day “among poets, haughty, cordial, congenial, obstinate, cheerful, intelligent.” He asked him to write a story for the *Revista Española* that he was preparing along with Ferlosio and Sastre, under the sponsorship of Antonio Rodríguez Moñino. This is the same literary group that José María Castellet came to know sometime in 1952 or 1953 as he made the rounds of the squalid Madrid nightlife with Ferlosio, Sastre, Moreno Galván, Fernández Santos, and Aldecoa. Ignacio Aldecoa, who with the story “Always Poor” won the 1953 Juventud prize, admits to being attentive to the most humble items and tasks, to the places in the villages where men turn up to rejoice or suffer, to speak and love, to play and sing. He loved taverns and never objected to lower quality bar-hopping, accompanied by José Manuel Caballero Bonald and Carlos Edmundo de Ory. For him being a writer was “above all else, an attitude in the world.” “I have seen and continue to see what the poor of Spain are like. I do not take a sentimental or biased attitude. What moves me, above all, is the certainty that there is a Spanish reality, crude and tender at the same time, which is almost unknown in our literature,” he told *Destino* in December of 1955, just a month before *El Jarama*, by Sánchez Ferlosio, won the Eugenio Nadal prize for that year. The prize would go next to *Con el viento solano*, by Aldecoa himself, and the following year to *Entre visillos*, by Martín Gaité, all of which were, just like Fernández Santos’ *Los bravos* of 1954, implicit condemnations of the irritating global lie, detoxifiers of rhetorical triumphalism, as Jordi Gracia classifies them.³³

In Barcelona, things were no different, although there the Falange was not what it was in Madrid, and by Castellet’s reckoning there were fewer priests and soldiers seen in the streets. In any case, the ideological hijacking that Comín speaks of, and the experience of visiting the miserable slums and working in the fields with SUT was the same and had the same results as in Madrid. It is no coincidence either that two of the most bustling groups at the beginning of the fifties met at the offices of *El Ciervo* and *Laye*. Inspired by devotees of “the migrating tertulia of La Cucaracha”—a bar where they had only met once—the group of young Christians from *El Ciervo* learned to “embody,” to cast a critical gaze and a reproach, “more bitter than angry,” towards the forms of official Catholicism and the society that it sustained. They also learned to discover, by way of personal experience, the injustice of the capitalist system, bourgeois classism, and the world of labor and the poor. Directed by Lorenzo Gomis, it received the benefit of

experienced youths from a group whose name also evoked resurrection by death. El Grano de Mostaza (The Mustard Seed) met at a school run by Jesuits in Sarrià, where González Casanova himself met-up with José Ignacio Urenda and the very strong personality of Alfonso Carlos Comín.³⁴ The second group, *Laye*, depended on the Provincial Education Delegation, and had in Manuel Sacristán and José María Castellet its axis of thought, as Carlos Barral defines it. Or rather, as Pinilla wrote to Bonet, “at *Laye*, there were two poles: at one end the Ferraté brothers, and at the other, Manuel Sacristán, the aesthetic pole and the political pole.” Whether it was an axis or two poles, it was about a “group of young intellectuals unified by strong generational and local bonds.” They were young, mature, rebellious, cosmopolitan; in other words, they had not participated in the civil war; born around 1924, they no longer dealt in myths, they had not internalized, or perhaps they let slip away, the legitimization of the regime, and finally they had gone about discovering what was going on in the rest of Europe. At least that is how those that frequented the group remember it, perhaps with just a touch of anachronism. Sacristán and Castellet had extended their influence to the Barcelona Institute of Hispanic Studies, run by a pair of officials, one of whom, the future sociologist Juan Francisco Marsal, who was “venomously fascist.” Barral does not attribute the same identity to Manuel Sacristán at that time, perhaps because his fascism was not venomous, but it certainly had been very firm and serious. At *Laye* and at the Institute, Ramón Viladás and Francisco Farreras ran the show, and Sacristán to a lesser degree. “The rest moved behind the scenes, like a team with a head made of ideologues and a tail made of poets.” A principle member of the team was Esteban Pinilla de las Heras, of more than just notable productivity, who accounted for a third of the editions of the magazine, Barral exaggerated. Although perhaps he is right when he remembers that Hegel called him Ejel: he moved about at that time in the best family circles. Along with the Ferraté brothers, Juan and Gabriel, he completed the most active nucleus of a magazine that, unlike *El Ciervo*, was only allowed to live for three years.³⁵

It was long enough to demonstrate that in Barcelona, just as in Madrid, the road they had set out on led to the discovery of reality. Josep María Castellet occupied a central place in this trend. His friends from the Institute remembered him as a Falangist—even though he denied it and presented himself as liberal, democratic even, from birth.³⁶ At the Faculty of the Boscán Seminar, he was of great influence on the attitudes and orientation of the others and he encouraged discussions on foreign authors as well as also being a bridge between readers and collaborators of *Laye* and *El Ciervo*.³⁷ Today in Spain, Castellet asserted, no one writes. It’s not that novels are not published but what does get published are not novels but rather innocuous, ineffective, and impersonal works. It is said, for example, that *La vida nueva de Pedrito Andía* or *Viento del Norte*, by Rafael Sánchez-Mazas and Elena Quiroga, are good novels, but those are two novels that belong to another era and have been written before by other authors. Therefore one must write in a different manner, but it so happens that Joyce’s *Ulysses*, or Faulkner’s *The Wild Palms*, or the *USA* trilogy of Dos Passos, or the novels of Moravia, Sartre, or Hemingway, can hardly be found by the Spanish writer in the

bookstores of his country. If you add censorship to this, with its effect on spontaneity and thematic limitation, the result is that no one writes, as is evidenced by the fact that not a single novel or play has given expression to the most important national commotion since 1898: the civil war.³⁸ The solution? First, to stop crying and then to stop writing in the nineteenth century style. Next, to write is to reveal the totality of the life of a real man in order to assign it as a task for the reader, Castellet prescribes, rather than writes, showing signs that he was very familiar with Sartre and his question about literature. Literature is putting life into words, the editorial staff at *Juventud* had written in their letter to Aldecoa. Life, the totality of life, was what needed to be revealed, not as a better exercise of style but rather with the express purpose of putting forward life as a task. Such was the formula that rang out as revelation to the members of the generation, which Castellet himself labeled as being of the mid-century, and that echoed not only among the attendees of the Boscán seminar, nor just among the readers of *Laye. Alcalá* made haste to reproduce this fundamental article, which did not limit itself to the more or less typical literary criticism of the day, but defined a path, a path that led to the extraction, in literature but also in life, of all the consequences of that collision with reality that had so moved university students and young writers around 1950.

THE TEACHERS WERE MADE OF CLAY

Up against this confrontation with reality, the response of those who continued to struggle with the unfinished revolution, with a Spain that was displeasing, with the denunciation of conformity, and finally, with the evocation of the martyrs and the redemptive blood, was disappointing. Let us look, for example, to October of 1954, a year before Ortega's death and let us open up again, as an example, another magazine, *Juventud*, which Dámaso Santos considered "a platform, a training camp, with open attendance of the most self demanding writers, who were grown children during the war and who Enrique Ruiz García calls 'those of the intermediate generation.'"³⁹ We find there, in the special edition celebrating the founding of the Falange, Raimundo Fernández Cuesta's call not be carried away by melancholy or by narcissism. We find Jesus Frago del Toro's denunciation of conformity and declaration of civic war against the society in which we live. We find a discourse on bitter love, with which Miguel Ángel Castilla commemorates the Foundational Discourse, always capitalized. We find Carlos Luis Álvarez's homage to the dead and the Falange doctrine, and his proposal to return to the memory of the Falange of the catacombs. In other editions but from the same year, we find José María de Llanos' sermon in response to "Your objections to continence," and Enrique Luis García's umpteenth exaltation of the Caudillo of the National Revolution. He believed Franco to be the one who had come to resolve, once and for all, the antinomy between the Church and the State, and the National Revolution, always capitalized, as being the "most serious Spanish revolution and the best and most fruitful of the current world."⁴⁰ This magazine was the repertoire of the common themes that, in 1954, fell on deaf ears, as did the insistent show of disgust for the state of the Spanish university, which Pedro Laín often repeated: the University,

like Spain herself, displeases us, wrote the rector. The problem should be addressed head-on, “not from the branches of trees.” And what would coming down from the branches entail? Well, it would entail affirming the supposed principles of an institution worthy of that name, specifically: the intellectual love of created realities. According to the psalmist, the heavens, Laín reminds us, sing the glory of God. That was the first principle, which must have sounded to its audience more like celestial music than a song from the earth. The second principle was no less comforting than the first: a capacity for devotion to the production of intellectual works, since there was no use in intellectually loving reality if this love was ineffective. The third and final principle: the spirit of social community. Here we have the remedy for this ‘displeasing university,’ or at least, all that the rector had to say about it to the youth who also did not like the university.⁴¹

Any attempts to find other responses would be futile. It is Laín in Madrid, with his call to dedication to selfless service, to generosity and openness of spirit; or it is Tovar, in Salamanca, with his constant complaint that the Falange was not allowed to assume all the power; or minister Ruiz-Giménez, with his repeated reminder that the University was nothing without the militia. No matter how much you search, this is what makes up the public discourse of the team that had taken on the fascinating job of channeling the enthusiasms of those new generations who recognized them as their “big brothers.” Channel them, perhaps, but to where, not even they knew for sure. As much as it may have caught them off guard, it should not be surprising that the morale of “the boys” and the teaching of “the elders” suffered a rapid and simultaneous collapse as soon as the pretexts disappeared and the alibis vanished. In 1948 and 1949 they had been celebrated and honored as the great teachers of the generation, those that guaranteed the direction of history. In 1951 they laid out the path of hope: finally the contents of all those masterful lessons would be implemented. In 1953 they triumphed over their main adversaries: the neo-traditionalists of the self-labeled generation of 1948, the exclusives, those of the Opus. But by 1954 they begin to be singled out as the most distinguished representatives of a failed generation. The return to reality, apart from producing high caliber literary results that inaugurated a “discursive opposition to the rhetoric of the dictatorship,”⁴²—or more specifically to the peculiar mix of Falangist and hegemonic Catholic rhetoric during this phase of the dictatorship—culminated in the breakdown of that illusory line of continuity they had sought to establish between the “integrationist” generation and the one that was treading on their heels.

The first, or perhaps the harshest, argument along these lines was made by Juan Ferrater, from *Laye*, being unimpressed by the politics of Ruiz-Giménez and unaffected by the attitudes of his followers. It was provoked by a reply by Aranguren “in his peculiar “rhapsodic style” to a piece by Ridruejo about the “integral conscience” of his generation, which appeared in *Revista*. Ferraté felt that the article was not an ideal one to claim for itself the quality of “integrationist”. He found within it a need for self-justification that tormented many members of the generation that had gone to war and that identified with it.

For a start, no one that identifies with the war can boast about being integrationist. That a young man could see this with such clarity in 1953 says much about his sharpness, but even more so about what was hiding behind the integration rhetoric. They had all participated, with chiliastic optimism, Ferraté continued. They had monopolized the exercise of the political and intellectual life of the country, which ended up being cut up and divided. Therefore, the situation is confusing, as Antonio Tovar —one of the “ideological ‘leaders’ of that generation of optimists”—demonstrated, just after he finished reminding the State how much it owed to the Falange. However, confusing situations are cleared up by public debate and fair play, which remained impossible. In these conditions, one thing is clear: optimism turned out to be the worst position; the collective and detailed failure of the war generation was resounding.⁴³

That a youth’s voice was needed to express these elemental matters for the first time says everything about the insurmountable limits within which the “integrationist” generation operated. As long as the discourse of war was maintained and there was neither public debate nor fair play, the politics of integration would always be a fraud. This is the harshest criticism aimed at the war generation’s comprehensive faction, not by their eternal adversaries, but by one of their younger brothers. Not even Aranguren comes out unscathed. He says he doesn’t belong to the group but Ferraté doesn’t believe him: what he is doing is to “make off with the body”. We are talking about May of 1953, the moment of the faction’s greatest strength, when they held power at the universities. This was evidenced by the eye-catching Assembly of Universities, in which Ruiz-Giménez saw Franco as a star surrounded by a rainbow of university togas in all colors. Even in this situation Ferraté speaks of the failure of a generation, a temerity that *Laye* would pay the price for, not because of a reaction on the part of those explicitly singled out, but rather because of the decision of those in Barcelona itself, who felt they had been alluded to by some “know-it-alls who studied for their degrees, taking advantage of the blood shed by the very ones they now scorn.” It always came back to the blood of the martyrs as an insuperable alibi to put people in their places. The dead, in effect, are still in command. But Ferraté had put his finger in the wound. Integration was a fraud as long as no public debate happened. The closure of the magazine would be the most convincing proof of the fraudulent nature of integration.⁴⁴

As Juan Benet would later write, remembering this moment: as much they tried to make them into marble, “the great figures of our youth were all made of clay.” From this moment on, with this new attitude towards those who had attempted to act as teachers, the conscious awakening acquired an unexpected velocity for this very youth and, above all, for their older brothers. In the first place, the proof is in the social and political implications that immediately were derived from the turn towards realism in literature: in novels and short stories, as well as in poetry. It was in the poetic lecture halls of the Faculties of Philosophy and Liberal Arts, Law and Political and Economic Science, where there emerged an initiative to organize a conference of young writers which would be a source of misfortune for the ministerial team presided over by Ruiz-Giménez. Meetings of intellectuals

had been routine in recent years, from the international talks of San Sebastian and the Catholic talks of Gredos to the poetry meetings of Segovia and Salamanca. They were places of intellectual encounters and exchanges, conveniently removed from the noise outside. The Catholic meetings were organized by Alfonso Querejazu and Carlos Santamaría, the poetry meetings by Dionisio Ridruejo. In Gredos, Llorenç Gomis remembers, the group of invitees was carefully chosen, and the resulting sessions were very spiritual, secluded, and intimate. “It was forbidden to speak of politics, show-off, or propagandize,” writes González de Cardedal, who laments, with good reason, “the misconception and misinterpretation” of the meaning and scope of these talks derived from the disparaging pages José Luis L. Aranguren dedicates to their memory. This was the same Aranguren who was Querejazu’s right-hand man until 1961, when he decided not to return, and who “re-interpreted his own previous history in light of his subsequent attitude,”⁴⁵ a skill he did truly master. The talks in San Sebastian were not much different, although their highlight was above all the presence of European theologians who opened up the closed perspectives that at the time defined the Spanish-Catholic world. Lain, Aranguren, Marías, Díez del Corral, and Maravall were assiduous participants. These meetings, with their focus on the liturgical celebration, were far-removed from the triumphant Church, the perfect society in true canonist style, from which so much benefit had been derived with the Concordat, but which refrained from sliding into what would very soon become known in Christian circles as “prophetic denunciation.” In these meetings the liturgical celebration and the community of faith were highlighted, and in them a theological philosophy was developed, of equal French and German influence, that years later would reach its prime in the first sessions of the Second Vatican Council.

