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Introduction

Carlos Jerez-Farrán and Samuel Amago

In a lecture he delivered in Buenos Aires in 1933, Federico García Lorca, Spain’s most celebrated poet and playwright, observed that “a dead man in Spain is more alive when dead than anywhere else in the world: his profile hurts like a razor’s edge.” Although the remark was made somewhat flippantly, it carries more irony today than Lorca could ever have imagined. More than thirty thousand people, including Lorca, fell victim to Francoist political executions. Seventy-two years later, their bodies, unlike Lorca’s own, have been exhumed from the numerous mass graves into which they were dumped all over the country, and they have become both culturally and politically some of the most “alive” dead bodies in contemporary Spain. They have become living mementoes of the power of the dead to speak beyond language as they mutely but eloquently remind the nation of the crimes perpetrated against its own people during and after the Civil War. These mass burial sites and the bones they contain are part of the Franco legacy, especially of the years of the Civil War and the dictatorship that followed, when thousands of political detractors were massacred and secretly dispatched to the anonymous graves throughout the Spanish landscape.

Owing to the conspiracy of silence imposed by the Franco regime and perpetuated even after his death, the whereabouts of the tens of thousands of the General’s victims were seldom discussed in private or in public, even though their resting places were known by neighboring residents. As is often the case with authoritarian governments, the silence that followed what happened during and
after the Civil War was due mainly to the fear inflicted on the populace by the prevailing ideology. This collective pact of silence (known in Spain as the pacto del silencio) was also created in part by the genuine fear some Spaniards felt of seeing their country slip back into a painful past that was still all too vivid in their minds, especially at a time when the newly born democracy was in a process of consolidation. Consequently, during the transition years of the late 1970s and early 1980s, the experience of the Civil War was deliberately played down. As Paloma Aguilar has put it, “During this same transition period, both right and left agreed that the bitterest aspects of the past should not be aired in public debate. The memory of the Civil War was used, and then only implicitly, to facilitate the many social and political agreements and pacts made during this period. The transition to democracy was the almost obsessive desire to avoid a repetition of the war or the failings of the Second Republic” (“Agents” 103).

The Socialist Party (PSOE) that prevailed in the general elections of October 1982, just seven years after Franco’s death, preferred not to deal with the subject in order to avoid provoking adverse reactions from the Right. From the other side of the political spectrum, members of the Partido Popular (PP), the right-of-center party that governed in Spain from 1996 to 2004 (all democrats but direct heirs of Francoist ideology and tactics and, in some cases, even former members of his government) were—and continue to be—reluctant to talk about this recent past, claiming that at best such discussion is an exercise in futility, a return to a historical past that contributes nothing of value and can only provoke social and political divisions that, they claim, have already been overcome. According to this reasoning, “coming to terms with the past” for the Partido Popular would entail, in Theodor Adorno’s terminology, “wishing to turn the page and, if possible, wiping it from memory” (“What Does” 115). Even twenty-five years after the consolidation of Spanish democracy, when the Spanish parliament has approved a new law recognizing officially the suffering of thousands of victims of Franco’s regime, ordering the removal of statues erected in his honor, and condemning the forty years of rule that followed his victory, representatives of the PP continue to remind the nation of the same kinds of perils experienced in the past, using nearly identical rhetorical language when trying to avoid airing unpalatable truths.
Regardless of the efforts made to silence the past, the way the Spanish Civil War continues to intrude on current politics was made all too evident in the aftermath of the March 2004 terrorist incident in Madrid, an attack that most commentators suggest cost the governing PP the presidential election. The two main opposing parties, moved by the political opportunity they saw in the incident, blamed each other for employing tactics reminiscent of the ones that provoked the Civil War some seventy years ago: the PP accused the winning PSOE of manipulating the terrorist assault for its own political advantage, while some members of the governing Socialist Party, on the other hand, accused José María Aznar and the soon to be defeated PP of preparing a coup d’état much like the one that had brought to power their ideological forefathers after a similar electoral defeat in February 1936. As Antonio Feros indicated in his analysis of the event, “the fact that a 70-year-old conflict should so quickly come to mind indicates how deeply ingrained the civil war is in the collective memory of the country and how it continues to have a profound influence on the ways Spaniards speak about national politics” (9). Accusations of this kind are an example of the political tensions that are still alive in Spain and of the ongoing difficulties involved in extracting the country’s past from its present.4

Although Franco’s regime and its contemporary heirs have spent decades trying to control collective memory by a variety of means—such as obliterating official records, sanitizing universities of suspected political dissidents, barring access to historical archives (thus enforcing a national amnesia about what happened during the Civil War and the years of dictatorship that followed), and withdrawing financial and logistical support for the exhumation of located graves—there has nevertheless been heard a public desire to confront Spain’s recent past more persistently every year. As Geoff Pingree and Lisa Abend remark, “the so-called Pact of Silence, which effectively curbed open discussion of the past in order to secure the country’s move towards democracy, has over the past few years given way to a chorus of demands to confront the past” (22).5 This return of the repressed, to draw on Freudian terminology, can be seen as the inevitable result of the peculiar nature of the transition Spain experienced as it went from a repressive dictatorship on the one hand to the formal restoration of what is today a constitutional democracy, all without “the self-critical working through of the past”
that a process of this kind requires (Suleiman 5). Instead of admitting that much of what happened during Franco’s dictatorship needed to be recognized before moving on, the new democratic government, agreeing to abide by a mutually beneficial Amnesty Law of 1977, decided to turn the page on the past as if nothing had happened, recommending instead a kind of amnesia that would only delay matters further. And yet, as Suleiman has observed regarding the cultural manifestations of the traumas of the Second World War, “the deeper the political and ideological divisions that characterized the event and its aftermath, the more difficult it is to forget an offense by the opposing side, especially if the forgetting itself becomes a contested object of legislation” (224).6

As a result of a combination of factors—including a more permissive political climate, the stimulus to reflect on the past that resulted from the collapse of Communism in 1989 (Richards), and the discovery in 2000 of the burial site in Priaranza del Bierzo that initiated the current waves of exhumations—it is only over the course of the last ten years that Spaniards began to discuss openly the consequences of their turbulent past and recognize the long, silenced suffering shared by thousands of countrymen who saw members of families fall victim to the excesses of this war. As part of the long overdue effort to confront their past and come to grips with it wherever possible, an ever-increasing number of volunteers, led by teams of forensic experts, anthropologists, political activists, relatives of the disappeared, and sympathizers with their plight, set out to identify and exhume the numerous mass graves that are scattered throughout the country. As of July 14, 2008, according to Natalia Junquera and Luis Gómez, 171 burial sites had been excavated and a total of 4,054 bodies exhumed. This literal digging up of past violence has brought to light gruesome facts about the thousands of victims who disappeared mysteriously, the manner of their execution, and in some cases the reason for their death.

