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Abstract

During and after the Spanish civil war, over 500,000 people left Spain; at least 200,000 would remain outside Spain for many years, some for the rest of their lives. They went to France, Mexico, Argentina, the USSR, and across the globe. These Spanish ‘republican’ refugees were also connected to those who had stayed within Spain, by familial and political ties or the bonds of friendship. In order to investigate this reality – a group of people from all kinds of political, social and economic backgrounds based in so many different geographic locations – this thesis foregrounds the role of the individual in both experiencing and constructing history, being defined and resisting definition from different entities. Consequently, it seeks to intervene in the historiography of the Spanish Civil War and republican exile by highlighting the ways in which individual experiences and narratives both strengthen and weaken categories such as: political, a-political, refugee and exile.

This PhD brings together underused source materials stored in Spain and Mexico, as well as digital archives stored online; it is based on archived oral history interviews with refugees, additional oral history interviews undertaken by the author, several collections of letters, unpublished and published memoirs, and official documents. Each chapter considers a different aspect of the refugees’ experiences and how these experiences are represented in the source material: departure, separation and communication, return and home, and the memory of exile within families. How and why did people leave? How did they change their behaviour in order to adapt to or survive particular circumstances? How have the children and grandchildren of Spanish refugees reacted to family narratives and memories? Central to this analysis is the role played by factors such as gender, age, class, status, personality and political views in shaping peoples’ experiences, as well as an emphasis on ‘non-elite’ alongside ‘elite’ refugees’ experiences of displacement.

The historiography of the Spanish Civil War and subsequent exile has been shaped by political and ideological debates, as well as the different national contexts refugees found themselves in. From the numbers of refugees recorded as having left Spain, to the idea that returning to Spain was a betrayal, to the memory of the exile within Spain, almost every aspect of the refugees’ experiences has been used to make or refute arguments surrounding the morality of the republican cause and the nature of the Francoist regime. At the same time, the different circumstances of refugees living in countries like France and Mexico meant that different narratives or collective memories regarding the role of refugees in their host countries are still being constructed and reconstructed. One of the central aims of this thesis is to show how these debates have obscured the richness of individual experiences; the thesis therefore argues that considering stories which do not “fit” or details which are difficult to synthesise ultimately leads us to a more profound understanding of history.

Driven by an extensive use of a range of oral history interviews, the thesis will also explore how historical time is complicated by personal testimony. The events of one person’s life are carried into the present, as they continue to affect their character, state of mind and attitude to success and hardship. Personal memories and perspectives will provide a contrast to historical narratives which focus on the role of the state, military events, ideology or political parties; instead, the thesis will show how these entities and events affect people’s lives, and the lives of their children. The central argument of this thesis is that Spanish refugees were not ‘preordained’ by the ideological conflicts which were embedded in the Civil War or their displacement. Instead, refugees actively constructed their ‘self-hood’ in response to these circumstances, rather than being (wholly) defined by them.
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Introduction

‘I am very proud of being a refugee!’

Carmen Bahi de Parera, speaking in 1987

So there were people who fought with me [who thought] that the very fact of leaving Europe – that being called a refugee for having left Spain, that this was of worth, I never considered it worthy of anything; it was a misfortune, a necessity […] But that this misfortune, that because it is raining you stand under a doorway or a balcony, that this should be seen as something of merit, [something to create a feeling of] community, no thank you.2

Francesca de Linares de Vidarte, speaking in 1988

Note that I have always had a universal spirit, very internationalist, so I have never applied that term refugee to myself – I have not said that about myself.3

Jose Duque, speaking in 1979

What does it mean to be a refugee? Well, being a refugee is, it means that we are the ones who lost, that we are the defeated, no? But that we have, what's it called? A clear conscience because we, we defended the legally constituted government in Spain till the last.4

Jaime Camarasa Lluelas, speaking in 1979

During the course of hostilities (1936–1939) and at the end of the Spanish civil war over 500,000 people left Spain.5 These refugees travelled by land and sea, following old

1 Entrevista realizada a Carmen Bahi de Parera, en su domicilio particular de la ciudad de México, por Enriqueta Tuñón, los días 7, 14 y 28 de Diciembre de 1987 y 5 de Enero de 1988, PHO/10/89, Libro 07, p.140.
2 Entrevista a Francesca de Linares de Vidarte, realizada en su domicilio particular de la Ciudad de México, por Enriqueta Tuñón, los días 27 de febrero, 1, 9, 10, 16, 22 y 28 de marzo de 1988, Libro 60, PHO/10/98, p.347-8.
3 Entrevista a Jose Duque, realizada en su domicilio particular de la Ciudad de Guadalajara, Jalisco, por Dolores Pla, los días 25, 26, 27 y 28 de Noviembre de 1979, Libro 38, PHO/10/66, p.203.
4 Entrevista a Jaime Camarasa Lluelas, realizada en Guadalajara (Jalisco, México) por Dolores Pla, los días 19 y 22 de Agosto de 1979, Libro 19, PHO/10/42, p.121.
5 The 500,000 figure includes significant numbers of people who left Spain during the Civil War, people who left with the retirada in the winter of 1938-1939 and people who left Southern Spain on boats bound for North Africa in March 1939. The 200,000 figure includes those who were still in France and North Africa or who had re-emigrated to Mexico, Argentina, USSR and various other countries, following the return of approximately 300,000 refugees to Spain by 1940. There has been considerable debate and disagreement over different figures, for more details see chapters one and three or for a relatively concise overview, see: Dolores Pla Brugat, ‘El Exilio Republicano Español’, Aula-Historia Social, 13 (April 1, 2004), pp.14–34.
migratory paths and new routes forged by circumstance; some 300,000 returned soon after they had left in 1939, but approximately 200,000 remained outside of Spain for decades, sometimes until they died. They also left friends and relatives behind, individuals who went on to experience life under Franco’s dictatorship (1936/9–1975). This thesis is about some of these Spanish refugees, their ‘personal experiences’ and their ‘subjective understandings’ of what they lived through. It is partly based on archived and original oral histories with refugees who went to Mexico and their descendants, so it is also deeply concerned with the lived consequences of historical events and the ways in which current identities shape personal accounts of the past.

As implied by the epigraphs from various interviews with Spanish refugees, undertaken in the late 1970s and 1980s with those who had lived at least some portion of their exile in Mexico, being a ‘refugee’ was anathema to some people, just as it was welcomed by others. Being (or not being) a refugee was something with which all so-called refugees, had to grapple from the moment they left Spain. Tension between the self, carefully constructed in written and spoken life stories, and the various external ideas about what it could mean to be a Spanish refugee, or indeed one of the ‘defeated’, is what lies at the heart of this thesis. Relating refugees’ experiences and words through this prism risks reducing their lives and subjectivities to how they were defined by other people or entities. What I hope to do is the opposite: to show how Spanish refugees shook off or put to use the ‘labels’ which were inevitably attached to them.

The word ‘labels’ is in inverted commas because I am using it to describe official and unofficial discourses and policies, rather than a piece of paper (although one of the things refugees often lacked was, in fact, a piece of paper, to confer upon them the right to move about within France in 1939, for example). The labels I refer to range from ‘refugee’, ‘political’ (or ‘communist’, ‘socialist’, ‘anarchist’, ‘Trotskyist’) and ‘a-political’, ‘economic

---

6 Many crossed and re-crossed the border several times or left Spain after 1939. The complexity of the routes taken by different refugees will be explored in greater depth in chapter one of this thesis.


8 In this sense, I emulate Carolyn Steedman, who wishes to avoid reproducing the historian’s ‘subordinating gaze of sympathy’, in her writing on servant girls in the English industrial age, see: Steedman, Master and Servant: Love and Labour in the English Industrial Age, (Cambridge: CUP, 2007), p.178.
migrant’, to ‘red’, ‘traitor’ and ‘repentant red’. They are the product of the political conflicts which characterised the Civil War, the immigration policies pursued by host country governments and the punitive stance taken by the Francoist regime towards 'the defeated’.9 They were also created by different groups of refugees (reflecting political conflict within and between these groups) and they have since been used by historians of republican exile striving to construct an intelligible historical narrative. People living under any circumstances construct their sense of self in ways that in some way relate to, respond to, or even actively oppose societal norms. However, the Spanish Civil War and the population displacement it caused predicated a particularly fraught relationship between people and society because the stakes were so high. For example: the label attached to a refugee within France in 1939, coupled with their own self-determination, could determine whether they were incarcerated in French or later Nazi concentration camps, allowed to move about freely, or whether they were granted passage to other host countries, and this often equated to the difference between living and dying.

Scholars working on subjectivity in Soviet Russia, amongst others, have tried to ascertain how far people exercised control over their ‘self-fashioning’: ‘to what extent is self-fashioning and self-authorship a dynamic process of constructing subjectivity out of ideology and local experiences, rather than a process preordained by [or controlled by] these social locations and normative discourses?’ 10 In other words, is the individual a vessel into which the state or society pours an identity, or does the individual actively and ‘dynamically’ shape their own identity? The answer to this question clearly depends on both

9 The term ‘vencidos’ (defeated or vanquished) is used by scholars to describe those who lost the Civil War but it refers to different groups of people, for example, Alted applies it to refugees: Alicia Alted Vigil, _La Voz de Los Vencidos: El Exilio Republicano de 1939_, (Madrid: Aguilar, 2005). Other scholars use it to describe those who stayed in Spain, had some form of connection with the republican war effort and who were marginalised during Franco’s dictatorship, as well as republican refugees. For example: Michael Richards states that during 1939-1945 those ‘who suffered most […] were the defeated in the war, as they now had to pay for their political ideology’, Richards, _A Time of Silence: Civil War and the Culture of Repression in Franco's Spain, 1936-1945_, (Cambridge: CUP, 1998), p.93.

the person and the circumstances in which they find themselves; Soviet Russia was
different to Spain during and after the Civil War, and these two societies changed over
time. Furthermore, although positioning these two alternatives at one end of this spectrum
clarifies a complex problem, the relationship between the individual and society is (and
was) more ambiguous and unstable. Bearing these caveats in mind, the central argument of
this thesis is nonetheless that Spanish refugees were not ‘preordained’ by the ideological
conflicts which were embedded in the Civil War or by their displacement; refugees’
subjectivities were not simply derived from their exile, instead they actively constructed
their ‘self-hood’ in response to these circumstances, rather than being (wholly) defined by
them.

These processes were not limited to a particular time or place, either. This thesis is largely
based on oral histories which were conducted years after the Civil War and the departure
from Spain. The circumstances under which refugees shaped their subjectivities changed
dramatically and constantly over many decades, the ‘selves’ which they project back in time
must therefore respond to the society in which they were speaking, as well as their memory
of past events and circumstances, not to mention the research questions of the interviewer.
However, the ways in which refugees choose to speak about certain events nonetheless tell
us something about the situation as they experienced it, and like Linda McDowell I remain
somewhat paradoxically ‘committed to a modernist version of memory as rooted in
material events, despite accepting the fragmentary and transitory nature of memories and
their continuous construction and reconstruction over time’.11

It is also important to draw a distinction between how refugees viewed themselves and how
they were portrayed by other people or entities. Spanish refugees were mistreated for
reasons entirely unrelated to what they considered to be their ‘individual’ attributes and
their experience was often one of seeking to convince powerful entities that they were not
what other people had said they were. The tension that lies at the heart of this thesis is
therefore one which was lived by the people whose experiences I will describe: on the one
hand, a particular person existed in a specific place and time and their experiences must be
seen to be ‘individuated’, on the other, that person was constantly perceived as belonging
to a group, and defined by how they were treated by external entities – objectified by

11 Linda McDowell, Hard Labour: The Forgotten Voices of Latvian Migrant Volunteer Workers,
political parties and governments, relationships like gender and class, and acts of violence directed towards the ‘mass’ rather than the person. Equally important to remember is that the individual is in many ways a politicised concept, intertwined with liberalist discourses. Many individuals in 1930s Spain saw their identification with political groups as far more important or meaningful than what we might deem their individual identities and experiences: the historian’s quest to ‘individuate’ might therefore run counter to the beliefs of the person being so singled out. At the same time, there is no doubt that people experienced the Spanish Civil War in lots of different ways. Therefore, the second part of my argument is that historians should attempt to convey this sometimes confusing and contradictory detail, in order to avoid replicating the divisive ‘you’re either with us, or against us’ discourse which underpinned the violence which took place during the war.

This introduction will now show how this thesis can be situated in the broader historiography of the Civil War and republican exile. It will also relate the lives of Spanish refugees to a number of historical debates. One is about how to think about the role of the individual in the history of the Spanish Civil War and exile, another is to do with using personal testimony as a historical source, a third is about the production of memory and the fourth is about how this thesis has been shaped by the content of archives, and thus how it relates to what is called in Spain the ‘recovery of historical memory’. However, the vocabulary used to describe the subjects of this account is integral to all of these discussions, so I shall first provide an outline of the different words used to describe Spanish refugees.

---

12 See for example Susan Bibler Coutin’s account of US policy towards Guatemalan refugees seeking asylum in the 1980s, which convincingly shows how words like ‘individual’, the ‘state’ and ‘agency’ were and are grounded in ‘liberalism’: ‘The Oppressed, the Suspect, and the Citizen: Subjectivity in Competing Accounts of Political Violence’, Law & Social Inquiry, 26 (2001), pp.63–94.

The vocabulary of Spanish exile

In the Spanish-speaking literature on republican exile, words commonly used to describe the refugee include: *exiliado* (exile), *refugiado* (refugee), *desterrado* (uprooted person) – or just *republicano* (republican, which here means ‘supporter of the Republic’, rather than ‘member of one of the republican political parties’). Words less commonly used include: *emigrante* or *emigrante político* (emigrant/political emigrant), *expatriado* (expat) and variations on the theme of *migrante* (migrant). The exile as an event is most often referred to by historians or Spaniards as the *exilio republicano* (republican exile) but in Mexico, for example, it is usually called the *exilio Español* (Spanish exile). It has also been called the ‘emigration’ or ‘exodus’ produced by the Civil War. The word *desplazado* (displaced person) exists but it is rarely used (if ever) to describe Spanish Civil War refugees.

Spanish refugees have also played with these words, producing neologisms or preferring to refer to themselves as something else. Francesca de Linares, who went to Mexico (after a period of time in various countries in North Africa) and whose dislike of the word refugee is clear from the quotation included in the epigraph, said that she would rather be called a ‘foreigner’ than a ‘refugee’. The philosopher, and refugee, Jose Gaos, adapted the word *desterrado* to create *‘transterrado’*, which means something like ‘rooted across places’ or ‘person with more than one set of roots’. The implication, in Gaos’ use of the term, is that as a result of Mexican generosity and the Spanish exiles’ consummate skills in adapting to life in Mexico, a new category of person, who was adjusted to exile, had emerged.

‘Refugee’ is also a technical word conferring a particular legal status. For example, in modern Britain, refugees are those who have been granted asylum and ‘leave to remain’ in

---

14 For a discussion of the historic usage of these different words in Spanish, see Juan Francisco Fuentes, ‘Imagen Del Exilio Y Del Exiliado En La España Del Siglo XIX’, *Ayer*, 2002, pp.35–56.

15 ‘Displaced person/people’ or ‘DP/s’ was commonly used to describe refugees in post-Second World War Europe, see Jessica Reinisch, ‘Introduction: Relief in the Aftermath of War’, *Journal of Contemporary History* 43:3 (July, 2008), pp.371–404.

16 Entrevista a Francesca de Linares, p.343.


18 The term itself is also indicative of the Spanish refugees’ feelings of debt and public demonstrations of loyalty towards the PRI, the (repressive) ruling party in Mexico. See Faber, *Exile and Cultural Hegemony: Spanish Intellectuals in Mexico, 1939-1975*, (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2002), p.8.
the UK. By contrast the word in scholarly, political and journalistic texts, or in everyday use, is often meant to describe someone who is in flight and whose future is uncertain. In images of humanitarian disasters, published by charitable organisations in fundraising literature or some sections of the global media, the refugee is most often presented as a victim – hungry, desperate and ragged in appearance. Whilst many thousands of peoples do suffer in these ways, such forms of representation also mean that contrasting images of refugees are wrongly assumed to be inauthentic. Lynda Mannik, for instance, found that photographs of well-dressed Estonian refugees travelling to Canada in 1948 were met with disbelief: ‘Observations such as, ‘They don’t look like refugees; they don’t look like they are suffering at all’ were common, even from fellow academics’.

The word ‘exile’ is equally heavy with association. It evokes particular psychological traits – a lack of belonging, alienation, frustration – and is used to group together sometimes quite disparate people, experiences and literary works into the same category. Responding to these generalisations, the late Chilean writer Roberto Bolaño dismissed ‘exile literature’ as a meaningless term. Works which focus on exile literature have nonetheless proven influential, partly because of these ambiguities and the ways in which they prompt new critical perspectives.

---


24 The most compelling texts on exile thrive on these ambiguities, see for example: Edward Said, Reflections on Exile and Other Literary and Cultural Essays, (London: Granta, 2001).
Valentine Daniel has sought to minimise the distinction between internally displaced people and refugees, but also between refugees in transit and people with leave to remain in a country, highlighting the impact of psychological rather than physical displacement.25 Similarly, the use of the term ‘inner-exile’ in the Spanish context recognises that experiences and behaviours associated with ‘exile’ were also possessed or performed by people who were not physically removed from their homeland. Paul Ilie, for example, states in his study of writers in Francoist Spain that ‘exile consists in some degree of exile from a culture and not merely from a society’. The experience of alienation from the culture of Francoism led many writers to a state of inner-exile, manifested in repeated references to prison cells and metaphorical prisons in their literature.26 Other scholars have developed broader conceptions of inner exile: Soo and Alicia Pozo Gutierrez suggest that the term ‘internal exiles’ could refer to those who went into hiding within Spain in 1939 – people who were known as ‘topos’ or ‘moles’ – or that it could also refer to ‘those who, without having to physically hide, felt forced to repress their ideas and existence [after] the [Civil War]’.27 Susana Tavera, refers, in passing, to the ‘long interior exile’ created by Francoist legislation in the post-war period and Michael Richards to ‘a kind of internal economic exile’ in the years 1939-1945.28

The concept of inner, internal or interior exile demonstrates the attractions of the word ‘exile’ as a signifier or shorthand for something like alienation. In much the same way that images of desperate refugees lost in large crowds arguably ‘de-historicise’ not just the experiences of those in the crowd but all refugees’ experiences, the concept of ‘inner-exile’ is problematic. Naharro-Calderón, who writes about Spanish exile literature, argues that ‘exile without displacement loses, in the myth of the inner exile, its historical markers and is

28 Tavera, ‘La Memoria de Las Vencidas: Política, Género Y Exilio En La Experiencia Republicana’, Ayer 60 (Jan., 2005), pp.197–224 (p.198). All translations from Spanish texts into English are the author’s own, unless otherwise indicated; Richards, A Time of Silence, p.99.
converted into a [...] critical language that dissolves the [more] tiresome elements of exile: the specific uprooting [...] and above all, [the] ideological silhouette’.\(^\text{29}\) Naharro-Calderón’s insights tell us something else, though, which is perhaps not what he intended: if one term, ‘inner-exile’ converts the experience of exile into a metaphor, emptying it of historical context, does not the other, ‘exile’, do so as well? As this thesis will also demonstrate, uprooting is not necessarily related to, neither does it ever pre-determine, what Naharro-Calderón terms ‘ideological silhouettes’, which could also be translated as political affiliation or particular ideological commitments. A minority of refugees did not identify themselves as ‘political’, just as thousands of people were unable to leave Spain but were nonetheless totally ideologically opposed to the Francoist regime.

These epistemological and philosophical debates are also intertwined with politics (in the broadest sense of the word) and different national contexts. In Mexico, for example, the term *refugiado* or *refugiado político* (political refugee) was used to distinguish the Spanish refugees from Spanish economic migrants who, in Mexico, were and still are referred to pejoratively as *gachupines*. This reflected the strength of a mainly left-wing movement in Mexico known as *indigenismo*. Broadly speaking, *indigenismo* equated to a rejection of the Mexican nation’s Hispanic or Latin roots and an increasing emphasis on the country’s pre-Hispanic past. Different articulations of this principle began to gain popularity during the Mexican revolution (1910-1920) and for some proponents of *indigenismo*, Alan Knight suggests, ‘[the] necessary corollary of rehabilitating the Indians was sweeping “systematic” condemnation of Spaniards, the hated *gachupines*’.\(^\text{30}\)

This reality is clearly demonstrated in the on-board newspapers produced by groups of refugees on their way to Mexico on three boats from May-July 1939.\(^\text{31}\) Much of what is written about the *gachupines* in the papers is presented as a warning. In one article, published in the boat *Sinaia*’s newspaper, they were described as a threat – ‘Be careful! We are all at risk!’ – emphasising the idea that the refugees’, and by extension republican Spain’s,


\(^\text{31}\) For more information about Mexican policy towards the Spanish refugees, see chapter one.
reputation was in danger. On the Mexique, refugees were reminded that they were not going to Mexico to ‘make a fortune, like the vulgar indios’, another word for the miserly and exploitative gachupin. The distinction between the two groups was (and is) not necessarily obvious to Mexicans but continues to be upheld by some ‘refugees’ to this day, according to descendants of refugees I met in Mexico. This helps to explain why although, in Spain, Spanish refugees are usually referred to as ‘exiles’, in Mexico they are often, though by no means always, referred to as ‘refugees’. My use of the word ‘refugee’ is thus shaped by the fact that many of the sources referred to in the thesis were produced in the Mexican context, but it is also related to my desire to write a ‘social history’, rather than a history of ‘elite refugees’. The terms ‘Spanish exile’ or ‘republican exile’ are often used to refer to the departure from Spain of distinguished intellectuals, political leaders or artists. The problem with this approach is that it overlooks the experiences of the vast majority of refugees, who did not achieve fame or produce artistic works. I therefore use the word ‘refugee’ in order to break down the barrier between histories of Spanish ‘exiles’ and ‘refugees’.

The individual and the Spanish Civil War

In 2004, Michael Richards suggested that the history of the Spanish Civil War is ‘unusually complicated by conflicting mythologies’. This is overstating the case: compelling accounts of the aftermath of the Greek or Lebanese civil wars, for example, demonstrate how often ‘conflicting mythologies’ are produced and employed for political reasons in other national contexts. However, it is certainly true that there are multiple and ‘splintered’ histories of the Spanish Civil War, which reproduce conflict between Franco’s forces and the Republic.

---


As Richards goes on to state, one of the consequences of these ‘conflicting mythologies’ is that historical accounts of the Civil War often ‘[play] down individual agency’. The study of ideological conflict takes precedence over the study of everyday lives or, less commonly, polemicists seek to further their own ideological agendas, using past events as ammunition in contemporary political debates. In all kinds of ways, then, the personal narratives of those who lived through the Civil War are engulfed by what Vieda Skultans calls the ‘collective narrative of history’. For example, the Spanish Civil War is often positioned as the ‘first act’ in a ‘bloody European war’ between Fascism and Communism. It is true that Franco’s uprising was supported by both the Nazis and Mussolini’s Fascists. In-depth studies also show how the pact of non-intervention, signed by Britain and France, as well as the USSR, Italy and Germany, led the Republic to rely on Soviet aid, whilst Germany and Italy continued to provide aid to Franco. Communist parties across Europe organised volunteer forces which travelled to fight against Fascism within Spain. But descriptions of the war between Fascism and Communism de-emphasise the specifically Spanish context, and they see the role of individuals reduced to a raised fist in support of the courageous communist-led defence of Madrid or an outstretched fascist salute, welcoming Franco’s

37 Taken from Richards’s and Chris Ealham’s phrase to describe the ‘splintering’ of Spain, during the Civil War: see: ‘History, memory and the Spanish civil war: recent perspectives’ in The Splintering of Spain, pp.1-20.
38 Richards, ‘Egos and Ideals’, p.341.
39 One of the most notorious and popular right-wing polemicists is Pio Moa, see for example, his ‘advice for Ian Gibson’ (an Irish ‘hispanist’ who supports the campaign for the recuperation of historical memory) which condemns the movement to exhume mass graves containing the bodies of republican victims of Francoist executions: ‘Un consejo a Gibson’, Libertad Digital, 8 Sept. 2009, http://www.libertaddigital.com/opinion/pio-moa/un-consejo-a-gibson-38772/, [accessed 22 July 2014].
40 Mc Dowell, Hard Labour, citing Vieda Skultans, p.190.
41 See for example, Gerald Howson’s illuminating study of the Republic’s struggle to procure arms: Arms for Spain: The Untold Story of the Spanish Civil War, (London: John Murray, 1998).
42 Some of whose experiences have been memorialised: Peter Darman (ed.), Heroic Voices of the Spanish Civil War: Memories from the International Brigades, (London: New Holland, 2009).
forces. It is less clear how people responded to life during the war, how they conceived of their political identity or whether they genuinely supported either Franco’s forces or the republican army – or what genuine support might actually consist of.

Two of the longest-running debates within the historiography of the Civil War testify to a broad split between the ‘Left’ and the ‘Right’ (terminology which does not necessarily aid an understanding of the political reality in 1930s Spain). First, there is some controversy surrounding the role of the Spanish Communist Party (PCE) during the Civil War, particularly the extent to which ‘they’ influenced the decisions made by Juan Negrín, who was President of the Republic from May 1937–March 1939 (and in exile, until 1945). Arguments about Negrín and the nature of the influence exerted by the PCE divided Spanish refugees as well. The Spanish Socialist party (PSOE) in exile was made up of many factions. The two most prominent were first, those who supported Negrín and second, those who supported the more ‘moderate’, by this time essentially anti-communist, Indalecio Prieto (Minister of Defence for the Republic from May 1937 – April 1938). In 2012, this debate manifested itself in the publication of En el Combate por la Historia, or Fighting for History (literally ‘In the battle for History’), also known as the Contradiccionario, which is a reference work for the history of the Republic, the Civil War and the Francoist dictatorship. It was explicitly positioned as a rival to the Diccionario Biográfico Español (Spanish Dictionary of Biography), published by the Real Academia de la Historia, which is equivalent to the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. The Diccionario was strongly criticised for its right-wing bias. Franco, for example, is described as an autocratic head of state whereas Negrín, is described as a communist dictator. Fighting for History, as the title suggests, directly refutes the validity of these entries.

---

43 For comments on the significance of the Fascist salute, see Luisa Passerini, Fascism in Popular Memory: The Cultural Experience of the Turin Working Class, trans. by Robert Lumley and Jude Bloomfield, (Cambridge: CUP, 1987), pages 185 and 188.

44 ‘They’ is in inverted commas because it is not always clear whether the question is about particular individuals or a more diffuse conception of the ‘party’; Helen Graham has convincingly argued that the Republic’s experience of the war, effectively drove Negrín to rely on Stalin’s aid, which was given only grudgingly and at great material cost to the Republic. See for example: Graham, The Spanish Republic at War, 1936-1939, (Cambridge: CUP, 2002), pages 155 and 368-70.


Second, there is the polemic surrounding the nature of the violence enacted behind the lines during the Civil War, and by the New State (the Francoist regime), after Franco’s victory. It is estimated that a ‘maximum of 150,000 were executed in rebel (or 'Nationalist') Spain, including 50,000 after the Civil War, while there were 50-60,000 victims in the republican rear-guard, including over 6,000 members of the Catholic clergy’. Since the 1960s, Hugh Thomas and Stanley Payne, and in the past 15 years, Julius Ruiz and Nigel Townson, have argued that historical accounts of repression which took place in the republican zone have been shaped by ‘Marxist’ or ‘republican’ narratives. They cite Paul Preston and Richards (for example), who argue respectively, in a way which echoes the explanations offered by Republican politicians during and after the war, that the executions carried out in the republican zone were the work of ‘uncontrollable elements’ or that they ‘performed no particular social function’, whilst the executions carried out by Franco’s forces are defined by Graham as organised purges or ‘genocide’. To counter this reading of events, Ruiz suggests that the violence which took place in both zones was motivated by ideology and pragmatism (the urge to get rid of the enemy). However, he focuses his analysis on Nationalist tribunals (particularly post 1940) and is thus less convincing when addressing extra-judicial killings in both zones during the war, the nature and operation of the violence enacted in the Republican zone and the extra-judicial, Francoist state sponsored violence (for example: unregistered beatings of those in police custody) which took place after the end of the Civil War, till at least the early 1950s, with resurgences of violence at different stages of the dictatorship.

47 For the most comprehensive, if controversially titled, account of violence undertaken by both republicans and nationalists behind the lines, see Preston, The Spanish Holocaust: Inquisition and Extermination in Twentieth-Century Spain, (London: Harper Press, 2013).
50 Ruiz, ‘Seventy Years on’, pp.469–70; Richards, A Time of Silence, p.31.
Despite the predictable and sometimes intransigent nature of these long-running debates, it is important to emphasize the existence of carefully researched micro-histories of different localities during the war. Further studies also seek to explain the causes and the significance of murder, rape and other forms of violence behind the lines, like Mary Vincent’s compelling work on religious violence. A ‘third Spain’, which was neither fascist nor communist, has also been evoked by historians such as Preston to highlight the existence of individuals who were pulled into the conflict, despite the fact that they were not politically affiliated to left or right-wing parties.

Matthews has used military archives to contribute to the conceptualization of this group of people, explaining that the majority of troops who fought in the Civil War were not volunteers but conscripts, and were arguably far less likely to be fighting in accordance with their own beliefs. Michael Seidman, using similar sources, has described physical conditions both on and behind the front lines during the war and his work shows how the lack of food and basic supplies sapped the morale of soldiers and civilians in both zones. Seidman has also argued that histories of the Spanish Civil War too often dismiss ‘individualisms’, producing models of identify and identification which ‘[neglect] individual dissidence’. To reiterate the above discussion on the concept of the individual: whilst it is true that many Spaniards did not ‘internalize the dominant ideology’, at times Seidman risks dismissing the capacity of individuals to subscribe to, and identify with, particular ideologies.

---

The historiography of Spanish exile

A similar pattern is evident in the study of Spanish exile: whilst histories written by refugees themselves sometimes reproduced the arguments which had characterised left-wing politics during and immediately after the war, more recent accounts seek to historicise these arguments and use new sources to develop fresh interpretations.\(^{58}\) From the first years of exile, disagreements over the future of the Republic and personal recriminations were published alongside ruminations on the meaning of defeat, echoing the Chilean poet Neruda’s assertion that ‘the exodus [was] the most painful event in the history of [Spain]’.\(^{59}\) Scholars such as Ugarte have noted that the Spanish ‘exile’, regardless of whether they came from a literary background, possessed an ‘uncontrollable need to write’.\(^{60}\) Whilst Ugarte is probably exercising a certain amount of creative license, it is true that Spaniards from all kinds of backgrounds interned in French concentration camps produced handwritten and printed journals, pamphlets, diaries and letters in an effort to record their experience for posterity.\(^{61}\)

I have already alluded to the ways in which the academic study of ‘Spanish exile’ has, at times, been confined to a study of particular writers, musicians, composers or professionals. For example, one of the first major historical accounts of Spanish exile was the impressive multi-volume study coordinated by Abellán (1976). Each volume documents a different aspect of the history of Spanish exile, focusing on the fields of literature, music, science and the visual arts, and was designed to capture in great detail the contribution of exiles to their host countries, and to celebrate achievements and resilience. This was not a social history, nor was it a history of ‘everyday life’, and the collection was devised to


\(^{61}\) Sharif Gemie draws upon some of this literature in his article: ‘The Ballad of Bourg-Madame: Memory, Exile, and the Spanish Republican Refugees of the Retirada of 1939’, *International Review of Social History* 51:1 (April 2006), pp.1–40; See also, digitised diaries and journals at ‘La Web exiliad@s’, \(<http://www.exiliadosrepublicanos.info/es/proyecto>\>, [accessed 21 July 2014].
highlight the loss to Spain of a particular kind of cultural and economic output. This means that the collection of volumes represented a history of an elite group of Spanish refugees, even as it provided background information relevant to all sections of the refugee population.

There is a slight bias towards the history of Spanish exile in Mexico in Abellan’s collection as well. For example, the number of pages devoted to exile in France in the first volume of the series is 15, whereas for Mexico it is 28. This is despite the far greater numbers of refugees living in France (well over 150,000 compared to an estimated 20,000 who were living in Mexico) their experiences were tacitly deemed less significant. 62 Broadly speaking, the Spanish refugees who remained in France were less likely to possess professional qualifications and more likely to come from poorer backgrounds than those who went to Mexico. 63 And, whilst the proportion of intellectuals and professionals who went to Mexico has been vastly exaggerated, it is true that prominent writers and intellectuals did reside in Mexico. 64 This is partly why, in cultural histories of Spanish exile, the ‘elite’ refugees in Mexico receive what is, in numerical terms, a disproportionate amount of attention from the scholarship. As Javier Rubio argued at the time, by 1977 much of what had been written about republican exile focused on key names and reduced the experiences of, for example, thousands of republican troops, ‘to a few lines, a few figures, which [were], most of the time, wrong’. 65 However, since then scholars such as Dolores Pla, Pilar Domínguez Prats and Clara Lida, writing about non-elite Spanish refugees in Mexico, Scott Soo and Geneviève Dreyfus Armand on the French context, and Dora Schwarzstein and Barbara

64 Clara Lida judges that it would be a ‘serious error’ to suggest that the majority of the refugees in Mexico were intellectuals or artists, see: Inmigración y Exilio: reflexiones sobre el caso español, (Mexico DF and Madrid: Siglo Veintiuno, 1997), p.111.
Ortuño on the Argentinian, have built upon Rubio’s approach and produced important and compelling social histories of Spanish exile.66 These scholars have nonetheless been more sympathetic than Rubio to the Republican cause (Rubio worked as an ambassador for Franco and is thus regarded as less than impartial by some scholars).67

Whilst Stein, Pla, Lida and Dreyfus-Armand in particular were committed to reconstructing pasts which had not been effectively documented, increasingly, scholars are driven by a desire to interrogate the discourses surrounding republican exile and the narratives or myths produced and contested by different groups of refugees. For example, Teresa Fèrriz Roure’s work on Catalan ‘exiles’ in Mexico has emphasised the ways in which an ‘orthodox discourse’ regarding the ethics or possibility of returning to Spain was propagated by certain exiles, and not others, only to be gradually undermined by ‘marginal discourses’ from the early 1950s onwards.68 Jorge de Hoyos Puente has also shown how exiled writers and politicians constructed a specific ‘refugee identity’ from 1939 onwards in Mexico, an identity which continues to shape historiography, even as it is repeatedly shown to be a myth rather than reality.69 I will combine these critical approaches with the extensive use of oral histories, in order to interrogate not just the ‘conflicting mythologies’ produced by refugees in different national contexts but also to consider how ‘refugees’ subjectivities’ can


and should be incorporated into our historical understanding not just of republican exile but also the Spanish Civil War.

Furthermore, although several historians have sought to write social histories of Spanish exile and to use oral histories to bring these accounts to life, they have either not connected the significant scholarship on personal testimonies with Spanish exile or, if they have, they have not allowed this to shape their text. In this sense, this thesis will refer to scholars such as Alessandro Portelli, Luisa Passerini, Penny Summerfield and McDowell in their use of oral testimony not simply to reconstruct the past but to consider why the past has been presented in the ways that it has been by people in their own oral narratives. I will argue that ‘the specificity of a person's life experience […] [does] not simply mirror group experience’, it constitutes their own sense of self. I therefore use interviews, and letters for two reasons: one, to focus in on the detail of individual lives and the emotional experience of particular events and two, to identify connections between these individual experiences and narratives, and broader historical themes. Both of these objectives contribute to the current historiography of the Civil War and exile in the way in which they destabilise and interrogate what Richards terms ‘competing mythologies’.

Sources and methods
Each chapter of the thesis draws upon sources stored in state, political and personal archives located in Spain and Mexico. The decision to focus on these two countries was partly driven by the requirements of a time-limited research project: the refugee community in Mexico is largely based in one city, and several archives contain relevant sources in the same location. At the same time, it was also possible to gain a broader perspective by drawing on sources produced by refugees in multiple locations, and to focus on individuals’ histories rather than national or institutional histories, as I will go on to explain. The majority of the sources referred to are therefore some form of personal testimony, usually either oral history interviews or letters written to family members, friends or different nations’ government representatives. The current section of this introduction will first of all

70 For example, Dora Schwarzstein includes an illuminating discussion of oral history methodology and the ways in which personal testimonies illuminate subjectivities but the majority of her book is still very much focused on the institutional and political history of Spanish exile in Argentina. For her analysis of oral history as a historical source, see: Schwarzstein, Entre Franco y Perón, pp.xvi-xxii.
71 McDowell, Hard Labour, p.189.
explain the types of sources used and the national or ‘transnational’ contexts it therefore illuminates. I will then discuss some of the methodological difficulties (as well as the benefits) inherent in using personal testimony as historical evidence and, by extension, the political contexts which have shaped the creation of different archives. As Aróstegui has noted: ‘a distinction must be made […] between the different social stratum in which memory operates, distinguishing between political leaders and the masses, between different currents of political opinion and between different territorial spaces’.72

The seminal histories of Spanish refugees in Mexico, Argentina and France and more general treatments do not draw anything other than rhetorical links between the experiences of refugees in different countries or between refugees and the defeated within Spain.73 Histories of Spain after 1939 describe how the political structures, economic policies and cultural discourse propagated during Francoism impacted on the Spanish population but they (understandably) do not, except in one or two paragraphs, describe the fate of the Spanish refugees.74 Very few scholars have grouped the experiences of those living inside and outside of Spain together, beyond the subject of a paragraph or specific studies of political parties (which are necessarily concerned with international networks).75

There is, therefore, space for an alternative perspective: instead of looking at the history of particular geographical areas, the thesis will shift the focus onto the history of individuals, social ties and journeys.76

73 Fagen, Exiles and Citizens: Spanish Republicans in Mexico (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1973); Schwartzstein, Entre Franco y Perón; Dreyfus-Armand, El Exilio; Soo, Routers Alted, La Voz de los Vencidos.
75 Gillespie, The Spanish Socialist Party, e.g., p.128.
This approach is also sensible from a practical perspective. People sometimes left and returned to Spain or they took longer to leave than everyone else. Despite the fact that of the 44 interviewees whose narratives are cited at length or in passing throughout the course of this thesis, 33 lived at least some period of their exile in Mexico, they also traced paths across Europe and the Soviet Union, North Africa, elsewhere in Latin America and the United States. The diversity of refugees’ experiences would not come across if the thesis only focused on those who travelled directly to Mexico from France and who then stayed there without returning to Spain or re-emigrating. This is also why I have also included letters written by refugees based in France, the United Kingdom and the United States because these correspondences represent connections between refugees in different places and are indicative of the ways in which individuals experienced their displacement. This wide-ranging approach means that I cannot provide a finely drawn analysis of the different national contexts in France, Mexico, the UK and the USA, but it also helps to identify links between the experiences of refugees living in different countries, as well as between refugees and those living in Spain.