On a different note, the poetry conferences—first in Segovia, then in Salamanca—organized and promoted by Dionisio Ridruejo, with the presence of Catalan poets Clementina Arderiu, Carles Riba, Josep-Vicent Foix, and Marià Manent, helped to re-establish with Castilian poets that dialogue that had been broken by the brutality of the occupation. It also helped to create contacts with poets of other latitudes: “the calling of dialogue, the dedication to integration . . . are highlighted in these events, which take place among the golden stones of Salamanca,” wrote *Revista* on the occasion of the announcement of the second conference.⁴⁶ The impact of this must not be underestimated; it was, as Manent remembers, the first contact since the civil war in which “men of diverse ideas participated, writers that just a few years before had been tragically separated.” In Ciudad Rodrigo there was a reading of modern Catalan poetry, J.T. explained in his chronicle for *Destino*. And, in the Fray Luis de León lecture hall of Salamanca, Guillermo Díaz Plaja’s voice resounded with the “broad and admirable verses of J.M. Sagarra’s *La Chora*, which were heard with excited attention.”⁴⁷ But none of this, not even the multiplication of courses and tertulias at the Magdalena Palace, nor the sessions organized in its halls, due to their nature and the scope that their protagonists gave them, had direct political consequences (nor were they intended to). They were meetings of an intelligentsia that was evidently fed up with their small-minded surroundings,

but that had known how, and been able, to create discrete alcoves in which to exchange lofty pleasures. Perhaps, as Vicente Aleixandre observed on one occasion, they could say in Segovia what they couldn't say in Madrid. But, while they said it and while those gathered at Gredos spoke of the responsibility of the Catholic intellectual and the liturgical renovation, the processional drums and loud speakers of the missions continued to thunder in the streets; the episcopate found itself as comfortable as it had been in the days of Constantine—as it soon became common place to label the relationship consecrated by the Concordat—showing no signs that these lofty colloquia provoked the slightest bit of irritation on its leathery skin. On the other hand, the fact that Carles Riba and Dionisio Ridruejo could embrace each other did have a high symbolic value, but still it lacked political consequences. So Ruiz-Giménez's team, which had promoted all these meetings and returned to their professorships various purged professors—Miaja, Millares, Rey Pastor, Duperier—not only saw no problem with the announcement of the planned young writers conference, but actually encouraged it and offered means and meeting space to the group in charge of its organization. Perhaps it was an appropriate initiative to channel what was already being noticed in the upper echelons, something like a malaise among university students, especially since Ortega's burial and the demonstrations it caused.

The fact was that the youth—writers and students alike—were upset and the university rectors knew it: "On the Spiritual Situation of the Spanish Youth," was the title of a report by rector Pedro Laín that was based on surveys of university students done by José Luis Pinillos. Laín forwarded this report to the higher authorities in December of 1955 and even personally delivered it to Franco during an hour-long interview that left an impression on the rector's soul. Almost a year had passed since the conference had been announced and, in the meantime, the initiative's promoters had published a *Boletín* (State bulletin) entitled *University Conference of Young Writers*, whose June edition included this agenda: "Social Realism: fields of endeavor, men, factories, against the stylistics of the pure schools," accompanied by the slogan "Humanize now: set the existential free. In fact: from earth to angel as soon as possible." All together then: realism, humanism, and existentialism. In the conference's secretariat and executive committee many people of diverse backgrounds revolved around a nucleus—and here lies the novelty—of recent inductees into the Communist Party. Among those present were Jesús López Pacheco, Julián Marco, Enrique Múgica, Jaime Ferrán, Julio Diamante, Gabriel Elorriaga, and Claudio Rodríguez.⁴⁸ The planned date of autumn 1955 had to be postponed due to the death of Ortega, an event that made evident the growing distance between the ministerial authorities' expectations and what the youth were pushing for. In fact it had become so obvious that no one failed to notice it, not even the authorities, who suspended the projected celebration of the conference. For this reason the rector rushed to calm everyone's nerves and preempt the situation with his diagnosis of "a swarm of writing and rumors that had circulated in recent weeks about the diversion of Catholic orthodoxy and of the July 18 ideals of the university youth." This is no innocent comparison between orthodoxy and ideals, between faith and a date: in

December of 1955 they went hand in hand, albeit with the controversial denial that the youth were turning away from either one.⁴⁹

If one takes into account the path the “university youth” had taken to their collision with reality, and if one confronts the moralizing paternalism that overflows from this document, then it’s no wonder that just two months later those in charge of university education found themselves perplexed, taken aback, incapable of any reaction, facing a phenomenon that had all the markings of a revolt. Pinillos had affirmed, as a result of his surveys, that between 55 and 60 percent of students were “openly dissatisfied with the present situation,” but Laín tackled this analysis, as Ortega would have, distinguishing between the masses and the minority. He defined the former as healthy in its daily morale and harmless in its religiosity, favorably disposed to the political incitement that social justice and real participation offered. The minority, for their part, felt disturbed in all four spheres of their lives: intellectual, political, social, and religious. They were unhappy with the “scientific, philosophical, and literary pabulum that Spanish society had to offer them” and uneasy about the future of Spain, “an urgent criticism due to our state’s lack of energy.” There was nothing new in this, rather it was old and hackneyed commentary that all the magazines had been saying for at least the last ten years. There was nothing new in the religious aspect either. Although cases of dissidence and lack of faith could be found here and there, what really stood out among the students was their “intense spirituality, cheerfully prepared to build with Christian authenticity the new society of the Fatherland.” Without a doubt, there were reasons to feel a certain amount of unease with respect to the future, above all because of the mindset of the young university student: his peculiar historical conscience, the result of “not having lived our Uprising”, the limited professional horizon, the poor example set by many social sectors due to their abusive zeal for profits, the condemnatory paternalism of the state and the constant flattery directed at the youth. But all of this could be channeled as long as the ruling classes of national life undertook a rigorous and shrewd examination of conscience; as long as the youths’ horizon was opened up and enriched; as long as a pertinent link was established between discipline and teaching, such that the teaching profession could achieve its own authority through its quality and level of persuasion; and finally, as long as an intelligent and flexible opening was initiated for everything of literary or artistic significance that occurred beyond our borders. If all this were done, then the preoccupations in the university would find an appropriate outlet.

Certainly, this kind of talk would have gone on indefinitely had there not existed, within the group responsible for the conference, a politically organized nucleus that made a strategic decision followed by a spectacular success: respond to the suspension of the young writers conference by calling for a national student conference. To carry out their plan they circulated and signed a manifesto that, “from the heart of the Spanish university”—a concession to Miguel Sánchez-Mazas, who with this phrase intended to leave a sign of his authorship—requested the calling of a “National Student Conference, with full guarantees, in

order to give a representative structure to their corporative organization.” They also proposed the calling of elections in each university district for the organization of the conference.⁵⁰ What happened after the massive collection of signatures was really astonishing: blindsided, the SEU bigwigs organized a counteroffensive that led to a violent attack on university students and the first generalized revolt in a Spanish university since before the civil war. It is true that here and there, in previous years, there had been some confrontations between Falangists and Monarchists, Juanists and Traditionalists: in Seville, in February of 1951 a group of Carlists scaled the statue of Rodrigo Fernández de Santaella and, aside from putting a red beret on his head, they hung a sign around his neck that read: “A mí, maese Rodrigo, / el SEU me importa un higo” (Master Rodrigo I must confess / for the SEU I couldn’t care less). This was enough to earn them a furious attack by angry SEU members the next day.⁵¹ But an open fight, with attacks by groups of Falangists in paramilitary formation, was something new that caught the world by surprise, including the university rector himself, submerged in “shocking passivity,” incapable of breaking a painful silence, as denounced in a new manifesto of February 27 by law students who asked for the freedom and rehabilitation of their companions and friends who had been “detained and insulted.” And, in effect, for the first time in the history of the regime, the press, accustomed to the routine censorship of anything that concerned the public order, had no other option but to include an unusual piece of news: the arrest of a group of activists to whom the General Directorate of Security conceded the respectful use of the term ‘Don,’ which was much less common then than it is now. They were, by order of appearance in that historic note: Don Miguel Sánchez-Mazas, Don Dionisio Ridruejo, Don Ramón Tamames, Don José María Ruiz Gallardón, Don Enrique Múgica, Don Javier Pradera, and Don Gabriel Elorriaga.⁵²

REJECTION OF THE GREAT TALES: THE CIVIL WAR AS A USELESS FRATRICIDAL SLAUGHTER

They were the first ones to go to prison. More would follow, for the demonstrations did not cease. From that time onwards, prison became a meeting place for university students and intellectuals coming from the political groups that began to take shape in the spring of 1956: members of the University Socialist Association and militants from the Popular Liberation Front; socialists from the “Tierno group” and friends that had followed Dionisio Ridruejo in his new Democratic Social Action Party; anarchists and communists and even one or two monarchists, detained in successive raids. It was a fundamental experience for all those that went through it or suffered it and for their friends and companions. Soon the dividing line drawn by the civil war, and emphasized by the massive indoctrination the younger generations had been subjected to, was erased in the circulating manifestos and in the prison yards. Belonging to a family from the winning side no longer determined one’s world vision or political views. This was not because new visions of the world or political views had sprouted up as a result of the assimilated experiences of resistance or rebellion within the youth organizations of the regime, of the Falange, of some branch of Catholic

Action, or even among the writing staff of the magazines, but rather it was because all of these elements, in the radical version that the system itself favored as a channel for the expansion of young energies, fell to pieces and left a void in their place: the SEU magazines, the poetry meetings, all lost their meaning. From this moment on “one couldn’t be a Falangist in Spain,” Luciano Rincón remembers.⁵³ The time of the mixed Falangist-Catholic identity, which had become so abundant in the previous decade, was coming to an end as well.

Moreover, from this moment on, one could no longer go on recounting the great tale of the civil war, recited with so much conviction by the generation that created it, in any of the factions, whether exclusive or comprehensive. Therefore, the loss of confidence in the elders became immediately apparent in the rejection of the until then codified tales that from every platform and pulpit had been inculcated in the youth: neither July 18 as hope for the dawning of an assumptive Spain, nor July 18 as point of departure for a rigorously unified Spain, nor Spain as a problem, nor Spain devoid of problems. All of this grew old so quickly that nothing was left but ruins for historians to graze among. There was nothing from which to create a new tale that young generations could recognize themselves in. July 18 had established nothing more than the present misery which they had stumbled upon when they decided to reflect upon it and compare it with the rest of the world. April 1, a day equally conducive to meditations and parades, had not established that fatherland in which everyone could meet once again, reconciled. The civil war as a crusade for religion and fatherland, as a war of national independence, was now restricted to the discourse of official commemorations.