The ongoing resolution to come to grips with Spain’s national past has generated much interest among historians and journalists, politicians and political scientists, writers and film producers, church representatives and ethicists, many of whom have approached the subject as witnesses of the Civil War and its legacy. The attention this episode of Spanish history is attracting has reached an audience far wider than the national one, as readers of the international press will have noticed in
the last eight years or so. As a consequence of this delayed reckoning, hardly a year has gone by without the inauguration of a new museum exhibit on this historic event, sometimes held concurrently with another exhibit and for extended periods of time, as was the case with Franco’s Prisons and The International Brigades, held in the fall of 2002 in Barcelona. Prior to these exhibits, in September of that same year King Juan Carlos officially inaugurated an exhibit in Madrid on the Republican exodus to neighboring France. More recently, in 2005, the Círculo de Bellas Artes in Madrid held a photographic exhibit on the 33,000 orphaned children who were expatriated during the war and sheltered by families in different parts of the world.

The large number of autobiographical accounts and memoirs that continue to be written by people who grew up in Republican families during Franco’s dictatorship, together with an increasing output of works of fiction, history books, TV documentaries, newspaper articles, and public commemorations dealing directly with the Civil War, is unprecedented in Spain. This cultural production represents yet another facet of the current unabated surge of memory that attests to the central place this chapter in Spanish history continues to have in the present. As Pierre Nora remarks in his analysis of the reconstruction of the French past, “Memory has been promoted to the center of history,” as if the current interest in exhuming a national past, physically, symbolically, and psychologically, were the way modern Spaniards have found to refill a “depleted fund of collective memory” and to arrive at truths deeper than those offered by an epoch devoid of history (qtd. in Sivan and Winter 2). This unabated interest indicates that the time has come for Spain to revise its past and publicly confront Franco’s legacy just as the people of Germany, France, the Netherlands, and Italy have confronted and condemned the repressive regimes of the 1920s, ’30s, and ’40s and civilians’ role in them. Even if Spain had to wait for more than seventy years to recover a “consciousness of historical continuity” that had atrophied, Spaniards are now living up to the claim that “enlightenment about what happened in the past must work, above all, against forgetfulness that too easily goes along with and justifies what is forgotten” (Adorno, “What Does” 117 and 125).

The present volume grows out of the need to address this ongoing debate from a variety of disciplinary perspectives and aims to offer a
comprehensive account of how the Spanish Civil War continues to make itself felt in the present. Some of the essays included in this book are expanded versions of papers initially presented at a conference on Franco’s mass graves held at the University of Notre Dame in the fall of 2005. The book, much like the conference that inspired it, gathers together a wide range of international experts from several disciplines—history, cultural studies, literary criticism, anthropology, and journalism—who discuss one common theme: how the Spanish Civil War and the years that followed are being remembered collectively by modern Spaniards, and what factors contributed to the ensuing silence, its distortions, and its denials. Each of this volume’s four parts is preceded by an introduction and commentary by experts in each of these respective disciplines.

The preceding pages of this introduction will no doubt make clear that this collection of essays departs from a decidedly critical stance. Each chapter begins with the assumption of what the editors consider a series of historical facts: that in July 1936 a military rebellion led by General Francisco Franco and other members of Spain’s military elite emerged to challenge the country’s democratic institutions and elected government. And while some historians have suggested that the causes of the Civil War lay perhaps in the first military rebellion against Republican democracy led by General Sanjurjo in 1932, or in the Asturian general strikes that occurred in October 1934, we instead understand that it was, in fact, the illegal and undemocratic coup d’etat led by General Franco that was the generative cause of the country’s bloody fratricidal war. Further, we take for granted the fact that the Spanish Civil War ended with a thirty-six-year repressive dictatorship that systematically denied human rights to Spanish citizens and overtly and covertly sought to eradicate any ideological or political opposition. The mass graves that continue to be unearthed today are a testament to these historical facts.

This collection of essays concentrates principally on the cultural, political, and historical ramifications that the Francoist repression has had in the democratic present. While we do not deny that the Spanish Republic suffered from many problems before the start of the war or that those who fought against the Fascists between 1936 and 1939 committed many atrocities of their own, the reader will not find in this volume any sustained accounts or analysis of the killing undertaken.
by Republicans against Nationalist rebels or their sympathizers, principally because of the above stated reasons, but also because the regime had ample opportunity to memorialize its dead. As Helen Graham has pointed out, it was the military coup that allowed the culture of brutal violence to flourish, and “its original act of violence was that it killed off the possibility of other forms of peaceful political evolution” (18). Indeed, “if there had been no military rebellion then there would have been no extra-judicial killing—anticlerical or otherwise”—by Republican sympathizers (38). And it cannot be forgotten that Franco, after all, took full advantage of his nearly forty years in power to perpetuate his own version of Spanish history and to memorialize those who fought in his crusade against the Republic. Although we recognize that there remains work to be done on understanding why Spain’s “political Left has not sufficiently tackled its responsibilities for extra judicial killings during the war” (Labanyi, “Politics” 123; see Loureiro), the essays included in this volume explore the history of Spain’s defeated Republicans and their sympathizers, and analyze the unofficial histories that have been all but forgotten.

The primary focus of part I, “Franco’s Mass Graves and the History of Forgetting,” deals with the repercussions of Franco’s dictatorship on the defeated. Soledad Fox, whose work on the Republic intersects in many ways with the issues raised here, provides an insightful introduction. Paul Preston then offers an analysis of the convoluted way in which extreme right-wing parties during the Second Republic and the authoritarian four-decade rule after Franco’s victory campaigned to demonize and destroy “the entire Left of the political spectrum,” which was seen to be conspiring against traditional Catholic and monarchic Spain. This was partly carried out, Preston argues, through the regurgitation of anti-Semitic sentiments dating back to the early Middle Ages in Spain, which reappear during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and are deployed once again during the dictatorship of Primo de Rivera in the 1920s. This campaign of political vilification included the association of Bolsheviks, Socialists, Africans, and Freemasons, all of whom were characterized as an infernal mix engaged in the diabolical corruption of a supposedly healthy body politic. Just as the Nationalist general Mola was among the first to involve sacred principles as guides in what was after all a socio-political conflict (Casanova, La iglesia 79), these ultraconservative groups
went to incalculable lengths to demonize the liberal agenda of the Republican government in order to win the support of those Spaniards who saw leftist ideology as hostile to their religious values, their political ideology, and their economic interests.