Oral history archives
There are numerous physical archives, as well as an increasing number of digital archives, which hold collections of oral history interviews pertaining to the experience of exile, Francoist repression or life in Spain during particular time periods. Some of these archives store interviews in audio-visual form, in audio or as transcripts (or both). This thesis is based on a selection of 22 interviews from 117 interviews conducted by mainly Mexican researchers and historians and stored in transcript form in both Spain and Mexico, in an archive entitled ‘Fuentes Orales: Exilio en México’ or ‘Oral Sources: Exile in Mexico’, and will hereafter be referred to as ‘EM’; 11 of my own interviews conducted in Mexico DF with refugees and their descendants in March-May 2013, one further interview conducted in Spain in September 2013, and a selection of 10 interviews from an estimated 110 stored online in video form and conducted by the researchers from the University of San Diego.

77 Particularly because this would limit any study to quite a specific political and social group, for a breakdown of the social backgrounds of those who arrived directly in Mexico from France, see: Pla, ‘Características’.
for the Spanish Civil War Memory Project (SCWMP). Whilst some of the interviews are quoted consistently and at length throughout the thesis, others serve to provide additional examples to illustrate particular arguments (for more information on all the interviewees, see appendix 2).

Spanish refugees interviewed for ‘EM’ were usually born before 1910, some as early as the 1880s; those I interviewed belong to several different generations, being born between 1920 to 1987, and the people interviewed for the SCWMP range in age from those born within a few years of 1909 to those born long after 1939. For the most part, the memories of those who were not alive during the war are referred to in the context of debates surrounding the ‘postmemory’ or inherited memories of Spanish exile in Mexico (see chapter four). Interviews from the ‘EM’, which form the backbone of chapters one–three, were selected according to the following criteria: the age, gender, regional identity, political affiliation and class/social background of the interviewees. I have therefore included interviews from a wide range of backgrounds, deciding not to focus on a particular age, region, social group or political identity. It should be noted, however, that the experiences of those affiliated or in some way connected to the PCE are slightly over-represented. The interviews from the SCWMP were selected based on these same criteria but also according to a typology of different experiences: namely, whether they had attempted to leave Spain during or after the Civil War, whether and how they had returned to Spain and their experiences of being a ‘red’. The selection of all the interviews was designed to provide greater access to a variety of life stories, rather than to suggest that the ultimate source base is in any way statistically representative. Those I interviewed in Mexico were a self-selecting group and they were all women, apart from one informant.

---

78 The ‘EM’ interviews quoted form part of an oral history project conducted by historians and researchers from Mexico and Spain in the late 1970s and 80s and funded by the Mexican Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia (INAH) and the Spanish Ministry of Culture. 117 interviews were conducted and copies of transcriptions are stored in Mexico in the Biblioteca Manuel Orozco y Berra, Dirección de Estudios Históricos, Tlalpan, Mexico DF and the Centro Documental de la Memoria Histórica (CDMH) in Salamanca, Spain. The interviews are sometimes referred to as the ‘Archivo de la Palabra’ but this title describes the wider collection of oral histories stored in the Dirección de Estudios Históricos, many of which are entirely unrelated to Spanish exile. For more information on the methodology of the interviewers, see: Pla, *Els exiliats Catalans*, p.26.
A number of methodological questions are provoked by first, the storage of interviews, second, the research objectives of different projects and third, the role of the interviewer in eliciting answers from informants. Alessandro Portelli emphasises the importance of the totality of verbal communication and states that the storage of interviews in transcript form ‘inevitably implies changes and interpretation’. Verbal or audio-visual recordings will at least retain some semblance of ‘the emotional states of interviewer and interviewee alike’, whereas in transcript form ‘their effects upon the resulting testimony, are rendered largely invisible’, allowing the interview to be interpreted, in Michael Roper’s words as ‘purely’ an ‘instance of genre or form, and not a subjective experience’. The SCWMP also draws a link between the complexity of responses to the Civil War and Franco’s dictatorship and the imperative to record interviews in film as well as sound. They suggest that non-verbal responses to the trauma enacted by past experiences should be documented as an integral part of how people respond to historical events.

This is often impossible, however: for example, the ‘EM’ interviews can only be referred to in transcript form because the tapes are inaccessible to researchers for reasons of consent. And we should not discount the utility of the transcription, which is, after all, better than nothing. Neither should we dismiss what we can learn from interpreting interviews as instances of ‘genre or form’, as well as subjective experiences. For one thing, reading, listening or watching an interview in this way may facilitate an analysis of the ways in which certain individual narratives allude to ‘collective memory’ or group narratives about the past. Many scholars, starting with Maurice Halbwach, have invoked the idea of collective memory to explain how and why particular groups within society, or even nation-states,
produce certain narratives about the past. Common language and with it a common understanding creates a framework upon which societies or sub-groups within societies can hang group recollections, and it is sometimes possible to discern traces of these common understandings within oral history interviews. At the same time, these ‘frameworks’ are in constant flux: ‘forgetting, or the deformation of certain recollections, is also explained by the fact that these frameworks change from one period to another’.

The research aims and the context within which the research took place also varies for each project. The 117 interviews conducted for ‘EM’ were recorded in the late 1970s and throughout the 1980s by mainly Mexican researchers and historians, some of whom were related to Spanish refugees. At the time of writing, the SCWMP is still working to record further interviews, having started in the summer of 2007, and the interviews are conducted by mainly American researchers. For ‘EM’, researchers sought only to interview Spanish refugees who had lived some portion of their exile in Mexico, whilst the SCWMP has interviewed a range of people – the only thing that they have in common is their connection to experiences of the Civil War and Francoist repression. For example, interviews have been conducted with people whose family members were murdered during the war, or whose grandfather was incarcerated for a time in a Francoist concentration camp but also with those who spent some time in exile in French territories and the USSR.

The refugees interviewed for ‘EM’ were all interviewed after Franco’s death in 1975 but they were still speaking at a time when the history of the civil war and Francoist repression were not necessarily topics of open discussion within Spain (although they were within Mexico). By contrast, interviews taking place in the 2000s took place in the context of a ‘memory boom’ in Spain, as represented by limited debate regarding the possible prosecution of Francoist executioners, a growth in the number of successful fictional
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representations of the Civil War and the passing of the law of ‘historical memory’ in 2007.\textsuperscript{86} The process by which Spain’s past is discussed and ‘uncovered’ is complicated and will be discussed in greater detail below.\textsuperscript{87} Different people and groups are fighting for different objectives, whether it is legislation, recognition or simply the freedom to speak about the execution and imprisonment of republicans during and after the Civil War. Nonetheless, one could argue that the prevalence of the discourse surrounding ‘historical memory’ in Spain and the formal institution of the law of historical memory, no matter how limited its actual provisions were, provided a safer and more stable environment within which interviewees could talk about the past.

\textbf{Generating personal testomonies}

Scholars such as Roper have placed the relationship between interviewer and interviewee under scrutiny for slightly different reasons. The aims of a particular research project and the context within which the interview takes place undoubtedly direct the course of the interview but so too does the intimacy of the situation. Using the psychoanalytic concept of transference, where the characteristics of relationships with other people are transferred from patient to analyst or vice versa, Roper suggests that in any given interview both parties take different roles and play out different relationships. For example, an older interviewee might talk to the younger interviewer as their son or daughter (or grandson/daughter) or as happened in one of Roper’s interviews, the researcher might respond to the interviewee’s memories as versions of their own. These kinds of temporarily constructed relationships affect the course of the interview, the questions asked or not asked, answered and not answered.\textsuperscript{88} Whilst these processes are less easy to discern in


\textsuperscript{87} For a well-rounded critique of the meaning of historical memory and how it has been interpreted by different people, see Faber, ‘Entre el respeto y la crítica: Reflexiones sobre la memoria histórica en España’, \textit{Migraciones y Exilios} 5, (2004), pp. 37-50 and ‘The Price of Peace: Historical Memory in Post-Franco Spain’, \textit{Revista Hispánica Moderna} 58: 1/2 (Jun.-Dec., 2005), pp. 205-219.

\textsuperscript{88} Roper, ‘Analysing the Analysed’, p.30.
transcripts or video interviews, through the course of my fieldwork, it was clear that my relationship with those who I interviewed shaped the spoken narratives I was able to record. I was cast alternately in the role of the English researcher who must be taught the history of republican exile, the granddaughter, daughter or fellow historian. For my own part, listening to personal family histories of Spanish exile was an enjoyable, humbling and sometimes difficult experience. Some of the women I interviewed reminded me of my grandmother or great-aunts, if only because they were elderly, articulate and witty, not because I have any Spanish or Mexican roots. Several informants were also of a similar age to my mother but were talking about vastly different lives and experiences. They were all people I would be glad to count as friends, and I am sure this context has shaped the way I have interpreted their testimony.

The oral historian Gina Herrmann has explained how other relationships can shape memories of the past, specifically the impact of mother-daughter relationships on mothers’ memories. After analysing interviews with several women who had actively participated in leftist political parties or groups during the Spanish Civil War, Herrmann noted how the attitude taken by their daughters with respect to their mothers’ actions and beliefs strongly affected the way they recounted their life story. Those women whose daughters shared their ideology and/or continued to participate in politics in a similar way were able to construct their life stories in a way that emphasised this common commitment to a cause. In this way, the practical and emotional difficulties caused by the subsequent demonization of the people who had fought for the Left under the Francoist dictatorship were partially overcome with recourse to these shared familial and political identities. When other interviewees’ daughters, in contrast, rejected the views held by their mothers and blamed their mothers for their lowly status as rojos (reds) in Franco’s Spain, the women were unable to draw meaning from a recounting of their past. Their accounts were therefore more disjointed than the accounts of women who felt their past actions had been validated by their daughters.

The central theme of Herrmann’s work is that relationships in the present shape how people structure their accounts of past political activity. We can extend this to say that the

constantly changing nature of inter-personal relationships shape how people structure oral accounts of their life, whether they were politically active or not. A number of the interviews I conducted in Mexico support this idea, very clearly demonstrating how mother-daughter or grandmother-granddaughter relationships shape both the ways in which memories are articulated and how they are understood. Narratives of exile, abandonment and separation are all expressions of present identities but they are also reflections of the nature of intra-familial relationships. The ways in which memories of another person are subsequently interpreted years after that person’s death are also the product of changing life circumstances: as the child becomes older, they may interpret memories of their parent differently.

**Interpreting personal testimonies**

I consider there to be four main ways in which oral histories have been used to construct historical narratives. First, oral history was originally conceived as a radical discipline, designed to incorporate hidden, ‘forgotten’ or dissenting voices into historical scholarship. Secondly, oral testimonies are used to enrich or embellish existing narratives and ‘bring them to life’. Thirdly, they are used to show how individuals have made sense of the past, and how they have constructed their subjectivities in relation to the past, so the focus is not directed so much at what interviewees said but instead, how they said it. Fourthly, and relatedly, interviews are used to show how individuals interact with ‘collective’, ‘cultural’, ‘group’, ‘public’ or ‘societal’ memories, so interviewees are shown to draw upon ‘cultural frameworks’ to make sense of their personal experiences. A fifth way is also beginning to emerge, represented by the work of Susan Crane and Roper, which is more directly to do with the importance of the historian as a ‘subject’ interacting with and actively shaping the production of history; for example, my ‘subjectivity’ as an interviewer has shaped this account.
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90 Pamela Sugiman reflects on how her relationship with her mother shaped both her mother’s testimony and her response as a historian: “These Feelings That Fill My Heart’: Japanese Canadian Women’s Memories of Internment’, *Oral History*, (2006), pp.69-84 (p.71).


Accounts of republican exile which are based on oral histories, like Dolores Pla’s seminal social history of Catalan exiles in Mexico or Alicia Alted’s account of Spanish exile in various different countries, tend to limit themselves to the first and second uses of oral history, using spoken narratives to reconstruct the past and bring it to life in the words of those who experienced it. By contrast, this thesis will use all techniques, focusing particularly on the third and fourth, in order to ask how and why Spanish refugees talk about the past, and how this might relate to the ‘cultural frameworks’ produced in the national and transnational spaces of exile. Echoing Luisa Passerini, whilst I am aware of the existence of a considerable literature on the inconsistencies in the use of the word ‘memory’, the concepts of the ‘national’ and ‘transnational’, the notion of a ‘self’ or ‘personality’ which shapes oral testimony and many other important questions, a ‘theoretical reassessment will not be undertaken in this work’, instead I will use ‘concepts which promote analysis without first attempting to resolve all the related theoretical problems’.

Also in common with Passerini and scholars such as Summerfield, this thesis conceptualises ‘the life history’ as ‘the place where ‘stirrings of the memory’ are transferred into pre-existing moulds’. Referring to women’s memories of working during the Second World War, Summerfield first highlighted the importance of existing narratives (‘moulds’) pertaining to the role of women in the family and the workplace, disseminated by the British state and in popular culture, and then gave examples of how these moulds or ‘frameworks’ shaped her informants’ spoken recollections. In Passerini’s case-study, the ‘moulds’ were determined by the context of Turin under Fascist rule but also older working-class cultural and linguistic forms. In the case of this thesis the moulds, ‘frameworks’ or ‘cultural scripts’ are produced by the politicised narratives in use during and after the Spanish Civil War, the politics and culture of Spanish exile in different sites, as well as the less easily discernible heritage of Spanish local cultures pre-1930s.

Passerini’s remark that the ‘order in which memories are recalled undermines the notion that the chronological order is inherently 'natural and automatic' is also suggestive of

93 Pla, Els exiliats Catalans; Alted, La Voz de los Vencidos.
94 Passerini, Fascism in Popular Memory, pp.3-5; for a discussion of the many ways in which ‘memory’ has been employed by scholars, see for example: Geoffrey Cubitt, History and Memory (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), pp.5-19.
95 Passerini, Fascism in Popular Memory, p.60.
Portelli’s evocation of informants whose narratives ‘shuttlecock’ between the past and present, and who produce factual inaccuracies. The existence of factual inaccuracies in oral histories is inevitable but it is only very rarely the product of deliberate deception, although researchers have identified cases where this has taken place. Most of the time, these oral forms and inaccuracies provide valuable clues:

[the] discrepancy between fact and memory ultimately enhances the value of oral sources as historical documents. It is not caused by faulty recollections […] but actively and creatively generated by memory and imagination in an effort to make sense of crucial events and of history in general.

Throughout the course of this thesis, I seek to identify both the linguistic clues which hint at alternative meanings and the discrepancies between fact and memory which do the same, using different sources to place spoken narratives into context, although it has only sometimes been possible to cross-reference interviews with official documents in the way that Portelli does. Ultimately, as Summerfield suggests, ‘no one’s story is wrong, but we need more than the story itself to understand what it may mean’.

McDowell has combined all of these approaches in her work on Latvian migrant workers, who came to the UK after the Second World War. Her book Hard Labour specifically focused on the impact of displacement on her informants’ lives. Not only her conclusions but also the content of her study was shaped by her informants, reflecting Portelli’s assertion that informants can be, ‘if we listen and try to understand, more articulate and credible historians’ than ‘professional writers and administrators of history’.

McDowell’s conclusion that the 25 Latvian women she interviewed have maintained a ‘steadfast commitment to their national origins and of exile’, and that this was ‘characterised above all by hard work and a stoical determination to survive for the sake of their children’ is not what this thesis will argue with regards to the experiences and narratives of Spanish refugees. Many refugees only partly associated themselves with the country they had left behind, often because the circumstances under which they departed from Spain were very
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97 Passerini, Fascism in Popular Memory, p.27.
100 Summerfield, Women’s Wartime Lives, p.286.
different to those experienced by McDowell’s informants, as chapter one will demonstrate. This reminds us once more how subjectivities are not constructed in a vacuum, rather that they are constructed and reconstructed as part of a dynamic relationship with a range of different and changeable contexts.

**The production of historical memory**

Francisco Marin, who was born in 1923 and interviewed for the SCWMP in 2008, described his father’s abduction and murder by Francoist forces after the Nationalist occupation of Seville. He is the oldest of seven children and he avoided politics during the dictatorship in order to protect his family. Marin now sees himself as having a responsibility to talk about his father’s story, to school children and his own grandchildren, so that people will *know*. This is just one of the ways in which ‘historical memory’ is recovered within Spain. Intimate relationships and memories need to be situated within broader national and political contexts: the collection of oral histories within Spain, for example, is often positioned as a way to access truths which were repressed and destroyed during the Francoist dictatorship, whilst the conservation of materials relating to the Spanish exile in Mexico is designed to both sustain and *create* a particular ‘memory’ of this event. The politicised nature of all archives but particularly those archives dedicated to storing documents pertaining to the Spanish Civil War, republican exile and the Francoist dictatorship means that it is worth demonstrating how this context has shaped the current historical analysis.

As Vincent states, ‘[for] the forty years of Franco’s reign, the archives remained closed – giving those in charge of them ample opportunity to select and to shred’. The Centro Documental de la Memoria Histórica (CDMH), which contains several collections relevant to this thesis, started life as the Archivo de la Guerra Civil (Civil War Archive) which had once been a tool of Francoist repression. From 1937, ‘a number of Francoist agencies were created that had different names and were split into separate administrative units but had a
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102 Marin, Francisco “Paco.” Testimony of the Spanish Civil War and the Francoist Dictatorship. University of California, San Diego, 2008: his father’s death: part 1, 15-30 mins; fear of speaking about these events during the dictatorship: part 2, 2-4 mins; historical memory, part 4, 23-35 mins.

single purpose: ‘to know, expose and punish enemies of the Fatherland.’ The Delegación Central de Recuperación de Documentos (Central Delegation for Document Recovery) was based in Salamanca and it was here that evidence against enemies of the New State was stored. On 28 October 1977, the Ministry of Culture took control of the contents of the Delegation, dissolved its functions and defined the contents as belonging to the Spanish National Archive; in 1999 the materials were formally recognised as the Civil War Archive. Over the years, the archive was supplemented with personal archives and photographic collections; for example, the ‘EM’ interviews have always been stored in Salamanca. In 2007, coinciding with the declaration of the law of historical memory, the Civil War Archive was integrated into the CDMH.

The transformation from what was an instrument of state repression to an archive has not been smooth. The polemic over the Catalan papers demonstrates how these documents can fuel contemporary political battles. At the end of the Civil War, a train with twelve freight carriages filled with official documents left Barcelona. These documents, known as the Catalan papers, contained information which was used to repress Catalan nationalism and persecute individuals. This context helps to explain why the Catalan government was so vehemently opposed to the documents remaining in the Salamanca archive, even after they received the microfilm versions in 1983: the fact that the papers were kept in Salamanca was interpreted as an example of a (Castilian) centralised state exerting its authority over Catalonia. The conservative Mayor of Salamanca saw things differently: in 2006, when a number of the boxes were successfully repatriated to Barcelona, he decreed that the street on which the archive is located be renamed ‘Calle del Expolio’, roughly translated as ‘Plunder Street’. The name never took off and has since officially reverted to what it was before.
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104 Quoted from the official summary of the archive: <http://censoarchivos.mcu.es/CensoGuia/archivodetail.htm?id=1> [accessed 11 April 2012].
107 References to repression and the street re-naming: Anderson, ‘The Salamanca Papers’, pages 178 and 172-4 respectively.
Other archives consulted for this thesis also have important foundational histories. The Ateneo Espanol de México (AEM) was founded in 1949 by Spanish refugees in Mexico DF and, like Ateneos within Spain, acted as a cultural centre and social space for refugees living in this city.\textsuperscript{108} The AEM has since developed a library and an archive of documents; it also sponsors the publication of memoirs and hosts exhibitions and book launches related to Spanish exile. The Ateneo’s memo was partly sponsored by the Spanish Ministerio de la Presidencia, or Ministry of the Presidency, and the upgrade of the archive was also sponsored by Spanish state funding. Refugees have donated their personal archives, containing letters and other personal effects, to the archive. The fact that the AEM exists and that it has developed this collection is testament to the organisation and the interest of refugees in preserving their own history. However, this history is incomplete because the AEM represents only a small section of the refugee population and, clearly, only those who consider their identity as refugees to be something worth preserving.

Political archives in Spain have their own foundational histories and have been maintained with varying levels of effectiveness. The Archivo del Gobierno de la Segunda República en el Exilio (The Archive of the government of the Second Republic in Exile), for example, is difficult to navigate. The catalogue published by Alted is now out of date, as two filing systems operate alongside one another.\textsuperscript{109} On the other hand, the collections of the Fundación Largo Caballero (FLC) and the Fundación Pablo Iglesias (FPI), (Largo Caballero and Pablo Iglesias Foundations), which are financed by the UGT and the PSOE respectively, are meticulously catalogued. This thesis does not draw upon an equivalent archive of CNT materials: it includes extensive quotations from socialist politicians’ letters from exile and the interior but none from CNT members. Soo and Sharif Gemie have worked hard to emphasise the high proportion of libertarian refugees in France, arguing that this aspect of the Spanish exile has too often been overlooked.\textsuperscript{110} This is a criticism which could be levelled at this thesis, which has been shaped by the contents of socialist archives: each personal archive is stored in foundations for reasons pertaining to each

\textsuperscript{108} Memoria del Ateneo Español de México, 1949-2012, (Mexico: AEM and Gobierno de España, Ministerio de la Presidencia, 2012). Organisations with a liberal (and republican) cultural heritage – Ateneos (or Athenaeums) existed in most of the major Spanish cities in the 30s and were places/cultural centres where people gathered to debate or talk about ideas and events (called ‘tertulias’).
\textsuperscript{109} Alted, El Archivo de la II República española en el exilio, 1945-1977, (Inventario del Fondo París).
\textsuperscript{110} E.g. Soo, Routes, pages 39 and 95.
individual’s political persuasion and the subtle variations in the aims of particular organisations. Equally significantly, the letters which are stored in the archive of the Residencia de Estudiantes (Students’ Residence, Residencia) and the personal archive of Vicente Llorens (in the Valencian library), are preserved because they belong to high profile exiled writers. Despite my objective to write a ‘non-elite’ history, the experiences of elites are always represented to a higher degree in a certain type of archive and their personal testimonies will appear in this thesis. In common with Dora Schwarzstein, however, I do not seek to privilege the role played by ‘elites’.111

The creation and sustenance of these archives was and is intertwined with what is, in Spain, called memoria histórica or ‘historical memory’.112 The interviews conducted to document Spanish exile in Mexico, for example, were partly funded in 1977 by the Spanish Ministry of Culture (along with the INAH in Mexico). This is testament to the efforts, following the transition to democracy, to recuperate Spanish ‘historical memory’ in the post-Franco period, and should be viewed alongside measures introduced by the first democratic government (also in the late 1970s) to provide pensions for Republican soldiers and refugees who could prove that their wages had been disrupted by the Civil War.113 Indeed, ‘By 1991, twenty-six per cent of social security payments were related to the Civil War’.114 Whilst these measures testify to the transition government’s recognition of some of the unresolved problems created by the Civil War, scholars have also shown how the transition to democracy within Spain foregrounded the importance of stability, over ‘truth’.

For example, Paloma Aguilar has explained how the political processes of the transition to democracy in Spain passed over the memory and history of the Spanish civil war during the

111 Schwarzstein, Entre Franco y Perón, p.xv.
112 The word memoria in Spanish can only roughly be translated as ‘memory’: memorias, for example, does not mean ‘memories’ but ‘memoirs’ or ‘annals’ – recorded history, although memoria is used to refer to memory of the past, recuerdo is the word more commonly used to describe a ‘recollection’ or ‘memory’; the term ‘memoria histórica’ is often criticised by Spanish scholars, e.g. José Antonio González Alcantud, ‘Maurice Halbwachs En España, Reflexividad Sobre Una Ausencia’, Historia, Antropología y Fuentes Orales, 2009, pp.81–94, (p.81).
113 Josefina Tome’s father was able to claim a pension from his former employer in this way: Author’s interview with Tome, 29 April 2013, Mexico DF.
1970s and 80s, in order to avoid a resurgence of the conflict.\footnote{Paloma Aguilar Fernández, Memoria y olvido de la guerra civil española, (Madrid: Alianza, 1996), p.31.} This tacit agreement is often referred to as the pacto de olvido, pact of forgetting, or pacto de silencio, pact of silence.\footnote{Ealham, “‘Myths’ and the Spanish Civil War”, p.366.} ‘To forget’ in this instance equated to a lack of legislation, policies or state led actions designed to bring to light and respond to the imprisonment, execution and shame experienced by hundreds of thousands of people during Franco’s regime. The vocabulary of memory and forgetting continues to be employed at the expense of words like ‘truth and justice’, perhaps because of concerns over the strength and resilience of Spain’s democracy.\footnote{Although Vincent convincingly argues that the emergence of these debates is a sign of the robust nature of Spanish democracy, rather than its failure: Spain 1833-2002: People and State (Oxford: OUP, 2007), p.241.} One of the better known campaigning groups, for example, is called the Asociación para la Recuperación de la Memoria Histórica (Association for the Recuperation of Historical Memory, ARHM), and was formed by the journalist Emilio Silva, whose grandfather was executed by Nationalists during the Civil War.\footnote{For an illuminating discussion of the ARHM, as well as the more explicitly political communist organisation Foro por la Memoria, see Layla Renshaw, Exhuming Loss: Memory, Materiality and Mass Graves of the Spanish Civil War, (London: Left Coast, 2011), pp.20-35.} A grass-roots network, with groups operating in different regions of Spain, ARHM organises the exhumation of mass graves, so in this context, ‘recuperating historical memory’ becomes a literal uncovering of the past.\footnote{A process which has created its own digital archive: Francisco Ferrándiz and A. Baer, ‘Digital Memory: The Visual Recording of Mass Grave Exhumations in Contemporary Spain’, Forum: Qualitative Social Research 9, (2008).}

Those who fight for ‘memoria histórica’ and those who actively oppose it are nonetheless politically motivated. Craig Larkin, in his study of second generation memories of the civil war in Lebanon could be describing Spain when he states: ‘the issue is less about memory recovery than the on-going contestation of social history in a post war setting – its meaning, representative forms and interpretative power’.\footnote{Larkin, Memory and Conflict in Lebanon, p.3; One of these representative forms is the construction of memorials, see for example: Dacia Viejo-Rose, ‘Memorial Functions: Intent, Impact and the Right to Remember’, Memory Studies, 4 (2011), pp.465–80.} In this way, the ‘heirs’ of Franco’s regime are the PP or the conservative party, and they tend to de-emphasise the importance of historical memory.\footnote{Although this does not prevent the PP associating themselves with highly-regarded left-wing exiles such as Max Aub, see: Faber, Exile and Cultural Hegemony, pp.269-270.} The PSOE and other left-wing parties such as the PCE
are more likely to support the recovery of historical memory. Nevertheless, all parties, including the PCE, which was one of the most effective organisers of anti-Francoist resistance throughout the dictatorship, agreed to the general amnesty of 1977, and when the PSOE was in power from 1982-1996, their ‘main aim was to reinforce an 'optimistic' interpretation of the Spanish past and to insist on forgetfulness for the sake of political stability, particularly after Spain joined the European Community in 1986’.122

The history of Spanish refugees and those who suffered under the Francoist dictatorship, too, is often rescued from oblivion by well-meaning historians, and as we have seen in the case of the AEM, by refugees and their descendants. This process is not always welcome by those who lived the ‘history’ in question. As one author of a memoir of Francoist repression experienced by his family states in the foreword to his book: ‘The undeniable contribution that historians have made to our knowledge of the Francoist repression does not give them licence to argue – as they have done – that Spain entrusts [only] them with the survival of this memory’.123 I would also like to emphasise that historians and archives do not have exclusive rights over the production of history, neither did the ‘pact of forgetting’ necessarily equate to the destruction or silencing of individual and familial memories. My aim as a historian in this context is to weave together over 40 refugees’ experiences but also to show how we can draw connections between individual accounts and the broader history and historiography of the Spanish Civil War and exile, rather than to position myself as the saviour of a forgotten history.

Chapter plan
The thesis is divided into four chapters which investigate different aspects of the refugees’ experiences: one, their departure from Spain and what it meant, two, whether or not they were able to maintain contact with those they had left behind, three, the decision to return (or not return) to Spain prior to Franco’s death and, four, the memory of exile within

123 This became clear during the presentation of a book held at the AEM, 6 Mar. 2013: Pedro Piedras, the author, explained that he had written the book to provide a personal account of what the Francoist repression had meant to his family, and particularly one uncle who was imprisoned, because he wished to show how historians’ accounts are not definitive and can instead silence the voices of those they are purporting to represent: Piedras, *La Siega Del Olvido*. (Madrid: Siglo veintiuno, 2012).
families living in Mexico DF. These four themes do not encapsulate every aspect of the refugees’ lives; in choosing them I have had to omit responses and experiences like ‘adaptation’ or ‘professional lives in exile’, and I have only briefly reflected upon demographic change, generational change and the political lives of refugees in different host countries. The reason I have chosen these subjects is partly because they are underserved by the existing historiography (which already includes careful research on the ways in which refugees adapted to life in France, Argentina and Mexico, for example) and because they are characteristic of an approach which emphasises both the importance of individual experiences as well as the connections between refugees living in different countries, rather than one national context.

Each chapter is structured differently. For example: in chapters two and three, I have included a subtitle ‘historiography’ which introduces a focused discussion of the existing scholarship on the relevant topics, whereas in chapters one and four I have integrated the discussion of relevant scholarship into the main text in different ways. This was done to avoid repetition both within this thesis and compared with existing historical accounts of Spanish exile.

The first chapter, entitled ‘An uncertain future - Leaving Spain and becoming a refugee’ asks who the refugees were and what motivated them to leave Spain. In so doing, it will show how factors such as political affiliation, money, status, occupation, gender and age shaped the choices that people were or were not able to make. Pierre Bourdieu’s conception of ‘social capital’ will be drawn upon to consider what it meant to become a refugee, and what kinds of strategies people used to negotiate their displacement. The chapter thus explores the tension between individual agency and the restrictions imposed on people’s freedom of movement by the Francoist regime and the French state, and it will also show how refugees were sometimes able to use existing identities or disguise themselves in order to survive. Ultimately, it argues that whilst categories such as ‘refugee’, ‘republican’ and ‘political/a-political’ suit the demands of historical narratives, they are complicated by a closer reading of the source material. It also shows that the orthodox historiography of republican exile encourages the reinforcement of categories which have increasingly been shown to be flawed by historians studying political mobilisation prior to and during the Spanish Civil War.
The second chapter, entitled ‘Conceptualising the spaces in between, Refugees and those in Spain, 1939-1975’ will explain some of the different ways in which people were separated from one another and how they drew meaning from their separation. It will show how people communicated through letters, telegrams and money transfers and thus will explain how these links between those inside and outside Spain were representative of familial and kinship bonds which were not broken by the exile. Different refugees had different responses to separation, so this chapter will present an interpretation of three of the ways in which refugees conceptualised ‘the spaces in between’, namely, in terms of ‘righteous defeat’, ‘unmitigated loss’ or as a ‘release’. The phrase ‘spaces in between’ also evokes the spaces of the imagination which were filled with memories of those who would never be seen again.

The third chapter, called ‘Returning Spanish refugees, from France and Mexico, 1939 - 1975’ explores how and why refugees returned to Spain before Franco died in 1975. It will compare the ways in which the Francoist state defined returning refugees, the ways other refugees defined returnees as ‘traitors’ and the ways in which returnees spoke about their own experiences of temporary and permanent return. Using official documents referring to the period 1943-1956, alongside Francoist decrees issued in the period 1939-1969, it will explain the effect of political amnesties and the bureaucratic and legal processes which some refugees had to negotiate on their return, and how the Francoist state criminalised refugees. Ultimately, it will also suggest that physical return to Spain may not have equated to a return ‘home’ and that many refugees were in fact able to ‘find their home’ in Mexico, France and other places outside of Spain.

The final chapter, entitled ‘Postmemory, collective memory and the history of Spanish exile in Mexico’, will not focus on what happened but rather how those who experienced particular events and those who were not alive at the time interact with and contribute to the ‘collective memory’ of Spanish exile in Mexico, thus showing how spoken recollections are influenced by different national ‘cultural scripts’. Based on 12 original oral history interviews with descendants of Spanish refugees, it will allow the reader to see how narratives describing the Spanish Civil War and the departure from Spain are shared within families, and how this connects to Marianne Hirsch’s concept: ‘postmemory’. Touching on a familial connection between the postmemory of exile in Mexico and Spain, the chapter will also highlight the existence of emotional ties which connect the ‘recovery of historical
memory’ within Spain and the relationships between the families which were split apart by the exile. The conclusion to the thesis will summarise the central themes of each chapter and the highlight the arguments which run through the thesis from beginning to end.
1. An uncertain future - Leaving Spain and becoming a refugee

‘But when we saw the thing lost, well then they gave us permission to leave’.1

Ramon Rodríguez Mata, speaking in 1979

The above quotation comes from an interview with a Spanish refugee, Ramón Rodríguez Mata, who went to Mexico on board the boat Sinaia in May 1939. The thing lost (la cosa perdida) was the Spanish Civil War. In December 1938, Ramón left Barcelona and the hospital in which he was working as a doctor, in order to travel with his wife to France. Over 450,000 Spaniards had a similar idea throughout the winter of 1938-1939, particularly once Nationalist troops entered Catalonia at the beginning of January 1939. This event is called the retirada or the retreat and it is here that most histories of Spanish exile usually begin, before describing the conditions faced by refugees in France or the other regions they went to, which included French North Africa, Mexico, Argentina and the Soviet Union.2

This chapter will address questions which have not been explored in as much depth. First, it will consider the multiple and complex reasons why refugees left Spain. In the past twenty years, historians of the Spanish Civil War have sought to emphasise that the ‘conflict was not a tidy split between right and left’ and to show how the Spanish people did not always fit into the ‘binary categories drawn from political ideologies’.3 However, in accounts of the Civil War, the ‘republican exile’ continues to be reduced to something which has symbolic importance, a short-hand to evoke the tragedy of Franco’s victory; the 500,000 refugees are alluded to, along with the 270,000 people incarcerated by the

---

1 Entrevista a Ramón Rodríguez Mata, realizada en su domicile particular de la ciudad de México, por Marisol Alonso, los días 16 de marzo y 4 de abril 1979, PHO/10/15, Libro 92, p.87.
2 Although several also provide information on earlier refugee movements. For what remains an excellent account of the retirada, see Louis Stein, Beyond Death and Exile: The Spanish Republicans in France, 1939-1955, (London: HUP, 1979), pp.19-38; Several useful overviews of Spanish exile in different regions exist, including but not limited to: Dolores Pla and Nicolás Sánchez-Albornoz, Pan, Trabajo Y Hogar: El Exilio Republicano Español en América Latina (México, D. F.: Instituto Nacional de Migración, Centro de Estudios Migratorios, 2007) and Alted, La Voz de Los Vencidos, (2005).
3 Preston,Comrades!, p.8; Ealham and Richards, ‘History, memory and the Spanish civil war’, p.20.
Francoist state. It certainly did and does play a symbolic role but if it is important to dismantle binary categories when we seek to explain political mobilisation during the Civil War, then it is just as important to do so in the context of the republican exile.

Broadly speaking, the refugees were republican soldiers in retreat or civilians who feared the arrival of Francoist troops because they anticipated reprisals for supporting the Republic or because they were afraid of being caught in a battlefield. Motivations for leaving Spain were more complex, ambiguous and changeable, however. On the one hand, there is the question of politicisation or ideological commitment. To what extent did political beliefs or identities determine who left and who did not? On the other, we should draw a distinction between the way in which people defined their own beliefs and the way in which the Francoist regime, or individuals who had some measure of influence in the post-war state, would interpret them. Refugees were deprived of the power to define themselves, becoming instead objects to be labelled by the Spanish victors or host country governments, a process which Soo aptly describes as the ‘unravelling’ of ‘rights and identities’.

Secondly, the chapter will draw upon Bourdieu’s articulation of the relationship between people and the ‘social space’ to consider in greater depth what it meant to become a refugee. This chapter will demonstrate, as Soo has done with different sources, how some refugees were able to maintain control over what had happened to them. The strategies used by refugees, however, were often determined by their ability to access different forms of social capital or to use recognised status symbols such as qualifications or membership of different groups (political parties or the Masons, for example). These ‘symbols’ are what Bourdieu refers to as the ‘titles’ which allow people to ‘be perceived’ as the person they really are or, in the case of the refugees, had been before their displacement.

The question of refugee agency, though, is not only about the choices people were able to make or the ways in which they resisted the French state or Franco’s regime, it is also about

---

4 For example: Ealham and Richards, ‘History, memory and the Spanish civil war’, p.3.
6 Soo, Routes, (chapter one).
8 Soo, Routes, pp.82-83.
how labels such as ‘refugee’, ‘exile’, ‘victim’, ‘political’, ‘a-political’, or indeed, ‘wife of a communist’, reduce our understanding of what it meant to be a refugee. In their own accounts of the past, Spanish refugees attribute particular actions with great importance in order to emphasise their ability to determine the course of their own lives, and it is this aspect of refugees’ oral histories that I wish to highlight in particular. The heroic tales told by refugees should not be read as straightforward factual accounts but they are highly significant; they demonstrate what it meant to become powerless and paperless, and yet to survive and eventually rebuild your life. Of course, it is only those who live who can tell their tale. Any discussion of refugee agency must therefore take into the account the role played not just by status, class and power but also physical health, age and maybe even luck.