The problem consisted in what to put in the place occupied for so many years by the great tale that had nourished the infancy and youth of those who were now becoming adults. In 1956 nothing could replace the grandiose structure that was simultaneously symbolic, ritual, ideological, moral, and political, which had been built by the winning side. Carmen Martín Gaité, a student in Salamanca and later in Madrid, remembers the war as something that “almost no one mentioned, for better or for worse . . . a characteristic of thoughtlessness, due to our age at the time.” No one mentioned it, but no one could stop writing about it in the daily press, in magazines—university and otherwise—in which its presence was permanent, as in the NO-DO (Noticiarios y Documentales, state-controlled newsreels), with its overwhelming attention to “places of memory” related to the civil war. Jaime Gil de Biedma, reflecting after the events of February on what was happening to his generation, wrote, “the most intelligent of us, among the children of the winners, were able to build ourselves a system of inhibitions that annulled the interpretation (of the civil war) that our fathers gave but we were unable to jump the fence and find a different one.” What he didn’t say was that they would only be able to jump the fence and find a different one when the interpretation they had received was annulled, not only by a system of inhibitions, but also by the positive action of rebellion that would situate them in a new political terrain. The system of inhibitions was forged during the years of searching for reality: the Spanish reality of 1950, the shanties, the hunger, the contagious diseases, the misery that entered through the eyes of any who cared to

see it. But in 1956, something happened beyond visiting the slums, going to the working fields, or discussing Sartre in tertulias. Gil de Biedma was correct in highlighting its significance: "If the asphyxiating years after the civil war have not succeeded in irredeemably suffocating the country, I doubt that the disproportionate and ridiculous current reprisals can cancel out the unusual fact that in Spain it is still possible to confront the government. We had been educated to believe that this, what was happening, was not possible." The twenty foolish years had not made fools of us all.⁵⁴

All the education received was only to be rejected, just by demonstrating that in Spain it was possible to confront the government. Today this is easy to say, sometimes due to an indulgent view plagued with the nostalgia that on occasion gazes on that education, and at other times because one tends to leave out from the discourse of teachers everything that clashed with a later evolution, judging it to be episodic and circumstantial. But back then there was little nostalgia, and everything the teachers said was heard: the students had won a war and as a result they expressed themselves as comprehensive winners, intending to reconstruct an intellectual community with the remains of the vanquished. That is why, to come to the conclusion, through political action, that these teachers were made of clay, opened up an unlimited field of freedom to each individual, and allowed, as Benet writes, "the dominating pressure to be shaken off by means that were beyond the control of the bodies, organizations, and instruments of State security, and family."⁵⁵ At first, they escaped this system of control through the system of inhibitions that Gil de Biedma mentions, but later, and more definitively, they did so by direct confrontation: it was with an act of rebellion that they shook off the legacy of their elders and began to abandon the task they had been assigned. Logically, with the breakdown of authority, the great tale of the civil war collapsed as well, in both of its versions, which, without deviating from the central plotline, had fought for control over memory and the imposition of cultural politics.

It was necessary then, to recount the past in such a way that it could project a new policy addressing the future over its memory. But in 1955 the students had no system of ideas at their disposal that could replace the one that had been constructed since 1936: the dissatisfaction that Pinillos had detected was "reactive by nature." A clearly structured progressive ideology had not suddenly appeared, Pinillos maintained. Instead it was a "disagreement with what was in place . . . a vague spirit of dissatisfaction that was halted in its practical consequences by collective fears, economic ambitions and, above all, by the lack of clear, constructive ideals."⁵⁶ Therefore, it is impossible to exaggerate the February incidents, which might look "trivial, in and of themselves in the eyes of western democracies," but that revealed the first "serious crack" in the supposedly monolithic regime, British ambassador Ivo Mallet writes.⁵⁷ The student rebellion brought about the downfall of the team who from their position of power had attempted a policy of national integration without first requiring that those "integrated" enjoyed the slightest possibility of speaking, writing, or defending their positions. Moreover, it meant the end of the SEU as a political

force; on the first occasion that the students voted freely, the SEU representatives were defeated. It provoked the first suspension of rights, falsely recognized in the Fuero de los Españoles (Jurisdiction of Spaniards), and created a governmental crisis that would drag on for a year. It erased the line that, since the war, had divided the victors from the vanquished, and that had served as a determining factor in the political scene. Finally, and no less importantly, after February of 1956 it became increasingly common to see in university manifestos the demand for “rights of opinion, expression, and association,” and the demand for the “democratization of university organizations.” The “political conscience” that Spanish students had earned during the 1955-1956 school year would be expressed from then on in the language of democracy.⁵⁸

Those who had simultaneously disrobed their teachers and the regime were a combination of young writers and upper-level students. They would also be the first ones to take a new look at the civil war, which would lead to the necessity of strengthening a new political subject, defined by the decision to erase from memory or cast aside the political determinacy of the dates July 18 and April 1. It is no coincidence that only after the events of February does the phrase “we children of the victors and vanquished” appear in a political document, a manifesto that the newly created University Socialist Association handed out on April 1, 1956, on the anniversary of a victory that “has not resolved any of the problems that inhibit the material and cultural development of our homeland.” This was the work of Jorge Semprún, “after consulting with university comrades, particularly Javier Pradera and Francisco Bustelo,” in which the civil war loses its halo and is reduced to an exclusively military act that, ultimately, was useless. It had not solved a single problem. These students in Madrid address themselves to their companions in Spain and to public opinion “precisely on this date . . . because it is the founding day of a regime that has been unable to integrate us into an authentic tradition, to steer us towards a common future, or to reconcile us with Spain and with ourselves.” It is the verification of the failure of integration policies and at the same time the expression of a sense of alienation from Spain, with which they did not feel reconciled, just as they did not feel reconciled with themselves. The regime, for its part, had been incapable of projecting a common future. Spanish society remained split, although the new moral and political individuals that had appeared had resolved the division caused by the civil war by proclaiming themselves to be the children of victors and vanquished.⁵⁹

If this was the manifesto written in Madrid, then a more elaborate “testimony” came out of Barcelona. Written by Esteban Pinilla de las Heras in the summer of 1956, it was edited and expanded by Castellet, Sacristán, and Vicente Girbau. According to Pinilla it was not circulated widely, although thanks to Joan Reventós and Girbau it did reach the White House, albeit with no effect. Girbau also took it to *Ibérica* magazine, which Victoria Kent published in New York, and Pinilla himself handed a copy to Jean-Michel Bloch, for *Preuves. El Socialista*, a PSOE (Spanish Socialist Workers’ Party) enterprise in Toulouse, published it in its entirety on August 22, 1957, with the title that Pinilla himself had given it,

“The Testimony of Generations Detached from the Civil War.” Moreover, Indalecio Prieto, who had long since been fighting for policies similar to those expressed in this document, saluted Vicente Girbau’s arrival to the PSOE, highlighting the decisive role of the appearance of these “generations detached from the civil war.” Their chronological limits would be, Prieto wrote, on the one hand not having taken an active part in the civil war, and on the other hand, having some remote childhood memory either of the war itself or of its immediate aftermath: “We are talking about the children of the ‘dominant caste’ who have freely chosen to become, in spirit at least, part of the ‘dominated caste’ or rather they have aligned themselves with it in order to create a new situation in which there are no castes, only free citizens of a free country.” Girbau himself had an audience with the directing committee of PSOE, where he announced that the war had ended in 1948, and by 1956 a new era had begun.⁶⁰

This is what these generations detached from the civil war believed. It is for this reason that they left behind such a “testimony:” to proclaim that the war had ended and to begin this new stage, creating a new tale that laid to rest the one of the victors without reviving the one of the vanquished. They were those Spaniards who were either born after the war, or at least were still dressing in children’s clothes during “those incomprehensible years.” Their generation was formed by those that in 1936 were at most twelve or thirteen years old: the children of the war. If the authors of the document seem to have an interest in highlighting this detail, it is because they were attempting to shake off all responsibility for everything that had happened since then: “No one has been allowed to participate in the slightest way in the social structure imposed on the country after the useless fratricidal slaughter.” This emphasis on declaring themselves detached from the war and its result could be related to the fact of having been “German” as adolescents and having negotiated “with perfect unawareness the concepts of Providence, Destiny, God, Will and others,” a Germanic illusion that fell to pieces in 1944,⁶¹ but whose consequences did not immediately disappear. Their youth—the testimony continues—was surrounded by a mythological air and a reverential cult to a man that had been sent by Providence to save Spain. They have had no teachers, and they do not recognize any real teaching in what has been taught them. The image of the country that was instilled in them—a metaphysical Spain, perverted by loathsome ideologues—“doesn’t hold up anymore.” Not because they have learned foreign ideologies, or because they intend to oppose this metaphysical Spain or the imperial myths with a different metaphysical tale: it is the accumulation of small experiences, derived from their participation in SUT, or the social conscience that awoke in them as young Catholics, which obliges them to repudiate the heritage they received and its origin. It is the experience that they lived, that of having tried to translate their religious beliefs into practical deeds, only to find it useless.

What is significant about this testimony is that the void produced by the rejection of the great tale of the winners is not filled by another tale of the same, albeit reversed, nature. As Carlos Barral would remember, they formed part of the “first literary graduation that was neither confessional nor anticlerical, free from

inherited phobias or fidelities of any kind. We were no longer even children of the Republic.”⁶² They had asked questions of the previous generation, the one that had fought in the war and won it, and they had obtained some revealing answers: most had confessed to them that they “had been the victims of a fraud.” It should come as no surprise, therefore, that the flood of propaganda dumped on the postwar generation, “in an effort to inculcate in us a permanent hatred for those that had been defeated, only served to awaken our indignation.” Rejection and indignation, or just indifference, like that of the San Javier cadets who refused to act as extras in a movie, *Alas de juventud*, produced by Johann Reinhardt, without being the least bit moved by the German producer’s portrayal of the services of Spanish aviation during the war: it was a long time ago, they told him.⁶³ The youth, the “Testimony” continued, couldn’t hate by the force of another’s will: “what we shall do is fight this slogan of hatred that still exists. For now we know that the defeat was the defeat of everyone, against everyone.”

nsistently declared, the feeling of being detached from the war, according to Castellet, results in a nonconformist attitude that nevertheless, “does not translate into the unconditional acceptance of the position of some groups of intellectuals in exile.” The war, writes Luciano Rincón a few years later, is already something so far removed, so uninteresting, so marginal to the new problems, and has been told so inaccurately by the victors and the vanquished, that the only thing “we are sure of, is that it is not our job to finish [it]:” the war, a useless catastrophe, has not accomplished a single thing.⁶⁴ This is obviously not the tale of the vanquished. It is that of the children of the victorious, who have proven, through their experience of opposing the dictatorship, that they have been the victims of a fraud. All they can do, once this discovery has been made, is declare themselves detached from the civil war, refuse to accept any of its great tales and reclaim a series of rights that have been denied in their name: the right to the truth, to free press, to participation, to basic education for all. It is still just babbling, a first and a confused demand to “leave behind the collective lie”, and to “unmask the public lie.” But it is already a language of democracy: academic, industrial, and local democracy; democracy that is not a gift that comes from the heavens, but a political democracy that can only be achieved by an education in the exercise of democracy, as the authors of the “Testimony” claim.

This authentic demolition of the great tales of the civil war was not solely the work of university students and young writers, mostly children of the victorious. A few months after the events of February, 1956, a long editorial was published in the July edition of *Las Españas*, a magazine founded and run in Mexico by José Ramón de Arana and Manuel Andújar. This editorial supported the creation of a new climate that did away with the history of partisan revolts, brawls, wars, crises, repressions, and uprisings that had filled the history of Spain from the mutiny at Aranjuez to the military coup of Martínez Campos. Only in that new climate, and not in the preservation of “confrontational fronts, was—is—the possibility of a way out, not only from the circle of ruin and shame that had come about during the last two decades, but also from the ancient labyrinth in which various generations of Spaniards have been uselessly exhausted.” It was not just a

question of bringing the civil war to a close, but also of laying to rest a dispute that was already several decades old. To achieve this, *Las Españas* champions the opening of a civil dialogue to put an end to the series of “factors of national anger and dissolution that cause us to live in permanent subversion.” The civil war, with its resulting indignities and miseries, is understood as a “great lesson” that “together with the renovation that time has brought about for a considerable section of the population, allows hope for what yesterday was impossible: the integration of a national formula for the reconstruction of Spain, not just for this person or that person, but for all people, always.” Naturally, starting up a dialogue that leads to a national formula with a place for everyone wouldn’t be easy: it called for, above all, “sinking one’s teeth into the truth.” And the truth was that “the tragedy of the civil war was not the work of the Devil: neither that red demon nor the blue-shirted one of the respective propagandas.” The generation of those that went to war, the editorialist continues, have “the obligation to end it by jumping out from behind the barricade and saying the word.” Given that “we couldn’t avoid it, let us put an end to it the only way possible: abandoning the trenches and burying them along with the “dead” that do not want to come out.”⁶⁵

Not all those in exile shared these points of view, but it is significant that a Spanish University Front (Frente Universitario Español or FUE) founded in Mexico by a group of graduates at Spanish universities and technical schools, “using the clean anagram of the University School Federation (Federación Universitaria Escolar, also FUE)”, approved another manifesto in 1957 whose first point begins with a surprising affirmation: “The great responsibility for the past civil war is a collective one that no member of Spanish society can claim exemption from, nor can they place the entire burden upon the shoulders of their adversaries.” Naturally, representing the war as a collective fault does not make sense if it were not for the fact that it is from this representation that the political strategy of the FUE members can be derived, which they defended by declaring their desire that “such deeds are never again repeated,” and that it was necessary “to settle the civil war, sincerely and without evasions, through a national concord, also settling at the same time all the echoes and residues of the civil wars of the nineteenth century, of which the most recent one was a latent consequence.” The Spanish students working in Mexico go a step further when they define the national concord as the will to coexist with all of their compatriots, renouncing violence, and they advocate an “intermediate situation” that would lead to democracy. To reject the great tales of the civil war means postulating democracy as the only form of the State that allows for the reconstruction of coexistence among Spaniards.⁶⁶