These concerted efforts—often used by persecutors whenever the security of individuals or the cohesion of a given community is threatened (Girard)—were based, according to Preston, “on a convoluted logic whereby Bolshevism was a Jewish convention and the Jews were indistinguishable from Muslims, and thus leftists were bent on subjecting Spain to domination by African elements.” The irony is that this defamation and persecution was partly carried out by descendants of Jews themselves and by generals who, like Mola, were put in charge of the colonial army in Morocco to repress social unrest and aid the Nationalists’ endeavor to oust the democratically elected government of the Republic (see Preston, Coming). The same can be said of Father Joan Tusquets, a Catalan priest who played a vital role in propagating the theory contained in the Protocols of the Elders of Zion of a worldwide Jewish conspiracy to destroy Christianity. As Preston remarks, “despite, or perhaps because of his own remote Jewish origins . . . his investigations into secret societies had developed into a fierce anti-Semitism and an even fiercer hatred of Freemasonry.” As postmodern theory has demonstrated, the Other is often inextricably within, just as the excluded is required for the construction of the identity of the excluder. One is reminded of a similar case occurring a couple of decades before Tusquets’s attacks, that of Otto Weininger, a Jew, a homosexual, and author of Sex and Character (1903), a widely disseminated book that became well-known for its misogynist attitudes and its virulent anti-Semitism. The main difference between Weininger and Tusquets is that the former committed suicide upon finding out about his own “criminal” sexual nature, that is, upon “recognizing his own otherness as a homosexual and a Jew, and masochistically accepting the ‘correctness’ of the Aryan antipathy to his ‘subversive’ ambiguity of race and gender” (Dijkstra 401–2). Father Tusquets did not kill himself. He lived on for more than fifty years after his invited visit to Dachau, if only to admit how shocked he was by what he had seen during that visit.

The deep moral and theological dilemmas raised by the Church’s involvement—addressed implicitly in Preston’s essay—are taken up
more explicitly by another expert on the contemporary history of the Catholic Church in Spain, Hilari Raguer Suñer. In his essay, “The Spanish Church and the Civil War: Between Persecution and Repression,” Raguer analyzes the connections between the Vatican and the Catholic Church in order to show how the latter’s intervention was more bellicose and supportive of the excesses committed by the Franco regime than the former. The Vatican is portrayed as having played a double game, combining on the one hand a covert collaboration with the Republicans during the war and, on the other, maintaining a cordial but tense relationship with the Fascist government in Burgos. It was only after the Nationalists won the war that the Holy See granted official recognition to Franco’s victorious regime. Raguer goes on to contrast the conduct of some members of the Church with the otherwise exemplary behavior of a handful of clergymen whose main aim was to uphold the Christian values in which they believed, denouncing publicly and at their own peril the killing of persecuted Republicans. Such was the case with clergymen Marcelino Olaechea and Father Huidobro. In order to show that not all Church representatives were supportive of the atrocities they were witnessing, Raguer draws on the example of Aita Patxi, a chaplain who offered himself as sacrificial victim to save a Republican prisoner’s life. Sadly, Patxi later found that the prisoner had not been pardoned, as the military had told him (likely to get the priest out of the way), but been executed the following morning.

As was the case in post-Holocaust Germany, by the end of the Franco dictatorship one would have expected the Church to have shown a less passive attitude to what it had witnessed, to have made some public statement admitting its guilt, or, at least, to have condemned the atrocities committed by Franco. But nothing of the sort has come from its representatives so far, which tends to suggest that perhaps they colluded by their silence in those acts revealed by posterity. As Robert Ericksen and Susannah Heschel have remarked about the German churches after the Second World War, silences like these can be construed as a “strong indicator of the attitudes held during previous years” (11). Some of the inevitable questions that arise from these investigations are these: What humanitarian and religious convictions activated resistance in some priests and compliance in others? Why did so many high-ranking members of the Church fail so dismally to react when they were witnessing
some of these atrocities? (Ericksen and Heschel, 4). Was their conduct justified on the basis of the persecution the Church suffered as a result of the anticlerical excesses before and during the war? Where does the moral authority of the Church in Spain rest when it participated in this kind of conduct?

In “The Faces of Terror: Violence during the Franco Dictatorship,” Julián Casanova, a world expert on the Spanish Civil War and on the complex role the Catholic Church played in this event, analyzes the era of terror that dawned in Spain as soon as Franco proclaimed himself head of state, especially in the provinces that had remained faithful to the Republic during the war. He lists the measures of punishment legitimated by Franco’s regime, the travesty of the judicial system that was created, the proliferation of regional tribunals, the executions by firing squad of those who were suspect of opposing the National Movement, and their subsequent anonymous internment. The violent political repression and human rights violations perpetrated by the regime were considered to be a just retribution against a group of people deemed barely human, partly because of the social stigma that came with being a “Red.”

A portion of the essay deals also with the public humiliations and harsh conditions that imprisoned women had to endure, a topic also taken up by Fernández de Mata in the commentary he offers on the challenges to gender-based constructions that the sudden empowerment of women posed for men during the Republic (see his essay in part IV). This topic has received increased attention since the 2002 publication of Dulce Chacón’s best-selling, prize-winning novel The Sleeping Voice. What is surprising to learn from Casanova’s essay is that this treatment, which was meant to “exorcise the demons from the body,” was performed under the official moral stamp of the Church and the Sección Femenina, a right-wing organization founded in 1933 and presided over by Pilar Primo de Rivera, sister of the president of the Falange, whose main objective was to educate Spanish women according to the Christian principles upheld by the movement. If the “intangible effects” of the repression the nation experienced were deployed primarily from above, they were also reproduced from below, as a result of the social, political, and material advances accrued from collaborating with the government.
This all confirms the fact that “the traumatic collective memory that most Spaniards have, even today, of the Civil War is explained not only by the events of the war of 1936 to 1939, but also by the experience of millions of Spaniards in the aftermath of the conflict itself” (Aguilar, “Agents” 84). The social and political “purge” Spain went through and the legal system of repression Franco established would not have been possible, Casanova claims, without the direct involvement of the Church. This was the main reason why it enjoyed the protection, privileges, and power Franco bestowed on it throughout his dictatorship.

Michael Richards’s essay, “Grand Narratives, Collective Memory, and Social History: Public Uses of the Past in Postwar Spain,” focuses more directly on the relations between history and memory. The essay draws subtle distinctions between historical knowledge and the mnemonics involved in recollecting the past, while posing compelling questions for historians. Richards asks, for example, “how to achieve the necessary critical distance from a period whose contested meanings are still part of contemporary political and social debates: How do historians operate from a vantage point between memory and history when recollections are still alive?” One of the salutary effects of the recent movement to recover historical memory in Spain, Richards claims, is that it “has mounted a sustained critique of the social and political ‘amnesia’ after Franco’s death and has provoked some profound questioning of the democratic Transition as the founding myth of contemporary state legitimacy.” The other positive value of this growing national reckoning with its past—which the essays by Ignacio Fernández de Mata and Francisco Ferrándiz in this volume ratify—is that “these memories and representations have focused largely on individuals, their experience of the war, and their suffering in the postwar period and have offered a corrective to a previous predominance of structures and ideologies in historical analysis.” Besides demonstrating how history as an analytical discipline benefits from the social memory of a given group, Richards proposes a deconstructive approach to “our myriad images of the Spanish war” in order to “understand the process by which the narratives were produced and evolved (for example, the evolution of the ‘crusade’ construct into the ‘fratricidal struggle’ image). Dismantling them is the task of historians and broader movements for the recuperation of memory.”
Part II of *Unearthing Franco’s Legacy* is dedicated to the documentary films and testimonios (testimonies) that have played a crucial role in the recovery of historical memory in Spain. This section is introduced by Anne Hardcastle, a specialist in contemporary Spanish cinema and cultural studies, who elegantly underlines the central issue uniting the three essays included in this section: their shared sensitivity to how ideologies and meanings are constructed in cultural texts that aim to uncover lost or repressed memories of the Spanish Civil War and the years of franquista repression. All three essays are reflexively concerned with understanding the trappings of historiographical representation and attempt to account for how memory texts—be they documentary films or testimonios—function in the cultural realm to make meaning out of the past.