In order to provide some historical and historiographical context for these assertions, the first section of the chapter will provide an outline of both the end of the Civil War and the early stages of the republican exile. The chapter will then address two interrelated questions: what motivated people to leave Spain and what it meant to become a refugee. Whilst much of the chapter will focus on journeys which took place between 1937-1945, it will also refer to journeys which were delayed until the late 1940s, when ‘refugees’ were more likely to be defined as migrants and when they were travelling under different circumstances. Displacement, for the vast majority, equated to the shattering of familiar societal structures and the abrupt disappearance of familiar languages and cultural environments. For some it equated to the loss of valuable properties and sources of income and for many it led to a loss of pride and professional status. The defeated Spanish population who remained within Spain experienced a similar kind of social upheaval; indeed, the experiences of some refugees overlap with the experiences of those who stayed, as we will go on to see. Ultimately, the detailed evocations of the past which we find in personal testimonies make clear to us not only the routes which people took but why they took them and how they were able to keep going.

---

9 Notwithstanding the clandestine movement of people over the border with France throughout the Francoist dictatorship, see description of the Archivo del PCE, ‘Equipo de Pasos’, <http://www.fim.org.es/05_05_3.php> [accessed 17 March 2014].
Displacement during and after the Civil War

The Spanish Civil War ended when Francoist forces marched into Madrid on 28 March 1939; Franco officially announced victory on 1 April. These events were preceded by the breakdown of Republican unity in Madrid: on 5 March a Republican military officer, Colonel Seigismundo Casado López led a coup against the President of the Republic, Negrín, and the PCE, which Casado believed had too much influence over Negrín’s decisions. Casado opposed Negrín’s policy of absolute resistance to Franco. He thought this stance would increase the chances for a negotiated peace with Franco’s forces, allowing anyone who wanted to leave Spain to do so safely. He did not achieve these aims: the attempted coup ‘led to the abrupt collapse of resistance’ but it failed to persuade Franco to negotiate.

The nature of the Spanish Civil War, which was fought in different zones at different times, meant that significant numbers of civilians had already left their homes prior to the beginning of 1939. Following the Nationalist advance on Malaga in February 1937, for example, thousands of refugees attempted to escape along the coast road going East towards Almeria as they were ‘shelled from the sea and bombed and machine-gunned from the air’ by Franco’s forces. Elsewhere in Spain, internally displaced people often presented problems for municipal councils, who feared the high rates of infectious disease amongst the refugee population and the pressure they placed on food supplies.

Anderson has also shown how ‘Francoist’ refugees, who had fled from Republican to Nationalist zones, began to catalogue information on individuals they deemed guilty of committing atrocities.

---

11 For more details on the debate surrounding Negrín, see the introduction to this thesis. For a narrative account of the coup, drawing on a wide range of evidence, see: Thomas, The Spanish Civil War, 4th edn, pp.860-890.
14 Seidman, Republic of Egos, p.143.
Republican refugees also sought refuge in foreign embassies within Madrid, emerging at different times throughout the war and once hostilities had ended.16

### 1.1: Table to show numbers of refugees arriving in different destinations17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/region</th>
<th>Arrivals in 1936-1938</th>
<th>Arrivals in 1939-1945</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td>Small numbers.</td>
<td>12,000.</td>
<td>Alted, La Voz de los Vencidos, p. 127.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>5,000 Basque children.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sierra Blas, Palabras Huerfanas, p.69.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>4,000 Basque children.</td>
<td>Several hundred.</td>
<td>Sierra Blas, Palabras Huerfanas, p.69; Catalán, Odisea En Albión.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Small numbers.</td>
<td>Small numbers.</td>
<td>Llorens, La emigración republicana, p.172.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-4,000.</td>
<td>Schwartzstein, Entre Franco y Perón, p.41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Approx. 189,000.</td>
<td>(by February) 475,000.</td>
<td>Pla, Els Exiliats Catalans, p.42.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1,000 (children, intellectuals).</td>
<td>6,236-20,000.</td>
<td>Fagen, Exiles and citizens, p. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Small numbers.</td>
<td>Various.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>3,000 (children, teachers.)</td>
<td>6,000.</td>
<td>Pla, ‘El exilio republicano’, p.104.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refugees left Spain during the hostilities as well. The first mass exit of groups of people we can define as ‘republican’ refugees followed Nationalist attacks on San Sebastián and Irún when approximately 15,000 people left the Basque country in the summer of 1936; the second, came after the fall of Santander and Asturias to Franco’s troops in June 1937, when an estimated 160,000 people left; and the third after the Aragon campaign in the Spring of 1938, when around 7,000 soldiers and 7,000 civilians left.18 Most of these refugees went to France and later returned to Spain, often through Catalonia (which remained in Republican control for much longer); accordingly just 40,000 refugees were recorded as resident in


17 The list of countries is not comprehensive but includes all countries which hosted the highest numbers of refugees.

18 Rubio, La emigración de la guerra civil, p.37.
In 1937, the Republic also arranged the evacuation of 30,000 children to the USSR, Britain, France and Mexico. Evacuated children have since created their own organisations, participated in oral history projects and produced memoirs and novels, in order to document their experiences.

The largest movements of people out of Spain took place in the North West (the Basque country, Asturias) and the North East (Aragon). Clearly, where refugees lived in Spain often determined when they left, unless they had previously moved from one area to another: Catalan refugees represented over a third of those who left Spain with the retirada, compared to around 13% of the Spanish population because they were already near to the French border. Similarly, parts of Galicia were under Nationalist control from the very beginning of the war, which meant that those who had supported the Republican war effort were more likely to leave Spain before 1939 either permanently or with a view to re-entering through Catalonia. The traditional links that Gallegos had with Latin America, also meant that the route from Galicia to countries like Argentina was embedded in local migratory practices, as Galician refugee Ramón Esturau explained in 1979:

My paternal grandfather was in Cuba [in 1939]; an older brother, Manuel, died in Buenos Aires, and there’s my brother José, who is still in Buenos Aires […] when there was some land, anyone who had some funds in the bank would take out his three or four thousand pesetas and send his children, who would be about 15 or 20 years old, to América [the Americas].

---

19 Pla, ‘El Exilio Republicano’, p.36.
20 Verónica SierraBlas, Palabras huérfanas: los niños y la Guerra Civil, (Madrid: Taurus, 2009), p.69.
21 Adrian Bell, Only for three months: the Basque refugee children in exile, (Norwich: Mousehold Press, 2007); Alicia Pozo-Gutierrez has conducted further interviews: <http://www.southampton.ac.uk/ml/research/projects/los_ninos.page> [accessed 7 Nov. 2012]; Children transported to Mexico were housed in a school in Morelia, Michoacán which is why they are referred to as the ‘niños de Morelia’. See for example: Agustín Sánchez Andrés, (ed.), Un capítulo de la memoria oral del exilio: los niños de Morelia, (Madrid: Comunidad de Madrid, Consejería de las Artes; México, 2002).
22 Pla, Els Exiliats Catalans, p.43.
24 Entrevista al Señor Ramón Esturau, realizada en su domicilio particular, por Dolores Pla, los días 21, 22, 23 y 24 de Noviembre de 1979, en la ciudad de Guadalajara, Mexico, PHO/10/61, Libro 116, pp.3-4.
Equally, some of the Spanish refugees who settled in France at the end of the Civil War had lived and worked there previously.\textsuperscript{25} The different routes taken by people leaving Spain were shaped by regional traditions, existing familial or kinship networks, as well as the political beliefs held by refugees and their family members.\textsuperscript{26}

It is also worth emphasising that prospective host countries often viewed Basque refugees as more desirable than the rest of the refugee population. As a result of the pact of Non-Intervention, the transportation of the Basque children to the UK was not funded or supported by the UK government but by civic humanitarian, religious and left-wing political organisations.\textsuperscript{27} The Pathé news report describing the arrival of the children nonetheless emphasised the neutrality of the Basques and alluded to their distinctive racial characteristics:

\begin{quote}
they come from the Basque provinces along the Bay of Biscay and theirs is a cause not obscured by any political issue, for the Basques belong to neither side in the unhappy Spanish struggle […] for eight months the hardy Basque mountaineers have been defending their capital of Bilbao.\textsuperscript{28}
\end{quote}

In fact, many of the children came from highly politicised families, with leftist antecedents – some continued to vocally support their parents, belying the image of the neutral Basque innocent.\textsuperscript{29} The description of the ‘hardy Basque mountaineer’ echoes the Venezuelan government’s assertions that Basques belonged to a ‘healthy race’, with ‘moral principles’, in order to justify their decision to receive Basque refugees who were willing to re-migrate from the Dominican Republic. In July 1940, the Argentine government declared Basques welcome and 1,400 arrived according to the records of the Comité Pro Inmigración Vasca

\textsuperscript{25} Dreyfus-Armand, \textit{El Exilio}, p.27.
\textsuperscript{26} Spanish migrant communities living in Argentina were often able to intercede on behalf of refugees who did not possess the correct documentation on arrival: Ortuño, \textit{El exilio y la emigración española de posguerra en Buenos Aires, 1936-1956}, pp.98-103.
Refugees in French territories

The conditions faced by refugees in France have been the subject of careful research. Dreyfus-Armand and Soo have expanded upon Stein’s impressive narrative account with more extensive use of French archival sources and all of these scholars have provided insight into French policy towards refugees and detailed descriptions of the conditions faced by refugees in different regions of France at different times; namely, before and after the outbreak of the Second World War, during the Nazi occupation or Vichy and after peace in Europe was declared. Charitable assessments of French policy written in the 1970s emphasise the steps taken by the government to care for the refugees. The ‘sick, the wounded and disabled’, for example ‘were put in hospitals and other institutions’. However, whilst refugees spoke of the kindness of French individuals, they rarely had a good word to say about the attitude of the government and its representatives. Soo convincingly shows how the refugees were viewed as a serious threat to French political stability; deemed to be dangerous ‘reds’, they were forced to reside in concentration camps in mid-winter with little shelter, appalling food and no sanitation. In fact, hospital facilities

---

31 The experiences of refugees from the different regions of Spain, not just the Basque country, in different host countries have formed the subject of a number of historical accounts, see for example: Fernández, Carlos, *El exilio gallego de la Guerra Civil* (La Coruña: Ediciones do Castro, 2002) and Pla, *Els exiliats catalans*.
32 Scholars such as Francie Cate-Arries have also shown how the image of the concentration camp became central to the ways in which refugees memorialised and commemorated the Spanish exile both within Spain and in exile: Cate-Arries, *Spanish Culture behind Barbed Wire: Memory and Representation of the French Concentration Camps, 1939-1945*, 2nd edn, (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2004)
34 See for example, the first chapters of Pla and Schwarzstein’s their books on exile in Mexico and Argentina, which are heavily based on oral histories: Pla, *Els exiliats catalans*; Schwarzstein, *Entre Franco Y Perón*.
35 The Spanish speaking historiography has always referred to ‘concentration camps’ but this terminology was more controversial within France, see: Scott Soo, ‘Between borders: the remembrance practices of Spanish exiles in the south west of France’, in Henrice Altink and Gemie, *At the Border: margins and peripheries in Modern France*, (Cardiff: University of Wales Press: 2007), p.102; On French policy, see Soo’s excellent summary: *Routes*, pp.36-44.
were woefully inadequate according to some aid workers.\(^{36}\) Refugees who arrived prior to the retirada were not subject to such discrimination but on 12 November 1938, Daladier’s administration had issued a decree which ‘enabled the government to intern all “undesirable” foreigners unable to find an alternative country of refuge into “special centres” that were subject to heavy surveillance’ and the situation fundamentally changed.\(^{37}\)

During January and ‘the first fortnight of February’ 1939, ‘France had absorbed between 350,000 and 500,000 Spanish refugees’.\(^{38}\) Thousands of refugees who arrived with the retirada had to wait until the French borders, which had been closed to prevent their entrance into France on 26-27 January, were opened on 28 January 1939 for ‘women, children and the elderly’, and on 5 February for soldiers. By 15 February the exodus was over.\(^{39}\) Republican soldiers were required to give up their weapons and all refugees had to hand in any objects of value at the French border.\(^{40}\) The gradual accumulation of material and emotional losses is particularly well conveyed by Dolores Pla.\(^{41}\) Refugees were usually divided so that men were in one group, women and children in the other.\(^{42}\) The majority of the men were then taken to concentration camps. Women and children did sometimes spend a period of time in the camps but they were usually housed in refuges, which were based in several areas of France in places like large abandoned factories, warehouses or barns. In 2009, Isabel Aillón, who had left Barcelona in early 1939, spoke about the rats which infested the derelict factory in which she slept with other female refugees near

\(^{36}\) Soo, Routes, pp.42-43.


\(^{38}\) Stein, Beyond Death and Exile, p.38.

\(^{39}\) Dates cited by Pla, Els Exiliats Catalans, pp.41-42 and Soo, Routes, p.37.

\(^{40}\) Enrique Tomas recounts how soldiers were asked to hand in binoculars and even their watches: Entrevista realizada a Enrique Tomas en su despacho de Veracruz por Concepción Ruíz-Fuime, los días 2 y 3 de octubre de 1980, PHO/10/92, Libro 106, p.71.

\(^{41}\) Pla, Els Exiliats Catalans, pp.58-59.

\(^{42}\) As Maria Magdalena García Hernández recalls: she was transported along with her parents to Argeles camp but she and her mother were later removed to a refuge at Cordes-sur-Ciel: SWCMP, 2009.
The situation was broadly similar in North Africa, in that large numbers of refugees were housed in camps and women and children were separated from men.44

The majority of refugees were forbidden from moving around France or North Africa; only those who were able to procure the right national documents, a kind of laissez-passer, were entitled to free movement (but that did not stop refugees from contravening these regulations). In early 1939, French authorities conducted manhunts to track down refugees without papers, searching hotels and rented rooms in several French cities. Concentration camps were designed to concentrate the refugees in isolated areas so that they were easier to manage, to assuage the ‘great fear of 1939’ and confine what were viewed by some sections of French society as ‘hordes of dangerous radicals’.45 Perhaps just 15,000 refugees avoided being confined in camps for at least some period of time, along with 10,000 injured refugees who were housed in hospitals, although it does seem likely that these numbers were higher.46

Other kinds of ‘social capital’, meaning friendships, connections with powerful people, membership of particular groups or valuable professional qualifications provided some refugees with a route out of the camps, as is discussed in more detail below.47 At the same time, the population of the camps decreased throughout the course of 1939, from an estimated 222,000 in April, to approximately 173,000 inmates in June, until in August the number had probably reduced to 84,000.48 This was largely due to the return to Spain of an estimated 300,000 refugees by the end of 1939, the recruitment of camp inmates to work in French industry and agriculture, or to join the Foreign Legion, and the re-migration of over

---

43 She described walking for a time with communist General Enrique Lister’s column, which dates this part of her journey as taking place somewhere between 5-9 Feb.: Aillón Murgi, Isabel. Testimony of the Spanish Civil War and the Francoist Dictatorship. University of California, San Diego, 2009, 24-25 minutes; for details of Lister’s column, see: Alted, *La Voz de los Vencidos*, p.67.


45 On ‘manhunts’ and on the ‘great fear’: Stein, *Beyond Death and Exile*, see pages 48 and 39 respectively.

46 Pla, citing David Pike (whose sources are not always clearly referenced), *Els exiliats Catalans*, p.85.


30,000 refugees to various countries.  

Pla cites Dreyfus-Armand’s estimate that, in total, 180,000 refugees thus remained in France in 1940.

**Mexican policy towards Spanish refugees**

The policies pursued throughout the period 1936-1945 by different host countries’ governments towards the refugees cannot be summarised here and they have been the subject of a range of academic studies. It is worth highlighting some of the particular features of Mexican policy towards the refugees, however, because the majority of the interviews referred to throughout this chapter were conducted with those who eventually travelled to Mexico.

During the period 1937-1946 over 20,000 Spanish refugees arrived in Mexico. They were invited by President Cárdenas’s government, on the condition that they could pay their way and that they would not involve themselves in Mexican politics. Whilst the Mexican historiography tends to emphasise the generosity of the welcome given to the refugees, Mexican immigration policy was only partly driven by humanitarianism or political solidarity. The Spaniards were viewed as a potential driver of economic growth and as racially suitable, possessing the right ‘sangre’ or ‘blood’.

---


51 Rubio’s study still provides the broadest sweep of host country policies: *La emigración de la guerra civil*, (first two volumes); See also an online project and useful map, managed by historian Lidia Boca Negra: ‘La Web e-xiliad@s’, Proyecto de investigación sobre el exilio republicano, [http://www.exiliadosrepublicanos.info/es/proyecto], [accessed 21 July 2014]; For the impact of the Spanish Civil War in various host countries, which influenced immigration policy towards the refugees, see also Mónica Quijada, Nuria Tabanera y José Manuel Azcona, ‘Actitudes ante la Guerra civil Española en las sociedades receptores’, in *Historia General de la Emigración Española a Iberoamérica* (vol. 1) edited by Carmen Martínez Gimeno, (Madrid: Historia 16, 1992).


53 Faber, *Exile and Cultural Hegemony*, p.17.


55 See for example an address given by President Cárdenas to the Spanish refugees, in which he refers to the refugees’ Hispanic ‘blood’ reprinted in the on-board newspaper of the ship *Sinaia*: ‘Como nos recibe México’, No. 17, 11 Jun. 1939, *Los Barcos*, p.116.
demonstrated by Daniela Gleizer, in her revealing study of Mexican policy towards Jewish refugees fleeing Europe. Jews were discouraged from entering Mexico and sometimes even turned back on arrival for reasons that were clearly related to their ‘race’. At the same time, Spanish refugees who were unable to afford the journey were also either forced to remain in France, or to rely on the charity of the Republican government in exile or various other charitable agencies.

The selection in France of the refugees who could not afford to pay for their journey to Mexico is the subject of some controversy. Reflecting a long term rift in the PSOE, two agencies were set up by different factions of the Republican government in exile in order to provide aid to Spanish refugees. The first major voyages to Mexico were organised, with the collaboration of Mexican embassy staff in France, by SERE, an agency founded by ex-President of the Republic, Negrín. Whilst the existence of a bias is difficult to prove, I would argue that those who had connections within the Negrínist camp or friends who worked for SERE were more likely to gain passage to Mexico or the Dominican Republic than other refugees. It was certainly more difficult for anarchist refugees, or members of the POU, to go to Mexico. At the end of July 1939, a rival agency was created by the moderate socialist Indalecio Prieto called JARE. In an extraordinary, and still obscure, series of events, Prieto managed to procure republican government funds which had been transported to Mexico in a yacht named Vita. Set up in part to provide a more efficient service than SERE, and specifically to provide more targeted relief for refugees interned in...

58 De Hoyos, La Utopía del Regreso, pp.115-116; See also, Pla, ‘Características’, p.229, Pla cites research conducted by Concepción Ruiz Funes and Enriqueta Tuñón but the same research was cited by Francisco Caudet to dispute the communist bias, see: Caudet, El Exilio Republicano de 1939, (Madrid: Cátedra, 2005), p.247.
59 The circumstances of this event – was it theft? Was it safe-keeping? – remain the subject of controversy. For the most detailed and up-to-date research, see Angel Herrerrín López, El dinero del exilio: Indalecio Prieto y las pugnas de posguerra (1939-1947), (Madrid: Siglo veintiuno, 2007).
concentration camps, JARE’s work was also hampered by internal conflicts and inefficiency.\textsuperscript{60}

The refugees whose journeys we can trace through interviews or their own letters traced paths all over the world. Despite the fact that the majority of the interviews cited in this chapter were conducted with refugees who ended their journeys in Mexico, they travelled through North Africa, the Dominican Republic, Cuba and Chile. Some were not able to leave Spain for many years; some left and then returned to Spain, before leaving again. Just as most refugees’ trajectories do not fit into neat historical narratives; neither do they necessarily fit the political profile of the republican refugee.

**Motivations for leaving Spain**

Reflecting on what motivated people to leave Spain, Dreyfus-Armand, states, with reason, that:

Many of the Spaniards who arrived at the French frontier in 1939 were simply refugees, forced into the exodus, driven by the desire to escape the dangers of combat, [they were] not self-confessed opponents [to, or] objectively threatened by the victorious [Francoist] regime. This explains, in part, the large number of immediate returns, but it has also given rise to a persistent controversy, albeit without a real foundation in fact, over what the figures really mean.\textsuperscript{61}

Soo also states: ‘There were (non-political) refugees who had left to escape the violence […] or who had found themselves in the republican camp […] at the start of the Civil War, but who were not necessarily opposed to the nationalist regime’.\textsuperscript{62} These scholars agree that many of those who had left Spain wanted to return. Dreyfus-Armand cites the Catalan refugee Lluís Montagut’s account of his taciturn companion, a *campesino* or agricultural labourer, who had never left his village before the war. He intended to return to Spain because he had arrived in France following military orders.\textsuperscript{63} With Montagut’s help the *campesino* wrote to his wife who replied, saying that the village priest had assured her that her husband could return safely.\textsuperscript{64} Similar stories are told by refugees in oral histories:

\textsuperscript{60} Mateos, ‘Espejismos de La Derrota. La Ayuda Republicana a Los Refugiados de La Guerra Civil’, *Ayer* 65 (Jan., 2007), pp.213-236, (p.217, p.229).
\textsuperscript{62} Soo, *Routes*, p.83.
\textsuperscript{63} It seems likely that he was a conscript rather than a volunteer. For more discussion on the mechanics of conscription and ‘recycling’ soldiers from the other side, see: Matthews.
\textsuperscript{64} Dreyfus-Armand, *El exilio*, pp.77-78.
Carmen Bahi de Parera’s mother, for example, ‘would have been fine had she stayed’ because she did not share the strong political views of her husband and daughter. On the other hand, for many refugees, the departure from Spain was fundamentally intertwined with their ideology. Luis Salvadores, for example, was a militant member of the PSUC (Catalan Communist Party), which had strong ties to the PCE. Although he was no longer a member of either party in 1979, when he was interviewed, his account of leaving Spain was clearly shaped by his past identity as a communist.

Salvadores first passed over the French frontier with his regiment on 14 February 1939, sleeping huddled in the snow in the border town Prats de Mollo because the French would not provide shelter. After being transferred to Agde camp, he was charged with acting as the camp’s PSUC/PCE ‘representative’, where he faced ‘a series of desertions’ and had to deal with people who ‘were searching for their own solutions’, whilst Salvadores and the party ‘were fighting for collective solutions’. It appears that between 1939-1945 most of the decisions about Salvadores’ future were made by the PCE. For example, he went from Agde to St Cyprien (also a concentration camp) on the party’s orders, and he was provided with passage to the Dominican Republic with the support of the SERE and the PCE. Some years later he travelled on to Mexico because the party ordered him to:

Interviewer: Did you apply [to go to the Dominican Republic] through the SERE?
LS - The party did it [‘lo hizo el Partido’]
...
I – And why did you go to Mexico?
LS – Well because the party decided. [‘Pues porque así lo decidió el Partido’]

Elements of Luis Salvadores’ account would merit further investigation, particularly by those interested in the conflict between the PCE and the POUM, to which he referred several times. For the moment, his testimony serves as an example of what Dreyfus-Armand defined as the ‘self-confessed opponent’ of the Francoist regime, thus his political beliefs and identity, along with his obedience of the orders issued by the PCE, were what

---

65 Entrevista realizada a Carmen Bahi de Parera, p.36.
66 Entrevista a Luis Salvadores realizada en su despacho de Barcelona, España, por Concepción Ruiz- Funes, el día 26 de abril de 1979. Y anexo realizado por Enriqueta Tuñón, p.35.
drove him to leave Spain. Passage was also provided for his wife and daughter, with whom he was eventually reunited in France.

However, the distinction Dreyfus-Armand, and other scholars, have made or implied between those who were ‘simply refugees’ and those who were ‘self-confessed opponents who were objectively threatened by the victorious Francoist regime’ does not effectively convey the uncertainty which defined refugees’ experiences and the complexity of their motivations for leaving Spain. We cannot always distinguish between the ‘refugee’ who fled ‘simply’ because she or he had to, like Montagut’s friend the ‘campesino’, and the ‘exile’, who fled as a result of their political identity, like Salvadores. ‘Political affiliation’ does not only equate to the ideas or membership cards belonging to a particular person; it also depends on how external agents seek to define someone. As several examples in this chapter will show, Franco’s regime could identify opponents who were not ‘self-confessed’ and who would have preferred to remain neutral or at least in disguise – un-confessed. These people were required to negotiate the grey area between how they saw themselves and how the regime wished to classify them.

The experiences of Valencian writer Vicente Llorens Castillo give one example of this interplay between individuals and external agents. Llorens was a member of the PSOE at the outbreak of the Civil War in 1936. He later enlisted in the Republican army, working as a translator for the Austrian socialist General, Julius Deutsch, who had joined the fight against Franco. As the war ended, Llorens travelled to France; some accounts suggest that he had to search the concentration camps before eventually finding his wife, Lucia Chiarlo, who had travelled over the border separately. His relationship with Deutsch meant that he was able to avoid the camps and live in Paris, where he found work. In October 1939, Llorens sent a letter from France to Raul Maestri Arredondo, a friend living in Cuba (the
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68 It is interesting to note that some Anarchist leaders are recorded as having urged those who were ‘not really compromised’ to return to Spain, as did the Socialist leader Indalecio Prieto (see chapter 3), Schwarzstein, _Entre Franco y Perón_, p. 23.  
70 Llorens, _Memorias_, p. 2-3.
letter therefore would not have been read by Francoist censors). He stated ‘[my] first attempt to migrate to Mexico failed […] The fact is that Mexico is inaccessible, and Chile will not admit anyone except manual workers, and a very reduced number at that.’ He went on to explain that to enter Argentina he would need to revalidate his marriage, which had been annulled by Franco because it was non-religious and had taken place in the Republican zone during the war. Llorens concluded that Latin America was ‘off limits’.

Like many other refugees, he also considered returning to Spain and had managed to procure a visa from the Spanish consulate. This plan turned out to be untenable:

[…] I did no more than mention my intentions, when my father, who is a conservative man as you know, with very good relations with elements of the current regime, and who has maintained his official post after a rigorous purge, immediately told me not to move from here [Paris], despite the dangers of the [Second World War] and despite his wanting to see me before he should die. Soon after, I found out that after seven months […] [Francoists in Valencia] had begun to persecute one of my brothers and to try and save him, I was obliged to fake [in letters sent to those in Spain] that he was here with me in France. His crime consists of having been an officer, like me, in the Republican army.

Llorens learnt that he could not return to Valencia safely. Belonging to a privileged section of Valencian society and being the son of a conservative man did nothing to prevent Llorens’ prolonged absence from Spain. He eventually migrated to the Dominican Republic in 1940 on the boat Flandre, with 300 other Spanish refugees, as part of one of SERE’s organised evacuations.

On the one hand, therefore, Llorens’ experiences, described in this letter, clearly demonstrate the difference between the often pragmatic beliefs held by someone and the meaning attached to their beliefs or previous actions by external actors like Franco’s state. On the other, Llorens wrote to Raúl Maestri Arredondo in order to ask him whether he could somehow find him work in a Cuban university. It was therefore in his interests to paint a bleak picture of his prospects and to portray himself as someone who had tried everything, to no avail. By setting out his lack of options, including the mechanics of his failed plan to return to Spain, perhaps he exaggerated the seriousness of his plans in order to convince his friend to do everything possible to find him a job. Llorens also stated that
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71 For a detailed discussion of the censorship of post, see chapter 2.
73 Letter from Llorens to Maestri, no.545.
74 Llorens, Memorias, p.3.
he had made the arrangements to go back to Spain, ‘above all’ (‘sobre todo’) for his wife Lucia Chiarlo: arguably, his attempt to return was nothing more than an experiment, which he never intended to carry out.

However, considering the advance of German troops into France and his failure to gain passage to Latin America, it seems unlikely that Llorens had to manufacture despair to try to incite action from his friend. His comment that his wife Lucia Chiarlo was the main reason why he explored the possibility of returning to Spain is significant for other reasons because it highlights one of the ways in which political identities were gendered. Embedded in this short aside, perhaps, is the idea that Llorens’ wife was more strongly attached to her home and less likely to be subject to Francoist repression. To return to Dreyfus-Armand’s construction, the ‘simple refugee’ is sometimes defined as more likely to be a woman and the ‘exile’ a man, an idea which will be explored in the following section of the chapter.

**Gender, family ties and politics**

Aside from high profile women like the anarchist Federica Montseny, who lived in exile in France, or La Pasionara, the iconic communist leader, Dolores Ibárruri, who eventually reached the Soviet Union, Spanish refugee women are often viewed as less likely to have left Spain on their own account. Some scraps of evidence support this perception: for example, of the 32 female Spanish refugees interviewed for what I have termed the ‘EM’ project, roughly one third were not affiliated, compared with under a fifth of the 84 men interviewed: many of them could thus be said to have accompanied their husbands, rather than to have left Spain in their own right. Equally, whilst statistics are impossible to acquire on this point, anecdotal evidence suggests that some women stayed in Spain irrespective of what their husbands did – perhaps because they had never agreed with their husband’s political beliefs or because they could not bear to leave the rest of their family.

The exiled writer Arturo Barea’s bleak novel The Broken Root, depicts a bitter rift between the fictional exiled husband and his religious wife who remained in Madrid. Such acrimonious feelings and complicated personal relationships surely existed, although
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75 For an account of Montseny’s exile, see, Pedro García Guirao, "The Ground Rots Equally Everywhere": Federica Montseny and Those who Returned to Die in Francoist Spain’, in *Coming Home?*, pp.70-88; Tavera has argued that these high profile women can eclipse other women’s narratives: ‘La Memoria de Las Vencidas’, p.201.

76 For an extended breakdown of the backgrounds of the women interviewed for the ‘EM’ project, see: Domínguez Prats, *Voces Del Exilio*, pp.80-85.

relevant sources have proven impossible to locate. A closer reading of existing testimonies nonetheless allows us to present a more complex picture of the way refugee women described their political beliefs and how these beliefs motivated their decision to leave Spain.78

To begin with, we can consider the testimony of Carmen Bahi de Parera. Resident in a town in Catalonia, she had waited until the fall of Barcelona before travelling to France with her parents, her brother and her son in a truck. Her husband was working on the railway at the time and they were reunited in France. Bahi was politicised at a young age: she joined the Marxist party, the Catalan Bloc Obrer i Camperol, Workers and Peasants’ Bloc (BOC) when she was 17. Her father was an anarchist and he had helped to instil similarly radical ideas in her, giving her a ring to celebrate the end of Primo de Rivera’s dictatorship in 1930. In the late 1980s she still had her membership card, and she described herself as committed to improving social equality, not just Catalan independence: ‘[in the BOC] at the same time as the Catalan question, they also paid attention to the social question. This is what motivated me to […] join the BOC.’79 She described her decision to leave Spain as being clearly motivated by her commitment to the BOC and her belief (and the high probability) that she would be persecuted under Franco’s regime.

Political beliefs play a more ambiguous role in Carmen Dorronsoro’s narrative. Eager to learn about politics from her future husband Wences Roces, a prominent communist, she threw herself into the relevant Marxist literature and subsequently worked for the PCE (although it is not clear whether or not she was an official member). Her reasons for doing so were not necessarily driven by an adherence to a set of political beliefs: ‘I don’t know whether [I learnt all of this] because it really interested me or if it was a little bit of snobbery, to be different to what I had lived as a young girl’.80 Coming from a middle-class background, Dorronsoro’s descriptions of her political motivations support Graham’s

78 The existence of a rich scholarship on female participation in the Civil War which has drawn on oral histories in particular should also be highlighted, see for example: Shirley Mangini, Recuerdos de la Resistencia. La voz de las mujeres de la guerra civil Española (Barcelona, Península, 1997) and Mary Nash, Defying Male Civilization: Women in the Spanish Civil War (Denver, Colo: Arden Press, 1995); For an overview, see Alted, ‘El exilio republicano español de 1939 desde la perspectiva de las mujeres’, Arenal. Revista de historia de las mujeres, 4:2, (1997), pp.223-238.
79 For details of her journey: Entrevista a Carmen Bahi de Parera, pp.57-60 and her political affiliation, pp.7-9. Most of the BOC merged with the POUM, so Bahi later became a POUM member.
80 Entrevista a Carmen Dorronsoro de Roces, realizada en su domicilio particular por Matilde Mantecon, los días 6, 13 y 27 de junio y 11 de julio de 1980, PHO/10/59, Libro 35, p.34.
analysis of ‘Spain’s new middle classes’ as ‘aspiring’, that the appeal of Soviet modernity lay not in ‘political ideas’ but in the way they tied into ‘social aspirations’. Although the distinction between political ideas and social aspirations may not always be clear, in the case of Dorronsoro, it could be explained as the difference between annotating a copy of *Das Kapital* (political ideas) and the greater urge to escape the stultifying atmosphere of her family situation (social aspirations).

Carmen Dorronsoro’s political identity was also intertwined not just with social aspirations but with the roots of these aspirations, namely, her own individual or psychological need to reject her familial background. She applied to study piano in Paris during Primo de Rivera’s dictatorship: ‘My idea was to fly, fly, fly, fly, to somehow escape my family situation that wore me out’. Unlike other communists interviewed, she never refers to the diktats of the party, nor does she use Marxist jargon. Her departure from Spain was caused by associated but subtly distinct factors: first, her participation in a particular kind of political and intellectual society which would have rendered her suspect to Franco’s regime and secondly, her marriage to a prominent communist. The difference is between internal beliefs and external perceptions: Dorronsoro was imperilled by how she would be perceived by external actors, rather than a deeply felt commitment to Marxism. Both Carmen Bahi and Carmen Dorronsoro, one could argue, left Spain because of their ‘politics’ but they both expressed these identities in different ways.

The distinction drawn between the different political identities above is problematic, however. Carmen Bahi was a ‘militant’, in the Spanish sense of the word because she was an active member of her party. Her militancy is less easily measured, however. Within her narrative, there is still evidence of the interplay between family, society and political beliefs. For example, she described how her husband’s brother-in-law was a ‘fascist’, in her words he belonged to the ‘fifth column’. This did not prevent her, however, from taking him food and clean clothing after he had been imprisoned by the Republicans, in the short time period before the Nationalists’ advance on Barcelona. The Spanish Civil War was a fratricidal conflict; nevertheless, Bahi went out of her way to care for her ‘fascist’ relative. She was, therefore, both highly politicised and willing to place these beliefs to one side or
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81 Graham, *The Spanish Republic at War*, p.18.
82 *Entrevista a Carmen Dorronsoro de Roces*, p.17.
83 As Passerini states, ‘all those who have collected oral testimonies have noted that one of the constant features of the left-wing activists' life-histories is the 'cancelling out of individual private life’, see: Passerini, *Fascism in Popular Memory*, p.41.
interpret them in a particular way in order to assist a member of her extended family. Indeed, her dedication to the protection of her relations is echoed throughout her interview. 84 Bahi’s character and priorities shaped her political beliefs, just as these beliefs shaped her decision to leave Spain. Even self-confessed militants acted in ways which seem to subvert their political identities, although there is no need to assume that committed Marxists would not wish to treat their enemies with humanity.

The complexity of the interaction between political identities, gender and the motivation to leave Spain is also apparent in the experiences and testimony of Florinda San Agustín Labrada. Born in 1902, San Agustín married Germán Horacio Robles Sánchez when she was 23 years old. She worked as a manicurist in her father’s successful hairdressing and beauty salon in her native Gijón, an industrial port town in Asturias. 85 The majority of her customers belonged to the upper echelons of Asturian society, they were industrialists or rich merchants, and she always got on well with them. Pamela Radcliff’s history of Gijon situates San Agustín’s experiences in a particular spatial and societal context, explaining how hair stylists were essentially lower-middle class but that they also interacted with a wide range of Gijon society. 86 Her husband’s family ran a kiosk selling newspapers nearby and they had been friends as children; he worked as an illustrator, attaining a reputation for the propaganda he produced for the Republican war effort in Asturias.

Before the war San Agustín and Horacio split their time between Madrid, where they lived during the winter and Gijón, where they ‘summered’. They prospered in the capital – life was ‘good, very easy, we were happy’. San Agustín gave birth to their son in or around 1928 and the family were spending the summer in Gijón when the Civil War began in July 1936. They decided to stay there, rather than return to Madrid but when Nationalist troops advanced on Gijón on 20 October 1937, Horacio left by boat from the nearby port, El Musel. Although he had ‘never wielded a gun, only a pencil’, he would still have been in danger when the Nationalists arrived. San Agustín did not know he had left, nor anything about what had happened to him. It would be one year before she found out where

84 On her fascist relative: Entrevista a Carmen Bahi de Parera, p.151; on family life in Mexico, pp.139-150.
85 Florinda wrote a short account of her life which is included with the interview transcript, see: Entrevista a Florinda San Agustín Labrada, realizada en su domicilio particular, por Dolores Pla, los días 17 de junio, 19 y 30 de Julio de 1979, PHO/10/23, Libro 101, preface, pp.1-14.
Horacio was, longer till they started corresponding and nine years till the family were reunited in Mexico.87

In late 1937, after her husband had left, San Agustín and her sister were imprisoned because her ‘sister went out with a guy who was a prosecutor for the Popular Front […] and because we had been spending time with the Russians who advised the Republicans in Gijón’. San Agustín was not affiliated to any political party and described herself as ‘completely a-political’.88 She was sympathetic towards the Republic but she also helped many of her right-wing customers when they were imprisoned by republicans during the war, bringing them extra food and supplies. The crime committed by San Agustín and her sister seems to have been that they spent time with men who were not only communists but also not their husbands or novios (translated as boyfriend or fiancé).89 San Agustín did not draw a connection between the role of her husband and her imprisonment but the suffering of women as a result of their husbands’ actions is a recurring theme in her narrative. She witnessed women being removed from their prison cells and she believed that they were later executed because their husbands were fighting for the wrong side.