THE DISCOURSE AND PRACTICE OF NATIONAL RECONCILIATION

The representation of the civil war as a useless fratricidal slaughter entailed, sometimes implicitly, sometimes spelled out clearly, a vision of the future that found expression in a political strategy that came to have an extraordinary impact. Jorge Semprún is right when he remembers, “as a small historical detail,” that the April 1, 1956 manifesto is “the first clandestine document that mentions

this idea of reconciliation, which was to become so worn-out.” More than just mention it, the document set in motion its practical implementation. Reconciliation began, Nicolás Sartorius remembers years later, on San Bernardo street, in February of 1956, when the “we, the children of the victors and the vanquished demonstrated together in the streets of Madrid against the institutions of the dictatorship.”⁶⁷ Without a doubt, the new strategy found its recognition in a declaration published by the Spanish Communist Party (Partido Comunista de España, or PCE) in June of 1956. It was the first document to break away from the traditional “meanings” of the war, still in force, when it sent a message “to the patriotic intellectuals” in April of 1954, on the occasion of these “times of sorrow for the homeland” provoked by the “military, economic, and political alliance forged between Franco’s cronies and the United States.” The message continued to exalt “the secular fight of the people for the freedom of the fatherland” and to remember Móstoles and Zaragoza, Tarifa and Roncesvalles, Sagunto and Numancia, in order to once again define the civil war as “three years of fierce resistance in defense of national independence, of democratic liberties, and of republican institutions,” defended by the sublime heroism of “our people.” In June of 1956, however, the PCE evokes that historic date of July 18, close to its twentieth anniversary, but only to insist on the necessity of destroying “the two significances, still present until this day:” the official one that celebrated the victory and involved perpetuating the spirit of civil war, the hatred of republicans and democrats, and a tone of a crusade against half of Spain; the other, that of “we the defeated” which represented confidence in the reestablishment of democracy, the refusal to accept an unjust defeat, and a certain spirit of revenge. Two opposing meanings or stories that had to take into account the important evolution of recent years. Principally, considerable forces that in another time had belonged to the Franco camp were showing their disagreement with the politics of keeping alive the spirit of the civil war. This was on the side of the victors. On that of the vanquished, there were numerous and influential opinions in favor of burying the hatreds and grudges of the civil war because the spirit of revenge is not a constructive feeling. From this the PCE derived the existence of a spirit that was favorable to the national reconciliation of Spaniards that had fought in opposing camps, and it solemnly declared itself willing to “contribute, without reservations, to the reconciliation and to ending the division caused by the civil war.”⁶⁸

The proposal for reconciliation based on a memory of the civil war as a useless tragedy or slaughter that had done everyone harm was not new. Américo Castro had written in 1943 that, in order to escape “the horrors that all, all of us have unleashed,” he raised his voice in demand of a justice “in which we are all the judges and the accused.” Castro had learned from distance and pain, from contemplating Spain from afar, “that it is not true that there are two Spains.” This duality was just the “result of a sinister mirror illusion in which he who sees his reflection attempts to assassinate his counterpart, and ends up killing himself.” And Indalecio Prieto, at least from 1942 on, spoke about reconciliation in similar terms to those employed by the Communist Party in 1956. Using words uttered by Pla y Deniel when he took over the primatial see of Toledo, he proposed the

first politics of reconciliation: “confessing the whole truth and being ashamed of our own crimes and those of others.” No firm step forward may be taken, said Prieto, “before we all confess and repent of our sins.” Speaking about reconciliation therefore required admitting one’s own responsibility in a war that could no longer be classified as the defense of the fatherland against an invader, but rather as a collective tragedy, as Aranguren wrote in 1953, trying to establish a dialogue between Américo Castro and Francisco Ayala: “we all feel wrapped up in this human, fratricidal, brutal reality. We are all—though we may try to forget it—protagonists and responsible for the tragedy.” Therefore, Aranguren continued, “the only respectable way out is catharsis through the nausea produced by contemplating such a frightful event.”⁶⁹

This discourse of reconciliation as the basis of the new politics of the future had a very precise objective in the 1940s: to reach an agreement between unions and parties in exile and the internal dissidents in order to present itself to the victorious democratic powers of World War II as an alternative to the dictatorship: thus, it excluded the communists. Republicans, socialists, and anarchists both internal and in exile were aware of the impossibility of overthrowing Franco without the backing of some sectors from the victorious side and without the support of the Allied powers. But reaching an agreement with those with whom you had fought to the death for three years required that you first reach an agreement about the necessity of enacting a general amnesty. And there was no possibility of amnesty, which Spaniards must mutually concede to each other, as long as some still maintained the mythic tale of Spain and Anti-Spain, while others continued to speak of a war of the Spanish people for their independence and liberty against a foreign invader. In order to make a new policy possible, the representation of the war had to be modified: from being a war against a foreign invasion or Anti-Spain to a war between brothers; from a war of extermination to a useless slaughter; from a heroic feat worthy of celebration to a tragedy worthy only of sorrow. It is no coincidence that the agreement signed in September of 1948 by a delegation from the Confederation of Monarchic Forces (Confederación de Fuerzas Monárquicas), led by Gil Robles, and another agreement from the Socialist Party, headed by Prieto, both had as their first point the concession of a broad amnesty for all the crimes committed during the civil war.⁷⁰

In 1956, those that announced a new discourse on the war were not the ones who had waged it, but their children who, since the agreements signed between Spain and the United States, had abandoned—or perhaps had never really bought into in the first place—the expectation of a foreign intervention that would put an end to the dictatorship. This was therefore not their proposal. Instead, they wanted to draw a line between those in favor of and those against the regime which had been established by force of arms. This gave more power to their rejection of the civil war, to their expression of detachment from the event; the war had nothing to do with them. No one claimed responsibility for it for the simple reason that no one wanted to seem responsible for the current miserable state of affairs. For this reason also, among the youth no one was excluded; the reconciliation included

the communists, in large part because a sizable number of new communists were the children of the victors and they had taken their first political steps in Falange or Church organizations, or both. The youth, Ridruejo writes in 1962, resist the destiny of having to continue or reproduce the civil war and they have a hard time identifying with one Spain or the other. The warring Spains were “mere residues” and when the youth wondered about the future, it realized that “it can only be told by converting our past into history.” Convert the past into history. Ridruejo knew very well that was “the irreplaceable expression” used on multiple occasions by Enrique Tierno as he tried to forge an agreement between political groups from the internal opposition and those in exile. In our judgment, said an analysis of the situation prepared as a program of the socialist group led by Tierno, “the civil war should be assimilated as a historical fact that has the feeling and dark character of a collective sin.” As a consequence, the words vanquished and victorious should be considered “words without meaning” in the Spain of 1964. The attempt to perpetuate the mentality of the civil war in the minds of those that had not fought seemed to Tierno and his group to be “useless, unpatriotic, and clearly immoral.”⁷¹

In the end this amounted to the generalized belief that the regime would collapse by a process of rapid erosion of its own bases. In 1948 an Allied invasion was hoped for. In 1956 it was hoped that a policy of reconciliation would undermine the foundations of the dictatorship and, in a peaceful manner, completely excluding violence, resolve the Spanish problem. “I believe that Franco is effectively lost. And Spain won,” Miguel Sánchez-Mazas wrote in 1957 after remembering the children of the victors mixing with the children of the vanquished in the same prisons: the former renouncing their privileges, the latter their hatred “in favor of the same thing: civil peace and mutual respect between all Spaniards.” 1956 also sees, next to the great tale of national reconciliation and in large part determined by its content, the expectation of the rapid demise of the regime, encouraged by the fact that a student revolt was enough to cause a governmental crisis. Especially in the exile media, be it France or Mexico, it was repeated with insistence that the regime was drawing its last dying breaths, that the dictatorship was collapsing without any need for “subversive action.” The socialists and the republicans believed it, as did the anarchists and the communists. There was no other explanation for the excessive expectations that led the PCE to establish a national day of reconciliation and call a peaceful general strike with the objective of “making apparent the national desire for General Franco to abandon power and for political freedom to be reestablished,” two fiascos that did not modify the strategic direction established in 1956. The revolutionary general strike, with its accompanying armed insurrections that during the 1930s were directed against the governments of the Republic and had been a political weapon used by unions and socialists, changed not only its name but also its purpose: there would be no more insurrections or conquests of power by all means available, that is, by violence.⁷²

But if the great tale of national reconciliation was far from dynamiting the bases of the regime and accelerating its downfall, it did have a decisive influence on the

opening up of new territory in which those opposed to the dictatorship, and dissidents from the regime could meet without either of them having to renounce their own political discourse: the restoration of democracy and the revolutionary transformation of society. Democracy for now, revolution in the vague future: these ideas were incorporated into the political discourse that began to be spoken among young writers and students who had gone through the double experience of rebellion and incarceration. A substantial number of these youths came from Carlism, the Falange, the SEU, Marian Congregations, and specialized branches of Catholic Action, which, in terms of concrete political ascription, meant that Catholics and Marxists found themselves speaking a similar language in which democracy or transformation of the State, and revolution or radical transformation of social and economic structures appeared mixed in different doses: an inconceivable circumstance in the thirties, impossible in the forties, more and more widespread in the second half of the fifties, commonplace in the sixties. A good piece of evidence, among many such, is that someone like Elías Díaz—so well known for his defense of a state ruled by law and of a democratic society—should advocate in 1964 the “realization of the authentic revolution through democratic and pluralist means that progressively accomplishes the implementation of socialist economic frameworks.” And as if he wanted to apply the bandage before being wounded, he clarified: “it’s not about any sort of continuism; it’s about enforcing a democratic conscience, achieving a democratic system, and thus bringing about the necessary revolution.”⁷³

Democracy *cum* revolution: it was a radical change of political culture, the result of everyone moving about in a terrain with no internal borders: all democrats against the dictatorship, all revolutionaries against the unjust capitalist society. Although caution was maintained with respect to the intentions and goals of each individual, and although considerations of long-term political strategy or short-term revolutionary enthusiasms led to the formation of different and sometimes antagonistic groups, they all spoke a democratic/revolutionary language with different doses of its two constituent elements, depending on the moment in question or the attachment to this or that group. Of course, a principle factor in the emerging political culture and in the ideological displacement of an important sector of Catholic and Falangist intellectuals was the presence of small but consistent nuclei of communists in the actions of February of 1956 and in 1957, in Madrid and Barcelona. It soon became clear, to the great surprise of Ridruejo and other comprehensives, that what had been attempted at the end of 1955 was more than a mere gathering of young writers and “boys” to debate a few ideas that might lower the political temperature. In the two previous years, in Madrid as in Barcelona, the PCE and the PSUC (Partit Socialista Unificat de Catalunya or Unified Socialist Party of Catalonia) had succeeded in forming their first cells of young writers and university students. The facts are well known, as are the protagonists, the intellectuals responsible: in Barcelona, Jordi Solé remembers Octavi Pellissa and the “group that would soon become the university nucleus of the PSUC: Luis Goytisolo, Joaquím Jordá, Salvador Giner.” Additional students from the schools of Law and Philosophy and Humanities would join this initial group, as would the “dazzling figure” of Manuel Sacristán, who had returned

from Germany converted into a communist of very high theoretical caliber, capable of making an extraordinary impression on Miguel Núñez, responsible for the PSUC in Barcelona, and with whom Sacristán agreed upon the methodologies of their work in the university. In Madrid, Jorge Semprún remembers the first nucleus formed by Carlos Semprún, Enrique Múgica, Jesús López Pacheco, Julián Marcos, Julio Diamante, Javier Pradera, Ramón Tamames, and “a few more: Fernando Sánchez Dragó and Jaime Maestro, a good team, after all.”⁷⁴ The presence of Sacristán and Semprún, of very different biographies and personalities, but both gifted with a notable theoretical and political capacity, was decisive: not only did they have strategy and tactics at their disposal, but they could offer the youth, who had been politically socialized in Falange or Catholic Action organizations, an answer to the breakdown of the dogmatic/moral structure constructed in the forties: Marxism was, like Christianity, a discourse of totality, a philosophy of history and, at its extreme, a religion, as fascism had also been a political religion. But unlike Catholicism, it possessed the keys to creating, with convincing results, an analysis of the political situation, of the causes of class domination, and of the workers’ condition, and to announcing a future free from misery and exploitation. Moreover, Marxism, interpreted by the Communist Party, offered tangible proof of the efficacy of organized political action against the vacuous moralizing call of the Catholic social preachers or the routine evocation of the pending revolution by the Falangists. In the end, the Party, which possessed historical reason, above the vicissitudes and detours of the recent paths taken, competed favorably in the general offering of a profound feeling of camaraderie and intellectual security, by providing to the militant protection for his choices.