The first essay in this section, “Investigative Journalism as a Weapon for Recovering Historical Memory,” is by Montse Armengou Martín, a journalist who has worked since 1985 for Televisió de Catalunya, the regional public television station of Catalonia based in Barcelona. She has codirected, with Ricard Belis, three award-winning documentary films, *Los niños perdidos del franquismo* (*Franco’s Forgotten Children*, 2002), *Las fosas del silencio* (*The Spanish Holocaust*, 2003), and *El convoy de los 927* (*927 on the Train to Hell*, 2004), which were all produced by the weekly program *30 Minuts*. Two of these titles—*Los niños perdidos del franquismo* and *Las fosas del silencio*—were subsequently published as books. The importance of Armengou’s contribution to the process of recovering historical memory in Spain can hardly be overstated. In her essay included here, she describes her firsthand experience as an investigative documentary filmmaker: how she labored not only to discover and reconstruct lost accounts of Franco’s repression but also to generate public visibility for repressed and forgotten collective memories. Armengou emphasizes that journalists are ethically obliged to give a voice to those who have been silenced. Along with newsreel footage, legal documents, historical analysis by historians, and video footage that constitute her documentaries, Armengou stresses the crucial importance that personal memories play in the construction of these televisual histories of the Spanish Civil War and Franco dictatorship. Echoing some of the points made by Jo Labanyi in her own essay, Armengou indicates that personal memories and testimonios play an important part in construct-
ing a truly collective history, and therefore they must be included in any responsible historiographical account.

Gina Herrmann’s essay, “Mass Graves on Spanish TV: A Tale of Two Documentaries,” takes as its point of departure two documentary films that were broadcast less than a year apart but that present very different attitudes toward the historical memories they try to represent: Armengou and Belis’s Las fosas del silencio and Alfonso Domingo and Itiziar Bernaola’s Las fosas del olvido [Mass Graves of Oblivion, 2004]. Herrmann analyzes both documentaries in Derridian terms, linking televisuality to the political by investigating the methods by which these programs were made and what their authors have chosen to emphasize in the construction of their narratives. Through a combination of perceptive formal analysis and subtle theoretical framing, Herrmann highlights the fundamental differences between these two documentaries and takes Domingo and Bernaola to task for their ultimately specious representation of historical events. She convincingly exposes how their Fosas del olvido manipulates “archival images, words spoken in interviews, and editing techniques” to imply an even distribution of culpability among “rojos y fachas.” She points out that Armengou and Belis, on the other hand, take pains to imbricate their documentary within a concrete historical and political context that allows the thinking spectator to come to his or her own conclusions. While wartime abuses are nearly always committed by both sides, Herrmann—as do most of the contributors to this volume—rejects any implicit or explicit equiparación (equivalency) of the two sides that fought the Spanish Civil War. The main responsibility for the Civil War rests, after all, on the rebel generals who initiated their coup d’état in July 1936 against a democratically established Spanish Republic.

In “Testimonies of Repression: Methodological and Political Issues,” Jo Labanyi explores how testimonios allow the speaker (and, by extension, the reader) “to think about the war in helpful ways.” The essay argues that the responsible collection, organization, and publication of oral testimonies of the Civil War and postwar years can help to establish not so much a politics of truth but a politics of feeling. As such, Labanyi argues that the testimonio can function as both a legal document used to assign accountability and a crucial insight “into emotional attitudes toward the past in the present time of the speaker.” Labanyi’s discussion
of the various testimonios that have come out in recent years explores how those memories, even when they are unreliable, allow the speaker to engage in a very real way with a personal experience of reality that has important ramifications for the collective whole. Labanyi writes, citing Elizabeth Jelin’s work on postdictatorship Argentina, that “memory is not a slice of the past waiting . . . to be ‘recovered’ ” but rather “a process that operates in the present and cannot help but give a version of the past colored by present emotions.” Memory, she writes, is “affected by all sorts of interferences from subsequent experiences and knowledge,” for it is an ongoing process of working through things that takes place in the present. This “working through” is an important part of the recovery of memories in a way that will be meaningful to us in the present. In the process of assessing these testimonios, Labanyi encourages us to go beyond the false dichotomy of “victim” and “perpetrator” by investigating instead the significant grey areas that continue to exist between these semantic categories. By including highly personal oral accounts within more traditional histories, and by including interviews in their entirety, historians may create a public awareness of “the complex structures of present-day feeling that they reveal.” Labanyi concludes that it is important that editors, publishers, and scholars resist the temptation to remove the testimonio from its historical and personal contexts, for we must take into account the “specificity of memory as a mental process,” not as unmediated access to historical truth.

Antonio Gómez López-Quiñones points out that “since the mid-1990s, the Civil War has enjoyed a period of cinematographic and novelistic popularity” (La guerra persistente 11). But in spite of this popularity, there have been few honest reckonings of the role that many Spanish novelists played during and after the Franco dictatorship. The inability or unwillingness of many men and women of letters to acknowledge reflexively their own roles during and after the Franco regime has only recently earned attention. When the Nobel laureate Günter Grass revealed in August 2006 that, as a young man, he had briefly served as a member of the SS, for example, there appeared in the Spanish press a number of essays and editorials expressing alternately disappointment, surprise, and condemnation. The novelist Javier Marías came to Grass’s defense in the Sunday magazine of El País and proposed that perhaps it was time for Spaniards to begin to look at their own complicity—
overt or implicit—in the pall of silence that continues to cover the historical period that began with the Spanish Civil War and continued through Franco’s dictatorship. He wrote, apropos of Spain’s own sordid recent history, that “mientras proliferan los sesudos o frívulos artículos sobre cualquier intelectual extranjero repentinamente ‘manchado,’ en España sigue siendo casi imposible contar—sólo contar—las prin- gosidades fascistas o stalinistas de nuestros escritores” (while we have seen a proliferation of articles both frivolous and wise dealing with just about any foreign intellectual who has been suddenly “dirtied,” in Spain it continues to be almost impossible to talk—and only talk—about the oleaginous Fascist or Stalinist dealings of our own writers). With his characteristic severity, Marías insists that it is indeed high time that Spain begins to look inward at its own complicity in the quiet continuation of Franco’s repressive legacy during and after the war, reminding his readers that Spain’s own Nobel laureate, Camilo José Cela, willingly offered his services as an informer for Franco’s regime and moved voluntarily from Madrid to Galicia during the Civil War in order to join the rebel forces there. Cela later served proudly as an official censor during the dictatorship. Another popular and critically acclaimed novelist, Gonzalo Torrente Ballester, for his part, was an enthusiastic Falangist and Francoist ideologue.