In Gijón, San Agustín’s friendships and connections in local society allowed her to alleviate the deprivations of prison life: ‘I used to give the General and the other officer manicures […] they brought us lots of things to eat, because of how everything was rationed, you had to have a bit of influence.’ After some months in the Carcel del Coto and in the temporary prison Carcel del Cerillero in Gijón, she was released. By this time she had heard her husband was in France, ‘through a friend’ because Francoist censors ‘opened all the letters’.90 Horacio would later travel to Mexico on the boat Sinaia in May 1939.

In what was probably late 1938 or early 1939, she planned to procure fake documents and a passport from a ‘right-wing’ friend to go to France from San Sebastián, by then in the Nationalist zone. Local officials imprisoned her, without explanation, before she could depart. After spending 15 months in jail in San Sebastián, during which time San Agustín
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88 On the Russians: Entrevista a Florinda San Agustín Labrada, preface, p.6; On her politics, preface, p.3.
89 Their behaviour would have been unusual in a town in which only 2% of wives were recorded as employed and 17% of female adult children, in the early 1930s: Radcliff, From Mobilization to Civil War, p.326.
90 Entrevista a Florinda San Agustín Labrada, life in prison: preface, p.6; news of Horacio, p.102.
became very ill, she went to live with some friends in Madrid – at a time which she does not specify but which must have been after the end of the Civil War. During her entire imprisonment, San Agustín’s son remained in Gijón living with her parents and it is unclear why she chose to go to Madrid or whether she was prohibited from returning to Gijón – she does mention her desire to help the friend who lived in Madrid, whose son was in prison.91

In Madrid, she was detained again, this time, she explained, because a man who was the novio of her friend’s sixteen year old daughter had taken against her:

I asked him why he had gotten me involved in all of these things which had nothing to do with me [the charges they detained her on] and he said […] he feared my influence on his girlfriend, that I would convince his girlfriend to leave him […]92

The transformation of personal and petty dislikes or vendettas into ideologically justified acts of violence, whether denunciations or killings, happened across Spain and has been a feature of Civil Wars and dictatorial regimes in other times and places.93 At least during the first decade of the dictatorship, these kinds of impulses were encouraged and exploited: to inform on your neighbour was the patriotic thing to do.94

Irrespective of the reasons for her arrest and subsequent detention in Madrid’s Gobernación (the central government building where many ‘reds’ were detained) and the notorious Carcel de Ventas women’s prison, San Agustín’s explanation of her imprisonment never referred to her own political beliefs. In recounting her incarceration she alluded to reasons related to her gender (Gijón), bad luck and unpleasant officials (San Sebastián) or relationships that had gone bad (Madrid). This reflects her personal rejection of politics, as she said, ‘neither my family, nor my husband – we never involved ourselves

91 Attempt to leave from San Sebastián, Entrevista a Florinda San Agustín Labrada, p.102; imprisonment in Sán Sebastián, which probably took place in early 1939 but it is never specifically dated in the interview, preface, p.8; her friend in Madrid, preface, p.9.
92 Entrevista a Florinda San Agustín Labrada, preface, p.10.
in [politics, or discussions of political ideas]. Her wish to explain her imprisonment without reference to her own political status nonetheless opens up an interesting gap between her own narrative and what we might presume would be the Francoist reading of events.

She was the wife of a prominent albeit non-combatant republican, whose propaganda depicted Francoist forces as strange demonic creatures. She had been incarcerated by Nationalists. The ways in which San Agustín had been treated and perceived by the Francoist regime counted for just as much as her own conception (or presentation) of the role that she played, both in terms of the reality of her repeated imprisonment and in the way other people reacted to her. After reading her description of the reasons why she was imprisoned in Madrid – that this ‘muchacho’ (guy) feared her influence on his girlfriend – it is clear that the image she projected in her interview, of a woman without politics, is not entirely convincing. The guy’s fears are mocked, she exclaimed ‘what a mentality!’, but then confirmed, when the girlfriend found out what had happened to San Agustín, she did indeed break up with her novio.

San Agustín became ‘red’ because of her repeated confinement, not because of what she believed. Her view of society as being based fundamentally on individual relationships, which she evoked with reference to her ties with right-wing customers and her rejection of the bad deeds of both the left and the right, was supported by her own actions but undermined by the way that she was treated. The length of time she spent in Francoist Spain and in prison may also have imbued her with a fear of speaking about politics or presenting herself as political, the kind of fear which still exists within Spain and which has been powerfully documented by Layla Renshaw. Her resistance to seeing herself in ideological terms, however, also represents a strongly expressed rejection of every aspect of the conflict. Consequently, two parallel visions of Spanish society during the war and the 1940s emerge: one in which political beliefs played little part in hostilities, being subsumed by the inconsistencies of personal relationships, and one in which they were central. Or perhaps a third vision emerges, which shows how the personal and political were inextricably intertwined.
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95 Entrevista a Florinda San Agustín Labrada, preface, p.3.
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San Agustín eventually arrived in Mexico in 1946. She managed to procure a passport for her and her son and buy tickets for a boat going to New York, followed by a boat to Cuba. In Cuba (Havana) she obtained the relevant documentation from the Mexican consulate, convincing them that she was going to reunite with her husband. She contrasted her independence and financial security in being able to afford the tickets after saving money, with her husband Horacio’s poor physical health and lack of money. When she and her son flew to Mexico from Cuba, in September 1946 (although they only arrived in Mexico in December 1946), San Agustín was officially classified as a ‘migrant’, not as a refugee. She was, however, interviewed for the ‘EM’ project which defined her as a Spanish refugee living in Mexico.

As all the individual examples drawn upon in this section show, people remained within Spain or crossed the border for a mixture of political, social, economic and practical reasons. San Agustín was initially unsure where her husband was, so she did not leave Gijón as the Nationalist troops advanced on the city, imprisonment then prevented her from leaving once more and later, the need to save money delayed her journey to Mexico still longer. Llorens, on the other hand, was able to leave Spain but his decision to remain outside of Spain was influenced by news from his father, who suggested it would be unsafe for him to return. Carmen Bahi crossed the border to France because of her strong commitment to the Catalan Marxist movement but her political identity was also bound up in her commitment to her family, some of whom were ‘fascists’. Carmen Dorronsoro was the wife of a communist but she also determined her own future, leaving Spain was ultimately an expression of a political identity which was intertwined with ‘social aspirations’ and psychological needs. Salvadores acted on the orders of his party so his political identity strongly shaped his family’s future, whilst at the same time providing him with options that were not available for many other refugees. Whilst each person left for a combination of reasons, then, particular practical circumstances, political identities and personalities allow some motivations to emerge as particularly strong at particular moments. In the next section of this chapter, the consequences of the departure from Spain will be addressed in more detail.
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Social capital and becoming a refugee

Refugees who travelled to Mexico under SERE’s auspices were asked to fill in a form containing details of their life in Spain, their role during the Civil War, the location of their family members and their physical appearance. Several sections of the form also give us some idea of the material losses that many refugees sustained upon leaving Spain. They were asked how much they had earned, what their current economic status was and later, ‘what losses [they had suffered] (as a result of the war)’. Some refugees were expressive: Ramón Tarrago Xanxo, for example, stated that he had ‘lost everything apart from his life’, Ramón Gaya that he had lost ‘too much’. Others were more specific and had been more prosperous: Rosendo Carrasco y Formiguera stated that he had lost 9,000 pesetas of annual income and a small hotel he owned, Antonio Zozoya that he had lost ‘more than 500,000 pesetas’. These were considerable sums of money at the time.

Other refugees used words like ‘incalculable’ to describe the material losses (‘perjuicios materiales’) they had sustained. This powerful word evokes other losses, which were not easily quantified. Refugees left behind businesses they had built up from scratch, or cohorts of students who knew and respected them or groups of family members and friends. To a large extent they had lost their social status (if they had a status to lose), which was often rooted in particular places. In this section of the chapter, we will consider how refugees re-imagined their future and adapted to their new identity as refugees. This process was not restricted to a particular time period or geographical location. Spoken life histories show how past experiences continue to be lived in the present, so whilst particular events or

99 See: Estadística, Archivo del CTARE, INAH, (Mexico DF).
100 Exp. 3259, R.58, FJS 08, Tarrago Xanxo (Ramón), Jun. 1939, Estadística, CTARE, INAH; Exp. 1247, R23, Gaya Jose, (Ramón), July 1938; Ramón Gaya was a painter and writer, for information on individual exiled writers in Mexico, see: León-Portilla, Ascensión Hernández de, España Desde México: Vida Y Testimonio de Transterrados (Mexico DF, 1978).
101 Exp. 601. R.12, Carrasco y Formiguera (Rosendo), Jun. 1939; Exp. 3464, R.62, FJS ?, Zozaya You (Antonio), July 1939; Antonio Zozaya was a writer who travelled to Mexico on the Sinaia and whose address to refugees on the boat features in the on-board newspapers, ‘Pero tú, España, resurgirás!’, Sinaia, no.2, 27 May 1939.
102 National statistics are not available for 1939 and do not always include absolute values for the years to which they do refer but in 1933 the cheapest milk in Madrid cost 70 cents per litre, eggs cost 2.53 pesetas per dozen, whilst potatoes cost 22 cents per kilo: ‘Precios por menor en la plaza de Madrid’, Anuario Estadístico de España, Vol. 19, 1934, p.711; In Oviedo (Asturias) in 1931, a carpenter earned between 6 and 13 pesetas per day (some 2,000 pesetas per year) and a dress maker between 3 and 9 pesetas per day (around 1,300 per year): Radcliff, From Mobilization to Civil War, p.316.
103 Exp. 3005, R.53, FJS 34, Sánchez Sálcedo (Miguel Angel), July 1939.
strategies are limited to one point in time, the emotional impact of these events is long lasting and relived year upon year. Notwithstanding, the discussion here will be limited to descriptions of the experiences of refugees immediately after their displacement, specifically those in France attempting to travel to Mexico.

Spanish refugees were cast adrift from their country and their home; they had to find ways to alleviate the instability and the uncertainty of their situation. This explains why words like ‘recommendation’, ‘guarantee’, and ‘reference’ are repeatedly used in interviews with refugees and identified as a necessary prerequisite for leaving French concentration camps, procuring the right papers and documents, or gaining passage on boats leaving Europe. The availability of these kinds of resources has been called ‘social capital’, or, ‘the ability of actors to secure benefits by virtue of membership in social networks or other social structures’.

Examples are easy to find. Jose Marull suggested that a friend’s recommendation is what secured him passage on the boat *Sinaia* to Mexico. Francesca de Linares recounted how when she was detained in Ellis Island (New York), her friend wrote to the then US Secretary of State, Foster Dulles, and successfully petitioned for her release. Once in Mexico, Juan Vidarte, Francesca de Linares’ husband, who was a relatively prominent socialist, wrote to the Mexican diplomat Narciso Bassols, who was involved in arranging the evacuations of Spanish refugees from French territories, to encourage him to pay special attention to the transportation of his family members from Casablanca to Mexico. Ramón Rodriguez described writing letters to ‘everyone, to family and friends and political friends, to look for a way to prepare our exit [from France]’. Alongside the letter cited above, Llorens wrote to several friends based in many different countries, asking for them to recommend him for academic jobs. Replies arrived from across the globe: an acquaintance called Nan Brewer wrote in March and May 1939 saying she thought a job in the UK would be hard to come by. Similar responses came from Tomás Navarro based in the Romance Languages department of Colombia University in the US and Américo
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Castro, the eminent historian then working at the University of Texas, who rather pointedly suggested that Llorens improve his English and publish more if he wanted to procure a job in the US.\footnote{Letter from T. Navarro Tomás (NYC) to Llorens (May 8 1939), no.756; Letter from Américo Castro (Texas) to Llorens (May 12 1939) no.787.}

Numerous personal testimonies also refer to the role that Masons played in providing support and preferential treatment to other Masons and their families. First person narratives describe refugees being picked up from ships and removed from queues by their Masonic brethren.\footnote{Soriano, *Éxodos: Historia Oral Del Exilio Republicano En Francia, 1939-1945*, (Barcelona: Crítica, 1989), p.79.} Carmen Romero, daughter of the Republican colonel, Carlos Romero Giménez, said that Masons in North Africa had helped her and her mother to avoid concentration camps and obtain accommodation in Oran.\footnote{Author’s interview with Carmen Romero de Rayo, Mexico DF, (March 2013); See also: *Nuevas Raíces*, pp.117-142; Colonel Carlos Romero fought for the resistance within France and was imprisoned and tortured for 36 days by the Gestapo, and later incarcerated in Gurs concentration camp in France, see: Carlos Romero Giménez, *Bajo las garras de la Gestapo*, (Mexico DF: Sociedad Mexicana de Publicaciones de RL, 1943).} An international network, hated by Franco, Free Masonry represented a system whereby refugees were able to cling onto the status they had possessed within Spain: your Masonic rank or membership was not affected by whether or not you possessed the right documentation.

Most refugees were not Masons, however, and most were unable to count on powerful friends but this did not prevent them from searching for similar forms of help. State archives in Mexico DF (AEMF) contain over 7,000 letters sent by refugees from French camps to the Mexican embassy in Paris.\footnote{See: ‘Las cartas del exilio republicano’, *El País*, <http://politica.elpais.com/politica/2012/11/16/actualidad/1353073460_440549.html> [accessed 6 Aug. 2013]; Mateos, ‘Espejismos de La Derrota’, p. 228.} Given that a large proportion of letters were signed by groups of refugees, probably over 40,000 people signed their names in total. These letters are requests, ‘solicitudes’, to be allowed to enter Mexico. Standard form responses state that correspondents were welcome in Mexico if they could pay for their transportation; otherwise they were required to submit a request to SERE.\footnote{For example: Letter from Narciso Bassols (Paris) to Teresa Durán de Marsal (sent 19th April 1939), Archivo de Relaciones Exteriores (ARE), Archivo de la Embajada México en Francia (AEMF), Leg. 347, Exp. 1.}

A brief survey of a small proportion of files and letters reveals a common desire amongst refugees to convince the Mexican authorities of both the dire nature of their particular
situation and the abundance of their positive personal attributes. Letters emphasise the refugees’ respect for Mexico, their qualifications, their humility and desire to work hard and the fact that their only crime was to support a ‘legally constituted’ and ‘internationally recognised’ government. Álvaro Sánchez Ballesteros wrote to the embassy in February 1939:

Given the disgraceful situation in which we find ourselves and considering the impossibility of getting in touch with our relations, we absolutely lack any kind of resource, which [prevents?] us from being able to afford the journey to Mexico, a country which could fulfil [our desire?] for peace, liberty and work. [words in square brackets were illegible] Refugees appeared to respond to information they may have gleaned relating to Mexican policy, which did emphasise the need for qualified workers. Gabriela Carabias wrote for example:

Do not believe that we plan to live as parasites in the country that you represent, nor that we have ideas of adventures. We are honest workers that are persecuted for disagreeing with [this new] Inquisitorial, retrograde and miserable Spain. | Nothing more and nothing less.

The purest, ideologically driven motivations are cited for leaving Spain: a profound conflict with an ‘Inquisitorial’ regime sees Carabias associate Francoism with the rule of Isabel and Ferdinand, the monarchs who rebuilt Spanish Catholicism and who expelled the first large group of Spanish exiles, the Jews. Many letters contain distressing accounts of people’s situations, before going on to emphasise the top qualifications that the refugees offered Mexico. For example María García [Jaurrieta] wrote from Pontarlier in Eastern France:

I am the oldest of seven orphaned siblings, [our father] was shot in Pamplona in the first days of the war, I, and the majority of my siblings, are subject to being tried in a tribunal as a result of our political and union activity.

Under [constant] fear of forced repatriation to Spain, I want our good Mexican brothers to take our case into account, and for you to know that our

---

115 Letter from Álvaro Sánchez Ballesteros, from Camp de Septfonds, Barraca 43, received on the 3 March 1939, ARE: AEMF, 334, 1.
117 Letter from Gabriela Carabias (no address) to Narciso Bassols (received 10 July 1939), ARE: AEMF, 347, 2.
118 Some scholars have drawn connections between Spain’s expulsion of its Jewish population and other Spanish groups exiled throughout history. See: Llorens, La Emigración Republicana, chapter one; also, Kamen, The Disinherited.
119 For discussions of forced repatriation to Spain, see Jordi Guixé i Corominas, ‘El Regreso Forzado y la Persecución Contra los Exiliados en Francia’, Historia del Presente 18, (2011).
greatest desire would be to live side by side with the people who have felt our own tragedy as their own, and with whom we are united by bonds of gratitude.

I am a teacher, accountant [...] my siblings also have degrees [...] they have worked in offices during the war and are ready to keep working.120

We might ask why human beings in desperate circumstances felt (and no doubt still feel) obliged to emphasise their merits as an effective worker or their successful completion of a University education. It is not surprising to learn that people asked for help from friends or sought assistance from the Mexican government but the ways in which they did so tell us something about what it meant to be a refugee. Bourdieu’s identification of the ‘symbolic order and the power to nominate’ is particularly useful. Referring to the struggle to legitimise different visions of the social world, Bourdieu argued that agents (or people) must ‘engage the symbolic capital they have acquired in previous struggles [...] such as qualifications’.121 Qualifications, he went on to state, are one example of an ‘entitlement’ or *titre* that is ‘valid on all markets and that, as an official definition of official identity, [it] rescues its holders from the symbolic struggle of all against all, by uttering the authorized, universally recognised perspective on all social agents. This title is a ‘kind of “being-perceived” guaranteed as a right’.

Bourdieu’s description of the relationship between legitimacy and illegitimacy, between ‘being-perceived’ and being ignored, is particularly pertinent, even poignant, if we take the liberty of applying it to the situation of the Spanish refugees (or all refugees). Bourdieu was writing about which people or groups in society are seen as ‘noteworthy, well-regarded [and] recognised’.122 He specifically described the processes by which people gain power over particular forms of knowledge, rather than the basic right to be recognised as a citizen, the right not to be incarcerated in a concentration camp or to be allowed to enter a particular country. However, I can find no more suitable language to describe both the impact of being displaced from one’s social space (not just a location, also a position in society and a lifestyle) and the processes by which refugees attempted to *be perceived*, to be recognised as the person they had once been and who, they believed, they still were.123

---

120 Letter to Srta Vázquez Gómez from María García Jaurrieta, (Pontarlier, France) (19 March 1939), ARE: AEMF, 347, 2.
122 All quotations, Bourdieu, The Social Space’, pp.732-733
123 In referring to a social space and a life style, I again borrow from Bourdieu, see: ‘Habitus’ in Habitus: A Sense of Place, edited by Jean Hillier and Emma Rooksby, 2 edn (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), pp.27-34, (p.29).
The ‘title’ or professional qualifications insulated some refugees from the physical and mental trials of the concentration camp and the loss of dignity experienced by many others. Whilst some qualifications were relatively useless, some opened doors, contingent on the different policies pursued by the governments of potential host countries. A teacher, Enriqueta Ortega, was glad to be told that the Mexican ambassador had said: ‘All the Spanish teachers that want to come to Mexico will have their journey paid for and a job in the Polytechnic.’\footnote{Entrevista a la Señora Enriqueta Ortega, realizada por Concepción Ruiz-Funes el día 22 de abril de 1979, en Barcelona, España, PHO/10/30, Libro 79, p.25.} She was not interned in a camp and was indeed able to go to Mexico, teaching at the Polytechnic in DF for some years. Jaime Camarasa also avoided the camps because of his job: ‘anyone who was a pilot for the Air France Air Lines was guaranteed […] not to go to a concentration camp, which is something to be grateful for’.\footnote{Entrevista a Jaime Camarasa Lluelas, pp.94-97.} To a certain extent, the possession of qualifications of this sort points to a degree of family wealth. Whilst teachers in rural locations were often poverty-stricken, Ortega had received a good quality private education and Jaime Camarasa came from a lower-middle class background. This reflects the broader social make-up of the Spanish refugees in France: a higher percentage of refugees were skilled workers or professionals and a smaller percentage of refugees were agricultural workers, for example, than in the Spanish population as a whole.\footnote{For a more detailed breakdown see: Pla, Els Exiliats Catalans, p.43.} However, those from poorer backgrounds were also able to access opportunities as a result of their existing identity, if not from specific qualifications.

Cristina Ulibarri was the eighth youngest of ten children and had started work as a servant in her home town of Santander when she was ten years old. She and her husband secured passage on a boat, \textit{Salle}, on one of its various trips to the Dominican Republic from Europe in January 1939.\footnote{Entrevista realizada a Cristina Ulibarri, por Maltide Mantecon, en la ciudad de México, los días 10 y 17 de Julio de 1980, PHO/10/79, Libro 111, pp.63-69; For more information on the \textit{Salle}, see: El exilio republicano español en la sociedad dominicana, coord. by Reina C. Rosario Fernández (México: AGN, 2010), p.85, available online: <http://www.agn.gob.do/sites/default/files/publicaciones/volumen_113_0.pdf#page=79> [accessed 28 Aug. 2014].} Her husband procured their tickets – she described a third party who arranged everything for them, which may mean personnel within the PSOE, given her husband’s militancy on their behalf. Once in the Dominican Republic they lived on a
communal farm with other refugees for three years. At this point, in 1943, the Dominican dictator Trujillo cut off subsidies for the commune and life there became very hard. As a result the couple went to live in the capital, Santo Domingo, and Ulibarri found work as a house keeper and cook for a Spanish migrant family, made up of at least six men. She was hired partly because she was able to cook the Asturian food that the men missed. The head of the group was, Ulibarri said, a high ranking member of the Falange in the Dominican Republic (the Spanish fascist party) and was therefore unsympathetic to her and her husband’s essentially communist antecedents.

Ulibarri’s husband had been injured very seriously during the Civil War and never fully recovered. He became weaker in Santo Domingo and was recommended for surgery in Mexico. A Quaker organisation paid for his journey but did not pay for Ulibarri and her daughter to join him. In order to find the money for the journey, she had to prevail upon the kindness of her employer and the good will of the wider Spanish migrant population. Despite various setbacks, she managed to obtain an informal ‘guarantee’ (garantía) or good reference from the men she worked for and was thus able to raise the money for her flight. Her Spanish identity, especially her roots in the North West of Spain, as well as her ability to cook well and her role as a member, however lowly, of a particular household, had allowed her to cross political boundaries and seek patronage from a community with links to the Falange. The reference allowed her to ‘be perceived’, once again showing how central this process was to enabling refugees to overcome obstacles.

Within France, shared identities also helped refugees to build alliances with powerful officials: Carmen Bahi was able to communicate with a French officer in Catalan. This, she implied, helped to save her father. A group of Senegalese frontier guards had ‘done a raid’ on all men who were aged 60 or under, her father was 61 but they had taken him anyway. He had a stomach ulcer and was very weak so Carmen approached the most senior looking

128 For more information on Trujillo’s surprising and economically motivated policy towards Jewish refugees (as well as the Spanish republicans) see for example: Allen Wells, *Tropical Zion: General Trujillo, FDR and the Jews of Sosúa*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2009).
129 There is some ambiguity in Cristina Ulibarri’s interview regarding the relationship she had with her boss, who also asked her to marry him, despite the fact that her husband was still alive. Although she denied his advances, his attention towards her may have been something more than solidarity with a fellow Spaniard.
130 To the best of my knowledge, there is no reference to age limits in the secondary literature.
French officer amongst a group who appeared nearby, whereupon he asked her to speak Catalan:

He spoke to the two Senegalese and... said: “Give the Señor [her father] to the Señora [Carmen], so she can take care of him” [...] he ordered the Senegalese in French and explained [the orders] to me in Catalan; so this Señor was Catalan, Catalan from French Catalonia...

Whilst the search for contacts, references and guarantees, or the benefits afforded by qualifications and shared identities, are all examples of an attempt to be ‘recognised’, another strategy pursued by refugees was to hide or to disguise themselves. Dorronsoro talked about making herself appear ‘muy afrancesada’, ‘very frenchified’, in order to walk around Paris without papers. The proclivity to act, appear or speak French, allowed refugees to conceal their identity and to avoid problems with the police, as was the case with Enrique Tomas’s wife: ‘she speaks French very well, like a French woman [...] she was never in a concentration camp because she could pass for French in [frontier town] Perpignan.’ Again, this is related with more deeply embedded regional, cultural or social preferences. Those who lived close to the border were more likely to share a language with the French population, whilst cosmopolitan, bourgeois Spaniards were more likely to have been educated in France.

Physical health and resourcefulness also helped to overcome problems: some refugees left cities and set up homes in isolated rural areas, where they could hide from the French, and later Vichy or German authorities, and support themselves through subsistence farming. Others were able to melt into urban environments, finding employers who were willing to hire workers without papers or simply relying on what they could scavenge. Significantly, it appears that the similarities between the Spanish Basques and the French Basques in Toulouse were particularly worrying to the French authorities. According to French official reports, the fact that the two groups were indistinguishable meant that the Spanish refugees’ purported radicalism was difficult to identify and all the more dangerous.

131 Entrevista realizada a Carmen Babi de Parera, pp.79-80.
132 Entrevista a Carmen Dorronsoro, p.164.
133 Entrevista realizada a Enrique Tomas, p.82
Expressions of agency in testimonies
The moment of ‘being-perceived’ is sometimes converted into high drama in refugees’ spoken narratives. In this section, therefore, we will see how refugees reclaimed their agency and identity not only immediately after their displacement but also every time they retold their story. In 1939, Jose Luis Benlluire had managed to travel to Paris with his wife where they were living ‘precariously’ without ‘authorisation’. One of his friends suggested appealing to ‘Mariscal’ (Marshal) Pétain, of whom Benlluire’s father had sculpted a bust. He duly wrote Pétain a letter and he received a reply which invited him to meet with Pétain in the Invalides (French government offices). This proved useful when, as Benlluire described it,

[I was] in the bed with Sole [his wife] in the morning, very early and suddenly the door rang and it was the police coming to look for me. So, obviously, I got up half asleep, and these people dragged me out. But Sole said to me: “Mariscal’s letter! Mariscal’s letter!” And they were very surprised, I had not remembered because I was half asleep, I said: “Ay it’s true!”

He showed the police the letter from Marshal Pétain. The next day he went to the meeting and was given leave to stay in Paris till he found passage to Latin America.

Benlluire’s family were relatively well off and connected with wider European society because of his father’s work as an artist. It was a fluke that a man’s father should have sculpted a bust of one of the few people in France with the power to commute a notice of deportation but it was also indicative of the kind of milieu in which he belonged. At the same time, the way that Benlluire told this story is significant. It may well have happened just as he described it but the speed with which an idea suggested by friends is converted into the magic password uttered in front of the waiting French police is striking. This is a cherished anecdote, and quite rightly, it contains the perfect balance of danger, humour and a richly satisfying resolution, which sees our protagonist recognised for who he truly was.

Within individual testimonies, then, the presentation of key moments and the role that refugees’ abilities, decisions or skills played in determining their future should be seen both as an account of a particular experience and as a representation of what that experience meant to the interviewee. Isabel Richart Sotes, for example, described talking in French, heavily tinged with her Spanish accent and managing to convince the border guards that

\[136\] All quotations: Entrevista al Señor Jose Luis Benlluire López de Aranda, realizada en su domicilio particular (Madrid) por Elena Aub, los días 12 y 18 marzo de 1980, PHO/10/Esp.16, Libro 14, p.43.
she was ‘very important, very influential, a great diplomat’, so that they let her and her baby daughter through the frontier, whilst everyone else had to wait.\footnote{See: Entrevista realizada a Doña Isabel Richart Sotes, por Elena Aub, los días 4 y 8 de febrero de 1980 en Madrid, España, PHO/10/Esp.10, Libro 88, p.41.} Here we see how the force of Richart’s personality changed her fate. Other sections of her interview also demonstrate how well she was able to disguise herself as French, and how oral history interviews in particular show us both what happened, and the way in which the narrator wished to frame or to extract meaning from what happened.

Richart first left Spain to seek refuge with friends in France; at that time, she had crossed the border without any problems in a car.\footnote{Isabel states that she left Spain for the first time in 1939, returned to Barcelona after a fortnight, stayed there for almost two months and then left again before Franco entered Barcelona. It seems reasonable to suggest, however, that she left Spain for the first time in late 1938 and the final time before the 26 Jan. 1939, when Franco’s troops entered Barcelona.} She then decided to return to Barcelona, in order to be with her husband, taking her baby daughter with her as well; both decisions she would come to regret. She did not find her husband in Barcelona and the second time she left she was only able to take a small suitcase with a few things in it, including a fur coat. She had only driven a short way towards the frontier when she was stopped by a soldier carrying a machine gun, who requisitioned her car. In the freezing cold, she walked the rest of the way to France, joining a group of women and children – the journey was to take ‘eleven days and eleven nights’.\footnote{Entrevista realizada a Doña Isabel Richart Sotes, p.36.} Her fur coat saved her baby’s life from the cold and snow, and she took the uniform and shoes from a dead republican soldier and put them on in order to save her own. Throughout her interview, Richart describes herself as ‘strong’ and like a ‘lioness’. Despite the fact that she put on the clothes of a soldier, one symbol of masculine virility, Richart’s strength manifested itself in a kind of extreme femininity. Having recently been told to stop breast-feeding her baby, Richart had been bandaging her breasts to stop the flow of milk but during the journey she ‘took off the bandages’ and fed not only her daughter but another baby boy. In her words, delivered with humour, she ‘began to function as a portable restaurant’.\footnote{Quotations from Entrevista realizada a Doña Isabel Richart Sotes, pages 30 and 37 respectively.}

Later in her interview, Richart described being forced to board a train with other women, all of them to be taken to a concentration camp; at this point, she was afraid that the French authorities would send her daughter to Mexico or the USSR, as she believed other
children had been evacuated in this manner. To avoid this happening she carried out a dangerous plan which, according to the transcript, she described in breathless phrases. Amid a sea of disbelieving women, she jumped off the train, took her baby and ran. 141 The guards at the train platform saw her and shot at her, forcing her back into the station to wait for another train. Using her wits again, she managed to convince them that she needed to walk to help ease the pain in the foot which had been shot. Waiting for the right moment, she disappeared into the town, rang her French friends who wired her money, bought some clothes to transform herself into a respectable French woman, returned to the platform and bought a ticket for the next train, all without being caught and effectively in disguise. Eventually, she, along with her daughter, arrived at her friends’ house where they both recovered and were reunited with her husband.

This passage is highly dramatic but it takes on a different significance in the wider context of Richart’s narrative. Later in the interview, she castigated herself for putting her daughter in danger, saying:

> I’ve always had the feeling that I maltreated her because I did not have any right to take her on all those journeys and things that I did, taking her to France and then to Cuba and then… I treated her, I don’t know, like a thing… if I could [I would] have asked her: “Do you want this or do you want that?” 142

The descriptions of her saving her daughter during the retirada and acting in a daring, almost reckless, way in order to prevent their separation, take on an additional meaning. Richart’s courage and luck meant that she avoided death and the concentration camp but it also put her and her daughter in danger to begin with, as she pointed out several times. Her interview demonstrates her desire to appear in control and to present an image of herself as a capable (if impulsive) mother to her daughter. It is surely significant that at one of the crucial moments in her story, Richart saves her daughter’s life with recourse to the most paradigmatically maternal act: breast feeding.

Isabel Richart Sotes would not have been able to escape without the assistance her French friends provided in wiring her money, however. There were limits on individual agency and restrictions placed on people that they could not shake off on their own. For example, in March 1939 tens of thousands of people waited in the port of Alicante, hoping to escape to French North Africa but it was difficult to gain passage on the limited number of boats –

141 This account echoes French reports of Spanish refugee women holding up a train cited by Soo, Routes, p.82.
142 Entrevista realizada a Doña Isabel Richart Sotes, p.77.
and many relied on the kinds of connections (social, professional, political) referred to above.\textsuperscript{143} Fernando Pradel, a refugee who travelled to North Africa from Alicante aged nine, draws our attention to the role that the son of the local deputy (‘diputado’) played in securing his family’s passage on a boat: ‘I will always remember him - with his officer’s cap, his height and impressive girth. […] With his help we could finally embark on the English merchant ship’.\textsuperscript{144}

**Conclusion**

This chapter has explored the interaction between internal and external, or subjective and objective realities in a number of different ways. Several examples taken from a variety of personal testimonies have demonstrated that not everyone who left Spain was either an ‘exile’ or a ‘refugee’, ‘a-political’ or ‘political’. Instead, some people inhabited a grey area, trying to test the ground, before being defined by external actors, in this case, Franco’s regime or the French state. Whilst the existing historiography on Spanish exile includes statistical breakdowns of political affiliation, including a category for a-political refugees, or brief discussions of the reasons why refugees left Spain, it does not allow these observations to open up a more profound consideration of how people moved between categories. This chapter has sought to show how refugees talked about their political beliefs or identities. It has explained how some refugees, despite leading a life outside of Francoist Spain, were not as ‘militant’ as the historiography might lead us to expect. In many cases, however, they were nonetheless deemed to belong to groups which the Francoist regime condemned.

The examples of Vicente Llorens and San Agustín have also shown how thin the line sometimes was between those who stayed and those who left. On the one hand, this highlights the range of practical, geographic and financial reasons why many people were unable to leave Spain. On the other, it suggests that descriptions of the purely ideological motivations of the Spanish refugees, and the strength of their anti-Fascist identity, partially emanated from the refugees’ desperate need to reclaim their lost status and seek ways to gain assistance. More generally, and in keeping with the more recent historiography of the Spanish Civil War, the discussion of political identity or militancy should demonstrate how

\textsuperscript{143} Anderson has drawn attention to the British refusal to send naval assistance to these refugees: Anderson, ‘The Chetwode Commission’, p.252.

\textsuperscript{144} Interview with Fernando Pradal, in: Soriano, p.78.
personal needs, social aspirations and cultural legacies were (and are always) intertwined with political affiliation.

For many, becoming a refugee entailed the loss of ‘recognition’. Leaving your country, where many, if not all, the refugees would have possessed some form of social status, left people without the defensive fortress that home, family, friends and work represent in everyday life. In this sense, the theme of the internal vs external is picked up again, as refugees attempted to convert what they knew to be true about their own worth as people into an external or objective truth, a stamp of authenticity. As we have seen, they did this in a number of ways. Some were able to find a form of reference or guarantee, granted to them by more powerful friends, networks or the membership of groups like political parties or the Masons. Qualifications or professional identities sometimes acted in the same way, leading to what Bourdieu called ‘recognition’ or ‘being-perceived’. The Spanish refugees in France often arrived with no proof of their past: all of their possessions were left behind, their clothes were dirty, their identification papers lost, incomplete or inadequate. A reference from someone respectable or a piece of paper which conferred upon them a title, or even a smart new suit, could overcome these difficulties, proving that they were indeed who they said they were. The search for proof of one’s inherent respectability, therefore, was not just a case of fast tracking tedious bureaucratic processes; it was the search for proof of an existing identity. Refugees also described how they were able to dress up, speak French, adopt French airs or melt into the background, in order to avoid being confined in concentration camps or prisons for lacking the necessary documents to move about freely. In this sense, the disguise allowed some refugees to preserve their safety and liberty.

Partly as a result of the kinds of sources used, this chapter has not included accounts of serious failure – of the many occasions where refugees were unable to gain access to help, of the refugees who died in concentration camps of preventable illnesses, malnourished, cold and without shelter. Equally, many refugees were unable to conjure up the same ‘symbolic capital’ as richer, better-qualified refugees. Whilst Vicente Llorens was deeply depressed, almost suicidal, at the prospect of further years of drudgery in exile, his predicament was by no means as dire as thousands of other Spanish refugees, or indeed of the millions of European victims of Nazi persecution. This is one of the most serious limitations of using oral histories to reconstruct history – you only hear from those who lived – thus I want to emphasise that this PhD does not seek to present a monolithic version of events. Equally, one of the central aims of this chapter in particular has been to
show how the kinds of triumphant stories told by Jose Lluis Benlluire and Isabel Richart Sotes, for example, are not meant to be representative of a common, single, refugee experience. Instead, they show us how some Spanish refugees were able to reclaim their own meanings from the events through which they have lived: not everyone could.

Many of the refugees whose words have been cited in this chapter also left people behind in Spain. In fact, many thousands of refugees attempted to maintain lines of communication with their relations, friends and political companions who had been unable or unwilling to leave. Those who stayed within Spain were sometimes unable to locate or contact those who had left. At the same time, exile did not always equate to estrangement or a lack of communication, as we will go on to see in the next chapter.
2. Conceptualising the spaces in between, Refugees and those in Spain, 1939-1975

That having a brother who disappeared during the Spanish Civil War and having come to know that he entered into France through Figuera [sic] on the 9 February 1939, passing through the concentration camp San Siprien [sic] where he stayed for two months, being transferred to Barcaret [sic], then according to some information he asked to go to a special camp, from where he left for Mexico, where, according to recent news, he is living at the moment; I do not know where he is based or his address, and that is why I am humbly asking you if the Embassy has a register of his exit and where I should write to find this, I will be eternally grateful.