Therefore the reaction of someone like Jaime Gil de Biedma comes as no surprise, when he learns, thanks to the newspaper clippings his father sent him, about the events happening in Madrid and of “the same deliberate hysteria, the same absolute, feral, exasperating stupidity, the same bad faith” of the official reactions. The effect of downpours like this, he writes, “is that it embarrasses us and forces us to react, regardless of how, against what, or who with. I have no idea if sometime I’ll become a communist, but I am most decidedly a traveling companion, and now more vehemently than ever. I have no idea if communism would be good in power, but it is good that it exists. While it is not in power, I will be by its side; after that, we’ll see. The important thing is to get rid of what is here now.” It is difficult to express with as much precision in less space the reasons that drove a large number of young intellectuals to leave aside the question of what communism would be like in power, and focus instead on the insistence, deeply felt, of the necessity of ending what was currently in place. If, in order to accomplish this, one had to become a traveling companion, one became a traveling companion, and that was that.⁷⁵

Affiliates or traveling companions, the field opened up by the tale of reconciliation and, above all, by the results of the politics derived from it, was now being called upon to broaden its frontiers into Catholic media, not necessarily intellectual or university based. Without a doubt, the crisis of Catholic

identity, the first attempts to construct a Christian identity, embodied in the world, committed to the dispossessed; the prophetic denunciation, substitution of a sermon of Christianity rather than a sermon of mission, emphasis on testimony rather than on morality and dogmatic orthodoxy, were all phenomena that shook the body of the Catholic Church and thus superseded the Spanish reality. But in Spain, all of this was profoundly determined by a fundamental fact: the Church had triumphed in a civil war, which should have been a catastrophe for it, but from which it emerged at the height of its power. After being a martyr, it had been an executioner, completely devoid of sympathy for the vanquished. Quite the opposite: it had not only been victorious, but also vengeful. Its clerics had attended the executions of tens of thousands of prisoners once the war was over, supporting, with its presence and its words, a strategy of purification and cleansing. They had ordered the generous youth to burn evil writings. They had imposed a world of closed beliefs. The Church was indeed directly responsible, and to the highest degree, for the reality being rebelled against by those who had come face to face with the misery and the desperation that so many had been condemned to, and which they themselves had discovered and shared precisely because of their Christian values. If this reality was sordid and miserable, then those values that had impelled them to seek it out were now turned against the institution that impeded, from a position of power, the understanding of the material mechanisms of exploitation: Marxism began to illuminate that which, seen from a Catholic perspective, remained in the dark.

In this displacement of loyalties there was a significant difference between those that were coming from the Youth Front (Frente Juventudes), the SEU or the Falange, and those that came from the Catholic militancy. In the case of the first group, if they ended up in the communist militancy it was as a negation and rejection of their origin which they never wanted to remember again, not even to explain it to themselves, much less to their readers. Since adolescence they were all rebels against the situation and due to this rebellion they would come to realize they were Marxists *avant la lettre*, before the communists elaborated their strategy of “entryism” into the institutions of the dictatorship with the intent to take advantage of gaps in the legal system in order to organize a mass movement from within. So strong was that rejection of their own past that it is difficult to find a Spanish Marxist who came from the Falange who will openly admit to his early fascist militancy and offer a plausible interpretation of his political itinerary: they simply were not part of that, or if they were, it was just a silly mistake. Since something similar seems to have occurred with the Fascists that became liberals, very quickly we see that apparently in Spain, during the first twenty years of the regime, there were no true Falangists, that everyone in those organizations was camouflaging a different reality; that they were, deep down, liberals or Marxists.

In the case of the Catholics however, opting for Marxism did not necessarily negate their past as believing Christians, but rather, it opened up, to the degree to which they were believers, a new sense of commitment to those who in Christian terms were known as “the world of the poor,” or, in the best of cases, “the world

of the workers.” This penetration of the Christian faith by a specific theory and practice, by Marxism and the collaboration with the Communist Party, fit in perfectly with the politics established by the communists since 1956, which did not in any way attempt to absorb the Christians into the party, but rather to establish a relationship of collaboration in which each individual would continue to be what he had originally been. Alfonso Carlos Comín expressed it thus: “the politics of national reconciliation is still situated within the perspective of each individual in their own place,” as another example of the extended-hand policy towards Catholics that the communists tried to develop in France and Italy.⁷⁶ For reasons everyone understood, it was much more important to the communist that the Catholic with whom he had initiated a “dialogue” or with whom he had established forms of collaboration—meetings in local convents or parishes, signatures on manifestos, the organization of public action, lecture series in the halls of Episcopal palaces, public demonstrations and celebrations⁷⁷—remained loyal to the Church and to the faith. This was especially true if their loyalty was critical, that is in opposition to the dictatorship in their capacity as clerics or Christian believers on the one hand, and in condemnation of the Church’s collusion with the regime on the other. Thus, a critical Catholicism emerged that preferred to identify itself by replacing the noun Catholic with Christian: one spoke of the Marxist/Christian dialogue, not of Communism/Catholicism, although behind the dialogue between Marxists and Christians there existed an attempt to establish a new relationship between the Vatican and the communist states.

This awakening led to the establishment of a dialogue with Marxism in which the Christians adopted an attitude of having a lot to learn and very little to teach, except their willingness to accompany the communists who were battling the regime: “Marxistization,” to a greater or lesser extent, was therefore generalized and affected diverse political options. The presence of Christians in the Popular Liberation Front (Frente de Liberación Popular) is obvious—Cerón, Fernández de Castro, Recalde, Aumente, Urenda, Comín—as it is also significant that the meeting places were convents and parishes. But it would not be so obvious that even Ruiz-Giménez himself would feel obliged to weave complex bobbin lace, or elaborate hermeneutics, to derive from the Christian message the necessary reform of the structures implied in the term socialization, which was always accompanied by some nuance or another. That it was there in the structures that the problem lay, and that to change the structures political action was needed, from which one couldn’t always justify the exclusion of violence, was one of the most notable results of this process, perceptible in the rapid evolution of the ‘Notebooks for Dialogue’ (*Cuadernos para el diálogo*). From the “reason to be” that inspired its birth, from the “common desire to construct a more free, more supportive, and more just world,” things quickly became centered in the necessity of “a radical transformation of the structures, from land ownership, rural and urban, to the large industrial and commercial companies of the three sectors of the national economy, with banking at the forefront:” to the work of democracy we see the almost imperceptible addition of some form—yet to be chosen—of socialism.⁷⁸

Now, if the university rebellion of 1956 and 1957 determined the displacement of young Catholic students and intellectuals towards organizations which, in some form or another, had Marxism as a fundamental theoretical reference point, it would be the workers' mobilizations of 1962 that influenced the "conversion" of large portions of the young clergy, so abundant in those days, who had shared living conditions with the new working class in miserable slums or in the emigrant absorption districts erected with great haste in order to offer the Falange some consolation for its no longer pending revolution. Nothing better indicates the road taken by many Christians, clergy and laymen, than the programmatic and foundational document of Christians for Socialism (Cristianos por el Socialismo), a movement founded in Chile during the Popular Unity years, which was immediately implanted in Spain: "We are gathered here, more than 200 Christians from diverse regions of Spain," goes the document, "to reflect upon the direction of our faith from a classist, Marxist, perspective." What is fundamental here is to have derived from a commitment to the poor, to which their Christian faith had led them, a class option that could only be understood on Marxist terms. Laid out like that, the risk involved in presenting the class option as a direct requirement of religious experience and, as a result, making socialism the temporal fulfillment of Christianity, is evident, repeating in this way the same mechanism that just a short time before had been used to derive from the dogma and teachings of the Church a political and social doctrine that considered liberalism and socialism as the destroyers of human society. But in the Christians' reflection on socialism there is an element that breaks this direct and linear derivation. When they say, "we are Christians who have taken a socialist and revolutionary option," they do not attempt to present themselves "as an example of a unique and authentic experience of faith, nor do they try to guide us as "the ones sent" from the faith in the bosom of the Marxist militancy."⁷⁹

Faith and politics belong to two different planes. Although in more than a few of the considerations brought about by the new attempts to live both in faith and with a political option in an autonomous manner, liberation—the ultimate goal of the political option—is converted into a theological lesson, with results as surprising as presenting Moses as a guerilla leader. Moses, José María González Ruiz wrote, "acts as an authentic revolutionary leader. In the first place, he turns to the remote possibility of peaceful means and he has audience with the Pharaoh. Later, when experience drastically demonstrates that the path of peaceful negotiations has come to an end, he turns to the method of guerilla warfare, carried out in the singular manner that the biblical book of Exodus explains to us."⁸⁰ In any case, what is interesting for our proposition is that the conversion of a large portion of the clergy over to a discourse in which the restoration of democracy in place of the dictatorship is accompanied by a project of liberation from capitalist oppression, resulted in the rejection of the great tale of the civil war as a crusade. The moment in which this rejection appeared in the public light and became official, showing at the same time the profound split that had occurred within the Church during the sixties, was the combined Assembly of bishops and priests, celebrated in Madrid in September of 1971, an unheard-of

experiment in democratization of relations between the secular clergy and the episcopate. Upon presenting the first paper, "The Church in Spanish Society," those present went about approving, without too many problems, resolutions of great depth, which they succeeded in passing without much difficulty. Things went on this way until they arrived at the point that caused a considerable part of the assembly to frown. It read: "We humbly recognize and ask forgiveness for not being true ministers of reconciliation in the heart of our people, divided by a war between brothers." Certainly the word reconciliation had already been adopted by everyone, and would even end up being used by Gonzalo Fernández de la Mora, albeit with a meaning diametrically opposed to the original one: reconciliation was what the State achieved on July 18. But at the joint assembly, along with reconciliation came the recognition of blame and the asking of forgiveness. This was too much for seventy of the stomachs present. As a two-thirds majority was required, the point under debate was sent to a second vote in which its adversaries saw their ranks increase to the detriment of those that had favored it in the first vote, who had now been reduced to 123 while the opposition had grown to 113. The resolution did not pass, and the Church lost, once and for all, the opportunity to ask forgiveness for "a religion that inspires so much cruelty" as a "good young lad, properly raised and well-spoken" told Brother Gumersindo de Estella moments before the boy was executed by a firing squad on July 11, 1938.⁸¹

The split down the middle of the Catholic clergy illustrates very well that the new language of reconciliation and the politics that it served were anything but innocuous for a regime built upon the back of the Church as a result of the civil war. For all the efforts the technocrats made to disassociate the "organic democracy" from its origins and painstakingly search for a new legitimacy in administrative efficacy and economic development, at the moment of truth, the permanency of the regime required an acting memory of the civil war as a crusade against the enemy of the religion and the fatherland. If this memory failed, if the children of the victors and the vanquished wanted nothing to do with it, even if they renounced or simply weren't interested in putting some other great tale in its place, the entire legitimacy of postulating some Spanish difference in a world of constitutionally governed states and democratic societies made no sense. If the civil war ceased to be an acting element in politics then the great Spanish difference was eliminated: Spaniards would then be, or would demand to be, just like other Europeans, those of western democracies. Apart from that, this was the language used to express the demands presented to the authorities in manifestos and collective letters: a language of democracy that became the common patrimony of the intelligentsia as it moved between dissidence and opposition. The representation of the civil war as a useless fratricidal slaughter, the discourse of reconciliation, the demolition of divisions between the victors and the vanquished, the mix of Christians and communists, the collaboration in common actions, all brought about the appearance of a generation of democrats, before the appearance of democracy, who had renounced the great tales and replaced them with the common demand for rights and liberties.

It was exactly the same thing that had occurred with a significant sector of the intelligentsia, which from the time of the student rebellion, and six years later as a reaction to the mobilization of the working class, forgot about the great tales while simultaneously demanding respect for human rights and calling for democratic freedoms, changing from a deferential tone to an increasingly combative one. In November of 1956, a distinguished panel of intellectuals, headed by the now more than venerable Ramón Menéndez Pidal, addressed itself to the Minister of National Education so that it might “deliver a petition to the Council of Ministers.” This petition introduced, in the case of the young students still imprisoned for the past “disturbances of order”—Bustelo, González Muñoz, Montesinos García Lorca, and Sánchez Bonmatí, and especially in the case of Julián Marcos, the only one that had already spent eight months in protective custody—a new criteria of clemency. Those intellectuals did not realize how subversive or how irregular, even if presented in such a formal manner, this petition was, signed by a large group of university professors. They were asking the minister, in tones reminiscent of the petitions sent thirty years before to Primo de Rivera, to act as a mediator in their request for clemency. It was a petition that they would repeat for a second time referring to the “university disturbances” that took place in February of 1957 in Barcelona and Seville, harshly sanctioned by the “academic authority,” which had caused the signatories “discomfort, sorrow, and worry.” But being administrative sanctions, and the minister being a university professor, an intellectual, like the majority of those that signed the document, “they would hope to see the students treated with clemency and their cases reviewed so that the sanctions are either annulled or mitigated to the lowest levels.”⁸²

A far cry from a demonstration of dissidence, much less resistance, these two writings recover a form of traditional presence among intellectuals—there is nothing since the appearance of the word *intellectual* that defines it better than signing a letter or manifesto—that had completely disappeared in the first two decades of the dictatorship, with the exception of the “respectful greeting” sent to Juan de Borbón when he moved his residence from Lausanne to Estoril, in February of 1946; not exactly a document signed by intellectuals, although among the hundreds of signatories were the names of several dozen writers, department heads, and university professors. One of them, Juan José López Ibor, to the astonishment of his assistants, among them Carlos Castilla, was visited by a colonel within a few days with the order to pack up his things and vacate his post as chair of the Psychiatry department, which he only recovered after writing a letter of rectification to Blas Pérez and receiving his forgiveness.⁸³ This was the payback in those days for signing a document that wasn’t well received at *El Pardo*. It is understandable that this act wouldn’t be repeated for another ten years.