In the article in El País, Marías, whose name is often mentioned as a possible candidate for a Nobel Prize for literature, faults both the political Right and the Left for not daring to explore the roles that certain Spanish authors and intellectuals played during and after the Spanish Civil War. His cantankerous condemnation of Spanish national culture bears citation in full, as it relates directly to the central problems addressed in this volume:

En este país grotesco, ni la derecha ni la izquierda tienen el menor in terés en que se sepa la verdad, y ambas están aún dedicadas a ma quillarla a su favor, cuando no a tergiversarla con desfachatez. No cuente usted lo que escribieron o hicieron Cela, Laín Entralgo, Tovar, Maravall, Ridruejo, Sánchez Mazas, D’Ors, Giménez Caballero o Foxá, porque no fue nada malo, exclama la derecha, o empezó a serlo sólo cuando se apartaron del falangismo o de la dictadura, los que lo hicieron. No cuente usted lo que escribieron o hicieron Aranguren, Haro Tecglen
o Torrente Ballester, porque acabaron siendo muy “progres” y amigos nuestros, exclama la izquierda indignada, y menos aún Bergamín, que fue rojo de principio a fin. Por ambos lados la consigna es callar. Todo lo contrario que con Grass, Heidegger, Jünger o Cioran, no digamos con Drieu la Rochelle o Céline.

In this grotesque country, neither the Right nor the Left have the slightest interest in making the truth known, and both sides are still determined to touch it up—if not completely and shamefully distort it—to their own favor. Do not mention what Cela, Lain Entralgo, Tovar, Maravall, Rídruelo, Sánchez Mazas, D’Ors, Giménez Caballero, or Foxá wrote or did, because it was nothing bad, exclaims the Right . . . or at least it only began to be when they distanced themselves from falangismo or the dictatorship (those who actually did so). Do not mention what Aranguren, Haro Tecglen, or Torrente Ballester wrote or did, because they ended up being very progressive friends of ours, exclaims the indignant Left, and much less Bergamín, who was a Red from the beginning to the end. On both sides the agreement has been to keep quiet. This is all the exact opposite of Grass, Heidegger, Jünger, or Cioran, not to mention Drieu la Rochelle or Céline.

Marías explains this generalized reticence to discuss the past as a kind of political cynicism that springs from a self-interested double standard by which both the Left and the Right sought to promote their own perspectives. He continues,

No sé cuántos [años] habrán de pasar para que la verdad interese de veras (la redundancia es a propósito, hoy interesa de boquilla), pero está claro que setenta no han bastado, cuando aquí corren ríos de tinta sobre el pecado de Grass, que apenas si nos concierne, y se sigue amordazando con malos modos a quienes alguna vez mencionamos los de nuestros compatriotas intocables.

I don’t know how many years will have to pass before the truth begins truly to interest us (the redundancy is purposeful, today the truth is of interest only in theory), but it’s clear that seventy years have not been enough, since there have been rivers of ink spilled here on Grass’s
sins, which barely concern us, and we continue to muzzle rudely those of us who dare to mention one of our untouchable compatriots.

Apropos of this widespread silence about the pasts of public intellectuals, José-Carlos Mainer has remarked that Franco’s legacy has been very difficult to exorcise, but that it continues to be a very familiar (and sticky) skeleton lurking in the nation’s closet (“fue (es) un cadáver en el armario que acaba resultando familiar y que siempre es pegajoso”). Compared with other disastrous events that befell Europe during the twentieth century, the Spanish experience with Franco has been frustratingly difficult to acknowledge or metabolize: “el franquismo fue demasiado largo, contaminó toda nuestra experiencia de las cosas y, aunque culturalmente fuera inhóspito, se hizo costra de costumbre” (Franquismo lasted far too long; it contaminated our entire experience of things and although culturally it was not welcome, it became an ingrained, permanent reality).

Public declarations like Grass’s have been all too uncommon in Spain, where no intellectual has made public his or her regret for having supported Franco’s regime. *Intelectuales tránsfugas* (Turncoat Intellectuals) is the lead theme of a special edition of *Babelia*, El País’s Saturday literary supplement, dedicated to this subject. Inspired by the Grass confession, the issue is dedicated to the contrastive analysis of Spanish letters during and after the Franco dictatorship. A massive black-and-white photo on the front page of the issue tellingly features the poet Dionisio Ridruejo, who happily accompanies General Yagüe as he walks through Plaza de Cataluña after the Fascists took Barcelona in 1939. The literary supplement dedicates five pages to the topic, whose overarching title is “*La responsabilidad de los intelectuales*” (The Responsibility of Intellectuals). An article by Miguel Ángel Villena, “*Entre el miedo y la impunidad*” (Between Fear and Impunity), compiles commentaries by contemporary Spanish novelists who comment on the noteworthy silence of the older generation of Spanish novelists who continued to publish and speak publicly after the consolidation of democracy in the early 1980s. (Villena’s essay appears, significantly, below a photograph taken of Cela during the Nobel ceremony in Stockholm in 1989.)

Here, the novelist Suso de Toro affirms that there has not been one real case of auto-criticism or regret from a public intellectual associated with Franco or his regime: “si aceptamos que el golpe militar y el
franquismo fueron un error histórico terrible, deberíamos esperar algún gesto como el de Grass. Pero ningún franquista se ha arrepentido, no. Ni siquiera Dionisio Ridruejo fue capaz de asumir la culpa, indudable en su caso” (if we accept that the military coup and Franco’s regime were a terrible historical error, we really should expect some kind of gesture like Grass’s. But no franquista has ever repented, no. Not even Dionisio Ridruejo was capable of assuming his guilt, which was doubtless in his case) (qtd. in Villena). Meanwhile, Rafael Chirbes asserts that in some cases the Spanish transition to democracy had the perverse result of turning collaborators into heroes: “No podemos olvidar que Cela fue nombrado senador y que Torrente Ballester fue elogiado una y otra vez” (We must not forget that Cela was named as a senator and that Torrente Ballester was praised time and again) (qtd. in Villena). For his part, Pedro Altares indicates that often during the Transition anti-franquistas and the political Left were forced to renounce necessary compromises because of a generalized fear: “miedo a hurgar en el pasado o a rescatar el odio” (qtd. in Villena). As several of the authors included in this volume have highlighted, in the words of Rafael Chirbes, “el gran acuerdo de la transición . . . pasó por no remover el pasado” (the great agreement of the Transition was to not disturb the past) (qtd. in Villena). Villena concludes his essay with the observation that, alongside the generalized fear that intellectuals suffered during the Transition, “la impunidad aparece como la sensación más citada al analizar el papel de la cultura bajo la dictadura” (impunity appears as the most mentioned feeling when one analyzes the role played by culture under the dictatorship).