[One can identify my brother by two signs] a gold tooth and tattooed arms, one of a boat and another of a woman.¹

Manuel Peña in Malaga (Spain), to the Mexican ambassador in Paris, 1955

One of the bad things about now is the way you lose track of friends. I think of this all the time. The world apparently only gets smaller for bombers and armies, but bigger and bigger for friends.²

Marty Hemingway (Martha Gellhorn) in Cuba to Gustavo Duran in New York, 1940

La Voz de Madrid was one of the many newspapers produced and distributed by Spanish refugees in France.³ Although the French authorities banned it in French concentration camps (1939-1944), refugees continued to pass the newspaper from one to another in secret. According to Soriano, the most popular part of the paper was a section called ‘Paraderos’ or ‘Whereabouts’.⁴ It consisted of lists of the names and locations of people

---

¹ Manuel Peña is a pseudonym, ARE: AEMF, Leg. 513, exp. 1.
² Residencia, Archivo de Gustavo Durán, Correspondencia Personal, 36. Durán was a Lieutenant Colonel in the republican army, left Spain in 1939 and travelled to the UK and the USA in 1940. In 1951 he was accused of being a communist spy by Joseph McCarthy. He subsequently worked for the UN and died in Crete in 1969.
³ For an overview of the pamphlets, journals and newspapers produced by Spanish exiles at different stages, see: Ana González Neira, Prensa Del Exilio Republicano, 1936-1977, (Santiago de Compostela: Andavira, 2010).
who hoped to find or be found by their family members. This process continues today, as descendants of refugees attempt to locate a lost member or branch of their family.5

Both during and after the Civil War people often left Spain in conditions of chaos, as chapter one demonstrated. Refugees did not necessarily have the time to notify friends, political companions or family of their intentions. It often took many years for people to re-establish contact and sometimes they never did. This situation could work in favour of refugees who wished to evade the Francoist regime. However, many of the ‘defeated’ who had been unable to leave Spain in 1939 or who had returned from France shortly after the retirada could not escape. The proportion of returnees imprisoned is unknown and further local studies need to be carried out but it has been estimated that over 280,000 Spaniards were in prison by November 1940.6 Between 50,000 and 200,000 enemies of the regime were executed in the period 1939-19457 and additional numbers were incarcerated in Francoist work camps or concentration camps.8

For those who had survived the exigencies of exile but who nonetheless remained separated from loved-ones in Spain, the barriers imposed by incarceration, physical distances and national borders were not easy to overcome. Many refugees were unable to return to Spain, where they might face imprisonment, or even execution, a topic which will be covered in more detail in chapter three. The longevity of Franco’s regime therefore contributed greatly to the drawn out nature of these separations but it was not necessarily the only impediment to families or friends reuniting. Physical distance between certain

3 In May 2012 I was reading in the CDMH in Salamanca. On one occasion I overheard a Russian man and his interpreter ask the archivists whether there was any information available regarding the Spanish identity of his great aunt; he said she was a refugee who had come to the USSR when she was a very small child and he had only her Russian name and a photograph. Perhaps he hoped to make contact with his Spanish relatives?
6 For more information on numbers imprisoned, see Juliá and Casanova, Víctimas de la guerra civil, p.299.
7 Debate over the numbers of people murdered by the regime centres on disagreements over how to calculate the number of deaths; the figure of 192,684 comes from the state’s own Anuario oficial de estadística reporting on those executed or who died in prison, 1939-44, other figures come from deaths recorded in the regime’s legal records. For more information see: Richards, A Time of Silence, p.30 and notes 29 – 30 on p.179 and Ruiz, ‘A Spanish Genocide?, pp.171-2; Ruiz has also shown that the repression enacted against the Spanish population by Franco’s regime was much more severe than that carried out in either Salazar’s Portugal or Mussolini’s Italy.
8 To put these figures into context, the population of Spain in late 1940 was approximately 25,900,000, see Instituto Nacional de Estadística: <http://www.ine.es/inebaseweb/pdfDispacher.do?td=161351&ext=.pdf> [accessed 6 May 2014]. This means that over 1% of the population were in prison.
people might also be the result of scant financial resources, poor physical health, ideological disagreement, feelings of estrangement, or a combination of all of these things. For example, Guillermo Vignote Mignorance’s childhood separation from his father was at least in part explained by his parents’ divorce, which pre-dated his father’s exile in North Africa (from 1939 onwards).  

Importantly, however, Spanish refugees were not necessarily isolated or alienated from those within Spain, as some of the letters and interviews quoted throughout this chapter will show. Particularly after the end of the Second World War, which had disrupted international postal services, refugees were able to communicate with other refugees and those inside Spain, sending money or packages as well. These strands of communication, as well as silence, are the subject of this chapter.

**The spaces in between**

The first section of the chapter will show how the ideas and concepts used by historians studying Spanish exile, as well as scholars studying very different kinds of migrants, help us to understand the significance of the letters and packages sent between refugees and those in Spain. How were familial bonds maintained at a distance? What did it mean to write a letter to a refugee, someone marked out as deviant by the Francoist regime? The chapter will then set out some of the impediments to postal and other forms of communication between refugees and those inside Spain during 1939-1975, including the impact of Francoist censorship on correspondents. Finally, it will consider how refugees and those within Spain conceptualised the spaces that lay between them. Although Spanish refugees were heterogeneous, we can identify similar postures or strategies which the defeated adopted or produced, and which sometimes helped them to adapt to or cope with the situations in which they found themselves. This discussion will be arranged under three terms, which describe emotional responses, states of mind and rhetorical strategies: ‘righteous defeat’, ‘unmitigated loss’ and ‘release’.

---


10 And as briefly discussed by Pla: Els exiliats, pp.272-273.

11 Furthermore, like Florinda San Agustín and her son, family members who had been left behind in Spain continued to travel to host countries. On the Mexican context, see Pla, *Els Exiliats*, p.325.
Some refugees saw themselves as representatives of an alternative Spain, for example, or as actors locked in a struggle for legitimacy in the eyes of the world, a legitimacy that was continually threatened, even extinguished, by Franco’s Spain. Deeply personal emotional reactions were expressed in the language of righteous defeat. Being separated from particular people and the pain these situations inspired, served to validate or provide proof for anti-fascist and anti-Franco identities, which were in turn shaped by different material and political contexts within Spain, the various host countries and the transnational space of exile politics.

Missing those you had left behind could form part of this narrative of righteous defeat, then, but it could also cause refugees to question their beliefs or actions and the extent to which they were willing to allow their lives to be moulded by the political battles of the Spanish Civil War. The exile and the often heart-breaking separation from loved ones it entailed, was not something that could be viewed as part of a wider ideological struggle for all those who experienced it. Far from serving as one example of the trials that a group of people could endure, all the time knowing they were in the right, for some refugees, separation from friends, family and political companions came to represent the futility of ideological conflict and the irreversible damage done by both the Civil War and the Francoist dictatorship. Some relationships could not heal or survive and this unmitigated loss engendered feelings of regret and emptiness. What cause was really worth this?

However, separation did not always cause pain. For some Spanish refugees it amounted to an ‘escape’, a ‘release’ or a welcome distance from a country or group of people to which they felt they did not belong. These feelings often facilitated, or they were facilitated by, adaptation to life in exile. Separation from those left behind was thus conceptualised by some refugees as a welcome liberation. Refugee children who had travelled with their parents and grandparents also had fewer ties to Spain and so separation from their homeland was arguably less painful.\(^\text{12}\) The desire to use the fact of being outside of Spain to prove a political point was secondary or non-existent and distance from the homeland felt more like a release than a source of anxiety.

The secondary aim of this chapter is to consider these three responses to separation in more depth. The terms ‘righteous defeat’, ‘unmitigated loss’ and ‘release’ are not categories or boxes. Instead, they should evoke three extreme states of mind or emotional responses.

\(^{12}\) For example: author’s interview with Pilar Jiménez, 23 April 2013, Mexico DF; author’s interview with Ana María Gaos, 27 May 2013, Mexico DF.
that were not mutually exclusive. One person could talk about separation from their family member (for example) in terms of righteous defeat and unmitigated loss, whilst, on occasion, characterising it as a release. Over the course of one day or a lifetime, someone could view their predicament as the result of ideological struggles that were worth every sacrifice, as a catastrophe in which they had been caught up or as a set of events, which had allowed them to escape an unhappy country. I view these extremes as postures, strategies or stances, which refugees could adopt at different times and according to different contexts: cloaks that they could wear or discard if they needed to.

**Sources and society**

The postures which different refugees are shown to have adopted throughout this chapter are also determined, to some extent, by the sources used. Letters stored in political archives and sent to political companions, for example, are more likely to provide us with an example of a refugee adopting a posture of ‘righteous defeat’, as the vast majority were written by people who continued to be politically active. Oral history interviews, conducted after the end of Francoism and with refugees still living in Mexico, are more likely to provide us with examples of refugees who saw their exile as a release. They had stayed in Mexico, after all, and the need to prove their political credentials had, for many, long since passed. These postures were often gendered: whilst no claims of statistical representativeness are made, the sources used in this chapter suggest that women were less likely to characterise themselves as actors in a struggle for legitimacy and more likely to conceptualise their emotional response to separation as personal and private.

The ways in which people ‘conceptualised the spaces in between’ were also shaped by unstable and shifting material factors and political realities. The failure of the allies to invade Spain and restore democracy during the Second World War, for example, had a significant impact on some refugees’ emotional responses to separation: without allied assistance, adopting a stance of ‘righteous defeat’ may have felt increasingly redundant and meaningless post 1950.13 The evolution of the Francoist regime from the mid-1950s onwards, characterised by the end of autarky and the entry of Spain to the UN in 1955, also

---

13 Soo, *Routes*, pp.207-209.
had an impact on the way in which some refugees viewed their identity. If Franco’s Spain had been allowed to join the UN, surely the anti-Fascist struggle had been shown to be futile and thus not worth sacrificing one’s own happiness for? At the same time, for many, the symbolic power of Francoism meant that only Franco’s death could change the way they related to Spain and the way in which they viewed their relationship with those within Spain. Furthermore, these historical events and contexts will never tell us everything there is to know about peoples’ responses to separation from one another. The fragmentary personal testimonies quoted in this chapter provide a series of snapshots of subjective, rather than objective, realities, emotional responses that did not always respond to external cues.

Equally, whilst the description ‘spaces in between’ refers to the physical spaces and distances that separated people, a lack of information could also create a space in between reality and imagination. Manuel Peña, the resident of Malaga whose letter to the Mexican ambassador in Paris in 1955 is quoted in the epigraph to this chapter, had clearly been uncertain of his brother’s whereabouts since at least 1939. In fact, neither the embassy in Paris nor the department of immigration in Mexico had any record of his missing relative, so Peña will have been kept wondering about what had happened to his brother for an indeterminate number of years. This situation, which saw people unsure of where someone was or even whether they were alive or dead, is thus an alternative kind of in-between space or what Pauline Boss has classified as ‘ambiguous loss’. It is difficult to gauge these spaces of the imagination or write them into a historical account. With recourse to traces like those found in Peña’s letter, however, we can at least open up the possibility that these ‘spaces’ of the imagination formed a part of the experience of both refugees and


15 This will be discussed further below. See also for example Florinda San Agustín Labrada’s description of her husband’s attitude towards Franco, he could not return to Spain whilst Franco was still alive: Entrevista a Florinda San Agustín Labrada, p.140; Federica Montseny strenuously denounced returning to Spain whilst Franco lived, see: Pedro García Guirao, "The Ground Rots Equally Everywhere": Federica Montseny and Those who Returned to Die in Francoist Spain’, in Coming Home?, pp.70-88.


their family and friends who stayed in Spain. As Peña’s description of his brother’s gold tooth and tattoos (one was of a boat, one of a woman) demonstrates, this kind of in-between space could be populated by memories of the far-away person, memories which may have formed the content of family stories or which may never have been articulated.

**Historiography**

The topic of refugees’ separation from those they left behind is referred to in a variety of different contexts. Histories of particular political groups in exile have included consideration of the contact exiles were able or unable to maintain with their co-religionists within Spain.18 Studies of the maquis or the guerrillas, who mounted an armed resistance to Franco in some areas of Spain, also highlight the existence of clandestine routes used to transport supplies and information, as well as people.19 Biographies of key individuals, published collections of letters and works focusing on particular exiled writers often demonstrate how being outside of Spain did not spell an end to communication with those still in Spain, although this is not their primary aim.20

However, in the past few years, personal letters have provided the source material for broader ‘emotional’ histories of Spanish exile.21 Jemma Caballer and Queralt Solé have analysed several published and unpublished collections of correspondence sent between Catalan refugees in France and the UK and their friends and family in Catalonia during

---

20 For example, of the 12 collections of letters currently published and sold by the Residencia de Estudiantes, as of July 2014, five contain letters sent between exiles and writers based within Spain during Franco’s regime. See: Gabriel Celaya - León Sánchez Cuesta, *Epistolario, 1932-1952*, (compiled by Juan Manuel Díaz de Guereñu.), (Madrid: Publicaciones de la Residencia de Estudiantes, 2009) and Manuel Altolaguirre, *Epistolario, 1925-1959*, (compiled by James Valender); For an account through letters of family bonds maintained in exile, see for example: *Poco a poco os hablaré de todo*: historia del exilio en Nueva York de la familia de los Ríos, Giner, Urruti, cartas, 1936-1953, (compiled by Ritama Muñoz-Rojas); See also, several chapters in James Valender, (ed.), *Los refugiados españoles y la cultura mexicana: actas de las segundas jornadas celebradas en El Colegio de México en noviembre de 1996*, (Mexico: El Colegio de México,1999).
21 ‘Emotional’ is in inverted commas because there has been some debate amongst scholars as to whether emotions are the product of a ‘particular place and time’, or whether they are independent of these structures. See: Roper, ‘The Unconscious Work of History’, p.173.
1939-1946. The authors identified a marked (if not universal) desire to return to Spain in the letters, caused by the sense of loss that came from being apart from family, friends and home, rather than the circumstances refugees faced in their host countries. Writing in 2011, Caballer and Solé suggest that existing historical accounts of the Spanish exile ‘have left the personal feelings stirred up by [the exile] out of their [more expansive] global analyses’. Other scholars have in fact produced powerful emotional histories of Spanish exile although they have tended to focus on the experiences of evacuated children, perhaps because children are less likely to be viewed as the protagonists in political histories. Veronica Sierra’s book *Palabras Huérfanas* (2009), for example, is about the 30,000 children evacuated to various European countries and the USSR; it provides a compelling account of the emotions ‘stirred up’ by these events and Sierra has suggested that letters sent between children and their parents acted as a ‘thread which unite[d]’ these families.

More recently, Iker González-Allende has drawn upon a correspondence between two friends to show how emotional history intersects with literary, social or political history. Analysing the exiled Basque writer Pilar de Zubiaurre’s letters, now stored in the Basque country, González-Allende demonstrates how she was able to cultivate ‘transnational contacts’, bolster her ‘emotional security’ and keep up to date, in minute detail, with what was happening in her homeland. González-Allende suggests that this kind of close (if not always affectionate) correspondence ‘undermines the general conception of estrangement between Spain and the […] Spaniards in exile’. Instead, he continues, ‘the connection between the liberals in Spain and the exiles in Spanish America was sustained and vibrant during Franco’s dictatorship’.

González-Allende alludes to a ‘general conception of estrangement between Spain and the […] Spaniards in exile’ but he does not tell us where we might find this articulated. Nor is it particularly clear whether he is referring only to ‘liberals’ in Spain or to anyone who kept in contact with exiles, whether they were liberal, anarchist or a supporter of Franco’s regime.

---

23 Caballer and Solé, p.201.
The ‘conception of estrangement’ needs to be framed in a different way. The idea that the community of exile was cut off from those they had left behind pervades the historiography of Spanish exile, and particularly Spanish exile in Mexico, for two reasons. First, existing historical accounts of republican exile focus on particular national contexts, rather than identifying connections between refugees’ experiences. Secondly, and more significantly, the ‘conception of estrangement’ or the decision to remain detached from Spain was a stance adopted by individual exiles and particular political factions, which became harder to maintain as the dictatorship survived the successive challenges posed by the Second World War and the Cold War.

Manuel Díaz-Martá, for example, was a highly successful refugee – a PSOE member, he worked for the UN in exile. Díaz-Martá viewed public communication with Spain or the Spanish nation as a betrayal of the anti-Francoist cause. Staying outside of Spain was therefore a moral imperative to the extent that he was unable to visit his mother as she lay dying. Díaz-Martá, however, kept in touch with several members of his family, who had remained in Toledo throughout the dictatorship. His daughter, María-Luz Díaz Martá told me that her father and his brother conducted a ‘beautiful correspondence’ (‘una correspondencia preciosa’). As well as sharing a information about the aguas or waters of Toledo, which preoccupied Díaz-Martá in his capacity as a civil engineer, the brothers played chess by post for decades. Very shortly after Franco’s death, Díaz-Martá resigned from the UN and flew to Spain, winning the first democratic elections to become the socialist diputado or MP for Toledo. He attributed part of his success to the relationship he had been able to maintain with his hometown over the years. In this way, a ‘conception of estrangement’ becomes a tactical political stance, rather than an emotional (or even practical) reality. Díaz-Martá was publically estranged from Spain but he remained closely connected to the people and the city that he held dear.

On-board newspapers produced by groups of refugees in three boats travelling from France to Mexico (May-June, 1939) also contain articles which argue that refugees should be estranged from Spain. Given that the newspapers were funded by SERE, which was in

27 Information on Díaz Marta’s contact with Toledo: Author’s interview with María-Luz Díaz Marta, 23 May 2013, Mexico DF; discussion of the brothers’ correspondence, at 20 mins.
28 Entrevista realizada por Elena Aub a Don Manuel Díaz-Marta, (Spain: Junta de Comunidades de Castilla-la Mancha, 2001), p.79.
29 I cited the same collection of newspapers on p. 16 of this thesis, see also: Jorge de Hoyos Puente, La Utopía Del Regreso, pp.80-86.
turn managed by supporters of Juan Negrín, they also gave voice to Negrínist political aims in 1939. Despite the concurrent aim to ‘reconquer’ Spain, the ‘refugee’ was characterised as morally superior because they were outside of Spain; they were the ‘Spaniards who deserve that name’ and the voice of ‘legitimate Spain’. The boat passengers apparently acted as ‘the lively and faithful expression of [their] country through all of their activities’, travelling over the Atlantic with the real Spain ‘transported in [their arms]’, they were a ‘genuine representation of hard working and honourable Spain’. Faber has described evocations of Spanish spirit such as these as ‘cultural nationalism’, and convincingly characterises these rhetorical practices as ‘an irresistible ideological life saver, whenever group identity and collective self-confidence are being threatened’.

Whilst several exiled writers developed this rhetoric, contact with the interior remained of crucial importance for most political parties or groups in exile (across the world), a reality that exposes the inherent absurdity in suggesting that geographical location (being outside Spain) was associated with a greater level of legitimacy or Spanishness. With regards to the commercial sphere, Fèrriz has also shown how from at least the mid-1950s onwards, Catalan exiled writers in Mexico forged links with publishers based within Catalonia. This allowed a commercial and cultural relationship to flourish, which overturned the ‘false dichotomy between Catalans inside and outside Catalonia’. According to Fèrriz, these connections, and particularly refugees who returned to Spain, were criticised by ‘orthodox’ refugees who viewed this rapprochement as ‘weak’ and, ultimately, a tacit acceptance of Franco’s regime. It is significant that the examples of connections cited in existing scholarship are the correspondence of a Basque exile, Pilar de Zubiaurre, Catalan refugees’ letters and the working relationships of Catalan publishers. Refugees who identified themselves as belonging to these ‘peripheral’ nationalities were able to characterise their

30 De Hoyos, p.137.
32 Respectively: Sinaia, No.1, 26 May, Los Barcos, p.17; Ipanema, No. 24, 6 July and No. 15, 9 Jun, Los Barcos, pages 267 and 101; This stance was adopted by other exiled writers as well: Kamen, The Disinherited: The Exiles Who Created Spanish Culture, (London: Allen Lane, 2007), p.301.
relationship with those in Spain as innocent of the kind of ‘weakness’ or collusion to which ‘orthodox’ refugees (like Diaz-Marta) referred: their relationship was with an ethnic or cultural nation not represented by Franco’s state. At the same time, it is clear that even the most ‘orthodox’ refugees kept in touch with those in Spain both clandestinely to achieve political aims and through normal means, to maintain the bonds of family and friendship. The ‘conception of estrangement’ is both a historiographical straw man and a highly contested, politicised imagining of the relationship between Spanish refugees and those they had left behind.

Notwithstanding the valuable contributions made by the scholars discussed above, the ways in which people maintain affective bonds at a distance is a theme with which scholars studying ‘economic migrants’ are much more familiar. For instance, Mary Chamberlain has used oral histories to show how Caribbean migrants who travelled to the UK maintained ‘powerful bonds of love across the seas, the years and the generations’, arguing that migration could strengthen family identity. Elizabeth Aranda, who has conducted research on middle-class Puerto Rican migrants in the US, calls these bonds ‘emotional bridges’ which connect those in Puerto Rico and those in the US, explaining how ‘subjective, internal states […] cross borders on a regular basis’.

Letters also provide us with insight into the impact of historical events on people’s emotional lives. If exile represented a symbolic death, as some scholars suggest, then autobiographical writing of this kind might represent a ‘rebirth’ and an imposition of control over chaos. For Roper, the letter as an historical source can take on a deeper significance because it is the physical remnant or trace of deeply held emotions: he identifies ‘the often oblique clues’ which act as evidence of feelings which surfaced momentarily but were not expressed in words. The letters consulted for this chapter also show that correspondents were not always able to articulate their feelings or explain what had happened to them in the years during which they had not seen their friend. A short

35 However, not all refugees from Catalonia or the Basque country saw themselves as ‘Catalans’ or ‘Basques’.
The physical aspect of the letter is also important. In common with the ‘Atlantic’ families writing from countries like Britain and America during the 18th century, some Spanish refugees used paper bordered in black to denote mourning. Letters also act as historical artefacts in their own right: they are delicate indications of how people reached out to one another. Carmen Tagüeña’s experiences remind us of this: the daughter of two Spanish refugees, she was born in 1938 and she grew up in various corners of the Soviet Union before the family managed to gain passage to Mexico in 1955. Her maternal grandmother had travelled with them but her father’s mother had remained within Spain. In 2013, Tagüeña recalled how although she and her paternal grandmother had maintained a close written correspondence, Tagüeña had never heard her grandmother’s voice because she had died by the time international phone calls had become routine in Mexico. We should remember that even when phone calls did become possible, people were unable to see each other, embrace one another or sit in companionable silence. The loss of this realm of human experience was often difficult to cope with. In this way, the letter and the photographs sometimes sent in the same envelope became more than text, they were objects that could be held and touched, in the absence of the person.

40 Letter from “Carlitos” (Malaga) to Emilio Prados (Mexico) (Sept. 23 1959), Residencia, Archivo de Emilio Prados, Correspondencia Personal, 11:1.
43 Informal conversations with Carmen Tagüeña, 29 May 2013, Mexico DF.
44 Jesús García Sánchez, ‘La Correspondencia de Los Españoles En Francia’, p.334; For example there is a photograph of several grandchildren enclosed in a letter from a woman in Spain to her friend and sponsor in Mexico: Letter from María Márquez Cáliz, (Talavera de la Reina), to María Tarragona (Mexico DF) (May 1971), AEM, Organizaciones Políticas: Comité de Apoyo al Pueblo Español, 42:101.64; There is a photograph of the correspondent and his wife enclosed in letters sent from one Spanish ‘child’ refugee in the USSR to his family in Spain, Letter from José María Apocada Orive (USSR) to his siblings (Bilbao?, Spain) (1955-6), CDMH: Familia Apodaca Orive, 1914/2, 7.
Barriers to epistolary contact

The 1940s seems to have been a decade of relative (though by no means complete) silence, perhaps because of the chaos caused by WW2, postal censorship and Spain’s isolation from the rest of the world. From the early 1950s onwards, epistolary contact appears to have been easier to establish and maintain. The length of time it took letters to travel from Spain to Mexico or other far-away places, however, continued to place limits on the level of contact refugees maintained with those in Spain or elsewhere in Europe. Dr Antonio Navarro points to other reasons why people failed to keep in touch:

I – Living in Mexico, did you keep in touch with your family in Spain?
AN – Well at first it was very bad, very bad because I went two years without any correspondence, and after that letters took a horrifically long time, so there was very little correspondence. [...] And now [in 1979] I receive letters and I write but it isn’t, not as many as one would like [...] But now it isn’t anyone’s fault, now it is the fault of those who can write to me, whereas before it was the censor’s fault and all of these things.\(^45\)

The practical difficulties posed by war and the danger of running afoul of the censor had been replaced in later years by Navarro and his family’s laziness.

Ideological disagreements also formed an impediment to epistolary contact. Families were often divided long before the eventual physical departure of one or more of their members. Felix Galarza, who had travelled to Mexico post-Civil-War, was glad to be apart from his sister who had remained in Spain, because of their mutual distrust and ideological disagreements:

…the people who have helped me the most, including giving me financial support in Mexico, have been the siblings and relations of my first wife, whom I love like brothers and for whom I have much more affection and gratitude than for my own family, who tend to be Franquistas.
I – These siblings of your wife, of your first wife, do they live in Mexico?
FG – They’re dead now, they lived…no, in Spain
I – Ah! They lived in Spain.\(^46\)

Particularly (although not always) in the context of familial relationships, which people cannot choose, the meaning of separation from Spain was shaped by pre-existing feuds and indifferences. As Pearsall elegantly explains, ‘to enter into family life […] is to be

\(^{45}\) Entrevista realizada a Antonio Navarro en su domicilio particular de la ciudad de Guadalajara México, por Enriqueta Tuñón, los días 29 y 30 de Noviembre y 1 de Diciembre de 1979, Libro 75, PHO/10/70, pp.216-7.

\(^{46}\) Entrevista a Félix Galarza realizada en su domicilio particular de Guadalajara Jalisco, por Enriqueta Tuñón, los días 21, 22, 23 y 26 de Noviembre de 1979, PHO/10/62, Libro 42, p.163.
confronted with longing affections, clinging desires, deep chasms of misunderstanding.' During and after the Spanish Civil War, these affections, desires and misunderstandings were often entangled with ideologically driven antipathy.

Postal censorship
There is little scholarship about the impact Francoist censorship had on the Spanish postal service. It is generally assumed to have existed although neither Caballer and Solé’s article nor González-Allende’s specifically mention the role of censorship. Jésus García Sánchez’ concise and well-referenced overview of the letters sent by Spanish refugees in France (1936-1946) explains that post was censored in both the Republican and Nationalist zones during the Civil War, whilst, later on, post sent by Spanish refugees residing in camps was subject to censorship by the French military and, during the occupation, the Nazis. Refugees were often worried that their letters home could place the recipients in danger, as Richards states, 'families of prisoners or of those in hiding or enforced exile were expected by the local authorities to suffer'. Many of those inside Spain assumed that, at least in the early-mid 1940s, Francoist officials, often referred to simply as ‘they’ were able to read letters.

A series of letters sent via clandestine means offer further information regarding the impact of Francoist censorship on letters sent from inside Spain, in the late 1940s. Prominent members of the PSOE Ramón Lamoneda, at the time based in Paris was communicating with José López y López, based in Madrid. López y López, aware that he was under observation by the Francoist regime, had developed two systems to communicate with his comrades based outside of Spain: he sent letters via an associate who worked in the French

47 Pearsall, Atlantic Families, p.2.
50 See Entrevista a Florinda San Agustín Labrada, p.102 and Entrevista realizada a Doña Isabel Richart Sotes, p.61.
51 Lamoneda posed as the leadership of the PSOE in exile, in opposition to Prieto, in reality the ‘main organiser of this [essentially ‘Negrinist’] sector’ was the indomitable Julio Álvarez del Vayo, see: Gillespie, The Spanish Socialist Party, pp.64-65, on 23 April 1946 Lamoneda, Álvarez del Vayo, Negrín and 30 others were expelled from the PSOE by Prieto. For an account of Lamoneda’s possible collusion in republican atrocities behind the lines during the Civil War, see: Ruiz, ‘Seventy Years On’, p.471.
embassy and he asked a British journalist, named Oldfried, who periodically visited Madrid, to pass messages on. López y López also described a more risky way to beat the censor:

If our method of communication [via the French embassy] should fail, I will use the method used by my companion in the Daily Herald, even if only to send things to you all, given that with airmail they usually only censor eight or ten letters of every 100, I would do it without signing my name and in the same way he [Oldfried] writes to me.

The use of code-names, as well as the adoption of tactics like not signing one’s name, demonstrates that concealed messages were also passed through normal means. Letters sent between 1949 and 1952 from PSOE member Patricio Cruz Dorronsoro in San Sebastián to Manuel Albar Catalán in Mexico also show how those in Spain could adopt turns of phrase to fool the censor: when describing his failure to leave Spain in 1939, he said he had ‘missed the train’, and he referred to the ‘sanatorio’ (hospital) and illness, when he talked about his time in prison and the repression of fellow socialists.

Whilst all post was likely to be censored during the Civil War, fewer letters were censored in the late 1940s and probably fewer still in subsequent decades. However, if you were under observation from the regime as a result of your political activity or were suspected to be involved in anti-Francoist activities, then it was dangerous to include sensitive information in written correspondence sent via conventional means. Irrespective of whether censorship existed as a bureaucratic reality, embedded in institutional practices, the blurred lines between those who were observed and those who felt they were at risk may also have led to a high level of self-censorship. This self-censoring, adopted by the defeated population within Spain during the Francoist dictatorship, is still in evidence in the testimonies of elderly Spaniards and has been effectively documented by ethnographic

---

52 His contact was the: ‘Chargé d’Information et de Presse á l’Ambassade en la Embajada de France en Madrid’, Letter from José López y López (Madrid) to Ramón Lamoneda (France) (un dated but sent before 12 Feb. 1947), FPI, Archive of Ramón Lamoneda Fernández (ARLF), Correspondencia, 166-14-02; Telegram from Oldfried to Lamoneda, (pre 13 Aug. 1947) FPI: ARLF-166-14-21.

53 Letter from López y López to Lamoneda (29 April 1947) FPI: ARLF-166-14-08.

54 One code name in use was: ‘Plus Ultra’, Letter from López y López to Lamoneda (15 March 1947) FPI: ARLF-166-14-03.

55 See for example, Letter from Cruz to Albar (7 Nov. 1949) FPI: AMAC-159-11. Cruz was imprisoned several times, and, as this series of letters powerfully conveys, his family and friends were decimated by the Francoist repression. In 1952 he was arrested whilst in possession of ‘lists naming national and provisional leaders’, which contributed to almost complete destruction of the PSOE in the interior: see Gillespie, *The Spanish Socialist Party*, p.161.
fieldwork conducted by Layla Renshaw in two towns in Northern Spain. The historian Antonio Cazorla Sánchez similarly evokes the culture of fear created by Francoism, which may well have inflected the letters sent from Spain from 1939-1975. In fact, the decision to self-censor may not have been a conscious one on behalf of the correspondent.

The chaos of the exodus, the many difficulties created by the Second World War and the repression enacted by the Francoist regime created immense barriers for those who had been separated as a result of the Spanish Civil War. Not only was it hard to locate one another, particularly because refugees and those within Spain were often required to move around a great deal in search of work, it could also be hard to express exactly what you meant when you did locate one another. Using the three terms ‘righteous defeat’, ‘unmitigated loss’ and ‘release’ as guides, I will now demonstrate how people conceptualised their separation from one another and how this helped them to adapt to or cope with both exile and Francoism.

**Righteous defeat**

In December 1945 Fermín Astudillo, based in Middlesex (UK), wrote a letter to his friend Carlos Esplá, who was living in Mexico DF. Astudillo was a leading Republican activist in the UK, who had left his wife and daughter in Spain, as he explained to his friend on Christmas Eve:

> Politics, through Izquierda Republicana (Left Republican party, IR) is the love of my life. It has caused me to sacrifice much, most clearly and always present in my heart, is being separated from my wife and daughter for over seven years, who find themselves in Spain, in a distressing situation. I don’t think that my case is exceptional; on the contrary and unfortunately thousands of Spaniards are in a worse situation than I am. I remain, despite all of these calamities, faithful to my ideals, and if History were to repeat itself, I would do exactly the same, with the same faith and conviction with which I acted in July 1936, that is to say, as I have acted throughout my life.

At the time, Astudillo was working in a factory for nine hours each day before dedicating three or four hours of work (he estimated) to IR. His cheap lodgings and his factory job suggest that he could not afford to bring his family over to the UK, whilst his passionately

---

57 Cazorla Sánchez, *Fear and Progress*, pp.18-37.
58 Letter from Fermín Astudillo (Middlesex, UK) to Carlos Esplá in (Mexico, DF) (24 Dec. 1945) CDMH, Archivo de Carlos Esplá, 11/7152.
expressed political commitment imply that he could not envisage a safe return to Spain. The way in which Astudillo juxtaposed his love of politics with the painful separation from his family indicates that he wished to present his situation as a trade-off or a cross that he had to bear. His reference to ‘History’ with a capital ‘H’ effectively positions his own experiences, beliefs and actions in a grander context: citing the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War in July 1936, he demonstrates that his current exile and separation from his family is the logical consequence of a political and moral conflict which is not yet resolved.

The nature of the letter and the archive is important as well. Astudillo was writing to a friend but Esplá was also involved in organising Republican party-politics in exile. It was in Astudillo’s interests to prove to Esplá that he was a man who would continue to endure suffering for his political ideals. Perhaps Astudillo sometimes felt that the sacrifices he had made were not worth it but in this letter he employs stirring language to suggest otherwise.

Whilst Astudillo’s Christmas Eve letter clearly made a connection between the sacrifices he was required to make and his continued commitment to Republican politics, other refugees used images and stories to demonstrate the righteousness of their cause in more humorous, less explicitly political ways. Descriptions of sending money home could form part of these stories. Evidence of money transfers is stored in personal archives: receipts or telegrams containing the details of how much money was sent and Western Union (a global money transfer company that still operates) papers confirm that it was relatively easy to send money home. Interviewees describe sending ‘giros’ via the postal service or via telegram, which were (and still are) cheques which were sent by the remitter, to be accepted and cashed by the recipient. In Mexico, several cafes belonging to Spanish refugees acted as points of exchange and communication: refugees could send coffee, clothes and other goods to Spain with ease.

Speaking in 1979, Ramón Esturau, then living in Mexico, described sending his father ‘a giro cheque for 100 dollars, 150 dollars’, at an unspecified time. In 1939, he had retreated into France with his regiment, under the command of the communist General Lister. After the regiment was stripped of their arms, a number of soldiers were sent to prison in Montpelier. Esturau was later released because he had been granted passage to the

---


61 See for example, Author’s interview with Carmen Romero, 12 March 2013, part 4.
Americas, which meant he was transferred to a section of Agde camp reserved for those going to Mexico. Throughout his time in France, he appears to have received financial support from SERE and, when he was in prison, directly from Juan Negrín who sent 12,000 francs in aid of the imprisoned soldiers. In Mexico, he moved to Guadalajara and eventually set up a convenience store selling ‘imported goods’ to relatively well-off customers. Before 1939, he had lived in Cuba for several years and continued to receive money from contacts there. He appeared not to need this money himself so he sent it to Spain, as he recounted to his interviewer, the historian Dolores Pla:

it was processed there and my late father, a campesino (land labourer) then went to the taverns and looked at the giro and said: ‘Do you read, because I cannot read anymore. What is this that my son has sent me?’ The people he did with this were mostly Francoist individuals. So they said, ‘Coño, [Fuck me] well, this is amazing, there are 150 dollars here!’ ‘Hombre! [Man!] Well if he is sending me 150 dollars it means my son must be doing very well in [Latin America!], right?’ So he [Ramón’s father] did that to rub it in to all these guys who did not share his son’s politics. And that’s not to say that my late father was a man of the left, because he wasn’t; he had militated for a right-wing party. But well, above all, he supported his son.

In this story, Esturau conceptualised his distance from Spain in terms of righteous defeat. Why else would the public scene in the tavern have assumed such importance in the telling and re-telling of this anecdote? The stupendous amount of money, 100 or 150 US dollars, is shown off to a group of Francoists who are forced to see that Esturau, a ‘red’ whose politics is not to their liking, has achieved stability and success in Mexico. Esturau described his father as showing the Francoists the cheque ‘para hacer sufrir a ellos’, which I have translated as ‘to rub it in’ but which could also be translated as ‘to make them suffer’. A refugee living in relative prosperity in Latin America, Esturau was able to assert his moral worth from afar; his money proving the lie in Francoist descriptions of the ‘reds’ as immoral, despicable troublemakers. This story also evokes the classic tale of the Spanish immigrant (indiano) who returns from ‘doing America’ – ‘hacer la América’ is the phrase used to describe going to make one’s fortune in the Americas – with his pockets stuffed with cash, in order to boast about his achievements in front of the citizens of his former village.

62 Details of experiences in France: Entrevista al Señor Ramón Esturau, realizada en su domicilio particular, por Dolores Pla, los días 21, 22, 23 y 24 de Noviembre de 1979, en la ciudad de Guadalajara, Mexico, PHO/10/61, Libro 116, pp.95-102. Esturau’s shop in Mexico is described in the prologue written by interviewer.
63 Entrevista al Señor Ramón Esturau, pp.174-5.
64 For a brief overview of Francoist discourse and policies towards the ‘reds’ see: Cazorla Sánchez, Fear and Progress, pp.19-23.
The scene in the tavern demonstrates how refugees situated their ‘private’ experience of separation in a broader context, as a way to reconfirm their political identity. Those living within Spain could also position their experience of separation in the wider context of the exile and the righteousness found in defeat. In 1960 Ramón Ariño Fuster, who was provincial deputy of Madrid during the second Republic, sent a letter, through an anonymous intermediary to avoid the censor, to his friend, the previously mentioned Carlos Esplá. Ariño described his reaction to the ‘long and punishing years of his imprisonment’ at the hands of the Francoist regime. He states that ‘During long years existing at the edges [or margins] of other peoples’ lives, my memories of and affection and respect for absent friends has never wavered’. Ariño’s letter shows that he felt connected to the Spanish exiles by a common experience of separation and suffering, which could also overcome political differences:

Nowadays, back at home with my family, after so much bitter and sad solitude, so much injustice and cruelty, so much oblivion, my thoughts are with those who are absent for the crime of thinking that freedom and democracy are better and more functional than tyranny – and also more elegant; so I ask you to send my solidarity and sincere affection to all those who feel the pain of absence [who are in exile], whatever their particular way of thinking [politics].

In this case then, the realisation that everyone who had lost the civil war suffered similar consequences, whatever their political background, prompted a feeling of solidarity. Ariño was able to draw some small solace from a shared ideological standpoint, in the face of the suffering he had experienced. The ‘absence’ of the exiles, as well as the injustice he had endured, both came as the consequence of a strong commitment to ideals that were ‘better and more functional than tyranny’.

Using similar language, José Coll Creixall, based in Barcelona, expressed his opinion of Spain in a letter to his friend, Rafael Heras, a refugee and fellow member of the Spanish cooperative movement in October of 1958:

In Spain there is a sense of unrest (malestar), mostly because of the economy, which is getting worse. But the Spanish who have culture and sensibility and who live looking towards Europe, cannot forget the Biblical phase ‘man cannot live on bread alone’ and we wait and we suffer.