But the beginning is everything, and shortly after the petition for clemency was respectfully handed over at the end of 1956, a new document headed by Menéndez Pidal in April of 1959, this time sent to the minister of Justice, pleaded for the grant of a general amnesty. “Wounds in the national soul that have yet to

heal,” as *Ecclesia*, the official magazine of Catholic Action and the voice of the episcopate, pointed out in an April 4 editorial; thousands of compatriots in prison and in exile, “with no chance of participating in the work that the life of our nation requires:” the signers of this document believe that “nothing can justify this painful fact any longer.” The time has arrived, they affirm, to heal the remaining wounds, and they add: “The obstacles that impede the reconciliation of Spaniards must be eliminated. We believe that a very important and effective step in this process would be a general amnesty for all political prisoners and exiles.” Reconciliation is no longer a discourse of the youth that have erased the division created by the war. It is a demand of the older generation that had never attached their signature to the foot of a manifesto and that now, summoned by “nascent political groups,” respectfully address themselves to the authorities, “asking for some freedoms or denouncing the facts.”⁸⁴

If the majority of the signatories of this request for amnesty came from within the regime, the document sent on November 26, 1960 through a Madrid notary to the ministers of Information and Tourism and National Education, Gabriel Arias Salgado and Jesús Rubio, brought together 242 signatures from all the possible political factions that had emerged in the previous years. The motive behind it certainly had something to do with this, as did its tone and its moderate demand: for some time writers and journalists had resented, more than just the existence of censorship itself, the stupidity of the censors, as Luis Calvo, the director of *ABC* wrote to the then Director-General of Press, Adolfo Muñoz Alonso, on March 3 of 1960, upon sending him evidence of a passage from *Azorín* that “had been idiotically mutilated by the censorship.” Carlos Barral, for his part, would maintain an “indescribable conversation” two years later with the Director-General of Information, Vicente Rodríguez Casado. After offering the editor public subsidies to consolidate his businesses in America if he would voluntarily go into exile, the Director-General advised him that if he didn’t accept this proposal he would have to live with the consequences. Such were the procedures of censorship in the press and the editorial world. It is logical then that journalists and writers, although they belonged to the “elites of *franquismo*,” felt humiliated and lived in permanent “anxiety, bordering on exasperation.” They complained of this in their writing: of not knowing “what to live with in terms of what was possible to express and what wasn’t.” As a consequence, and always with all due respect, they addressed themselves to the gentlemen ministers to request: 1) the urgent regulation of the matter with due judicial guarantees, establishing the right of recourse, and 2) that “the officials in charge of applying said regulation have a public profile, given that the anonymity in which the current censors do their work is cause for the worst arbitrariness.” More than just the text, what is of interest is the initiative and the broad support it received, from Pemán to Azcona, Bardem to Aldecoa, Pérez de Ayala to Comín, from Moreno Galván to Muñoz Rojas: monarchists and communists, old Falangists and new Marxists, filmmakers and poets, novelists and journalists, priests and literary critics, and a notable presence, for the first time, of women: Josefina Rodríguez, Elena Soriano, Carmen Conde, Mercedes Fórmica, Carmen Martín Gaité, Ana María Matute, and María Aurelia Campmany.⁸⁵

The next step in a process, which would not be stopped in later years, was significantly original: twenty-five intellectuals decide to mobilize the entire intelligentsia and they address a letter to their “dear friend[s] and companion[s]” in order to call their attention to the gravity of certain events “that we are witnessing:” the strike movement in the mining region of Asturias had acquired “vast proportions”, information about which had been available through the “foreign press and radio.” The distinguished group of twenty-five invites all of the addressees to “write to the head of the State, individually exercising the Right to Petition, and making their favorable points of view known: 1) For the practice of faithful reporting of the news reported to Spaniards, on the part of the national government, press and radio; 2) For the normalization of the system of negotiation for economic demands by means generally practiced in the western world, renouncing repressive and authoritarian methods.” It is about taking advantage of the legal avenues permitted by the regime—the Right to Petition—in order to obtain rights denied by the regime—freedom of information, the right to strike—evoking the order of things in the western world: three points that will be repeated again and again in the dense history of letters and manifestos endorsed by intellectuals in the sixties.⁸⁶

These letters and some manifestos, that in 1962 cost those gathered in Munich fines and banishment, and in 1963 cost Bergamín⁸⁷ another exile; and that more than a few times caused some of the signatories to be brought before the Tribunal of Public Order (Tribunal de Orden Público), constitute the best example of the rapid expansion of a common language among the different sectors in opposition to the dictatorship, which were coming from the most diverse ideological backgrounds. It was a language in which what stands out above all is the reference to the “western world” as a mirror in which Spain should look at itself. An example that speaks for them all is the document sent to the “President of the Government” in December of 1969 by some 150 professionals and intellectuals in order to take issue with the proposals announced by the recently named government and to present a series of demands or petitions. The signatories demanded governmental action that provided a clear and unequivocal evolution aimed at reducing the distances that separated Spain from the world to which it belonged. They asked for the right of workers to create autonomous and representative unions, as recommended by the International Labor Organization (Organización Internacional del Trabajo or OIT) and the Spanish episcopate; the right of political association, which in the western world meant the existence of diverse political parties; the concession of broad amnesty for those convicted or accused of crimes for social or political reasons, with the objective of contributing to true national pacification; the revision of the development plan according to democratic criteria; reciprocal independence and positive cooperation with the Church, starting with the reform of the Concordat; and the facilitation, as in western democracies, of the work of the press and other media “so that they can directly and completely report on whichever topics, related to the governance of the country, that might interest the Spanish people.” There was no congenital ailment that prevented the Spanish people from authentically participating in the

government of the public realm like other European peoples, no more or less violent. A tragic war between brothers, they added, “doesn’t justify that we continue to be treated politically as minors. Democracy in Spain will be, as it is in the other countries of our continent, the decisive factor in the control of governmental acts and social progress and stability as well as opening doors for our progressive integration into the European Community.” At the foot of the document, there are signatures of intellectuals no longer belonging to the different generations—those that made the war or lived through it and those born after its conclusion—but rather of intellectuals of diverse ideological horizons. There was a common language in which the right of association, autonomous unions, free press, democracy, and integration into Europe were the results of a different vision projected onto the past, especially onto the civil war, understood ultimately as a tragic war between brothers, and onto the lesson that this experience had to teach: that of an amnesty that would favor “true national pacification.”⁸⁸

Reconciliation thus came to be a tale that erased the great tales. As soon as opponents and dissidents could only find common ground by speaking the language of democracy, the reason behind the great tales, whatever it may be, vanished into thin air. It is possible that science, as Lyotard maintains, is incompatible with the great a tales: it is certain that democracy destroys them. When the language of democracy is spoken, the result is that it is more than just embarrassing, it is ridiculous, to speak of the eternal origins of the nation, the greatness of the past, the wars against invaders and traitors; it makes no sense to speak of the unity of culture, of own identities, of Catholic essences; tales of decadence, death, and resurrection, digressions on Spain as a problem or Spain without problems, become curiosities of times past. The language of democracy speaks of the Constitution, of individual rights and liberties, of the separation and balance of powers and, among Spaniards, of integration into the Western world, of being like Europeans: nothing upon which a great tale can be constructed. Spanish intellectuals were late in learning this, but in the end, as the ‘60s advanced, they repeated it on every possible occasion with the double aim of eroding the foundations of a dictatorship built upon a war of vengeance and extermination, as Manuel Azaña defined it, and preparing a common ground upon which it was possible to build civil peace and coexistence among citizens.

NOTES

THE MORAL ROOTS OF POLITICAL DISSIDENCE: INTELLECTUALS, MARXISM, AND THE LANGUAGE OF RECONCILIATION

¹ Jorge Semprún, "La oposición política en España: 1956-1966," *Horizonte español 1966* (Paris, 1966), vol. 2, pp 44-45. Director-General of Information, "Nota para el Ministro," October 16, 1963, The General Administration Archive, (3) 104.4 Box 426 Top 82/68.103. More on these confidences of Cela and his plan to bribe the signatories, Pere Ysàs, *Disidencia y subversión. La lucha del regimen franquista por su supervivencia, 1960-1975* (Barcelona: 2004), pp 52-54.

² Nicolás Sánchez-Albornoz remembers his sentence in "Cuelgamuros: presos políticos para un mausoleo," in C. Molinero, M. Sala, and J. Sobrequés, eds., *Una inmensa prisión* (Barcelona: 2003), 3-17. Ricardo Muñoz Suay, director of FUE during the war, detained in September of 1946 and sentenced by council of war: Benito Sanz Díaz, *Rojos y demócratas. La oposición al franquismo en la Universidad de Valencia, 1939-1945* (Valencia: 2002), p 27. Front Universitari de Catalunya: Josep M. Colomer i Calsina, *Els estudiants de Barcelona sota el franquisme* (Barcelona: 1978), pp 55-61.

³ Alberto Ullastres, discourse upon the inauguration of the Feria de Muestras of Barcelona, *ABC*, June 3, 1962. Franco, in Garabitas, before thousands of provisional officers, *ABC*, May 29, 1962.

⁴ Josefina Rodríguez de Aldecoa, ed., "Introducción" to Ignacio Aldecoa, *Cuentos* (Madrid: 1988), 17. Also by Josefina Aldecoa, *Los niños de la guerra* (Madrid: 1987).

⁵ Letter from Serrano to Franco, September 3, 1945: Ramón Serrano Suñer, *Memorias* (Barcelona: 1977), pp 394-403.

⁶ Spiritual directors, Alfonso Carlos Comín, *Fe en la tierra* [1975], *Obras* (Barcelona: 1986), pp 306-307. The relic-arm of Saint Teresa, Giuliana di Febo, *La Santa de la Raza. Un culto barroco en la España franquista* (Barcelona: 1987), pp 117-136. Priest-announcers, Armand Balsebre in *Historia de la radio en España, vol. II, 1939-1985* (Madrid: 2000), pp 117-122, where he remembers the very famous Venancio Marcos and half dozen other preachers who inundated the radios before and, above all, after the signing of the Concordat. Antonio Tovar, "Lo que a Falange debe el Estado," *Arriba*, February 28, 1953.

⁷ In "Proyecto filosofía en español," www.filosofia.org/hem/med/m015.htm, one can see the entire collection of this magazine.

⁸ "Nuestro propóstio," *Alférez*, February 28, 1947. An early analysis of *Alférez* and *Alcalá* and a comparison of their contents with an Italian source, Gino Germani, *Autoritarismo, fascismo e classi sociali*, (Bologna: 1975), ch. 6, pp 255-304. An excellent anthology of texts from these and other publications, Jordi Gracia, *Crónica de una deserción. Ideología y literatura en la prensa universitaria del franquismo* (Barcelona: 1994). Also by Jordi Gracia, with many suggestions and reading clues, *Estado y cultura: el despertar de una conciencia crítica bajo el franquismo, 1940-1962* (Toulouse: 1996).

⁹ They are the slogans of *Alférez* for the months of April and July of 1947.

¹⁰ As it appears in *La Hora*, subtitled *Semanario de los estudiantes españoles*, November 19, 1949.

¹¹ List of the dead on the Russian fronts, David Jato, *La rebelión de los estudiantes* (Madrid, 1968), pp 462-463. Rafael Sánchez Ferlosio, "De la paciencia," *Alférez*, June 30, 1947.

¹² Antonio Lago Carballo, "Notas después de un viaje," *Alférez*, January 31, 1948.

¹³ Marcelo Arroita-Jauregui, "Nuestra actitud crítica" and "Diez años de España," *La Hora*, November 5, 1948 and April 1, 1949.

¹⁴ Fernando Vallespín, "Un maestro en tiempo de patronos. Entrevista con Francisco Murillo Ferrol," *Claves de razón práctica* 94 (July-August, 1999), p 58. Lorenzo Gomis to Laureano Bonet, *El Jardín quebrado. La Escuela de Barcelona y la cultura de medio siglo* (Barcelona: 1994), 36. Juan Benet, "Luis Martín Santos, un memento," *Otoño en Madrid, hacia 1950* (Madrid: 1987), p 119. Luciano G. Egido, interview with Miguel Mora, *El País*, December 5, 2003.

¹⁵ Carlos París, "Mundo burgués y marxismo," *La Hora*, December 31, 1948. Manuel Fraga, *La crisis del Estado* (Madrid: 1955), pp 37-38. Miguel Sánchez-Mazas, "Ante Europa: anverso y reverso," *Alfárez*, July-August, 1948. Pablo Lucas Verdú, "La democracia y sus caminos," *La Hora*, March 19, 1950.

¹⁶ José María García Escudero, "Dogma y libertad," *Arbor*, November, 1952, p 179, closing lecture given at Salamanca, as Director-General of Cinematography and Theater, for a course on film organized by the ACNP (Asociación Católica Nacional de Propagandistas). Examples of the action of pencil and scissors during this decade, Justino Sinova, *La censura de prensa durante el franquismo (1936-1951)* (Madrid: 1989), valid also for the fifties, when they still removed the legs from female models (*Pueblo*, October 4, 1954), in which the photograph of the auditorium that listened to Ortega in May of 1946 was suppressed (*Ya*, September 30, 1955), the General Administration Archive, (3) 49.01, books 5455 and 5457 Top 32/79.

¹⁷ "Profesión política," *Alfárez*, December 31, 1947.