In Germany, France, and Italy Fascist collaborators were publicly named, brought to justice, or censured, or they openly confessed or expressed regret, but this same auto-critical process did not and has not occurred in Spain. Enrique Gil Calvo laments that in Spain, “los fascistas españoles se permiten el lujo de ir con la cabeza bien alta y solo se ven obligados a dejar de presumir de las barbaridades que han cometido” (qtd in Villena; Spanish fascists are free to walk around with their heads held high; they only find themselves obliged to stop boasting about the barbarities they had committed). In many cases, the identity of perpetrators and collaborators remains secret, and the darker episodes of Franco’s repression have never been discussed or recognized in public. As Gil Calvo claims, “Es la doble moral típico de este país” (qtd. in Vil-
It’s the typical double standard of this country). Calvo expresses his disappointment in the fact that the Transition brought with it the pact of silence and collective amnesia that is, in part, the subject of this book. The result of this generalized oblivion is that Spanish intellectuals who were involved with the regime were able to keep quiet about their past actions, and in exchange they tacitly agreed to become supporters of the new democracy established after the death of Franco. Villena asserts, “lo que parece indiscutible es que este país se pelea continuamente por los fantasmas de un pasado turbulento, complejo y, desgraciadamente, poco estudiado” (what seems absolutely indisputable is that in this country we are constantly fighting for the ghosts of a turbulent, complex, and, unfortunately, little studied past).

The essays included in this section of *Unearthing Franco’s Legacy* attempt to address this historical lacuna and to explore these issues as they have manifested themselves in the cultural realm. The novelist Manuel Rivas has written extensively on the relationship between literature, history, silence, and memory from a decidedly Galician perspective. His remarks in a 2006 interview published in *El País semanal* are relevant to the main issues that Joan Ramon Resina and Samuel Amago explore in their essays in part III, as he points with some optimism to the redemptive qualities that words can have in the face of the willful oblivion that continues to permeate contemporary Spanish culture. Rivas explains that while silence has been pervasive, no silence can ever be total: “Esa pretensión de extirpar, de eliminar lo que representaba media España, no es posible. Las palabras viven y crecen también en la sombra. Hay formas de resistencia y de transmisión. La memoria tiene su propia estrategia” (qtd. in Pérez Oliva 14; This attempt to extirpate or eliminate what half of Spain stood for is not possible. Words also live and grow in the darkness. There are forms of resistance and transmission. Memory is its own strategy).

The power of words to memorialize the dead lies at the center of Joan Ramon Resina’s essay, “The Weight of Memory and the Lightness of Oblivion: The Dead of the Spanish Civil War,” in which he engages movingly with how death, memory, monuments, and ritual are and must be linked in the construction of ethical humanistic society. In his subtle argument, Resina analyzes the importance of all struggles against institutionalized forgetting, the power that images of the dead have in the
cultural sphere, and the mnemonic role of monuments to the dead. A common theme shared by many essays included in *Unearthing Franco's Legacy* has to do with how amnesty and oblivion have important ramifications in the cultures of the present. Resina surveys the ways in which “the exhumation of corpses in the presence of immediate relatives showed the impossibility of establishing a clear distinction between history and memory,” and he examines how “rituals of remembrance facilitate the disentangling of the living from the departed.” In this way, public rituals honoring the deceased sustain society in a larger sense, and thus, the “Antigone Agenda” (as Hermann terms it in her essay in the previous section) is all about how “culture is disrupted by the refusal of ritual and the [negation of] the work of mourning.”

In the classic text, the tyrant Creon's imposition of his will goes against one of the founding principles of culture, which is “the sublimation of violence into reassuring . . . images” of memory that will allow us to live nonviolently with those we may fear or do not understand. In the worst of cases, “under the aegis of horror,” Resina writes, “sovereignty is synonymous with the tyrant’s death-bringing power, while the images of carnage that he spitefully calls forth become the cornerstones of the new state.” The carnage that has emerged as the cornerstone of the Francoist state is represented chillingly by the skeletons that appear in the mass graves that dot the Spanish landscape. Resina argues that these mass graves, which continue to be exhumed, with the help of the memory of the survivors, “establish new overriding memories, which reorganize the relevance of the past.” But Resina’s reading of recent Spanish history is complex, and he allows that at the same time, as we see in the testimonios and documentary films discussed in part II, “memory retains the ethical force of witnessing and . . . rises easily to the status of a political factor.” The sheer volume of writing on the subject, along with the calcifying character of Spain’s constitution in the political realm have made it increasingly difficult to hold the state accountable because the state is not a continuous entity. Resina insists throughout, however, that the refusal of post-Franco governments—conservative and liberal alike—to confer symbolic burial on the victims of Franco’s regime represents, ultimately, “a fatal avoidance of responsibility.”

Amago’s essay, “Speaking for the Dead: History, Narrative, and the Ghostly in Javier Cercas’s War Novels,” attends to the rhetorical and ethi-
cal power that narrative has to memorialize the dead while also assuaging the fundamental human need to tell the stories that haunt us. Amago argues that, much like the unearthing of mass graves that has inspired this volume, Cercas’s recent fiction is self-consciously obsessed with digging up and giving meaning to the forgotten stories of the past. He considers how Cercas’s war novels, \textit{Soldados de Salamina} and \textit{La velocidad de la luz}, demonstrate the profound manifestations—physical and psychic—that untold histories can have on their narrators, and he analyzes the role of narrators in general—be they fictional or real—in recuperating lost accounts of historical happenings. The essay concludes by suggesting that reflexive narratives offer perhaps the truest method of engaging with the complexities implicit in the writing of history, for by drawing attention to the process by which memory becomes narrative and events become history, these kinds of stories draw attention to the responsibility of novelists and historians to tell the tales that have not been told, especially those that have been silenced.

Part IV, “Unearthing the Past: Anthropological Perspectives on Franco’s Mass Graves,” is introduced by Tony Robben, a scholar whose expertise is drawn from similar anthropological studies carried out in Argentina. His essay attests once more to the universality of the Spanish phenomenon that concerns us here, partly because of the global nature of the war and also because it deals with humankind’s unlimited potential to cause irreparable destruction. The essays that Robben comments on contain anthropological observations from two experts who bring firsthand experience in the actual excavation of the burial sites they study: Fernández de Mata in the province of Burgos and Ferrándiz in Valdediós (Asturias). Their essays offer valuable personal accounts of investigations into the repression that followed the war, the state of fear created by the Nationalists during and after the war, and the inability among Republicans to mourn their dead properly. They also serve as examples of the shift that is taking place “from the history of collectivities and structures toward individuals and human agency” that Richards sees as symptomatic of the new focus that “recent manifestations of collective memory” have taken in Spain.