65 Reference to the ‘intermediary’ in CDMH archive summary.
67 It is not clear whether Coll sent the letter via clandestine means or through normal routes.
In the same letter, José Coll states that in Spain ‘there is no political or social life’ and that ‘the people are going to lose their faculties for thinking and acting’, having already lost ‘their faith in the future’; like Ariño, he positions himself as standing apart from the Spanish status quo.\(^{68}\) In 1960, Coll, as Heras referred to him, stayed abreast of European news by reading French newspapers such as *Le Monde*, which he collected from the Institut Français (French Institute).\(^{69}\) He saw himself as part of a group of people living both inside and outside Spain who imagined an alternative to Francoism: the collection of letters make it clear that Coll attempted to resurrect the Spanish co-operative movement, for example, although to the best of my knowledge he did not achieve his aim. Coll nonetheless conceptualised his distance from Heras as one resulting from a shared and valuable political identity; irrespective of the distance between them, he felt closer to Heras, than to the average Spaniard, who was apparently liable to lose ‘their [faculty] to [think]’ at any moment.

Other letters in Heras’ archive also show how the experience of separation and distance became intertwined with a feeling of closeness and camaraderie in defeat. In a letter that re-established contact between two members of the Spanish co-operative movement in 1952, for example, Señor Don Félix Zarza described how he had maintained some knowledge of his friend Heras:

> Your letter of the 17th caused me a great deal of joy and satisfaction: joy to know directly from you that you are alive and kicking and the satisfaction to know that you haven’t forgotten your old friend. | I haven’t forgotten you either and I knew from your brother, who I asked about you the two times I saw him, that you were well.\(^{70}\)

Small networks of friends shared information and located one another through chains of people. An unknown correspondent based in Valencia, asked Heras about various mutual friends in 1953:

> If you know where Mauri is, could you let me know, it’s been quite a long time since he replied to me. Every now and then I see Arroyo, in his journeys […] Of our Madrid friends I only know of Freire, and poor Tutor, I had the opportunity to

---

\(^{68}\) Both quotations: Letter from José Coll Creixell (Barcelona) to Rafael Heras (Bordeaux) (1 Oct. 1958) FLC: ARH, correspondencia con españoles cooperadores, 53-5.

\(^{69}\) See: Letter from Rafael Heras to José Coll Creixell (13 Aug. 1952) in which Heras calls his friend ‘Coll’; In a letter sent in 1960 Coll mentioned that he obtained French newspapers from the embassy or the Institut Français: Letter from José Coll Creixell to Rafael Heras (15 Jan. 1960), both FLC: ARH-53-5.

\(^{70}\) Letter from Sr. Don Félix Zarza (Bilbao) to Heras (23 Jul. 1952), FLC: ARH-53-5.
talk to him on the phone two days before he died. My heart seemed to tell me that this call would be the last time I talked to him.\(^\text{71}\)

These fragile networks were not confined to a particular geographical location but rather particular groups of people, whether they were united by a familial bond, friendship, political kinship or more generally the common experience of living in the shadow of defeat. The benefits of living outside of Spain – which could include an uncensored postal system and access to global news – meant that refugees were often in a better position to keep in touch with a greater variety of people.

Indeed, Spanish refugees were sometimes able to take on the role of aid-giver to the defeated within Spain, subverting the image of refugees as victims. The work of the Comité de Apoyo al Pueblo Español, Aid Committee for the Spanish People, provides us with an example of this aspect of communication between the defeated inside and outside of Spain. The committee was based in Mexico DF and managed by the poet León Felipe and María Tarragona (both Spanish refugees). It was a small operation, in action from 1964-1975, which essentially consisted of María Tarragona’s hard work in sending letters and money to families whose relatives had been imprisoned by the Francoist regime.\(^\text{72}\)

Correspondence sent from all over Spain to María Tarragona provides us with some idea of what the money and letters sent from Mexico meant for recipients. As Mercedes Vall de Conill wrote in early 1970: ‘The very fact that you thought of my son Jorge during the festive period means I must consider you a good friend, even so far away, you remember those who remain here, deprived of liberty’.\(^\text{73}\) Whilst Ramón Ariño Fuster’s letter to Carlos Esplá was written in a literary, almost poetic style, the letters from those who received support from the Committee were more informal and colloquial. They also tend to focus more on the problems of day-to-day life, forcefully conveying what life was like for the

\(^{71}\) Letter from ‘unknown’ (Valencia) to Heras, (5 May 1953), FLC: ARH-53-5.


Correspondents emphasise the lack of work, the need to travel and emigrate to find work and a shortage of financial resources. They explain how, in the late 60s, the inflation of the prices of basic goods affected them and how difficult it was to visit their relatives in prison, particularly because they were often situated very far from their houses, at a time when public transport was not cheap. The following words from Felisa Ayuso Delgado, who was María’s cousin, in 1966, are representative:

Very grateful for your attentions and the rest of the family, well the money you send [fits our circumstances] one fails to deal with life, simply just [finding] things to eat, clothes and footwear, the prices are sky high and I am not [even] talking about the sale of houses, this verges on madness, suffice it to say that in the house next to mine the neighbours pay 800 pesetas a month and when they left the new ones who have arrived now pay 2,000 pesetas and without any kind of tidy up. This little sketch shows [how] you have to battle […] to live badly.

Felisa’s husband Nicholas had spent 25 years in Burgos prison, an experience which had left him with chronic breathing problems and a propensity to contract chest infections. The money from Mexico helped Felisa and her family survive, to buy Christmas presents for one another or allow Nicholas to take a holiday to recuperate from his periodic illness. Other letters in the archive also demonstrate how those who received support from Tarragona felt more secure as part of a group of people who shared ideals and support. In 1966, Wladimir Ruiz Vega, a recipient of the Committee’s support who had just emigrated to Paris, stated that: ‘Our pride and our great satisfaction is that the cause, which people
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74 Graham estimates that 500,000 women were forced to support their families alone, as male relatives were incarcerated or executed in the 1940s: 'Gender and State: Women in the 1940s', in Spanish Cultural Studies, p.188. For the experiences of one prisoner and his wife, who became extremely ill whilst her husband was in prison in the 1970s, see: Ruiz García, José María “Pepín.” Testimony of the Spanish Civil War and the Francoist Dictatorship. University of California, San Diego, 2008, part 4, 9-13 minutes.

75 The connections between labour migration, poverty and being one of the defeated are not necessarily clear but are often confirmed by personal testimonies. See for example, Fernández Morelo, Ana. Testimony of the Spanish Civil War and the Francoist Dictatorship. University of California, San Diego, 2008, whose family were ‘red’ and whose husband worked in Switzerland for 6 years.

76 Letter from Felisa Ayuso Delgado (Eiber, Spain) to Tarragona, (18 May 1966), AEM: Comité de Apoyo, 42, 400.18.

77 Letter from Ayuso (Eiber), to Tarragona, (20 Dec.1965), 42, 400.23.

78 Letter from Felisa Ayuso in Vitoria, Spain, to Tarragona (DF), (30 Dec. 1967), 42, 400.23.
used to describe as the business of ‘crazies’, is the craziness of thousands, it is the
dementedness of hundreds of thousands’.  

Unmitigated loss
The sense of belonging to a group of people who shared concern for one another and a
commitment to resisting Francoism was often intertwined with feelings of exhaustion,
doubt and despair. Whilst the letters written in 1940s, 50s and 60s by Astudillo, Ariño and
Coll, amongst others, alongside the interview with Ramón Esturau in 1979, demonstrate
how refugees were able to situate their separation from family and friends in a broader,
righteous struggle, they also betray how difficult it was to maintain this stance. For some,
the nature of their experience or the extent of their suffering prompted more pessimistic
accounts of separation. For others, the pain elicited by missing those they had left behind
simply could not be alleviated by assertions of righteousness or what Clifford astutely
defines as ‘stubborn visions of renewal’.  

Jose Marull was the only member of his family to leave Spain permanently and settle in
Mexico in 1939, aged 27. His father, mother and brother returned to Spain after crossing
over with him to France with the retirada. They did so because they had seen Francoist
leaflets stating that those refugees without ‘blood stained hands’ would be safe from
reprisals, so they believed that they would not be in danger from Franco’s regime or their
fellow citizens. The regime subsequently imprisoned Jose’s father for over a year and
during this period of incarceration, Jose recounted, his leg was amputated after his diabetes
reached a critical condition and the authorities would not release him for treatment. In a
way which juxtaposed the severing of his father’s leg and the severing of future prospects,
Jose Marull also told his interviewer that some people we might assume were Francoist, he
described them only as ‘they’, prevented his mother and brother from resurrecting the shop
they had run for many years. Whilst the taped version of the interview is unavailable, it
seems clear that Jose described his family’s fate with great anger and sadness. He repeated
phrases and words in a way which conveys the extent of the damage done:

79 Letter from Wladimir Ruiz Vega (Paris) to Tarragona (28 Aug. 1966) AEM: Comité
de Apoyo, 42, 400.21.
80 Clifford, Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century, (London: HUP,
81 He later brought his mother over from Spain to live with him, after the death of his
father. See Entrevista a Jose Marull, pp.105-106
82 Entrevista a Jose Marull, p.45.
they stole absolutely everything, they stole everything; they cleaned them out, they
cleaned them out, they went there to look for any little thing, there to look for it,
there to look for it; they robbed [my family] up to the eyeballs, everything,
everything, everything. I was sending them money the whole time I was here, I sent
them money; they amputated my father’s leg, I also sent him money; I, well, from
the first…two months of being here, or three, I sent them the first three hundred
pesos and every month I sent them money.\textsuperscript{85}

The Marull family’s experience shows how sharply the lives of refugees and their families
and friends within Spain could diverge: Marull was not rich in Mexico but neither was he
subject to persecution of the kind his relatives endured.

Whilst Esturau’s account of sending money home focused on the glorious moment when
his father displayed his giro cheque to the assembled throng of Francoists, Marull’s
description is much more subdued. Given the persecution his family endured, it is not
surprising that his experience of separation from them equated to suffering and loss above
all. Assertions of righteousness although they certainly did exist in his interview are less
evident in this context. Although he makes no explicit mention of this, Marull’s distance
from his family may well have placed them in greater danger and his identity as a ‘red’ in
exile might have formed part of the reasons why his father was imprisoned and his family’s
business targeted. The money he sent ‘home’ helped his family survive but it may also have
helped him to allay his own feelings of powerlessness provoked by being unable to protect
his relatives in a more concrete way. It is significant that he interspersed his account of the
persecution of his family with mentions of the money he sent over: ‘they robbed [my
family] up to the eyeballs […] I was sending them money the whole time I was here […]
they amputated my father’s leg, I also sent him money’.

Repetition or unexpected phrases in interviews provide us with clues as to how narrators
confronted their life experiences and emotions. As we saw in the previous chapter,
Florinda San Agustín Labrada remained in Spain until 1946, when she travelled to Mexico
(via Cuba) with her son. The years apart from her husband had not prevented them from
maintaining a relationship but their separation nevertheless acted as a barrier towards the
continuation of married life. In one exchange with her interviewer, San Agustín described
the way she felt on reuniting with her husband:

I – And had things changed much between you and your husband after ten years of
separation?

\textsuperscript{85} Entrevista a Jose Marull, p. 47.
FS – No because when we wrote to each other, of course I burnt all the letters a short time ago, all of them; we wrote to each other as if we were just around the corner from each other. Our relationship… the only thing is that… well, this is a little bit of an intimate thing, no? That…when I arrived, I said to him ‘Look: I am not going to ask more than one thing of you, that you, that you don’t try anything on with me until a few days have passed’. Because of course, I knew that he had been with women here…it was a bit hard for me, and yes, he respected my wishes.84

Two aspects of this part of the interview draw our attention to the strain placed on relationships split apart by the civil war. First, San Agustín’s rather abrupt assertion that she ‘burnt all the letters’ sent by her and her husband to each other and the immediate juxtaposition of this information with the description of the letters as forming a bridge between them both whilst she was in Spain. Reading that the letters have been burnt, all of them, reminds us how fragile letters are; written on paper, they often convey emotions which change from one day to the next. Secondly, despite the couples’ apparent mutual respect, the difficulties, after so long apart, in resuming a physically intimate, sexual relationship come across clearly. Separation equated to the loss of physical contact with your spouse, child, sibling or friend. In the context of San Agustín’s relationship with her husband, it meant accepting that he (and perhaps she) would find other sexual partners, which was, as she says, hard to come to terms with. Long-term separation from one’s spouse had long-term consequences, with which the defeated continued to grapple throughout their lives. There is a tension between the way San Agustín describes her marriage as enduring and the perhaps incidental but arguably significant insertion of the fact that she had burnt all the letters her and her husband sent to each other. This, once again, demonstrates that the ways in which people speak, and the emphasis they give to certain events, provides us with insight into their lives.

Concepcion Baixeras’ experiences provide a further example of the strain which separation could place on personal relationships. She was born in 1925, so she was approximately 12 when she and three of her siblings were evacuated from Barcelona in 1937 by train to Bordeaux via Port Bou, and by boat from Bordeaux to Mexico (and eventually to Morelia), as part of a group of what is thought to be 463 children.85 As she said, ‘it was the same with everyone from every part of Spain, that they thought this would only last a year, they never

84 Entrevista a Florinda San Agustín Labrada, pp.113-114.
85 Sánchez, Un capítulo de la memoria oral, p.28.
thought it would be forever’. The evacuation had an enormous impact on Baixeras’s life. She and her siblings were schooled and housed, with the other ‘niños de Morelia’, in a large institutional building. They suffered from a lack of real human contact from any of the adults who cared for them and, sometimes, from a lack of basic care. When the Republic lost the civil war, Baixeras said, it became clear that the children would not be able to return to Spain. In her case, her ‘mother was in France, [her] father in Spain”; the situation was chaotic and there was no question of the family being reunited.

Baixeras’s mother returned to Spain from France after some years and lived with her husband and youngest son (Baixeras’s father and her youngest brother, who had not been evacuated to Mexico) until her husband died. At this time, which we can estimate was during the early to mid-1940s, Baixeras’s mother was ‘left with nothing’ and in subsequent years her children in Mexico were able to send her money they managed to save. In Baixeras’s words: ‘whenever my mother had a big emergency, like when my brother was ill or I don’t know, well we made a big effort and we sent her more, we were sending [money] till… for some time’. The family remained in contact, they wrote letters to each other and Baixeras and her siblings provided their mother and youngest brother with financial support. Emotionally, however, the bonds between Baixeras and her mother had been broken by the evacuation to Mexico. Although her mother visited her, she did not come to live in Mexico, a decision Baixeras describes as resulting from her mother’s life being based in Spain. It might have also been related to Baixeras’s estrangement from her mother:

I don’t feel like my mother is my mother […] we are two strangers. We meet up and we don’t know what to say to each other, we are always talking about the same things and there is nothing, nothing, nothing [no hay nada, nada, nada].

Loss, scarcity and ‘nothing’ are ideas or words that Baixeras used often when describing her childhood to her interviewer. She explained how her evacuation to Mexico ‘left her without
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86 Entrevista realizada a la Señora Concepción Baixeras en su domicilio de la ciudad de México, por Dolores Pla, los días 20 y 25 de Julio de 1979, PHO/10/25, Libro 08, p.10.
87 See for example, resignation letter from one of the head teachers of the school, sent to Cárdenas, which outlines the problems faced by the school: AGN, Sección: Presidentes, Lazaro Cárdenas, C.939, (Niños de Morelia), Exp. 550/84, 286.
88 Baixeras describes her mother as returning when the Germans invaded France but it is not clear exactly how long after or how long it took her to reunite with her husband/Baixeras’ father. See: Entrevista a la Señora Concepción Baixeras, pp.145-146.
a family’, ‘without a childhood’ and without her ‘youth’. 

Twice she mentioned a photograph, which her mother gave to her on a visit to Mexico in order to explain or justify why she had sent Baixeras away. The photograph depicted Baixeras’s family in Spain during the civil war, before the four oldest children had been evacuated. Baixeras stated that she and her family looked like survivors of a concentration camp, a phrase that she repeated later in the interview. Her mother focused on this photograph and her children’s appearance in order to justify her actions. Baixeras reported her saying ‘I sent you because of this, I sent you because of this’; the significance of the photograph and the two separate occasions upon which Baixeras talked about it, draw our attention to a conflict between the clear logic of the decision to send the children away and the terrible, life-long consequences that this act created. Baixeras described her mother as feeling ‘empty’ (‘se sintió vacía’) because of the loss of her children but unable to reconnect to them. For Baixeras and her mother, the language of righteous defeat held no significance: Baixeras had no choice about her evacuation and her mother had little choice concerning their continued separation. Mexico did not recognise Spain as a nation or Franco’s regime as legitimate and the governments of Cárdenas and Avila Camacho were unwilling to finance or facilitate the repatriation of most of the niños de Morelia.

Release

Whilst Concepción Baxeiras’ mother felt empty, and she herself felt deprived of her mother’s love, other refugees felt liberated in ‘exile’ and by extension, conceptualised their separation from Spain as a kind of ‘release’. Those who left Spain when they were adolescents or young adults were arguably more likely to characterise their ‘exile’ as an adventure. Carmen Romero, born in 1920, and a Spanish refugee still living in Mexico in 2013, felt that she had been born again on arrival into the Mexican port of Veracruz in her early twenties; she revelled in the tropical heat and the singsong coastal accent. Isabel Richart Sotes, whom we met in chapter one, actually returned to Spain with her daughter in 1939 without her husband, leaving definitively in 1941 to travel to Cuba and reunite with

---

89 Entrevista a la Señora Concepción Baixeras: on sending money: p.146; estrangement, p.148; photograph, p.170.
90 Both quotes, Entrevista a la Señora Concepción Baixeras, p.169.
91 Although some children did return with sponsorship from the Vatican, see: Alted, La Voz de los Vencidos, pp.352-354.
92 Author’s interview with Carmen Romero de Rayo, 12 March 2013, Mexico DF, 22 minutes.
her husband, from where the family later re-emigrated to Mexico. She described what it was like living in Cuba:

I mean that all the shortages of everything we had had [before] in our bourgeois education and all of that, it didn’t matter to us at all. We were in a free country: we were alone, relaxed, free from the pressure or control of mum and dad saying this is good [or] bad and of society, not just mum and dad, it was really freedom from all of it.93

In Cuba, Isabel Richart began to find ways to work and make money sewing clothes and massaging patients in hospital.94 In Mexico, she continued to make money as a masseuse but also worked on radio, writing and assisting her husband who directed plays. In a sense, leaving Spain represented an opportunity to reimagine herself and her future in a way she could not have done at home.

Enrique Tomas had a similar experience. He had left Spain in 1939, spent some months in St Cyprien concentration camp, then left to work in French industry for three months, before travelling by boat to the USA in 1940 and then to Mexico over land. He left his wife in France and she followed him to Mexico in 1942, although they later divorced. In Mexico, he had built a successful career as an architect in Veracruz and had remained an active member of the PCE. In 1980, when he gave the interview, he described the evolution of his and his fellow Spanish communists in Veracruz from being obsessed with Spain, to being more open to life and possibilities within Mexico. He stated, for example, that the communists ‘did not want to put down roots in this country […] we thought that this wasn’t our future, that in a very short time we were going to return to Spain because the political conditions were going to change from one moment to the next’. He judged that this ‘situation obviously changed bit by bit, as time passed, one integrated more’.95 Whilst Enrique Tomas was able to begin to see his future in Mexico, Spain’s future became more remote and less intertwined with his own.

Whilst Tomas integrated into Mexican society, those he had left behind experienced a different fate. When his interviewer asked him whether he had anything in common with his friends in Spain he answered:

94 Entrevista a Isabel Richart, pp.65-66.
95 Both quotations, Entrevista a Enrique Tomas, pp.111-2.
Well, I see myself as belonging with them, but I think they are – clearly, most of them are republicans, right? So Roso, who was republican, and naturally he suffered as a result, he was in prison, etc. a little bit as if they went into their shell. They remained a bit like this, self-absorbed [reconcentrados], you know? Their lives did not change much, no [Sin volar muy lejos, sí]. So this makes me think that I would have been a very different man in Spain.96

Although Tomas sees himself as belonging with his friends within Spain, because they had all fought for the Republic, he also explains how the suffering experienced by those within Spain had caused them to be isolated and insular. I have translated his ambiguous phrase ‘sin volar muy lejos’ as an expression meaning his friends’ lives remained unchanged, but it could literally be translated as ‘without flying far’. This is an interesting turn of phrase because Tomas initially related the process of going into one’s shell with exile, because he had ‘flown’ to Mexico and found his world to be smaller. However, he was able to change his stance towards Spain, and put down roots in Mexico, whilst his friends in Spain appeared to be locked into their isolation, ‘without flying far’. The impact of Francoism did not disappear after the transition to democracy either: in suggesting that he ‘would have been a very different man in Spain’ when he was interviewed in 1980, Tomas implied that particularly horrific experiences had changed his friends in Spain irrevocably. Whilst he does not state this as clearly as Isabel Ríchart, it is clear that Tomas viewed his separation from Spain as having saved him from experiencing the same fate as his friends.

Importantly, and in some ways ironically, conceptualising separation from Spain as a ‘release’ is compatible with conceptualising it as the product of a ‘righteous defeat’. Take again the example of Manuel Díaz-Marta who believed that it was extremely important that high-profile exiles did not fraternise in any way with the regime. When the brilliant architect Felix Candela, who had left Spain for Mexico in 1939 after fighting for the Republic, was invited to give a lecture by the Spanish regime in late 1964, Díaz-Marta advised him accordingly:

Invitations and flattering events for Spaniards who have triumphed are part of the task the dictator [Franco] and his followers set themselves some time ago as a means to eliminate the enemy. Initially it was physical suppression, the lack of freedom, prosecutions and even exile. Now the tactics have changed.97

Just as Franco’s regime attempted to cleanse its image by flattering successful exiles like Felix Candela, exiles were able to use their success, or cite other exiles’ success, as a way to

96 Entrevista a Enrique Tomas, p.142.
improve the image of the Republican cause. In this way, thriving in exile, as both Candela and Diaz-Martí had done, was also a way to prove the righteousness of republican exile. Capitalising on the opportunities available to them outside of Spain, these elite refugees were able to show how much better and more capable they were than those they had left behind. Thus, their detachment from Spain was later proven to be the greatest tribute they could have paid to their homeland, showing how a feeling of ‘release’ could also bolster a posture of ‘righteous defeat’.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has sought to convey something of what happened after the initial stages of the Spanish exile. Families, friends and political companions were split apart and they often remained apart for the entirety of the Francoist dictatorship, if not permanently. This meant that different halves of one family, for example, could experience hugely different fates in the post-Civil-War period. Much of the time, those who stayed in Spain suffered at the hands of the Francoist regime. Nameless representatives of the regime persecuted José Marull’s family and destroyed their business, whilst Francoist authorities imprisoned his father. Concepción Baxeiras’ mother, father and youngest brother were forced to leave Spain as Nationalist troops advanced, later returning to endure a life of poverty. Letters describe the ways in which people attempted to locate their friends and family and share information: ‘If you know where Mauri is […] Every now and then I see Arroyo […] Of our Madrid friends I only know of Freire, and poor Tutor’.

This was also an experience which those inside and outside Spain shared. I am unwilling to say that the ‘defeated’ were the only group to live with separation from one another because the Spanish population who in some sense of the word were the ‘victors’ were also liable to have relatives who were refugees. As we have seen, however, figures like José Coll Creixell and Ramón Ariño Fuster who lived inside Spain situated themselves as part of a wider group of people who represented an alternative to Franco’s Spain. This group of people was, evidently, ‘transnational’ – it constituted refugees living across the world and ‘the defeated’ within Spain.

The ways in which refugees expressed their experience of separation also demonstrates that the language of righteous defeat allowed them to draw meaning from often very difficult
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98 Letter from ‘unknown’ (Valencia) to Heras (Bordeaux) (5 May 1953), FLC: ARH-53-5.
situations. The letters written by Astudillo, for example, show how he was able to interpret separation from his wife and daughter living in Spain as an integral part of his political identity as a member of IR. In a way which I think is very striking, he asserted that all of his suffering and sacrifice were for a higher cause and that he would do it all again if he had do. Ramón Esturau, in a different but comparable way, demonstrated how he conceptualised the distance between him and his father as something that served to prove his success and superiority. Esturau’s vivid description of the Francoist men who were surprised by the amount of money he was able to send home shows how fiercely he wished to refute the idea that he was somehow not worth more than his father’s right-wing associates.

Feelings of great sadness and loss were not always expressed in the language of righteous defeat. At the very least, many refugees did not wish to foreground the global or political significance of their personal suffering. This was partly because of the level of suffering they had been required to undergo or the circumstances under which they were separated from loved ones. Concepcion Baxeiras effectively lost her mother when she was 12 years old and she does not describe herself as a politicised child, so it was hard for her to ascribe this event with a broader ideological significance. Jose Marull’s family were very badly treated under Francoism and he was unable to do anything to stop this from happening; feelings of powerlessness must have shaped the way he responded to and described this situation. At the same time, many of those who suffered a great deal still positioned their experiences in a narrative of righteous defeat. Perhaps differences in people’s subjective experiences of events account for the way they described them in letters or in later years: this is similar to what Roper calls the ‘underlay’, the ‘psychic’ reasons why certain memories are expressed in particular ways and others are not.99

A combination of external and internal factors also accounted for the more optimistic ways in which some refugees conceptualised their separation from both Spain and those residing in Spain. Refugees who had not left anyone behind because their loved ones had travelled with them had less call to view their separation from Spain as a cause for sadness. It was also logical that those who had been unhappy in some ways within Spain and Spanish society were at least partly glad to escape, viewing their exile as an adventure. This chapter has demonstrated how the three terms ‘righteous defeat’, ‘unmitigated loss’ and ‘release’ help us to arrange the ways in which we think about refugees’ experience of separation.

However, it has also demonstrated that refugees’ responses to separation were not fixed in time, nor were they necessarily related to external factors.

It is also true that much of what refugees and those they were separated from experienced must remain hidden, feelings that were as long as a lifetime and impossible to effectively communicate. In 1946, a Spanish refugee named Antígono sent a letter from Paris to his cousins Rafael Heras and his wife María, living in Bordeaux. They had not heard from each other since they had been together in Barcelona in 1938. Antígono wrote:

I can’t tell you much which is not about misery or calamities (and this is not worth recounting) I will only say that after the concentration camp, I worked in farming and transportation in Germany – I’ve been in Paris three months now, doing an electrician course organised by the Labour Ministry. I’ll be here till the course finishes and then we’ll see.100

Antí, as his cousins knew him, described the consequences of his exile in simple phrases: dwelling on the details of what happened is translated literally as not being worth the pain (‘no vale la pena’). The brief narration of experiences does not give us a clear indication of what impact they had on the narrator, except that during the moments in which he wrote, he preferred to focus on the present and future rather than the past.

The silence which Cousin Antígono (or ‘Anti’) wished to inhabit and his statement that all the misery he had been through was not worth recounting, draws our attention to how difficult it must have been (and still is) for so many people to try and convey what they had lived through. That is to say, it draws our attention to the importance of what people did not write, as well as what they did write.101 The organisers of the SCWMP, which has interviewed over a hundred Spanish people, suggest that the collapse of language as a reaction to the trauma enacted by past experiences should be documented as an integral part of how we interpret historical events, which is why they filmed their interviews.102

When it comes to analysing letters, however, the historian will rarely see the drafts unsent

100 Letter from Antígono (Paris) to Rafael y María Heras (Bordeaux) (30 Nov. 1946), FLC: ARH, correspondencia con su familia e hijo. For more information on Spaniards who were forced to work in various capacities Nazi Germany, see for example: José Luis Rodríguez Jiménez, Los esclavos españoles de Hitler, 1. ed. (Barcelona: Planeta, 2002).
101 Verónica Sierra Blas talks about the role of what is left out of letters as well, in: ‘The Kiss of Death: Farewell Letters from the Condemned to Death in Civil War and Post-war Spain’, The European Legacy 16:2, 2011, p.182.
or thrown away. We should perhaps remain respectful of how the authors chose to shape their narratives, of what they left in, rather than speculating about what they left out.

Antígono also asked his cousins Rafael and Maria Heras to tell him what happened to them. During the eight years apart he had ‘thought many times about how [they] got through this ordeal’; the word ‘ordeal’ probably referring to the triple calamity of the end of the civil war, escape from Spain and the mass upheavals and population displacements which France experienced during the Second World War. As we might intuitively suppose, bonds between people are maintained in absences through imagination and thinking about someone and wondering whether they are well; stating this is in a letter is also a way of expressing continued affection, reassuring your correspondent and flattering them. In the case of this letter, the phrase has an implication for the study of history because it reminds us that images of crowds of refugees or inmates in a concentration camp can sometimes lead to the dehumanisation of their subjects. In fact, each person in such a photograph had an inner life and a wealth of memories and thoughts.

Many of the refugees, who wrote to those in Spain, did so knowing they would never see their friends or relatives again. Over the course of the Francoist dictatorship, however, it became easier to return to Spain either for short visits or permanently but the ‘orthodox’ idea that it was treacherous to maintain close contact with Spain extended to physical return: those who returned to Spain were sometimes referred to as ‘rojos arrepentidos’ or ‘repentant reds’. The following chapter will explore the subject of refugees who returned to Spain prior to Franco’s death, showing how they coped with both the idea that they had betrayed their companions, and the difficulties of re-settling in their former home.

---

3. Returning Spanish refugees from France and Mexico, 1939-1975

On November 15, 1971, Spanish Refugee Aid Incorporated (SRA) sent a letter to potential donors. It began: ‘there are two questions which always seem to come up: “You mean there are still refugees from the Spanish Civil War living in France?” and “Why don’t they go back to Spain?”’ It went on to explain that 60,000 Spanish refugees remained in France in 1971 and that many of them were living out their last years in poverty, quoting grateful refugees who had received donations and advertising a scheme whereby donors were able to ‘sponsor a refugee’ with a monthly payment. Some of the refugees supported by SRA outlined two reasons why they had not returned to Spain. On the one hand, they feared persecution and imprisonment and on the other, they could not do something which, it seemed to them, would betray those who had died in the fight against Fascism. According to ‘Fernando L.’ it was preferable to ‘live off charity than to be a traitor to a million dead’.

SRA was a charitable organisation set up by a group of left-wing intellectuals in the USA in 1953 in order to provide financial and practical support to refugees living in France. It helped those who had arrived in France as the Civil War ended, as well as those who had crossed the border in later years, after having been released from Francoist gaols. Refugees who were unable to support themselves for a variety of reasons, ranging from their ineligibility for certain French pensions, to their inability to work as a result of physical or mental disabilities, received financial assistance. SRA was supported by the Liberal Salvador Madariaga, who was himself a Spanish Republican refugee who refused to return to Spain whilst Franco lived, and by a host of radical luminaries including Hannah Arendt and Noam Chomsky.

As Pamela Ballinger said in relation to other groups of refugees, the experience of displacement ‘profoundly unsettled senses of location and belonging’. For many Spanish refugees, re-finding this sense of belonging or ‘home’ had little to do with returning to
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1 Circular letter from SRA, sent to Vicente Llorens, (15 Nov. 1971), Archivo de Vicente Llorens, Correspondencia (1924-1992), Correspondencia recibida por Vicente Llorens (1924-1979), no.3085.

2 ‘Between 1953 and 2006 when SRA, by then a program of the International Rescue Committee, was dissolved, over 5,500 refugees received aid from SRA’ according to the following summary: <http://dlib.nyu.edu/findingaids/html/tamwag/sra_content.html> [accessed 10 Oct., 2013]; Also one circular letter dated 1974 celebrates their 21st year in operation. Circular Letter from SRA (May 22 1974), no.3323.
Spain, rather it amounted to what Ballinger refers to as a ‘journey of transformation’. Some refugees still wanted to return to Spain, however, and over the years this prospect became increasingly feasible. As those quoted in SRA’s letter nonetheless make clear, remaining outside of Spain was invested with moral significance. Refugees who returned were often required to justify their decision on these terms, deflecting accusations of betrayal. At the same time, they experienced similar difficulties and joys to returning economic migrants, adapting to situations and feelings which were in many ways unrelated to their status as refugees.

This chapter will address the experience of refugees who returned to Spain both permanently and for shorter visits before Franco died. The study of returning Spanish refugees has been hampered by a range of practical factors: studies of refugees rely on national archives in the different host countries, as well as oral history projects conducted in host countries, which are thus unable to incorporate the experiences of refugees who returned to Spain to live. Important projects exist, like the ‘EM’ interviews’, or those conducted by Dora Schwarzstein who, in her study of Spanish refugees in Argentina, interviewed refugees who had stayed in ‘exile’, as well as those who had returned to Spain at various stages. However, the work of these oral historians has not translated into an investigation into the connections between refugees’ subjective experience of return and the attitude of the Francoist state. This chapter will therefore juxtapose personal testimonies with Francoist discourse, as evidenced in official decrees and documentation, in order to show how refugees negotiated being labelled ‘red’.

Return during the dictatorship is interesting for two main reasons: one, as the letter from the SRA implies, even ‘a-political’ refugees had to contend with the idea that they were traitors if they set foot within Spain; two, the Francoist regime had consistently defined anyone they considered to be connected to the Republican war effort as ‘criminal’ and, although it issued successive pardons during 1939-1975, this discourse continued to shape how refugees recounted their experiences of return. Being defined as ‘red’ elicited feelings

---


of fear and anger, and created a sense of alienation. In common with chapters one and two then, this chapter will show how refugees responded to the labels that were attached to them, most noticeably in this case by the Francoist regime but also by other refugees, namely, being a criminal red and being a ‘traitor to a million dead’. Throughout the course of this chapter, I will situate refugees’ accounts of their experiences of temporary and permanent return in this context, demonstrating how the themes of firstly, ‘red’ or criminal identity and secondly, betrayal, emerge in personal testimonies. I do not want to imply that these labels and struggles were what defined these refugees but I would like to emphasise how, especially after returning to Spain, refugees described their experiences in these terms.

The third section of the chapter will not focus so directly on the labels and language of the Francoist state; instead it will address the ways in which refugees’ experiences of return were intertwined with their relationships to particular people and places. Dramatic descriptions of the moment of arrival, alongside more laconic and detached accounts of the initial encounter with Spain and Spaniards, show how returning to Spain put pressure on refugees’ notions of ‘home’ and belonging. Many years spent outside of Spain often meant that returning refugees, at least initially, felt out of place in their ‘homeland’. For those who permanently returned to Spain, these uncomfortable feelings were generally subsumed by the need to make a living and build up a life, a necessity which points to one of the main differences between accounts of temporary and permanent return.

Many refugees never returned to Spain or they waited until Franco died. Some were too old, ill or poor to make the journey; many simply did not want to or died before they were able.⁵ Others found ways to ‘return’ without leaving their host country, recreating ‘Spain’ in exile. They bought furniture, antiques or other objects which embodied their experience of Spanish life and helped to create what they defined as a ‘Spanish’ environment.⁶ These efforts were coupled with the cooking of Spanish (or Galician, Asturian Catalan…) food, the maintenance of what were for them Spanish cultural attitudes and the production and consumption of Spanish music, radio programmes, art and ‘tertulias’ or debates.⁷ The existence of large Spanish immigrant communities in countries like Mexico and Argentina

⁵ Something which, Schwarzstein rightly argued should not be forgotten by oral historians working on Spanish exile, who seek to reintegrate the exile into Spanish national history: Schwarzstein, ‘El Exilio de 1939’, p.155.
⁶ See e.g., Author’s interview with Ana María Gaos, 27 May 2013, Mexico DF, 10-20 mins.
⁷ See, e.g., Author's interview with Señora Josefina Tome, 29 April 2013, Mexico DF, 20-35 mins.
facilitated this kind of ‘suspended’ return, which was clearly very important for large numbers of refugees.\(^8\) This chapter will focus only on instances of ‘actual’ return, however, in order to unpack the relationship between Francoist discourse and the subjective experience of physical return.

The decision to return to Spain was often motivated by the desire to reunite with family and friends who had stayed in Spain or the urge to see lost landscapes. Returning refugees wanted to go home and to be in close proximity to the places of their childhood and adult life or, at least, to reconnect with parts of their family from whom they had been apart from for many years. Those who came back permanently had to find somewhere to live and some way to earn money; the severity of these challenges depended partly on what Clifford calls the ‘cross-cutting determinations’ of class or status and partly on the strength of existing social or kinship networks.\(^9\) Based on the ‘EM’ interviews, refugees who had achieved a high level of success in business or a particular profession were far more likely to find it easier to adapt to life in Spain than those whose skills were not in demand, for example. Not only had Spain changed, but for poorer refugees it was also expensive and difficult to return and, like all migrants, these returnees had to demonstrate enormous resilience as plans failed. It was hard to once again pick up everything and settle somewhere else, find work and fulfil different practical and emotional needs. In this way, fear of return was not only a product of the violence of Franco’s regime, it was also fear of failure and a fear that what was once home would now be alien. The moment of arrival in Spain takes on great significance in many personal narratives: descriptions of this event show how complex and ambiguous the feelings stirred up upon setting foot in Spain could be.

The experience of return was shaped by a range of factors, then, not least when someone returned and whether they were rich, poor, young or old. Notwithstanding, I wish to focus here on three themes which emerge in personal testimonies and which help to show us how we might generalise about the experience of return for Spanish refugees: first, the shared sense of being a ‘red’ or a ‘criminal’ and how this was linked to Francoist legislation; second, the ways in which this red identity related to feelings of having betrayed other refugees by returning and third, the more universal problems refugees faced in trying to find a home which no longer existed.
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\(^8\) Despite antipathy between refugees and Spanish immigrants in Mexico, for example, the two groups did begin to mix freely, particularly outside of Mexico DF, where the refugee population was much smaller.