¹⁸ "Profesión política," cit. in "Ortega a destiempo," that is presented as "collective group opinion," *Alfárez*, January, 1949, is of the opinion however that this Ortega cannot be the teacher of youth: everything about him seemed petrified in 1930.

¹⁹ "Texto de la conferencia de Antonio Tovar *Lo que a Falange debe el Estado*," given on February 27, 1953, in the inaugural act of the "Tribuna José Antonio," of the Deputyship of Franco's Guard, in front of "a very large crowd that completely filled the great hall of the Spanish National Research Council (Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas)" under the presidency of the Vice-Secretary of Departments, Juan José Pradera, accompanied by Pilar Primo de Rivera and other ranks of Franco's Guard: *Arriba*, February 28, 1953 for the news of the inauguration and March 1 for the entire text of the lecture.

²⁰ "Profesión política," cit. The observation of Rodrigo Fernández-Carvajal, "Avisos a los universitarios fieles," *Alfárez*, May, 1948.

²¹ José María de Llanos, "Carta a *Alfárez*," *Alfárez*, May 31, 1947. Llanos was an assiduous contributor to *Alfárez*, *La Hora*, and *Alcalá*, and he had a weekly section in *Juventud*. Not all the initiatives of this "spirited chaplain of the Youth Front (Frente de Juventudes)" enjoyed the sympathy of his superiors: the provincial bishop Manuel Sánchez Robles prohibited him from singing *Cara al sol* [Facing the Sun, the anthem of the Falange Party] in the novitiate gardens of Aranjuez, according to Manuel Revuelta in Teófanos Egido, coord., *Los jesuitas en España y en el mundo hispánico* (Madrid: 2004), p 366. Gonzalo Fernández de la Mora remembers that he ordered a group of Marian congregants to engage "a guerilla incursion at the Music Palace (Palacio de la Música) in order to [...] impede the showing of *Gilda*, because Rita Hayworth swung her hips while she took her glove off," *Río Arriba. Memorias* (Barcelona: 1995), pp 64-65 where the face and the slim lines appear.

²² José M. Maravall, *Dictaduras y disenso político. Obreros y estudiantes bajo el franquismo* (Madrid: 1978), p 203. Juan Benet, "El Madrde de Eloy," *Otoño en Madrid*, p 81.

²³ As remembered by Luis Ramírez [Luciano Rincón], *Nuestros primeros 25 años* (Paris: 1964), p 54, as the collective experience of the youth who began to "cross the frontier, speak with other people, read books, and introduce magazines."

²⁴ A magazine that in 1948 began its second phase as an instrument of SEU once the crisis was ended by the naming of José María del Moral as national chief (jefe, nacional) followed two years later by Jorge Jordana. For SEU's "crossing of the desert" between 1947 and 1951, Miguel A. Ruíz Carnicer, *El Sindicato Español Universitario (SEU), 1939-1965*, pp 204-205.

²⁵ José Bugeda, "Reencuentro con el pueblo" and Medardo Fraile, "Suburbio no es palabra de domingo," *La Hora*, November 19 and February 12 of 1950. In quotations, Luis Martín Santos, *Tiempo de silencio* [1961] (Barcelona: 1987), p 29, 37, of the memorable initiation journey of the researcher and the young boy to the shanties of the Madrid slums, colder in January than an Eskimo's igloo. Memories of Jesús Ibáñez, "Autopercepción intelectual de un proceso histórico," *Anthropos*, 113 (1990), 12 and 13.

²⁶ Marcelo Arroita-Jáuregui, "Diez años de España," *La Hora*, April 1, 1949.

²⁷ "Oración por los caídos," *La Hora*, February 6, 1948, edition almost entirely dedicated to those that had died "before seeing the light of victory." "El amén de nuestra vida," *La Hora*, February 11, 1949.

²⁸ Jaime Suárez, "Melancolía y claudicación: he aquí lo prohibido," *La Hora*, November 19, 1950. Editorial "Conciencia de generación," *La Hora*, November 26, 1950. Dionisio Ridruejo, "José Antonio, vivo," *Alcalá*, November 25, 1952 and "El 29 de octubre de 1933," *Revista*, October 29-November 4, 1953.

²⁹ Carlos París, "Nuestro sentido revolucionario." Javier Herrero, "Las dos Españas y José Antonio." Manuel Fraga, "Revolución y restauración," *Alcalá*, May 10 and November 25, 1952 and March 25, 1953, respectively.

³⁰ José Bugada to Juan F. Marsal, *Pensar bajo el franquismo*, 55-57. Juan Triguero [José María Moreno Galván], "La generación de Fraga y su destino," *Cuadernos de Ruedo Ibérico*, 1 (June-July, 1965), pp 5-16. The yoke and the arrows, memory of Carmen Martín Gaité who was there with Ignacio Aldecoa and his friends: "Un aviso: ha muerto Ignacio Aldecoa," *La Estafeta Literaria*, November, 1969, in *La búsqueda de interlocutor y otras búsquedas* (Madrid: 1982), p 47. David Jato, *La rebelión*, p 462. Fernando Fernán-Gómez, *El tiempo amarillo. Memorias ampliadas, 1921-1997* (Madrid: 1998), pp 358-359.

³¹ "Quién es quién en el 'Tercer Programa,'" *Arriba*, February 13, 1953, which includes Alonso, Diamante, Ducay, Fraga, Laín, París, Ridruejo, Sánchez-Mazas, Sastre, Sopena, Torrente, and up to 150 more contributors.

³² Alfonso Sastre, "Llamada al frente teatral" and "Teatro de agitación," *La Hora*, June 3, 1949 and January 29, 1950. And with José María de Quinto, "Manifiesto del T.A.S.," *La Hora*, October 1, 1950.

³³ Jesús Fernández Santos, "Ignacio y yo," *Insula*, March, 1970, 11. "Letter to... Ignacio Aldecoa," *Juventud*, November 4-10, 1954. In "Ignacio Aldecoa, programa para largo," *Destino*, December 3, 1955, 37, he tells of his plans for the immediate future: novelistically develop the epic of the great trades. Josefina Aldecoa evokes his love of taverns in "Tistala, el narrador de historias," prologue to Aldecoa, *Cuentos completos* (Madrid: 1955), p 19. Castellet, *Els escenaris*, pp 206-207 and Caballero Bonald, *Tiempo de guerras perdidas*, p 271. Jordi Gracia, *Crónica de una desertión*, pp 17-20.

³⁴ The slums and SUT as the beginning of a process of rupture, Alfonso Carlos Comín, *Fe en la tierra*, pp 320-321. Literary circle and assistants, Juan Gomis, *Memòries cíviques, 1950-1975* (Barcelona: 1994), p 19. Incarnation and reproach, Josep Antoni González Cassanova, ed., "Una teoría sobre el ser de *El Ciervo*," in *La Revista El Ciervo. Historia y teoría de cuarenta años* (Barcelona: 1992), pp 194-197. The Mustard Seed and Comín, Francisco J. Carmona, *Cambios en la identidad católica: juventud de Alfonso Carlos Comín* (Madrid: 1995), pp 140-145.

³⁵ Carlos Barral, *Los años sin excusa* (Madrid: 1982), pp 41-42. Sacristán, uncomfortable with Sergio Vilar's curiosity about his past, assures that he entered the Falange Youth Organization (Organización Juvenil de Falange) in 1940 and later in SEU, until the 1945-1946 school year in which he separated himself or "we were separated. I left and they kicked me out": Sergio Vilar, *La oposición a la dictadura* (Barcelona: 1976), pp 239-240. Laureano Bonet, *La Revista Laye. Estudio y antología* (Barcelona: 1988), p 318, affirms that Sacristán broke with Falange in 1946, although he continued collaborating with official institutions of a cultural nature. From Esteban Pinilla de las Heras, *En menos de la libertad. Dimensiones políticas del grupo Laye en Barcelona y en España* (Barcelona: 1989), pp 12-19 for the group's characterization and p 203 for the two poles.

³⁶ Although from a Carlist family, Castellet told Sergio Vilar that his grandfather, his father, and his mother had been liberals and that "the attitude of my entire family situated me in the terrain of liberal democracy, with many precautions against extremist commitments": Vilar, *La Oposición*, 269. Alberto Oliart and Carlos Barral remember him, next to Sacristán, as a falangist at the Instituto Balmes and the department's bar: *Contra el olvido* (Barcelona: 1998), p 180 and *Años de penitencia [1975]* (Barcelona: 1990), p 272, respectively.

³⁷ For the Boscán seminar, Salvador Giner, "Libertad y poder político en la Universidad española: el movimiento democrático bajo el franquismo," in Paul Preston, ed., *España en crisis: la evolución y decadencia del régimen de Franco* (Madrid: 1978), pp 317-319. Friendship between the two groups thanks to Castellet, González Casanova, "Una teoría," 221-224.

³⁸ José M. Castellet, "Notas sobre la situación actual del escritor en España," *Laye*, August-September, 1952, p 10 and pp 14-16; reproduced in *Alcalá*, January 10, 1953.

³⁹ Dámaso Santos, "Jesús Fernández Santos, síntoma y fruto de la generación intermedia," in *Generaciones juntas* (Madrid: 1962), p 120.

- ⁴⁰ Raimundo Fernández Cuesta, "XXI aniversario de la Falange"; Jesús Frago del Toro, "Conformismo, no"; Miguel Ángel Castiella, "Discurso del amor amargo"; Carlos Luis Álvarez, "De los orígenes," all in *Juventud*, 29 de octubre [1954]. José María de Llanos, S.J., "Vuestras pegas a la continencia" and Enrique Ruiz García, "La revolución nacional en la revolución española," *Juventud*, May 27 to June 2 and June 24-30, 1954.
- ⁴¹ Pedro Laín, "La Universidad como empresa," *Alcalá*, April 25, 1952.
- ⁴² The objective novel as "mentís implícito en su contexto textual [*implicit denial in its textual context*]" and difference with the social novel: Geneviève Champeau, "Una oposición discursiva al franquismo: la novela 'social' y la novela 'objetiva' en los años cincuenta," in J. Tusell, A. Alted, and A. Mateos, coords., *La oposición al régimen de Franco* (Madrid: 1990), pp 317-329.
- ⁴³ Juan Ferrater, "De generaciones y de cuentas, y de una esperanza," *Laye* 23 (April-June, 1953), pp 170-173.
- ⁴⁴ "Los cuervos no nos sacarán los ojos. (Réplica a los irresponsables que hablan alegremente del fracaso de una generación)," *Solidaridad Nacional*, July 10, 1953.
- ⁴⁵ Llorenç Gomis, *De Memoria. Autobiografía (1924-1994)* (Barcelona: 1996), p 201. Olegario González de Cardenal, "Semblanza de Alfonso Querejazu," in *Alfonso Querejazu Joaquín Garrigues. Correspondencia y escritos (1954-1974)* (Madrid: 2000), p 49. On page 48 one can see a long list of names that passed by Gredos. José María García Escudero calls him a right arm, "La autocrítica religiosa," in Joaquín Ruiz-Giménez, ed., *Iglesia, Estado, y sociedad en España, 1930-1982* (Madrid: 1984), p 130.
- ⁴⁶ "El Segundo Congreso de Poesía," *Revista*, July 9-15, 1953. Llorenç Gomis, participant in the poetry gatherings, remembers their pleasant, liberal, and educated environment in *De Memoria*, pp 205-210. A remembrance of the meeting at Segovia and those present, José María Caballero Bonald, *Tiempo de guerras perdidas*, pp 325-327. In his case, attending opened the doors to him, along with Luis Rosales, to the literary circle maintained by Juana Mordó at her home, also frequented by Aranguren.
- ⁴⁷ Marià Manent, "Como conocí a Laín," *Cuadernos Hispanoamericanos*, pp 446-447 (August-September, 1987), pp 59-60. J.T., "El II Congreso de Poesía. De Peña de Francia a Ciudad Rodrigo, pasando por Salamanca," *Destino*, July 18, 1953.
- ⁴⁸ News from *Boletín*, Fanny Rubio, *Las revistas poéticas españolas, 1939-1975* (Alicante: 2003), pp 120-121.
- ⁴⁹ For this and what follows, Pedro Laín, "Sobre la situación espiritual de la juventud española" and [José Luis Pinillos], "Las actitudes sociales en la Universidad de Madrid," both in Roberto Mesa, *Jaraneros*, pp 45-53 and pp 57-64. Due to frequent misquoting of this text, one should mention that Laín does not himself make the affirmation regarding the diversion of youth, but rather rejects it as a rumor.
- ⁵⁰ "El manifiesto de los estudiantes," February 1, 1956, in *El Socialista*, February 23, 1956.
- ⁵¹ What the United States consul in Seville, Robert E. Wilson, reports to the Department of State, National Archives, Decimal File, 752.00/2-1251.
- ⁵² There is a copy of the manifesto of the students of the University of Madrid School of Law, February 27, 1956, in Public Record Office, FO 185/1788. Pablo Lizcano, *La generación del 56. La universidad contra Franco* (Barcelona: 1981) contains testimonies of protagonists and witnesses of the events. The police statements, very eloquent in some cases: Roberto Mesa, *Jaraneros*, pp 159-250.
- ⁵³ Luis Ramírez [Luciano Rincón], *Nuestros primeros*, p 104.
- ⁵⁴ Carmen Martín Gaité, "Un aviso," 38-39. Jaime Gil de Biedma, *Retrato*, pp 246-247. On "NO-DO y los lugares de la memoria del franquismo," Vicente Sánchez-Biosca in the book he co-authors with Rafael R. Tranche, *NO-DO. El tiempo y la memoria* (Madrid: 2000), pp 446-579.
- ⁵⁵ Juan Benet, "El Madrid de Eloy," *Otoño en Madrid*, pp 91-92.
- ⁵⁶ [José Luis Pinillos], "Las actitudes sociales," p 63.
- ⁵⁷ Ivo Mallet, "Annual review of Spain for 1956," January 16, 1957, Public Record Office, FO 371 /130322.
- ⁵⁸ Democratic Student Union (Unión Democrático de Estudiantes), "A los universitarios de España," October, 1957, *El Socialista*, October 31, 1957, source of quotations.
- ⁵⁹ A copy of the manifesto, Public Record Office, FO 185/1768. For authorship, Semprún, *Autobiografía de Federico Sánchez* (Barcelona: 1977), pp 43-44. Bustelo also points to the

participation of Víctor Pradera and remembers that he was jailed and sentenced to a year in prison and fined twenty thousand pesetas for distributing it: *La izquierda imperfecta* (Barcelona: 1996), 22.