In “The Rupture of the World and the Conflict of Memories” Ignacio Fernández de Mata sees memory in Spain as being “at the heart of contemporary redefinitions of nationhood, civil society, citizenship, and
democracy.” He addresses the plight of the defeated from four perspectives: the difficulties involved in remembering and transmitting the traumas experienced by their victims, the violence perpetrated by Franco’s troops, the explanations of this genocide offered by different social groups, and, finally, the conflicts of memory created today by the exhumation of Franco’s mass graves. Fernández de Mata’s essay, which in several ways complements Casanova’s and Ferrandiz’s accounts of the culture of terror institutionalized by the dictatorship, explores the social, political, and economical opportunities that the lower middle classes saw in the coup, the allegiance they pledged to Francoist politics, and, adversely, the discrimination experienced by the vanquished. His essay speaks to key questions asked by commentators of similar atrocities elsewhere, such as how we might negotiate the past and the discomfort of guilt, especially when those responsible for this past “often feel remorse and live with guilty consciences, but few accept the responsibility of their participation in the events and ask for forgiveness.”

The uncomfortable and embarrassing position with which some perpetrators have had to struggle is vividly portrayed in his examples of a former civil guard and a Falangist in Aranda de Duero, both of whom “reveal that they want to remove part of their guilt by cooperating with the relatives of the assassinated victims, while simultaneously denying that they in fact have any guilt to remove.” The essay confirms the need expressed elsewhere by Mieke Bal “to legitimize traumatic memory in order to lessen the hold they continue to have over the subject who suffered the traumatic event in the past” (Introduction viii). Fernández de Mata deals also with the personal conflicts these exhumations have had on victimizers and victimized alike, and the unsettling effects this process may have on those who struggled “to construct an identity that distanced them from the Reds and was valued positively by Francoism.” Among the latter, Fernández de Mata lists the example of the mayor of a town near Villamayor de los Montes, a member of the PP who opposed the exhumation of a recently located mass grave, even though it was known to contain the remains of his own Republican father. Another example of identities being destabilized, as Fernández de Mata avers, is the one constituted by descendants of Republican families who have accommodated to the conditions imposed by the victors’ prevalent ideology and “blamed their murdered parents not only for their deaths but
for the problems they caused for the surviving family members.” Self-justifying attacks like these are not unique to the Spanish phenomenon, as they echo other counteraccusations made in post-Nazi Germany, which stated that “such things could not have occurred if the victim had not presented some kind of provocation” (Adorno, “What Does” 116). If the sudden surge of memory means one thing for the descendants of the perpetrators and something else for the victims, there are times when political orientation, age, and material prosperity stand in the way of making this distinction altogether convincing. As Stanley Cohen has remarked about similar “ideological shifts” during and after the Pinochet era in Chile, “well-informed, middle-class people, who must have known about the disappearances and tortures, simply denied what was happening. After the transition to democracy, they openly acknowledged that these abuses happened, but switched to justification: current stability and economic success have vindicated the junta; it was necessary to save the country from the chaos that Allende caused” (137).

The fear imposed by the Nationalists as part of a political and military consolidation of power is addressed also in Francisco Ferrándiz’s essay, “The Intimacy of Defeat: Exhumations in Contemporary Spain,” in which he demonstrates how the “memory-work taking place around mass graves, whether they are exhumed or not, has been progressively making visible a formerly neglected cartography of terror and repression that encompasses many landscapes and localities throughout the country.” Ferrándiz focuses on one particular incident that occurred in Valdediós in 1937: the execution by a firing squad of seventeen staff members of a psychiatric hospital whose bodies were dumped into one of the burial sites that has been exhumed in the northern province of Asturias. His essay draws on personal testimonies afforded by relatives of the victims interviewed by the author. Ferrándiz also addresses the difficulties involved in sharing personal traumatic experiences without their losing impact or, worse, being turned into clichés or commodified by the media to be sold in the form of popular narratives. Ferrándiz interviews some of the most vulnerable of the victims, like Emilia and Esther, the wife and daughter, respectively, of one of the murdered members of the hospital staff. All Emilia recalls is that “Asturias had fallen, some soldiers came, there was a Mass, there was a meal, and then ‘there was death.’ The closest Emilia gets to the killing is when recalling
her husband told her, when his name was called, ‘Do not worry. Nothing is going to happen to me just for taking care of mad people.’” These last words remembered vividly by the victim’s surviving wife are significant for several reasons. They serve as an example of the indiscriminate killing that was carried out during the Civil War, but they also corroborate the fact that in cases like these “memory work is intertwined with grief work” (Sivan, “Private Pain” 178–79).

What is so compelling about Emilia’s ellipsis is its emblematic power to convey on a personal scale the difficulties Spain is presently experiencing as it attempts to integrate its national past into a national narrative, partly because of the silence and invisibility imposed on what happened. This is what Ernst van Alphen, in his reflection on the Holocaust, calls “the inadequacy of the frames that are inflicted on the victims by the surrounding culture,” and the impossibility of traumatic memories to become narratives (34). It is beyond human comprehension capacity to record what actually happened. As Doris Laub has observed about other atrocities bearing a disturbing resemblance to what happened in Spain, it was “the very circumstances of being inside the event that made unthinkable the very notion that a witness could exist” (qtd. in Cohen 131).

Exhumations, Ferrándiz goes on to claim, can also be “understood and interpreted as a road map linking the political production of terror with the intimate experiences of the victims of repression.”

Although the present volume focuses on contemporary Spain, the implications of the issues explored here transcend national boundaries, since the book deals with the way a nation’s past is called up to bear on the present, and the repercussions it has at the social, cultural, and political levels. Unearthing Franco’s Legacy also poses crucially important questions, such as how victims of crimes like the ones remembered might be induced to forget when, as Suleiman posits about similar experiences, some of the actions experienced by those directly affected by them are difficult to forget and forgive (217). Indeed, how should a nation deal with those responsible for the traumatic events of its past? Should bygones be bygones for the sake of preserving the peace and prosperity brought about by a fragile new democracy? Silence is always unacceptable, but so too is remembrance as a means of healing since, as Walter Benjamin warns, it can be used as a means to cover up crimes and thereby protect their perpetrators (Sivan and Winter 5). Are recon-
ciliation and healing achievable when the nation is divided between those who would prefer to forget and get on with life and those others who want to see justice done? Can Spaniards come to terms with their past when the victimizers continue to have monuments in their honor maintained by the state, as is the case with Franco’s colossal mausoleum, known as the Valley of the Fallen, and when the country “dares not turn into a punishable crime the exaltation of the dictatorship, as the case is with other European countries who suffered similar historical blemishes” (Prado 1)? Can bygones be bygones for Spaniards when the Vatican beatifies 480 victims of the atrocities committed by the militias loyal to the Republican government but continues to ignore the death and suffering of thousands of victims of Franco’s brutality?