\(^9\) Clifford, Routes, p.12.
Historiography and historical context

To date, the ways in which refugees experienced and talked about returning to Spain – particularly those who returned before 1975 – have not been explored in much depth. Historians of Spanish exile in France have addressed the repatriation or mass return of refugees in 1939 in some detail, focusing on statistics and French policy. Soo has shown how a specific kind of ‘return’ was the primary objective for refugees’ political groups operating in France, a return which was synonymous with the destruction of Francoism, rather than going back under other circumstances.10 Providing more insight into the subjective experience of return, Alted devotes part of her history of ‘the defeated’ in exile to the return of child refugees from the USSR and Mexico, many of whom she was able to interview.11 Although Alted includes extensive quotations from oral histories and letters, she does not explore the impact of factors that affected almost all returning refugees, like the concept of betrayal, for example. Inter-disciplinary accounts of individual exiles do look at these themes, however: María González Pendas’ study of the architects Felix Candela and Jose Luis Sert, for example, contains a sustained discussion of the ways in which they were required to balance their desire to visit, or return permanently to Spain, with accusations of betrayal.12 This chapter aims to build on this recent scholarship by demonstrating how refugees wrestle with the themes of betrayal and political labelling (or identity as ‘reds’) in personal testimonies.

In general, the scholarship on returning Spanish refugees falls into two categories: the first is concerned with physical return to Spain, whether of large groups or particular individuals.13 The second is concerned with anything which is not physical return, namely, political discourses surrounding the longed-for and triumphant return to Spain, reflections on the meaning of return produced by exiled writers and commented on by different scholars and the ‘return’ in recent years of the Spanish exile as a prominent figure in Spanish national history.14 Some work sits in both categories; for example, an increased interest in the return of particular individuals is evidenced by GEXEL’s November 2013 conference entitled, ‘The Republican Exile of 1939, journeys and returns’. This featured
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10 Soo, Routes, pp.200-201.
11 Alted, La Voz de los Vencidos, pp.369-374.
12 María González Pendas, pp.58-60.
13 See for example: Rubio, La Emigración de la Guerra Civil, pp.124-126.
two and half days and 59 papers on the subject of exiles returning to Spain, mostly after Franco’s death, either physically or imaginatively in their literary works.¹⁵ The production of biographies allows scholars to provide rich accounts of the connections between physical journeys and all of the ideas, images and dreams inspired by the prospect of the journey.

Focusing on the ‘elite’ exile, however, tends to propagate a distinction between the exile and the migrant which is not necessarily valid.¹⁶ With regards to the French context, Soo and Pozo-Gutierrez have developed several different categories of return, which apply to Spanish refugees, migrants and inner exiles all ‘returning’ or ‘not returning’ to Spain from France in the period 1939-1990.¹⁷ The breadth of their proposed study is testament to the difficulties in distinguishing between the experiences of migrants and refugees. As shown in chapter one, there is tension between how people saw themselves, how host countries defined them and how the Francoist regime defined them. To investigate the dynamics of this relationship in specific cases, I have cross-referenced oral histories with the official documents produced by the regime on returning refugees in the period 1943-1956, alongside Francoist decrees issued in the period 1939-1969, a technique which has allowed me to look more deeply at how individuals dealt with the tension between their self-conception and their ‘external’ identity as ‘refugees’, ‘criminals’ and ‘traitors’.

Broader academic trends are also important. Long and Oxfeld’s edited collection of essays on the return of migrants and refugees from a variety of nationalities to their homelands is indicative of a movement in both history and social sciences towards addressing the ties which bind migrant communities with those they left behind.¹⁸ This text also shows how we can think of the return of Spanish refugees as having universal as well as specific features. As we saw in chapter two, separation and physical distances do not necessarily signal an end to the relationship between the migrant/refugee and their homeland. Equally, many migrants/refugees never viewed their displacement as permanent; they were always
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¹⁶ Some of the most useful scholarship discusses these two kinds of returning Spaniard alongside each other, see e.g.: Juan Bautista Vilar Ramírez, ‘El Retorno En Las Migraciones Españolas Con Europa En El Siglo XX: Precisiones Conceptuales Y Anotaciones Bibliográficas’, Papeles de geografía, 2003, pp.261–76 (p.262).
¹⁷ Soo and Pozo-Gutierrez, ‘Categories of Return’.
making plans for their eventual return. Scholarship on Caribbean migrants and other
groups demonstrate how common the expectation of return home is to migrant
experience. As Long and Oxfeld state, in an increasingly globalised world, people still
yearn for a feeling of rootedness: they state that only three per cent of the world’s
population live outside of the country in which they were born (thereby slightly skirting
around the fact that many people are prevented from crossing borders freely). Accordingly, although chapter two demonstrated how some Spanish refugees were able to
adapt to their displacement and thrive in their new country, particularly as Franco’s regime
showed no signs of weakening, others never lost the desire to return to Spain.

Refugees may not have seen themselves as returning to ‘Spain’, but they may have seen
themselves as returning to a particular region. The writer José Bergamín, having joyfully
returned to Spain and then been forced to leave once again for his opposition to the
Francoist state, wished to be buried in the Basque country, rather than Spain because he
considered it to be free from Francoist poison. This stance was disingenuous to a certain
extent, as it did not acknowledge the role played by the Basque country and Basques in
supporting Franco’s regime. During the transition to democracy in Spain, as Paloma
Aguilar has argued, Basque Nationalist moral authority was derived from a re-writing of the
past, which defined the Civil War as a foreigner’s war and emphasised the harsh treatment
received by Basques both during and immediately after hostilities, ideas which perhaps do
not accurately reflect how the war was experienced in the region. As we saw in chapter
two, Teresa Fèrriz Roure has argued that whilst what we might term the ‘official discourse’,
which espoused the merits of not adapting to life in Mexico but also condemned return to
Franco’s Spain, predominated until 1945-1950, ‘peripheral discourses’, which espoused the
merits of close communication with those living within Spain and returning to there to live,

19 Robert B Potter, Dennis Conway, and Joan Phillips, (eds.) The Experience of Return
Migration: Caribbean Perspectives, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005); Dennis Conway, and Robert
B Potter, (eds.) Return Migration of the next Generation: 21st Century Transnational Mobility,
(Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).
20 Long and Oxfeld, Coming Home?, p.2.
21 Nigel Dennis, ‘Le premier retour en Espagne de José Bergamín’, in L’émigration: le retour, ed. by Rose Duroux and Alain Montandon, (Clermont-Ferrand: Université Blaise-
Pascal, Centre de recherches sur les littératures modernes, 1999), pp. 501-511.
22 Paloma Aguilar Fernández, ‘Institutional Legacies and Collective Memories: The Case
of the Spanish Transition to Democracy’, in States of Memory: Continuities, Conflicts and
University Press, 2003), pp. 128–60 (pp.138-139).
were more common from 1950-1975. These peripheral discourses were found in journals produced by Catalan exiles. In this way, the return in question was not to Spain, it was to Catalonia. Differentiating between Spain and your village, town or what you held to be an independent country – like the Basque country or Catalonia, was one way to justify the decision to return whilst Franco was still alive.

**Repatriation of Spanish refugees**

It is estimated that over 300,000 people returned to Spain from France in 1939, a subject addressed in different ways by Rubio, Soo and Dreyfus-Armand. Soo tends to characterise this movement as ‘repatriation’, as although some refugees wanted to go back to Spain, many were forced to as a result of French government policy prior to the German invasion, although Soo also highlights the inconsistencies in how policies were implemented in different French ‘departments’. In a similar vein, Jordi Guixé has conducted ground-breaking research on ‘regreso forzado’ or ‘forced return’, demonstrating how Francoist spies worked with the cooperation of French police to forcibly repatriate refugees deemed to be criminally political and dangerous to Franco’s regime in the period 1937-1950. The more conservative Rubio, on the other hand, argues that most refugees chose to return to Spain, downplaying the role of the French government and highlighting the fact that Prieto attempted to arrange for the repatriation of all but the most politically high profile refugees.

The return of significant numbers of refugees in 1939 can be a taboo subject for ‘left-wing’ scholars studying republican exile because it is taken to negate the symbolic significance or legitimacy of the exile. This tension at least partly explains the considerable debate over the exact number of refugees who returned to Spain in 1939, a point addressed by Dreyfus-Armand and discussed at greater length in chapter one. Despite sentences which emphasise one line of argument or the other, however, these historians are in broad agreement over the evidence provided by different sources. The French government
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24 Soo, *Routes*, p.76.
26 Prieto tried and failed to make a deal with Franco, which would have guaranteed the safe return, without subsequent imprisonment, of all but the political elite; Rubio, *La emigración de la guerra civil*, pp.126-127.
certainly encouraged and, in some instances forced, refugees to return, at least until Spanish manpower was viewed as desirable in the face of German invasion.\(^{28}\) Importantly, refugees had very limited information at their disposal. Many, probably the majority, chose to return of their own free will for a variety of personal and practical reasons but this did not make them immune to reprisals once they had arrived home.\(^{29}\)

The term repatriation is also used to refer to the government-sponsored return of child refugees who left Spain for Great Britain, France, other European countries and the USSR and Mexico during the Civil War.\(^{30}\) Repatriation of children who were in Great Britain and the rest of Europe took place from late 1937 onwards. On 1 July 1938 the Delegación Extraordinaria de Repatriación de Menores (Special Delegation for the Repatriation of Minors, DERM) was set up in the Nationalist zone and this was in operation until 1954, when the Servicio Exterior de Falange (Falange Exterior Service) took over their responsibilities.\(^{31}\) With very few exceptions, children who had gone to the USSR were unable to return to Spain prior to 1955 and only 50-70 of the 500 children who had gone to Mexico returned.\(^{32}\) Repatriation programmes often coincided with the interests of refugees given that they provided opportunities for those who otherwise would have been unable to return for financial reasons. Notwithstanding, pressure to go back to Spain was sometimes resisted by child refugees and, in early years, the adults caring for them, following warnings communicated by their families within Spain or the realisation that their parents were imprisoned, had died during the Civil War or were no longer resident in their home town, having fled Spain. Hundreds of files kept on children who had been evacuated to Great Britain note the desperate situations of many of the family members who had been left

\(^{28}\) When the German threat was recognised, Spanish refugees were recruited to provide extra labour and were sometimes enlisted into the French army: Rubio, *La emigración de la guerra civil*, p.129; For more information on the refugees who fought for the French army and liberated France, see: Antonio, *Los Olvidados*.

\(^{29}\) As demonstrated by the experiences of the Marull family, for example, as discussed in chapter two.

\(^{30}\) Processes which have been written about in more detail by several scholars: for repatriation from the USSR and Mexico see: Alted, *La Voz de los Vencidos*, pp. 341-374.

\(^{31}\) Sierra, *Palabras huérfanas*, p.71, for an overview of repatriation of children during and after the Civil War, and the ways in which parents attempted to circumvent official routes, see pp.64-75.

behind: parents killed, houses destroyed, families in exile or wholly lacking any financial resources.\textsuperscript{33}

‘Return’ as a psychological state

Mari Paz Balibrea has posed questions about how we should situate republican exile in a broader debate about modernity and the idea of progress. She suggested that the archetypal individual ‘exile’ has a ‘circular conception of time’, which unites ‘the past with the future of return’ – because returning is equated with going back to the way things were, the exile is in the strictest sense of the word ‘reactionary’ or ‘anti-modern’. Balibrea plays with this notion later in her book, however, suggesting that the inherently marginal status of the exile could also be seen as a critique of the status quo; exile as a theoretical construct is thus not reactionary as such but unsettling, irrefutable evidence that other paths could have been taken and that nations are constructed rather than organic.\textsuperscript{34}

At the same time, what is ‘real’ was often contrasted with the unreality of exile by Spanish exiled writers themselves. In many accounts of return, the exile’s vision of Spain as unchanging, a place fixed in the past and memories, is compared with the living, breathing country. In his essay ‘El Retorno del desterrado’ or ‘The Return of the Exile’, ‘desterrado’ literally meaning someone who has been de-earthed, Llorens meditated on the ways in which both the desire to return and the experience of return were spoken about by republican poets who left Spain as a result of the Civil War and Liberal Spaniards exiled in 1823. The uprooted person (who in this context is a composite of different ideas) is ‘submerged by the past’, someone whose ‘eyes do not see what they look upon, rather what they carry inside’.\textsuperscript{35} For some, Llorens suggested, ‘the patria ceased to correspond with a geographic reality and became instead a species of earthly paradise’. At the same time, real Spain, ‘changeable like life’ was the ‘true’ version, ‘not the unmoving [country] forged in exile’.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{33} Antonio M. S Bert, Niños vascos: Rollo 9, Archivo de la Segunda República Española en el Exilio; see also: testimonies from children who stayed in Great Britain post 1945 quoted in, Bell, p.12; A similar set of difficulties faced Greek child refugees being repatriated immediately after the end of the Greek Civil War, see: Danforth and van Boeschoten, Children of the Greek Civil War, pp.80-81.

\textsuperscript{34} Mari Paz Balibrea, Tiempo de Exilio: Una Mirada Crítica a La Modernidad Española Desde El Pensamiento Republicano En El Exilio, (Barcelona: Montesinos, 2007), on the ‘reactionary’ exile see p.88 and on exile as a critique of the status quo, see p.96.

\textsuperscript{35} Llorens, Literatura, Historia, política (ensayos), (Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1967), pages 10 and 23.

\textsuperscript{36} Llorens, Ensayos, p.27.
Llorens did in fact return to Spain in 1957, and proceeded to spend every summer there (in Jalance) until his death in 1979.\textsuperscript{37}

In his much quoted and lyrical rumination on exile, written in 1977, ‘Fin del Exilio y Exilio sin fin’, ‘End of exile or exile without end’, the communist poet Adolfo Sánchez Vázquez remarked that the exile is ‘always in the air, never touching the ground’. They have not only lost their land but also, consequently, ‘their land as root or centre’. He states that this leads the exile to be blind to his or her surroundings; a similar meaning to Llorens’ statement that the exile cannot ‘see what they look upon’. Sánchez Vázquez goes on to conclude, ‘The decisive thing is not being – here or there – rather how one is - acá o allá - sino cómo se esta’.\textsuperscript{38}

The archetypal inner states evoked by Llorens and Sánchez Vázquez, remind us that physical return to Spain may not have equated to a return home or a return to the idealised and ‘centred’ psychological state which was disturbed upon first leaving (and which may never have existed). In a description of his own state of exile, writer André Aciman describes how he prefers to sit in a New York square and imagine or remember his lost city, Alexandria, than to return to the real place; some returnees may have wished they had done the same, as they found that Spain did not live up to their expectations.\textsuperscript{39} Eva Hoffman’s statement that ‘it may often be easier to live in exile with a fantasy of paradise than to suffer the inevitable ambiguities and compromises of cultivating actual, earthly places’, again reminds us that many refugees chose to recreate Spain in their host countries, enacting a form of ‘suspended return’ rather than making the journey to the ‘earthly place’.\textsuperscript{40}

\textbf{Francoist legislation concerning return: criminalising the refugee}

The distinction between physical and suspended or delayed return is in some ways false because refugees’ feelings, memories and imaginations helped to shape the experience of

\textsuperscript{40} Eva Hoffman, ‘The New Nomads’, in Aciman, p.61.
physical return. Actually setting foot in Spain before 1975 was entirely different in one respect, however, because returnees often had to respond to the Francoist state’s definition of who they were. Francoist policy towards returning refugees provided a backdrop to accounts or experiences of return and I would suggest that in a lot of cases it fundamentally altered them.

In February 1939, the ‘decree of political responsibilities’ defined any kind of support for the Republican war effort as a crime.\textsuperscript{41} Franco ‘placed the responsibility for the Civil War in Republican hands’, which reflected his desire to define ‘the Nationalists, not the legally elected Republican government’ as ‘the legitimate authority in Spain from July 1936’.\textsuperscript{42} Subsequent pardons issued by the regime never redefined support for the Republic as a legal act; they simply forgave those who had committed this ‘crime’, emphasising the supposedly magnanimous nature of the regime:

The state redrew the boundaries of ‘criminality’ so widely as to make imprecise that which actually constituted a crime. Franco, in April 1939, explained: ‘Of course, given the fantastic amount of criminality some mistakes [miscarriages of justice] are inevitable’ […] ‘so-called mistakes’ were built into the mechanism of repression; they were inevitable and desirable since they helped produce an all-enveloping sense of fear from which none but the most highly placed could escape.\textsuperscript{43}

Notwithstanding, recent studies suggest that, within Spain, the majority of political prisoners had secured parole from 1941 onwards.\textsuperscript{44} Furthermore, after the mass return/repatriation in 1939, refugees continued to cross the border from France to Spain in the period 1939-45.\textsuperscript{45} But these returnees were not recorded by the state and there is little way of ascertaining what their experience of return was without conducting studies of

\textsuperscript{42} Ruiz, ‘A Spanish Genocide?’, p.172; it is worth noting that historical accounts of the Spanish Civil War rarely consider the ways in which the legitimacy or illegitimacy of a particular regime or government are a product not just of legal elections but a range of other factors. This is not to say that Franco’s regime was ‘legitimate’, rather to complicate the notion that legitimacy is only conferred by legality or elections.
\textsuperscript{45} See for example: Isabel Aillón Murgi, SCWMP.
particular individuals, families or villages. This chapter draws upon official documentation stored in the Archivo General de la Administración, which refer only to refugees who applied for a state-sanctioned return from 1946 onwards. In these documents, the ‘total’ pardon issued on 9 October 1945 (and another decree issued on 27 December 1946) is the only legislation cited as forming the legal basis for return.\(^4^6\) However, whilst the decree of October 1945 therefore encouraged refugees to apply for an officially sanctioned return, it seems likely that it was issued as a response to an unknown number of refugees already returning of their own volition. Indeed, refugees continued to return clandestinely, disregarding the official procedures, throughout Franco’s dictatorship.\(^4^7\) My analysis of these documents is therefore partly driven by necessity, it is not meant to imply that this was the only means by which refugees returned to Spain.

Some scholars have suggested that 1954 was the first time refugees were able to procure passports from Spanish consulates abroad but it is not clear how this development differed from the decree of October 1945. Alted states that ‘A decree of October 1954 allowed those Spaniards living outside Spain to enter and leave the country, after obtaining a passport from Spanish consulates in their respective countries’.\(^4^8\) She goes on to state that a new decree in 1959 removed a 30 day limit on those visiting but I have been unable to locate these decrees or more detailed references to them. Nevertheless, the year 1954 does reflect important developments in the attitude of Spain to the rest of the world. The pact of Madrid, signed in 1953, saw the Spanish receive financial and military aid from the United

\(^{4^6}\) 9 Oct. 1945, Decree of Pardon, Decreto de 9 de octubre de 1945 por el que se concede indulto total a los condenados por delito de rebelión militar y otros cometidos hasta el 1 de abril de 1939, Limited pardon for those who supported the Republican war effort but a distinction was made ‘between those who fought driven by passions and those who led and excited the masses to the crime or committed acts which are repugnant to any honest conscience’, BOE, 20 Oct. 1945, No. 935, pp.2430-2431, <http://boe.es/datos/pdfs/BOE/1945/293/A02430-02431.pdf> [accessed 27 Aug. 2014]; 27 Dec. 1946, Extension of Decree of Pardon, Decreto de 27 de diciembre de 1946 por el que se prorroga por seis meses el Decreto de indulto de nueve de octubre de 1945, ‘Repeated petitions from Spaniards who, living abroad, have not been able […] to take advantage of the benefits accorded by the Decree of 9 October […] moves the Government to facilitate the return to the Patria of those who show themselves to be repentant of their errors and ready to contribute with their hard work and effort to the resurgence of Spain’, BOE, 27 Jan. 1947, No. 28, p.634, https://boe.es/datos/pdfs/BOE/1947/028/A00634-00634.pdf [accessed 27 Aug. 2014].

\(^{4^7}\) Soo, Routes, p.198.

\(^{4^8}\) Alted, La Voz de Los Vencidos, pp.378-379.
States. This signalled the end of Spanish economic autarky or isolation and facilitated Spanish labour migration to Europe, which may have reduced visa restrictions for returning refugees as well. Finally, in 1969 all of the ‘crimes’ committed before April 1939 were considered to have lapsed or ended but it was not till after Franco died that a total amnesty was ratified, in 1977.

Throughout the period 1939-1975 and arguably during the transition to democracy, an unknown number of refugees would have been in a dangerous position had they returned, even after 1969. Those who had previously been imprisoned by the regime and left Spain after 1939, those who were deemed to have ‘stirred up hatred’ during the Civil War, which was as we have seen an extremely flexible terminology, or high-profile personae non gratae like Juan Negrín (who died in Paris in 1956), for example, would have been at risk irrespective of the content of these decrees. The Spanish socialist leader Francisco Largo Caballero, for example, was prevented from leaving France by the French government, placed on a Nazi hit list by Francoist agents working in France and interned in the Nazi concentration camp Saschenhausen from February 1943 till April 1945. He died in Paris within a few months of his liberation. The answer to the question of whether the danger facing returning refugees was real or perceived, therefore, was dependent on when they returned, how they returned, their political profile, as well as the particular circumstances in the region to which they returned. The individual examples referred to in the rest of this chapter are designed to convey how many different factors contributed to the experience of and fear of return.

49 Franco had previously relied solely on Perón’s regime for wheat imports and other staples, see: Raanan Rein The Franco-Perón Alliance: Relations between Spain and Argentina, 1946-1953, trans. by Martha Grenzeback, (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1993), p.73.


51 31 March 1969, Decree, Decreto-ley 10/1969, de 31 de marzo, por el que se declara la prescripción de todos los delitos cometidos con anterioridad al 1 de abril de 1939, which stated that all ‘crimes’ committed prior to 1 April 1939 were obsolete, that they had ‘lapsed’. However, the vague definition of ‘crime’ would still have been of concern for many, BOE, 1 April 1969, No. 78, p.4704, <http://www.boe.es/diario_boe/txt.php?id=BOE-A-1969-392> [accessed 25 July 2013].

52 The tragic case of Largo Caballero is outlined by Jordi Cuixè, El regreso forzado, pp.12-15.
Negotiating being a ‘red’ and a ‘criminal’

On 2 January 1948, Jésus Sánchez applied to the Spanish consulate in Perpignan so that he might be issued with a visa to return to his home village of Ballobar and be reunited with his wife. In February, after his file had been investigated by various departments of the Francoist state machinery, Sánchez’s application to return was denied. It was alleged that during the Civil War he had committed several murders. Not only had he been a member of the Popular Front, he had also, the documents stated, participated in:

the murders and crimes committed in this locality [Zaragoza, Huesca, Teruel] during the Red [period of control], in folio [X] […] of the aforementioned ‘Causa General de Huesca’, there appears a written account from the Mayor of Ballobar, in which it is said that the red leaders did not interrogate nor judge their victims, they murdered them in a cowardly manner in their own homes […].

In May 1948, he made another application to return and in June and was once again denied entry. At this point, his wife, living in Spain, interceded on his behalf. The correspondence kept in his file states that at the end of August 1948, she, being ‘interested in revising her husband’s file’, had procured a certificate from the mayor of Ballobar, also the leader of the local Falange (or FET de las JONS), the only political party allowed to exist during Francoism. According to the report, she stated that her husband possessed no background of violent or criminal behaviour and presented herself in a ‘courteous and well-behaved’ manner. In late September 1948, the commission reversed their February decision and granted Jesús Sánchez ‘ADMISION’ (admission) to Spain.

Based on this set of documents, Jesús Sánchez was granted approval for his request to return to Spain and would not have fallen victim to reprisals if and when he did return. A combination of his and his wife’s determination, and her connection to a local Falangist officer meant that the accusations of murder levelled at Sánchez were overlooked. Thousands of these files, each containing a different story – of refugees who were granted entry on their first attempt or others who were never granted entry, for example – are available for scrutiny. They provide insight into the workings of the Francoist state and the

---

53 Jesus Sánchez is a pseudonym.
54 Communication from Ministerio de la Gobernación, Dirección General de Seguridad, Jefatura Superior de Policía de Madrid: AGA, (02)081.000, 61/19626, stamped 17 Feb. 1949.
55 Franco’s decree of unification in April 1937 created Falange Española Tradicionalista y de las Juntas de Ofensiva Nacional Sindicalista (FET y de las JONS).
56 This chapter cannot offer an overview of the justice system in Francoist Spain. This is best achieved with recourse to case studies of particular regions, as demonstrated by Julius Ruiz’s study of Madrid in the period 1939-1945: Ruiz, Franco’s Justice.
ways in which some refugees and their families were able to find ways to overturn judgements. What these files cannot tell us, however, is whether Sánchez did indeed return and if he did, to what extent he was able to avoid denunciations or to shake off the label of criminal back in his home town.

Juxtaposing Bernadina Domínquez’ account of her first visit to Spain after leaving during the Civil War with the forms she filled in before returning to Spain, demonstrates in greater depth how refugees negotiated being ‘reds’ and ‘criminals’. Domínquez departed from Spain with her children in 1937, travelling on to Mexico in 1939; almost 17 years later, in 1953, she flew from Mexico to Spain to visit her family, in the company of her daughter Isabel. Earlier in 1953, according to her file, which is kept in the AGA, she made a formal application to return to Spain. She submitted her application to what the documents refer to as ‘the representatives of Spain in Mexico’, rather than the Spanish consulate, due to the severance of diplomatic relations between the two countries. These representatives then sent her application to the head of the (Spanish) Exterior Police department, who received it on 6 May 1953. As we saw in the case of Jesús Sánchez, officials from this department would then have communicated with other government departments, in order to check Domínquez’s statement against any potentially incriminating evidence.

Refugees had to enter their date of birth, the names of their parents, their Spanish address on the day the Civil War broke out, their nationality, marital status and their current address. They were also required to enter a description of their activities during the Civil War and it is this section of the form that varies from application to application. Domínquez’s was short and to the point. I have included it here with the preceding section of the form, written in typically bureaucratic language:

> [...] the applicant makes this request to the Spanish Representation in the hope that they will formally notify them whether, as a result of their conduct in relation to the National Uprising [Civil War], they have responsibilities pending [are guilty of crimes] in Spain, and whether these fall under the remit of the Decrees of general pardon latterly promulgated [in Oct. 1945]. To this end,

> The applicant declares (2): [Domínguez writes] “Not to have criminal responsibility of any kind, before, during or after the National Movement.

---

57 Entrevista realizada a la Señora Bernadina Domínguez Gómez, viuda de Mendez Aspe, en la ciudad de México, por Maltide Mantecon, el día 3 de abril de 1979, PHO/10/16, Libro 34, p.56.
58 AGA stores files on refugees who returned between 1943 and 1956, and do not have files pertaining to later dates. I have not been able to find out whether this is because they never existed, have been misplaced or because they are stored in another archive.
The applicant left Spain in order to look after the education of her children in France and to establish herself afterwards as a business woman in Mexico. She left by boat from Santander.”\textsuperscript{59}

Dominguez did not lie; she did leave Spain in order to look after the education of her children and she did then establish herself as a businesswoman in Mexico. Unsurprisingly but significantly, she makes no reference to her husband’s work for the Republican government as one of the more important reasons why she left Spain. Instead she emphasises her gender – her role as a mother, caring for her children – and her status as an economic migrant looking to settle in a new country. Thus we should interpret this form not as a ‘personal testimony’ as such (referred to in the title of this thesis) but as a testimony that was both personal and determined by bureaucratic requirements. On the 2 September 1953 in Madrid, the ‘Fiscal Togado’, Attorney General, decided that Dominguez was not guilty of any crimes and she presumably received a copy of this notification.

Importantly, many refugees’ files contain statements that highlight that whilst the individual is guilty of criminal acts, he or she was pardoned under one of the decrees outlined above.\textsuperscript{60}

It is thus striking that, although Dominguez was not defined as guilty in any sense by the Francoist regime, her own account of returning to Spain nonetheless suggests that she felt herself to have been labelled as a ‘red’ by Spanish society. Here she describes the moment she arrived at the airport and later at the train station:

[The border guard] stood up, he kissed my hand, he did everything very smoothly, [he said] “have a very good time in Spain” […] that was how it happened. Fijate [NB], because I don’t know who he was. And he is a very important person.\textsuperscript{61}

Ah but the reception that [my family] gave us in the North Station [in Madrid] after we arrived on the high-speed train, you cannot imagine all the platforms full of people and family and friends […] Everyone hugging and everyone: “17 years, 17 years, 17…” and all the people in the station…looked at us, this group and well: ‘What’s wrong with these people…’ ‘Who are they?’ And the guards and everyone who was arriving, they came to look…they were watching us. And we…[we weren’t] uncomfortable and they all were. ‘17 years’ it was all jubilation for everyone, our house, what do you think? [laughs] It was like that. And later I learnt that a commission from the treasury wanted to receive me.\textsuperscript{62}

The aspects of her arrival which Dominguez chose to emphasise convey both the joy of the two occasions and the feeling that she was under observation from the state (embodied in

\textsuperscript{59} All citations from: Bernadina Dominguez Gómez’ file (1953), AGA, Inventory (02) 081.000, section 61/19636, 0269: 84.
\textsuperscript{60} For example: AGA, (02) 081.000, section 61/19642, 0275: expediente 001.
\textsuperscript{61} Entrevista realizada a la Señora Bernadina Dominguez, pp.59-60.
\textsuperscript{62} Entrevista realizada a la Señora Bernadina Dominguez, pp.61-62.
the courteous border guard and the guards in the train station), from her family and friends and from the general public. Her enigmatic description of passing through the border is particularly striking, particularly the guard’s solicitous manner and the overriding sense of the smoothness with which she entered Spain. This, along with the later reference to the commission from the treasury that wished to speak to Domínguez, is perhaps evidence of what Portelli calls ‘creative memory work’, memories which provide us with clues to alternative meanings.\(^{63}\) This idea is supported by the ambiguity of Domínguez’ statements: ‘I don’t know who he was. And he is a very important person’, as well as the way in which the reference to the treasury comes at the end of the account of the train station, almost as an afterthought. These phrases and images hint at how Domínguez wished to be viewed and treated by her home country, an attitude which is embodied by the official at the border: she wanted to be noticed, for someone important to stand up and recognise the momentousness of the occasion, kiss her hand and wish her well.

The account of her interaction with the guard conjures up a feeling of triumph undercut by insecurity and it reminds us that for Domínguez, this was no ordinary journey. Perhaps it also calls to mind the relationship between Domínguez and wider society. The scene in the railway station was unusual both because of the length of time the family members had been apart from one another, ‘17 years!’; and the audience that gathered around them, an audience of strangers who could have been both sympathetic and very hostile towards a returning refugee and her family. Indeed, the Spanish public’s conception of the ‘reds’ acted as a lens through which Domínguez viewed her experience of return. Despite her official stamp of approval, she felt she had been labelled as a ‘red’ and as a criminal. When asked what the Spanish attitude to the exiles was in 1953, Domínguez replied:

D – Very bad.
I – Why?
D – At that time we were reds, in Spain as well. All the bad things that happened, the blame […] it was down to the reds. The reds had kicked up the war, the reds we had…we had taken all the food away from Spain; the reds, we had committed crime and we would commit more crime.
I – Everything was down to…
D – *Everything was down to the reds.*
I – So, there was a lot of hostility
D – Hostility, at that time, yes there was. [Italics added]\(^{64}\)

\(^{64}\) *Entrevista realizada a la Señora Bernadina Domínguez*, pp.60-61.
Despite the fact that Domínguez sometimes distanced herself from political discussion in her interview, she was a ‘red’ and the reds, who were responsible for these bad things, were the refugees and more specifically, Domínguez and her family. She could not return to Spain permanently because her husband, Mendez Aspe, who was the Minister of the Treasury and Economy during Negrín’s second presidency, would have been, as she said, ‘very much in danger’. In keeping with this sense that she carried a stigma, even though she travelled without her husband, she suggested that her family breathed a big sigh of relief when she left Madrid only eight days later. At last they were safe, Domínguez implied, though safe from what is unclear – the state? Their fellow citizens? The unnamed, possibly non-existent but nonetheless keenly felt, danger she represented for her family was lurking in the background throughout the time she spent with them.

Negotiating being a ‘repentant red’: pride and betrayal

Domínguez was ambivalent about her status as a red: she viewed herself as part of that section of Spanish society but she also described herself as having been welcomed to Spain by an ‘important’ man, a vignette which sees her lowly status somewhat overturned. Whilst the refugees quoted in the SRA’s funding literature believed returning was equivalent to betrayal, Luis Salvadores viewed it as essential: far from seeing himself as a ‘repentant red’ he thought that he would be more effective fighting Francoism inside Spain than outside, an attitude shared by many anti-Francoists within Spain, and perhaps reflected in the communist leader Dolores Ibárruri’s attempt to return in the 1960s as well. Salvadores described politics in exile as ‘artificial’ and said that his friends were young people who stayed within Spain after 1939, indeed, he was arrested for protesting as part of the Spanish student movement during the late 60s. Barcelona in particular and also Spain were real for Salvadores, not the artifice created by the refugees living in Mexico. Within the context of his narrative, Salvadores’ country was where he belonged and where he could fight for his beliefs most effectively:

 […] my decision [to come back to Spain] was always there; I decided in 1956. I mean I have a very pleasant memory of Mexico, where I felt at ease…living in

---

65 For example, she talks about her disassociation from politics here, Entrevista realizada a la Señora Bernadina Domínguez, pp.10-11.
66 Thomas, Spanish Civil War, p.792; Mendez Aspe died in 1958; Domínguez returned to Spain for another visit in the same year.
67 Entrevista realizada a la Señora Bernadina Domínguez, p.61.
68 Alted, La Voz de Los Vencidos, p.378.
Mexico, but it isn’t about Mexico, the point is it is about my country, Spain and that’s it. And I have come back to my country and I have come back to where I lived in the *Sagrada Familia* which was here in Barcelona, I even live in the same area, because I used to live in the *Sagrada Familia* and, my flat now, it’s in the *Sagrada Familia*, do you know what I mean? My flat now is less than 200 metres away from the flat I had in 36’, ’37, ’38’.

Speaking from his Barcelona office in 1970 he described a strong attachment to his streets and his city. A PSUC and PCE militant, Luis Salvadores nearly returned to Spain in 1947 at the orders of the PCE. The party then changed their mind so he decided he was going to return independently in 1956; at this stage, he knew that the refugees who had gone to the USSR had started to come back and ‘if they could come back then why couldn’t he’.

After undertaking the necessary applications in Mexico, he visited Spain twice, before returning permanently to live in Barcelona in 1962. On the one hand, it seems as if he sought to go back in time because he chose to live 200 metres away from his old flat. On the other, he positioned himself as in touch with a real, young Spain – the ‘living breathing’ country which Llorens described, rather than the unreal country imagined in exile.

Whilst Salvadores overturned the idea that return equated to betrayal and in fact showed how exile could be conceived as a greater betrayal, Domínguez and Cristina Ulibarri had a more ambivalent relationship with both return and how it related to their identity as ‘reds’. Ulibarri had left Spain to go to the Dominican Republic before re-migrating to Mexico and she both emphasised the risks of being ‘red’ and took pride in this identity. Ulibarri had made a last minute decision to visit Spain in 1960 so she did not apply to the Spanish consulate before leaving Mexico: ‘I went without permission […] I did not have a visa’. Upon arrival in the airport, she was delayed at customs for two hours. Twice she stated in the interview that her lack of visa was not what caused the delay but the fact that customs officials were looking for her late husband, who had fought for the Republic and had a socialist and communist background. She recounted to her interviewer that, with her temper rising, she confronted the officials and said: ‘go to Mexico and in such and such cemetery and such and such a grave, there he is. So you should go and you’ll find him there. And leave me in peace’.

The role played by both the guards and Ulibarri in this altercation shows us how much anger, expectation and fear was stirred up by the arrival

---

69 *Entrevista a Luis Salvadores*, on his flat: pp.64-65; on returning, p.57.

70 Salvadores described making the application to return although I could not locate his files in AGA.

into Spain. In this description, Ulibarri drew a distinction between her husband’s identity as an enemy of the Francoist state and her own innocence. Elsewhere in the interview, she positions *herself* as a ‘red’, as someone who could assume responsibility for her supposedly criminal identity.

The fight with the customs officials would not be the last direct conflict Ulibarri had with officials in Spain. Staying with her sister and brother-in-law in Madrid, who had been *con nosotros* (with us or on the Republican side) during the war, she was able to travel to Burgos prison to attempt to deliver a present to one of the prisoners. The prisoner’s daughter lived in Mexico and had given Ulibarri a ‘sweater’ to pass on to him, something which would act as a message of love and support. Ulibarri described spending two hours waiting at the prison only to be prevented from seeing the prisoner. She believed that from this point onwards she was followed by the Guardia Civil (Civil Guard) until she left Spain for Mexico once again. At the airport she cast herself into the passive role, as the wife of a man the border police wanted to locate. By contrast, her account of the visit to Burgos prison demonstrated her own commitment to supporting political prisoners, explaining why she was then viewed by the Francoist regime as suspicious in her own right, not just as the *wife* of a militant refugee. In reclaiming her agency in this respect, Ulibarri’s experiences, like Salvadores, show how being ‘red’ could be a source not just of fear but also of pride.