⁶⁰ "Testimonio de las generaciones ajenas a la guerra civil," *El Socialista*, August 22, 1957. Esteban Pinilla de las Heras also publishes it, *En menos de la libertad. Dimensiones políticas del grupo de Laye en Barcelona y en España* (Barcelona: 1989), pp 315-317. Indalecio Prieto, "La del 98 y la del 36," *El Socialista*, January 8, 1959. Girbau's speech, Acts of the Committee Director of PSOE. Meetings of August 11 and 12, 1958, Fundación Pablo Iglesias, Archivo del Exilio 115-118, folios 26-28.

⁶¹ This confession of a "Germanic illusion" is from an unedited text of Pinilla himself "Sobre la generación joven (1946-1947)," that Laureano Bonet analyzes in *El jardín quebrado*, p 206.

⁶² Carlos Barral, *Los años sin excusa*, p 176.

⁶³ Remember the anecdote, from 1949, Fernando Fernán-Gómez, *El tiempo amarillo*, p 363.

⁶⁴ José M. Castellet, "La novela española quince años después (1942-1957)," *Cuadernos del Congreso por la Libertad de la Cultura*, 33 (November-December, 1958), 51, cit. by Laureano Bonet, *El jardín*, pp 114-119. Luis Ramírez [Luciano Rincón], *Nuestros primeros*, pp 43, 50 and 52.

⁶⁵ Editorial, *Las Españas*, July, 1956, pp 2, 30 and 31, facsimile edition (Madrid: 2002). There is mention of *Las Españas* in Manuel Andújar, "Las revistas culturales y literarias del exilio en Hispanoamérica," in José L. Abellán, ed., *El exilio español de 1939* (Madrid: 1976), vol. 3, pp 49-67; for its political evolution, James Valender and Gabriel Rojo, *Las Españas. Historia de una revista del exilio (1946-1963)* (Mexico: 1999), pp 47-96.

⁶⁶ Frente Universitario Español, "Coincidencia de propósitos," November, 1957, Fundación Pablo Iglesias, Archivo del Exilio, 617-4. Among its founders: Carlos Sáenz de la Calzada, Niceto Alcalá Zamora Castillo, Roberto Castrovido, Miguel Morayta, Daniel Tapia, Antonio María Sbert, and Manuel Tagüeña. For the act of constitution, *Las Españas*, July, 1956, pp 4 and 37.

⁶⁷ Semprún, *Autobiografía*, 44. Nicolás Sartorius, interview with Gustau Muñoz and Nicolás Sánchez Durá, *Pasajes*, May-August, 2000, pp 44-46.

⁶⁸ "Mensaje del Partido Comunista de España a los intelectuales patriotas," April, 1954 and "Por la reconciliación nacional, por una solución democrática y pacífica del problema español," June, 1956, both at www.filosofia.org. This resolution was adopted in similar terms by the PSUC at the conference celebrated in August of 1956: "Por la reconciliación nacional, por una solidaridad catalana," reproduced in Miguel Núñez, *La revolución y el deseo. Memorias* (Barcelona: 2002), pp 263-264. National Reconciliation [*reconciliación nacional*] is a phrase that the Italian communists had already used in 1936, at the end of the Africa war, when *Lo stato operaio* published an editorial extending "la mano ai fascisti nostri fratelli di lavoro e di sofferenze perché vogliamo combattere insieme ad essi la buona e santa battaglia del pane, del lavoro e della pace" and evoking "il cuore pulsante della nazione riconciliata": Paolo Spriano, *Storia del Partito comunista italiano* (Turin: 1970) vol. 3, 62-63.

⁶⁹ Américo Castro, "Castilla la gentil," in *De la España que aun no conocía*, vol. 1, pp 107-117. Indalecio Prieto, "La reconciliación de los españoles," March 3, 1942, in *Palabras al viento*, pp 246-252. Also by Prieto, qualifying the war as a "savage, brutal, inconceivable fight," and defending a policy of "peaceful coexistence among Spaniards": "Discurso radiofónico pronunciado en la radiodifusión francesa de París, el día 7 de agosto de 1947," in Fundación Pablo Iglesias, Archivo Luis Araquistain, 99-39. From Aranguren, "La evolución espiritual de los intelectuales españoles en la emigración" [1953], *OC*, vol. 6, p 137.

⁷⁰ A copy of the document, Fundación Pablo Iglesias, Archivo del Exilio, 634-25. I have dealt with this topic in *Los socialistas en la política española 1879-1982* (Madrid: 1997).

⁷¹ Ridruejo, *Escrito en España*, [1962], 287-289. Frente Unido Socialista Español, "El Partido Socialista y la política española actual: análisis de una situación," June 1, 1964, reproduced in Morodo, *Atando cabos*, pp 459-460.

⁷² Miguel Sánchez-Mazas, "La actual crisis española y las nuevas generaciones," *Cuadernos del Congreso por la Libertad Cultura*, 26 (September-October, 1957), pp 21-22. Appeals from the PCE, "A los jefes, oficiales y suboficiales de los ejércitos de tierra, mar y aire," April, 1959, and "A los trabajadores y a todos los españoles" on the occasion of May 1, both in Fernando Claudín, *Documentos de una divergencia comunista* (Madrid: 1978), 79.

⁷³ Elías Díaz, "Dos revoluciones imposibles," *Cuadernos para el diálogo*, 4 (January, 1964), 14-15.

⁷⁴ Jordi Solé Tura, *Una historia optimista. Memorias* (Madrid: 1999), p 90. Jorge Semprún, *Autobiografía*, p 38. Miguel Núñez, *La revolución*, pp 256-257. Also, Enrique Múgica, *Itinerario hacia la libertad* (Barcelona: 1986), pp 29-36.

⁷⁵ Gil de Biedma, *Retrato*, p 65. At the age of 22 or 23, Juan Goytisolo also decides to become a traveling companion when he finds that the recently discovered "marxist doctrine", also applies perfectly, like a ring on a finger, to his own family's history, *Coto vedado*, p 11.

⁷⁶ Alfonso Comín, "La cuestión de la militancia de cristianos en partidos comunistas," in *Cristianos en el partido, comunistas en la Iglesia* (Barcelona: 1977), p 61.

⁷⁷ Of these, there was a special relevance to the concentration of "mediterráneos, transterrados y comunistas" in Colliure, Februray, 1959, as homage to Antonio Machado upon the twentieth anniversary of his death, which was meant to be followed by a corresponding one in Segovia: Carlos Barral, *Los años sin excusa*, pp 169-170.

⁷⁸ Editorial "Razón de ser" and Joaquín Ruiz-Giménez, "Fin de vacación: Meditación sobre España," *Cuadernos para el diálogo*, 1 (October, 1963), pp 1, 47-48 (August-September, 1967), pp 4-5. In Elías Díaz, "La filosofía marxista en el pensamiento español actual," *Cuadernos para el diálogo*, 63 (December, 1968), pp 9-13 one can find the first assessment of Marxist theoretical production by Spanish authors.

⁷⁹ "I Encuentro de Cristianos por el socialismo. Documento programático y fundacional," Calafell ("Ávila"), March, 1973, taken up in *Diálogo*, 14-15 (January-August, 1989), pp 7-13.

⁸⁰ Passage extensively quoted by José Aumente in "Sobre el nuevo libro de José María González Ruiz, *Crear es comprometerse*," *Cuadernos para el diálogo*, 53 (February, 1968), p 40. Carlos Santamaría Ansa underlines "the paradoxes involved in this matter," in "Crisis actual del pacifismo y teología de la revolución," *Cuadernos para el diálogo* pp 57-58 (June-July, 1968), 12-14. The matter was indeed paradoxical and would require more attention than is possible here.

⁸¹ For the Assembly, chronicles of P. [José Luis] Martín Descalzo en *ABC*, September 12-24, 1971. Gonzalo Fernández de la Mora, "Reconciliación," *ABC*, November 13, 1975. Gumersindo de Estella was a compassionate capuchin monk who attended to those sentenced to death by council of war from 1937-1941, and left a horrifying testimony in *Fusilados en Zaragoza (1936-1939). Tres años de asistencia espiritual a los reos*, ed. by Tarsicio de Azcona and José Ángel Echevarría (Zaragoza: 2003), quote on p 128.

⁸² "Al Excmo. Sr. Ministro de Educación Nacional" and "Al Excmo. Sr. Ministro de Educación Nacional," November 2, 1956 and February 20, 1957. Archivo Salvador de Madariaga, fold. 136. They sign the petitions for grace, with Menéndez Pidal, Marañón, Azorín, Pemán, Hernando, García Vadecases, Ridruejo, Rosales, Herrera Oria, Sopena, Tierno, Lafora, Suárez Carreño, Marías, Aranguren, Sampdero, Lissarrague, Ollero...

⁸³ Text of the greeting, complete list of signatories and the account of the reprisals, Pedro Sainz Rodríguez, *Un reinado en la sombra* (Barcelona: 1993), pp 417-421. Carlos Castilla del Pino, *Pretérito imperfecto* (Barcelona: 1997), pp 359-360 for the colonel's visit accompanied by a comandant and a countryman, the latter being Vallejo Nájera's assistant at Ciempozuelos.

⁸⁴ Reproduced in Raúl Morodo, *Atando Cabos*, 520-522, signed, among others, by Menéndez Pidal, Aleixandre, Casares, Sopena, Pérez de Ayala, Neville, Laín, Celaya, Marañón, Dámaso Alonso, Cela, Montero Díez, Tierno, Aranguren, and Ridruejo. Complete list, *Horizonts*, first trimester of 1961, pp 80-81.

⁸⁵ Correspondence between Calvo and Muñoz Alonso, Elisa Chulià, *El poder y la palabra. El régimen de Franco ante la prensa y el periodismo* (Madrid: 2001), pp 133-134, where the author indicates that "las voces de protesta contra las arbitrariedades de la censura provenían la mayoría de las veces de gentes perfectamente integradas en las elites del franquismo." [*the voices of protest against the arbitrariness of the censorship most of the time came from people perfectly integrated into the elites of Francoism*]. Barral's conversation with Rodríguez Casado, who he qualifies as "especie de gangster del Opus Dei," [*a type of Opus Dei gangster*] which took place shortly before Arias Salgado replaced Fraga at the head of the Ministry: *Los años sin excusa*, pp 270-271. Text of the document, with all of the signatures, *Horizonts*, first trimester of 1961, pp 80-81.

⁸⁶ This letter, erroneously quoted on occasion as being addressed to the then director of the Institute of Political Studies (Instituto de Estudios Políticos), Manuel Fraga--though he would receive the letter

as well--, gained the support of a large number of intellectuals from Madrid and Barcelona who wrote to Menéndez Pidal, its first signer, to inform him that they had sent the head of state their respective letters in similar terms. The three letters, from May 6, 23, and 25, 1962, and the signatories, in Ignacio Fernández de Castro and José Martínez, eds., *España hoy*, pp 167-168.

⁸⁷ It concerns the letter addressed to "Excmo. Sr. Ministro de Información y Turismo," s.f. [October, 1963] by 102 intellectuals [see above, n. 1], signed first by Vicente Aleixandre, requesting accurate information and protesting the torture and cruelty suffered by Asturian miners and their wives. Manuel Fraga, its recipient, answered with a letter addressed to José Bergamín, who he astutely placed as the first signatory with the intention of presenting the rest as the victims of a communist maneuver adding sarcastically that if two women had been the victims of "corte de pelo" [*hair-cutting*] then they had been the victims of "tomadura de pelo" [*hair-pulling or leg-pulling, as per the English idiom*]. Photocopied examples of the letter and list: Archivo Madariaga, fold. 140. Fraga's response, with extracts from the prologue to Bergamín, to *El espionaje en España*, a libel against the POUM, published by the communists in 1937 under the pseudonym of Max Reiger: *El Español*, October 12, 1963. For Bergamín's response: Shirley Mangini, *Rojos y rebeldes. La cultura de la disidencia durante el franquismo* (Barcelona: 1987), pp 181-182.

⁸⁸ "Carta al Presidente del Gobierno," December 1969, *Cuadernos para el diálogo*, January, 1970, 20-21.