The universality of the issues discussed in this volume become more evident when we consider present political conflicts, unnecessary wars, and massacres that have resulted from similar abuses of power and military might. We only need to think of the Holocaust, los desaparecidos in Latin America, the Yugoslav Civil War, and the Rwandan genocide, together with other collective traumas too current to be named, to realize that the psychohistorical dynamics of ignored atrocities and systematic assaults on truth and memory are of universal concern. In all cases, denial is anathema because national amnesia—enforced or unconscious—about given genocides has the potential to provoke new ones. The central goal of this volume can be summarized with a quotation from the Uruguayan Luis Pérez de Aguirre’s Memoria de los detenidos desaparecidos: “No se recuerda, no se juzga el pasado sólo para castigar o condenar, sino para aprender” (One remembers not to judge the past, to punish or condemn, but to learn) (qtd. in Casanova, “Otras memorias”).

NOTES

1. “Un muerto en España está más vivo como muerto que en ningún sitio del mundo: hiere su perfil como el filo de una navaja barbera.” The paper, titled “Teoría y juego del duende,” was delivered in Buenos Aires on October 20, 1933. See García Lorca, 3: 312.

2. In the introduction to a special number of the Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies devoted to the politics of memory in contemporary Spain, Jo Labanyi points out that “apart from the condemnation of the Franco dictatorship by all parties in Congress on 20 November 2002,” Spain’s political Right has
been unwilling “to dissociate itself from or apologize for their predecessors’ support for the extra-judicial murder of civilians” (“Politics” 124).

3. Such is the case with Máximo Rodríguez, speaker of the PP, when he rejected in 2006 the proposal to indemnify victims of Francoism in Galicia, stating that to support this new law would mean to fall into the same “sectarian and Manichean imposition of the Franco regime,” adding that “to reopen wounds could provoke frictions and even social fissures considered to be overcome with the transition” (qtd. in Varela, 25). See Labanyi, “Politics,” and Golob, along with Giles Tremlett’s essay in this volume for more on the debate on the Ley de la Recuperación de la Memoria Histórica.

4. The frequent marches and manifestations organized by the PP in opposition to the PSOE’s antiterrorist program and other policies have brought the iconography of the past into the present. The front page of El País on March 23, 2007, for example, featured a photograph of the latest march organized by the PP to protest the prosecutor’s release of Arnaldo Otegi, leader of the outlawed Batasuna party. The photo features a group of hard-liners bearing preconstitutional Spanish flags and banners supporting the Falange—Spain’s Fascist party and the only political organization allowed during Franco’s regime—as they make their way through the streets of Madrid.

5. Paul Connerton observes, apropos of similar attempts to control collective memory, that “control of a society’s memory largely conditions the hierarchy of power . . . and the organization of collective memory . . . , is not merely a technical matter but one directly bearing on legitimation, the question of the control and ownership of information being a crucial political issue” (1).

6. The link we make here and elsewhere to World War II is purposeful, as we regard the Spanish case, with Golob, as one part of what has become a globalized transitional justice culture.

7. The article by Elizabeth Kolbert, “Looking for Lorca,” published in the New Yorker (December 22, 2003), brought the issue to a wide audience in the United States, as did a number of shorter articles published in a variety of newspapers: “Spaniards at Last Confront the Ghost of Franco” (New York Times, November 11, 2002) by Elaine Sciolino and Emma Daly; “Via a Grave Site, Spain Relives Harsh Divisions” (Boston Globe, August 22, 2004) by Charles Sennott; and “Even in Death, Franco Has the Power to Divide Spaniards” (Los Angeles Times, October 29, 2006) by Tracy Wilkinson. More recently, the investigation undertaken by Magistrate Baltasar Garzón of the whereabouts of approximately 137 war victims, the poet García Lorca among them, has moved center stage and received wide attention by the international press. Garzón’s judicial indictment of Franco and thirty-four of his generals and ministers for crimes against humanity committed between 1936 and 1951 was the subject of a recent article in the Economist (October 25, 2008, 62–63). The indictment was later found unconstitutional.
8. In the United States, Francesc Torres presented his photographs of the excavations of mass graves at the King Juan Carlos I of Spain Center at New York University and at New York’s International Center of Photography in the autumn of 2007. See Torres.

9. The dilemmas raised by the Church’s involvement in the massacres and repression that took place during and after the Civil War, together with the support it gave to Franco’s government, transcended Spain and “became a particularly acute problem of conscience” for leading Catholics like the French liberal theologian Jacques Maritain (Doering, 489).

10. It is telling that the first two official telegrams that Franco received after his victory in November 1939 came from Adolf Hitler and Pius XII (Preston, Franco 322).

11. Documentarians have been prolific during the last ten years, producing titles such as Muerte en El Valle (Christina Hardt, 1998), La guerrilla de la memoria (Javier Corcuera, 2001), La memoria es vaga (Katie Halper, 2004), Los héroes nunca mueren (Jan Arnold, 2004), Presos del Silencio (Mariano Aguado and Eduardo Montero, 2004), La mala muerte (Fidel Cordero and José Manuel Martín, 2004), La columna de los ocho mil (Ángel Hernández García, Antonio Navarro, Fernando Ramos, and Francisco Freire, 2005), Santa Cruz, por ejemplo (Günter Schwaiger and Hermann Peseckas, 2005), along with the two documentaries by Montse Armengou (discussed in essays in this volume by Gina Herrmann and Armengou herself). These and other titles have been broadcast on regional and national television stations and screened in art house cinemas throughout the country. Indeed, over the last few years documentary films have enjoyed an unprecedented popularity. In June 2005 a series of films carrying the title Imágenes contra el olvido was so successful that the Cine Doré in Madrid repeated the series in its entirety in October 2006. All of the films included in the series are now available for purchase in a boxed set sold at book and video stores throughout Spain.

12. The caption reads, “Frente a gestos como el de Günter Grass, pocos escritores españoles, de los que colaboraron con el franquismo, trataron abiertamente de su apoyo a la dictadura o renegaron de su pasado” (Considered alongside gestures like Günter Grass’s, few of the Spanish writers who collaborated with Franco’s regime dealt openly with their support of the dictatorship or renounced their past).

13. These kind of postdictatorship dynamics are no doubt behind the unfortunate impunity that perpetrators have enjoyed in Latin America and Spain. It is estimated that over 90 percent of the common crimes committed by the various Latin American dictatorships of the 1960s, ’70s, and ’80s (genocide, human rights abuses, crimes against humanity, etc.) were never addressed, nor were their perpetrators brought to justice. See Aznárez.