In both Ulibarri and Domínguez’ accounts of return, both Spaniards in general and the Spanish state are described as interested in the refugees, either because they wish to curtail their liberty or because they view them as ‘reds’. Helen Pereña, a Spanish refugee who returned to Spain for four months in 1949, gained quite a different impression. Writing from Mexico DF she recounted her recent trip to Vicente Llorens and his first wife Lucia Chiarlo then living in Baltimore, USA:

> I’ve been meaning to write to you for days […] with my impressions of Spain […] almost everything I saw has come to confirm what we have heard so many times before […] it shocked me a lot to see that just living in America [the Americas] put me into a certain category, almost everyone was envious of me and said how lucky I was, to the point that a ‘falangista’ […] asked me whether I could arrange it so he could come [to America] The question of the refugees, it is sad but it’s the truth – it no longer exists, we could have had the worst possible time and people [in Spain], including those on the Left, do not understand, it doesn’t occur to them that one doesn’t return [to retain] one’s dignity, etc. […] Those who have returned are treated neither well nor badly, nor are they bothered, nor anything […] Of course those who have returned want us all to do it and they want to justify [their decision] and I said to them that if they had such a bad time in France I understand completely but that we [refugees living in the Americas] have no real justification,
except in exceptional cases. But it’s painful to see that [we’re treated with a profound] indifference.\textsuperscript{72}

In Pereña’s vision of Spain, the refugees were an irrelevance, rather than ‘red’. In fact those who had gone to the Americas were envied, even by a Falangista. Any anger or feelings of solidarity provoked by their political identity, controversial or otherwise, had seemingly been forgotten and replaced by an obsession with their prosperity and the riches that they had apparently been able to procure. The concept of ‘dignity’ or having to justify an entry into Franco’s Spain on moral grounds was subsumed by the pressing concerns of survival under economic autarky.\textsuperscript{73}

The divergences between Pereña, Domínguez and Ulibarri’s sketches of Spain (and, indeed, Mexico) in 1949 and 1953 and 1960 reflect the length of time each woman spent there and the different social circles in which the three moved during their respective visits. Yet they all grapple with what it meant to be a refugee in Spain. Pereña’s account of her four months in Spain lacks detail – we do not know where she visited exactly or what her family background was. Nonetheless, she does make a reference to her mother’s work as a piano teacher and how this supported her family on a diet of black market food and foreign alcohol and cigarettes, suggesting that her experience of Spain was, to a certain extent, cushioned by and filtered through this relative prosperity.\textsuperscript{74}

Ulibarri’s account emphasised instead her own scarcity of financial resources. The initial impulse to return was tempered by her lack of money, she said: ‘I didn’t have one sorry cent, Matilde [the interviewer], not one sorry cent’. Her resolve to go, combined with what she described throughout her interview as her ‘proud’ (‘orgullosa’) or even ‘vain’ (‘vanidosa’) nature, meant that instead of asking her family in Mexico for help, she came to an agreement with her boss: he would pay for her plane ticket and dock the debt from her wages. Other interviewees refer to the high price of tickets or flying in winter in order to obtain cheaper charter flights.\textsuperscript{75} Ulibarri, who clearly made a large sacrifice to buy the tickets, ruminated upon the price: ‘so what then, what did it cost?’ she asked herself,

\textsuperscript{72} Letter from Helena Pereña and Javier Malagón to Vicente Llorens and Lucia Chiarlo (22 Jan. 1949) Archivo de Vicente Llorens: Correspondencia recibida por Vicente Llorens (1924-1979), no.1410.
\textsuperscript{73} For further discussion of the impact of Franco’s policy of autarky on the first years of Francoist Spain, see: Richards, A Time of Silence, 1939-1945.
\textsuperscript{74} Letter from Pereña and Malagón to Llorens and Chiarlo, no.1410.
\textsuperscript{75} For example: Entrevista a Llanos Navarro Ballesteros, realizada por Elena Aub, en Madrid los días 24 y 30 de Junio; 4, 9 y 14 de Julio de 1980, Y anexo realizado (por Enriqueta Tuñón) el 4 de Diciembre de 1981, Libro 74, PHO/10/ESP.24, p.257.
unprompted by the interviewer; ‘I think it was about two thousand and something pesos or three thousand’. She was not someone who had made her fortune in the Americas and she could not fulfil the role played by the prosperous refugee envied by all, evoked by Pereña. In a similar way, Domínguez’s account of her return focused not just on the scenes of her arrival but also on the ill-health endured by her sister and the suffering her family had experienced in the period 1937-1953, she said: they ‘had an awful time, my sister weighed 40 kilos, she had become deaf, simply because, as a result of how hungry they had been’. Domínguez’ memory of Spain was not of illicit yet tacitly accepted prosperity but of social exclusion and penury. Her description of the ‘rojos’ and the exiles as belonging to the same hated category must have been shaped by these experiences, as well as her own sadness at what her family had been through.

Finding home
The role played by family and friends who stayed in Spain in convincing refugees to return or not return from diverse locations was crucial. Explaining her decision to return to Spain for a visit in 1960, Ulibarri said, ‘I had to go to Spain so that I could see my mother. I said “I’ve already lost my father, so I want to see my mother”’. An absence of these kinds of bonds - because families had travelled into exile together, those left behind had died or contact had been severed for practical, political or personal reasons - accounts for why some refugees never returned, even after Franco’s death. They lacked any emotional motivation but they also would have lacked the immediate practical support which families and friends were able to provide to returning refugees in the form of accommodation and food. Whilst some were able to meet their family outside of Spain, a desire to see extended networks of people meant that return to the patria was often both practical and more financially prudent.

The prospect of death also helped refugees to crystallise what ‘home’ meant to them. When the poet and Spanish refugee Ernestina Champourcin was asked why she returned to Spain in the early 70s, for example, she said: ‘because my sister wrote to me asking me whether I

---

76 All quotations taken from Entrevista realizada a Cristina Ulibarri, pp. 118-127.
77 Entrevista realizada a la Señora Bernadina Domínguez, p.56.
78 Entrevista a Cristina Ulibarri, pp.126-127.
was thinking of dying in Mexico or what I was thinking of doing’. In a similar way, Heliodoro Sánchez states, after a long and circumlocutory explanation of the thought process that led him to return to Spain in 1972: ‘That is to say that I came back here because I wanted to die in my own land’. Some refugees, who died outside of Spain, still wished to return. As Jay Winter shows in his study of different state policies and individual emotional reactions to the question of what to do with soldiers’ bodies after the First World War, attitudes to this question provide insight into the priorities of different groups of people. In a series of letters written in 1972 to Llorens, a woman named Nora Hasenclever described her deep sadness following the death of her husband, a Spanish refugee named José Montesinos. She also explained how difficult it was for her to arrange the sale of her husband’s library and the bureaucratic procedures she had to negotiate in order to transport his remains to Madrid. Based on further letters written by Hasenclever, it seems reasonable to assume that Montesinos (as he is referred to) had talked to his wife about his wish to be buried in the country he had left at least 33 years before and that she was attempting to carry out his wishes. Montesinos’ request to return in death demonstrates to us the significance that he had attached to Spanish soil and his need to feel that at least in death he would return to the country of his birth. Florinda San Agustín, whose trajectory was discussed in depth in chapter one, also described returning her husband’s ashes to the sea off the coast of Gijón, where he had been born.

Home is a flexible term, which as we have seen can refer to a feeling of happiness or contentment, rather than a physical location: in Sánchez Vázquez’ words ‘it is not where you are, rather how you are’. Nonetheless, the presence of family, as well as the urge to ‘die in one’s homeland’, also implies that the idea of ‘home’ was inextricably linked with particular people and places. The significance of these emotional bonds is forcefully

---

79 Entrevista a Ernestina de Champourcin, realizada por Elene Aub en el domicilio de la entrevistada, en Madrid, el día 27 de Noviembre de 1979, PHO/10/ESP.5, p.28.
80 Entrevista a Heliodoro Sanchez, realizada por Elena Aub, en el domicilio de la entrevistadora, en Madrid, los días 25, 27 y 31 de marzo, y 16 de abril de 1980, Y en una quinta sesión sin fecha. Y anexo realizado por Enriqueta Tuñón en el domicilio particular del informante en Madrid, el 1 de diciembre de 1981, PHO/10/ESP.17, p.320.
82 Letter from Nora Hasenclever de Montesinos to Llorens, (undated, 1972), Archivo de Vicente Llorens: Correspondencia recibida por Vicente Llorens (1924-1979), no. 3168.
83 Entrevista con Florinda San Agustín, p.140.
conveyed by Adrian Olmedilla’s description of his arrival in the Spanish port, Cadiz. He had come by boat from Mexico because plane tickets proved prohibitively expensive and in Cadiz he was met by ‘four, five, six cars’ filled with ‘nephews, brothers, nieces’. Even transcribed, it is evident that his voice was filled with emotion, faltering at times and trailing off. He explained that in 1969 he only ‘knew his family from memory, he knew their faces from, when [they were] 20 something years old’ and he was about to see them again for the first time. He stated that the reunion was taking place after 40-something years but he was returning after 30 years. He also said that 40-something members of his family came to meet him. All of these numbers, ‘four, five, six cars’, ‘20 years old’, ‘40 something years’, ‘40 something people’, are not so much important for what they measure but for what they tell us about Olmedilla’s excitement. The strength of emotion he felt could not be quantified, so the numbers and figures he mentioned become more like exclamations, a way to convey how moving this moment was for him.

Olmedilla compared his reaction with those of other refugees’ he had come into contact with, again demonstrating how intense he found his arrival in Spain:

[…] there have been people with whom I talked about their arrival in Spain, after such a long time and everything, and I have heard them say and I almost have never believed this – they say that they don’t, that they weren’t moved, or any of this. I frankly, this I cannot believe, no, nor when I came, well, when I had the experience myself, before I had come myself and had this experience, I would never have believed it either; but, but after, when I had come, well, I couldn’t believe it, I couldn’t believe it after so many years to arrive there, well anyway… [italics added].

There was so much that Olmedilla did not believe: that other refugees returned without having this kind of emotional experience, that he himself reacted as he did but, most of all, that he had actually returned to Spain ‘after so many years’. These are memories of joy that inspired incredulity and amazement years later.

For some refugees, however, it was important to maintain a detached stance. Heliodoro Sánchez, for example, described his first visit to Spain before returning permanently with a dry sense of humour. He mocked the histrionic ‘exile’ who attaches significance to bags of soil:

I – Were you very happy, were you excited to be in Spain?

84 Entrevista a Adrian Olmedilla, realizada en su domicilio particular de Madrid, por Elena Aub, los días 7, 8 y 18 de Julio de 1980, y Anexo realizada por Enriqueta Tuñón el día 2 de diciembre de 1981, PHO/10/ESP.25, pp.365-367.

85 Entrevista a Adrian Olmedilla, pp.365-367.
HS – Hombre, yes, excited to come back…hombre, I am not going to say to you that I did these stupid things that the Pope did, to try and win Spanish support, kneel down and kiss the Spanish earth, nor did I carry a little bag of Spanish soil back to Mexico [at the end of his trip].

Sánchez presented himself as sceptical and anti-Catholic or at least unimpressed by the Pope’s actions; ‘excited’ but not ridiculous. In keeping with this idea, in the next phrases he switched from using the ‘I’ form of the verbs and the personal pronoun (‘yo no le voy a decir…’) to using the more distant third person form of the verb and pronoun: but yes ‘one is excited to return to one’s homeland’, to ‘leave at 19 years old and return at 40...to see family and parents that one hasn’t seen since one was a child’.  

He went on to describe the reception afforded him by his friends:

_Hombre, it is always exciting to see friends with whom you shared the struggle [brothers in arms] that, people who might have saved your life, and talk about the difficult things and the joys [you have experienced], in the exile and here in the interior, they received me very well, very well. Also, and this is something of a problem, the Spanish people are very effusive, as you know, and it always ends up in a huge banquet and drinking and partying._

His understated evocation of first family and then friends reuniting, after over 20 years, conveys something of what Sánchez must have felt in his initial, three-month trip. The precise references to the ages at which he left and came back (19 and 40), and to the fact that many of his friends were people who may have saved his life, recall the cataclysmic events which led to his departure from Spain in the first place. Instead of ascribing feelings of excitement directly to himself, however, he suggested they might belong to anyone: ‘it is always exciting to see friends’. The way in which he humorously referred to the Spanish enthusiasm for mass consumption of food and drink also creates the impression that he was somehow standing on the outside of these momentous reunions, looking in.

This sense of feeling apart from a place that was once home is present in other testimonies, Antonio Ballester, for example, describes his feelings towards Spanish people:

_AB – I was going to say to you that they’re very loud-mouthed, that is the first impression, but yes [...] we feel connected to the [Spanish people] but we also feel a bit out of place [desplazado] as if the young people don’t want anything to do with the old, it may or may not be a reasonable reaction but really, we do feel somewhat out of place._

_I – But is this because of the young people[’s attitude] or because you were outside of Spain?_

AB – Because of a lack of connection. We were outside of Spain and we have developed in a different way, but bit by bit, this feeling of detachment will change over time [to become a feeling of attachment].

The word ‘desplazado’ can be translated as feeling ‘out of place’ or like a ‘fish out of water’; it equally serves as the more literal ‘displaced’, indeed, the technical term ‘displaced people’ is rendered in Spanish as ‘desplazados’. Ballaster identified the divergent paths taken by those who lived their lives outside and inside Spain as causing a ‘lack of connection’, and in his description of Spanish people as ‘they’ he marks himself as being different. His lack of identification with a young, shouting Spanish population is also related to his age, as well as to his status as a returned refugee. Unsurprisingly, returning home did not always equate to feeling at home.

Llanos Navarro Ballasteros returned to Spain to visit in 1959, then 1963, and to live in 1969. She wanted to reunite with her family and to contribute something to the political opposition; upon returning, she considered it too dangerous to do political work and moving back to Spain did not quite live up to her expectations: ‘I used to dream of being here with my family. I had, I’ve already said, I had developed all of these ideas about how the years that I left behind were going to come back, but they don’t come back’. This did not stop her from adapting to life in Spain: she told her interviewer she liked to go to plays, to the cinema and that she loved to sit out on the street and ‘people watch’. The years did not come back but Llanos was able to shake off what Sánchez Vázquez referred to as the ‘blindness’ of the exile and see what was around her, rather than what she held within.

For those refugees who returned to Spain to live, the drama and excitement of meeting crowds of relatives at ports, train stations and the arrivals area of airports was superseded by the demands of everyday life. Heliodoro Sánchez, who returned to Spain to live in 1972, recounted his difficulty in rebuilding a life in Spain. His romantic notion that he would contribute his ‘grain of sand’ to the ‘reconstruction and democratisation’ of Spain was tested as he found himself in a foreign country. For Sánchez, this was linked to the fact that he had spent most of his adult life in Mexico. He described how he had been hungry and poor in his first months in Spain, until he was able to pull himself up: ‘I have had to learn how to walk. It will seem ridiculous when I say that I have had to learn how to sell’. He had

87 Entrevista a Antonio Ballester, realizada por Elena Aub en Valencia, España, los días 27, 28, 29 y 30 de Mayo de 1980 y Anexo realizada el día 7 de diciembre de 1981, PHO/10/ESP.22, pp.126-127.
89 Entrevista a Llanos Navarro Ballesteros, p.263.
worked as a salesman in Mexico but because of the “Mexicanisms” he used in Spain and his way of acting in public (‘forma’), his Spanish colleagues called him Mexican (‘Mexicano’): ‘because our life, the biggest part of my life was over there, so you still conserve a quantity of Mexican expressions that you can’t forget’. Refuges’ otherness could be inscribed in their behaviour and their language; arguably, these ‘Mexicanisms’ were also important to Sánchez because they acted as evidence of his exile and his identity as someone who had fought for the Republic.

For many, return to Spain served to demonstrate how well they had adapted to life in Mexico, becoming not refugiados or transterrados but simply ‘Mexicanos’, like Sánchez. One phrase in particular, used by Ernestina Champourcin, sums up the flexibility of ideas of home and belonging: Ernestina returned to Spain permanently in 1973, after having lived for 34 years in Mexico. Asked whether she would ever return to Mexico to live, she replied:

to live, frankly – no, because it would be a very big jolt [arrancón] to leave my family here. And also, well, I don’t know, I had to…burn my boats again and there are already a lot of burnt boats [muchas quemadas de naves].

The phrase ‘quemar mis naves’ is literally translated as ‘burn my boats’ but is roughly equivalent to the English phrase ‘burn my bridges’ or less commonly, ‘boats’. ‘Boats’ (or ships), however, rather appropriately calls to mind the transatlantic crossing from Mexico to Spain and back again. Champourcin’s imagery reminds us that return to Mexico would be an act of destruction, as much as it would be an act of re-encounter. Although she does not clearly state this, she implied that she burnt so many ships to come back to Spain in the first place, that it would be an act of destruction to go back to live in Mexico. Returning to Spain had required her to leave behind a life she had lived, happily, for many years; some refugees had to first leave home in order to return home.

Conclusion
Ulibarri described seeing her mother for the first time in over 20 years thus:

I found my mother, being such a pretty woman and so tall, I found her […] she was still pretty, no? And her carnita [“little flesh”] was still was so, so nice – a

---

90 All quotations, Entrevista a Heliodoro Sánchez, pp.253-256.
91 ‘Arrancón’ is a Mexican Spanish Word, rather than a Spanish Spanish word, reflecting her attachment to Mexico.
92 Entrevista a Ernestina de Champourcin, p.30.
country woman with, fourteen children she had, ten of us who lived – you saw: her rosy complexion, so pretty; I just felt her to be very small. Yes, and she was a very tall woman. And this, I felt her like she…she felt very small to me, no? It really struck me.\(^{93}\)

Llorens’ comparison of the unmoveable Spain imagined in exile with the ever-changing nature of the real, living Spain could perhaps apply to people as well. As Adrian Olmedilla’s testimony suggested, the faces of refugees’ relatives could remain fixed in their memories and imagination. Ulibarri’s mother, who was still ‘pretty’, ‘tall’, with a rosy complexion, seemed to perfectly embody Ulibarri’s memory of her. Yet she also felt smaller. Growing up, perhaps most people sense the relative shrinking of their parents but the long separations experienced by returning refugees made that sensation even more striking.

The contrast between memories of childhood and reality also shocked Isabel Richart, who found returning to Madrid in 1973 to be an emotionally wrought experience:

> I started to cry at the corner where I used to buy ‘churros’ with my father […] at the corner where my mother took me by the hand, we went…at the corner where […] So it was very moving, from an emotional point of view, for me, remembering my childhood, my parents that had died and now I didn’t have them, and all these things in your mind.\(^{94}\)

For Richart, physical landscapes had retained the impression of important events and memories, so each new corner of Madrid ‘stirred up’ memories which had been buried for years.\(^{95}\) These last examples serve to show how intertwined returning to Spain was with specific relationships, memories and past experiences.

The spoken narratives of refugees who returned for shorter visits, Domínguez, Ulibarri and Pereña for example, focused much more strongly on the issue of being a ‘red’. It seems that in Mexico, these were the memories and issues which were uppermost in refugees’ minds when they described their experiences. It is nonetheless important to remember that part of the reason refugees who returned to live in Spain permanently, like Sánchez, Olmedilla, Ballester and Navarro, for example, had not come back sooner was because they were aware of how they would be classified by the Francoist state. It is significant that Navarro had initially imagined she might be able to contribute to political life in Spain but on return,

\(^{93}\) Entrevista a Cristina Ulibarri, pp.126-127.

\(^{94}\) Entrevista realizada a Doña Isabel Richart Sotes, Anexo, p.25.

judged this to be too dangerous. I would also suggest that Heliodoro Sánchez attachment to 'mexicanismos' (Mexican turns of phrase) may also have been indicative of a conscious or unconscious attachment to his refugee identity: a way to be political, without being political.

As the wording of Francoist legislation makes clear, perhaps the majority of refugees who returned prior to 1969 at least, if not prior to 1975, were defined as ‘criminals’ and they had to negotiate being ‘red’. At this stage, a quantitative study of the documents produced on refugees who applied for visas to return to Spain would clarify further the attitude and actions taken by the state towards returning refugees. Importantly, however, even for people like Domínguez, who were acquitted of any wrongdoing by the Francoist regime, rather than pardoned, the atmosphere within Spain was overwhelmingly threatening. The fact that she suggested her family within Spain breathed a sigh of relief when she left after visiting them for eight days demonstrates how, despite being granted a visa and being welcomed into the country, she felt that her presence had posed a threat to her family. Conflicts in other refugees’ narratives also point towards this feeling of being judged and observed. Ulibarri, for example, was questioned by border guards and the police during her stay within Spain: she had gone back to visit her mother but irrespective of whether or not she was at risk, she could not help but feel in danger in the Spanish society of the mid-1960s.

This chapter has thus shown how the notion of being a ‘red’ was something with which refugees grappled, at different stages of the Francoist dictatorship. Rather than offer an account of Francoist discourse and how it developed during 1936/9-1975, I have shown how refugees reflected on these concepts, shaping their narratives in relation to this kind of terminology. I have also shown how much of the experience of return was pure excitement, enjoyment or confusion. Relationships between mothers and daughters, parents and their children, siblings, friends and political companions represented much of the driving force behind the decision to return and they also fundamentally shaped the experience of return. This interplay and symbiosis between the individual, the historical and public or state driven narratives, like being a ‘red’, also provides the foundation for the next and final chapter of this thesis. Whilst this chapter has focused on the situation in Spain prior to the end of the dictatorship, the next chapter is about how both memories and the ‘postmemory’ of Spanish exile interact with the ‘collective memory’ of exile within Mexico in the present day.
4. Postmemory, collective memory and the history of Spanish exile in Mexico

Reflecting on his past, the protagonist of Chekhov’s short novel *My life. The Story of a Provincial*, said:

If I wanted to order a ring for myself, the inscription I should choose would be: ‘Nothing passes away.’ I believe that nothing passes away without leaving a trace, and that every step we take, however small, has significance for our present and our future existence.¹

Like Chekhov’s narrator, I believe that ‘nothing passes away without leaving a trace’. Sosa and Serpente suggest that ‘the resonances of traumatic pasts travel back and forth’ in time; I would add that the resonances of untraumatic pasts do the same.² The difference is that the cataclysmic events through which Spanish refugees lived leave a deeper trace than less dramatic events because these experiences are remembered in public, as well as in private. In Mexico and particularly Mexico City, known in Mexico as Distrito Federal or DF, the collective memory of the Spanish exile continues to shape the way people express, or structure, their personal memories. Providing a contrast to the rest of the thesis, this chapter will not focus on what happened but rather how those who experienced particular events and those who were not alive at the time, interact with and contribute to ‘collective’ memories.

The two most prominent features of the ‘collective memory’ of Spanish exile in Mexico are the emphasis placed on the intellectual and cultural contribution that Spanish refugees made to the Mexican nation and Mexico’s generous welcome of the refugees.³ This narrative obscures the sense of futility and desperation that characterised a significant part of the Spanish refugees’ experience in Mexico. Considering the experiences of exiles who

engaged in oppositional politics against their former homelands in the 1940s, for example, Martin Conway concluded that:

Exile is the experience of impotence. This, at least, would seem to be the lesson of the mid twentieth century [. . .] the opponents of Franco forced to flee from Spain in the 1930s [. . .] had plenty of time to brood on Karl Marx’s dictum that exile was no more than ‘a school of scandal and of meanness’.4

Any number of quotations taken from the letters sent between Spanish political figures exiled in Mexico and elsewhere, which were sometimes dedicated to the pursuit of futile arguments, would support Conway’s assessment.5 Yet, as Jorge de Hoyos Puente has shown, through his analysis of exile-run journals, institutions and political parties, the image of the Spanish refugees living in Mexico which was constructed in the 1940s, and which has evolved and endured, is overwhelmingly positive: far from impotent, Spanish refugees are portrayed as having been reborn in exile.

The image of the cultured, successful and influential exile reflects the elite status and wealth that many Spanish refugees have in fact attained but it is also part of what de Hoyos calls a ‘myth’ pertaining to the history of Spanish exile in Mexico.6 Gadi Ben-Ezer states that myths ‘are particularly potent when a collective identity (and sometimes even when an individual identity) is at risk’. Ben-Ezer worked with and interviewed Ethiopian Jews who had endured atrocious conditions to leave Ethiopia, with the ultimate aim of travelling to Israel (most travelled to Sudan, from whence they were rescued by Israeli forces) and he concluded that the story they told about this epic journey:

acquired these characteristics of a myth. It is a story that makes sense of untidy and traumatic memories. It is a means of finding and keeping identity, and it has become a system of communication, a vehicle for conveying desired messages to themselves as well as to Israeli society.7

5 Letters in several personal archives attest to the bitterness and futility of arguments amongst exiled politicians or activists: AEM: Archivo de Tomás Bilbao, particularly letters from Segundo Blanco to Bilbao, e.g. carpetas 4 and from Alvarez del Vayo, carpeta 2; See also, Letters from Angel Galarza to Mariano Moreno Mateo, FPI: AMMM-472-29.
6 On the positive exile image, see Jorge de Hoyos Puente, ‘La Formación de la Identidad del Refugiado’, pages 49 and 68 and on the use of the word myth, or ‘mito’ in the context of Spanish exile in Mexico, see p.2.
The myth or myths surrounding the Spanish exile or refugee serve exactly the same purpose; they convey a desired message to refugees themselves and, significantly, to Mexican society. In addition to de Hoyos, historians have identified the ‘half-truths’ which have been repeated over time regarding the history of Spanish exile in Mexico, the ‘official exile discourse’ or, more basically, the consistent exaggerations of exiled writers.

The ‘myth’ is also broadly analogous to what Halbwachs termed the ‘collective memory’ or the ‘group memory’ of particular events, which will be discussed in greater depth below. One of the central tropes of the collective memory of Spanish exile in Mexico is that the ‘impotence’ of exile politics is passed over in order to celebrate a cultural victory. The complexities and disagreements between different groups have been ‘forgotten’ in favour of a more inclusive and, it should be said, a more satisfying, collective memory. An email sent out by the Ateneo Español de México, summarised the importance of Spanish exile in Mexico in order to introduce the preparations being made for the commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the Spanish civil war in 2014:

> Amongst other things, the exile [as an event] signified the great re-encounter of Spain and Mexico, and the beginning of another episode in the history that both these peoples share. The exile represented [an opportunity for] renewal which inspired development and creativity, [which had a] prominent [impact on] cultural, artistic and intellectual life in Mexico, but also on the commercial and industrial spheres, and daily life.

The key elements in this story, myth or expression of collective memory, are the great re-encounter of Spain and Mexico, the inherently cultured Spanish refugee and the benefits of the arrival of Spanish refugees for Mexico. The Ateneo is not the only organisation representing Spanish refugees or their descendants living in DF or elsewhere in Mexico, but although it is strongly associated with Republicanism, it does not have an explicitly partisan identity. The quoted narrative clearly does not demonstrate what ‘all refugees’ believe but it does provide a clear example of a public expression of what historians like de Hoyos have identified as the myth, or collective memory, of Spanish exile in Mexico.

---

8 Fèrriz, ‘Las Miradas Del Retorno’, p.51.
10 Pla contrasts the often repeated descriptions of the exile as intellectual with the information she was able to compile on the backgrounds of the exiles, ‘Características’, pp.218-231.
11 The aligning of the concept of the myth with that of collective memory has been a feature of recent scholarship, see: Kansteiner, ‘Finding Meaning in Memory’, p.181.
12 ‘Convocatoria para participar en el diseño de la Marca conmemorativa del 75º Aniversario del Exilio Español en México’, email sent on 8 Jan. 2014 to the members of the AEM.
The email avoids mention of conflict between Mexicans and Spanish refugees, political or other kinds of conflict within the Spanish refugee community and the fact that exile was by no means a source of inspiration for all exiled artists and intellectuals. To submit the triumphant narrative disseminated by the Ateneo to an empirical analysis would be to misunderstand its role, however. A close reading of refugees’ personal memories will show that this myth has both rhetorical power and emotional significance. How has this collective memory been incorporated into family and individual memories, if at all? How do individuals use collective memory to make sense of their own experiences? During March - May 2013, I conducted 11 interviews with Spanish refugees or the descendants of Spanish refugees now living in DF. The central arguments and analyses put forward here are based on these discussions, rather than the archived collections used in previous chapters. Ultimately, this chapter will show how personal and collective memories exist in a symbiotic relationship; that they influence and are influenced by one another.

Rather than presenting a comprehensive discussion of the relationship between memory and history, or memory and society, two key concepts will briefly be introduced: ‘collective memory’ and ‘postmemory’. Secondly, a summary of the methodology used to recruit interviewees and the ways in which this is related to the construction of collective memory in Mexico will be presented. The main body of the chapter will then be devoted to a close reading of oral narratives, demonstrating the significance of spoken memories, passed-down objects and remembered routines to people living today. It will also show how these spoken memories interact with – and bypass or subvert – collective memory. Lastly, an interview with one Spanish refugee’s cousin, whose family had stayed in Spain, will show how heavily the past can weigh on individuals and what ‘the recuperation (or recovery) of historical memory’ means in these intimate settings. This is not a comprehensive survey of the postmemory of the Spanish civil war and subsequent exile in Mexico but it is the first time these kinds of narratives will be looked at in an academic context and in this much detail. The relationship between individual, family and group, institutional, national or political memories is characterised by entanglement and it is not my intention to develop a diagrammatic or structural description of how these memories interact in the Mexican or the Spanish context. Instead, I would like to show how elements of these intensely moving and sometimes mysterious family histories connect with wider histories.

13 Germán Horacio, for example, who was Florinda San Agustín’s husband, was exhausted and enervated by exile in Mexico and far less productive than he had been in Spain, Entrevista a Florinda San Agustín, p.111.
14 See the introduction to this thesis, p.34.
Personal and collective memory

In his now classic work, Halbwachs posited that:

everyone has a capacity for memory [mémoire] that is unlike that of anyone else, given the variety of temperaments and life circumstances. But individual memory is [...] a part or an aspect of group memory, since each impression and each fact [...] leaves a lasting memory [...] to the extent that it is connected with the thoughts that come to us from the social milieu.15

On the one hand, the way we express our memories is conditioned by the social milieu because language, and thus the way we communicate memories, is determined by society— we have to copy in order to learn how to speak after all. But Halbwachs also suggested that we only keep hold of certain memories (bearing in mind that almost no one can remember everything) for reasons that are determined by society. This means that, for example, a Spanish refugee living in Mexico is more likely to ‘remember’, or recount memories, that refer to the positive aspects of the refugee population. These memories might refer to the conduct of the Republican government, the behaviour of refugees in French concentration camps or their subsequent flourishing in Mexico. The memories of the failings of the Republican government, political disagreements amongst different groups of refugees, any unpleasant behaviour on the part of the refugees or the deep sadness and failure to adapt experienced by some refugees upon arrival in Mexico, would be put aside in favour of more positive memories.

The collective memory of Spanish exile in Mexico has shaped the ways in which refugees and their descendants recount their own personal or ‘inherited memories’ but as Halbwachs also stated: the ‘variety of temperaments and life experiences’ people possess mean that ‘collective memory’ does not amount to homogenous memory.16 In an attempt to reconcile the apparently opposing forces of ‘history’, produced by professionals, and ‘memory’, which belongs to anyone, Susan Crane has suggested that when we talk (or write) about our memories of the past, we are all making history. ‘Each individual’, she suggests, ‘as a member of many collectives, holds and expresses personal memories of historical significance as lived experience’.17 Expanding on this idea, it is my contention that Spanish refugees and their descendants living in DF have, with considerable narrative skill,

15 Halbwachs, On Collective Memory, p.53.
positioned their family members and themselves in history. They were there at the ‘splintering’ of Spain and they witnessed the survival of republican culture in Mexico.\(^\text{18}\)

In Sebald’s novel *Austerlitz*, the eponymous character travelled from Czechoslovakia to Wales as a child with the Kindertransport, escaping the Holocaust to be brought up under a different name by Welsh adoptive parents. As a child in Prague, Austerlitz asks his nursery maid Věra how squirrels find the nuts they had buried once the forest floor became covered in snow. Decades later, Věra tells him: ‘Those were your very words, the question which constantly troubled you. How indeed do the squirrels know, what do we know ourselves, how do we remember, and what is it we find in the end?’\(^\text{19}\) – a question that is central to Austerlitz’ struggle to first bury his past, and then to uncover and explore what happened. ‘Austerlitz’ is also the name of a ‘famous battle’, so the literary critic James Wood suggests that when we read ‘Austerlitz said’, we should think ‘Waterloo said’ or ‘Agincourt said’. Indeed, when Sebald’s protagonist is told that his name is not that which was given him by his Welsh parents but instead Jaques Austerlitz, he asks his headmaster, ‘with the enforced politeness of the English schoolboy, ‘Excuse me, sir, but what does it mean?’ To which Mr Penrith-Smith replies: ‘I think you will find it is a small place in Moravia, site of a famous battle, you know’. Thus, Austerlitz cannot talk about his past, without talking about history; ‘he threatens to become simply part of the rubble of history […] a depository of facts and dates, not a human being’.\(^\text{20}\) Austerlitz’ struggle within the world constructed by the novel is precisely that experienced by the Spanish refugees in reality, yet I would argue that they are both part of the ‘rubble of history’ and human beings. Refugees’ tales of exile, loss and survival demonstrate how personal memories, family anecdote, collective memory and history are intertwined.

**Postmemory**

Of the twelve people I interviewed in DF, three had lived through the civil war and the departure from Spain in 1939.\(^\text{21}\) The rest were born in the 1940s or later. My discussion of memory in this context is therefore partly focused on how the ‘lived’ memories of one

\(^{18}\) Questions surrounding ‘testimony’ and ‘witnessing’ are sensitively explored by Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub, *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis and History*, (London: Routledge, 1992), see in particular, pp.75-92.


\(^{21}\) See brief biographical information on interviewees in appendix 2.
person can become part of a family memory. This is related to Marianne Hirsch’s concept, ‘postmemory’, a second-hand kind of memory which is shaped ‘however indirectly, by traumatic events that still defy narrative reconstruction and exceed comprehension. These events happened in the past, but their effects continue into the present.” This ‘notion’ was developed ‘in relation to children of Holocaust survivors’ but, as Hirsch herself states, it may ‘usefully describe the second-generation memory of other cultural or collective traumatic events and experiences’, in this case, the Spanish civil war and subsequent exile.

At the end of my interview with Pilar Jiménez, her daughter Rocío came into the room and joined the conversation. Pilar had left Spain aged 11 in 1939, and I had asked her about her experiences leaving her childhood home and adapting to life in Mexico. A few minutes before Rocío arrived, I had asked Pilar whether she had any particular anecdotes or stories she liked to recount to her children or grandchildren. Pilar related this question to Rocío, who responded by asking whether I had heard the one about the doll, which I had, or the jewels, which I had not; the family has a repertoire of stories to draw upon. Pilar duly described how her grandmother had sewn all her jewels into her skirts so that she might be able to take them with her when she left Spain. She also said that her grandfather had exchanged his dental fillings made of gold for money, once he had arrived in France.

According to Rocío, these stories had been told many times in family settings, perhaps sitting around the dinner table eating Mexican quesadillas (cheese tortillas) and nopales (cactus) or curled up on the sofa; Jiménez and her children had often cried together when talking about some of the things that had happened. The events Pilar described to me – wars fought in distant countries, characters surviving situations and circumstances far removed from a home in DF – seemed both immediate, being spoken of by someone who had experienced them first hand, and almost absurdly remote. These kinds of personal recollections of growing up in 1930s Spain, the Civil War and the departure from Spain have travelled a long way in time and space.

Pilar’s stories, and the settings in which they have been told, are also a form of ‘postmemory’. A term like postmemory, developed in order to encapsulate a common experience, is employed here to evoke a process of exploration, rather than a measurable

---

24 Author’s interview with Pilar Jiménez, April 23rd, 2013, part 3, 35-40 mins.
phenomenon. It is also worth saying that the use of the word ‘postmemory’ is not meant to suggest that different experiences are all equally traumatic or that they have played the same role in the lives of those people who lived through them. Smoothing over differences can lead to obfuscation. Erika Bourgignon has suggested, for example, that certain definitions of Holocaust ‘survivor’ are too broad:

The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum defines survivors in the broadest terms, including those who were fortunate enough to get away early. Yet for me, one of those who got out before the major killing started, to be considered, and to consider myself, a “survivor” seems nothing short of indecent.

Do descendants of all those deemed ‘survivors’ by the Holocaust Memorial Museum have post-memory? Is there a tipping point, a particular degree of suffering, which triggers the production of postmemory? Or can anyone be part of the ‘generation’ of postmemory, as Hirsch has, on occasion, suggested? Bourgignon’s unease reflects one of the difficulties with the way this chapter treats the historical events which were described to me by the people I talked to in Mexico. These are people who talked about a huge range of different experiences, events they lived through or memories their father, mother, or grandparents had shared with them. Some of them expressed similar concerns to Bourgignon’s: there were Spaniards who had been far worse off than they were, particularly the refugees who were unable to leave France or people who were incarcerated in German death camps, Francoist labour camps, concentration camps or gaols.

Refugees did not experience the same events, they were not all ‘traumatised’ and ‘postmemory’ does not equate to the passing down of trauma or dysfunction from a parent to their child. The diversity of the narratives collected reflects the diversity of peoples’ experiences, the practical difficulties of interviewing an aging refugee population in the

---

25 The assertion that everyone who has suffered painful events is traumatised is refuted by several scholars, see for example, a collection of articles on the memory of Southern Cone dictatorships: Sosa and Serpente, ‘Contemporary Landscapes of Latin American Cultural Memory’, p.159; See also, a critical examination of trauma as a concept: Didier Fassin, The Empire of Trauma: An Inquiry into the Condition of Victimhood, trans. by Richard Rechtman, (Princeton, NJ; PUP, 2009).


28 The importance of emphasising the fact that not all refugees are traumatised was also underlined by Peter Loizos, Some reflections on the study of displacement, Unpublished conference paper, Conference held at University of Manchester: <http://www.hcri.ac.uk/pdfs/Seminar%205%20report.pdf> [accessed 21st Oct 2013].
limited time allocated to fieldwork and the need to incorporate accounts which do not fit within the often narrow confines set out by previous historical accounts of the Spanish exile. This chapter, for example, will include the story of Lucia Gómez, who was born in Spain in 1944, only coming to Mexico in the early 1950s but who nonetheless defined her parents’ and her experience as one of exile. 29 The longevity of Franco’s regime produced these overlapping and elongated chronologies: Gómez is thus both a ‘second generation’ exile because she is the daughter of exiles and she was born in the 40s but she is also a ‘first generation’ exile, having grown up in Madrid.

Hirsch asks whether ‘locating trauma in the space of the family […] risk[s] occluding a public historical context and responsibility, blurring significant differences – national difference, for example, or differences among the descendants of victims, perpetrators, and bystanders? 30 Different national (not to say regional, familial or individual) contexts, do shape how people express their memories. In Spain, the Francoist regime propagated a particular ‘memory’ of the conflict through the (re) naming of streets, placement of triumphalist statues and inauguration of several key dates upon which the Spanish people would commemorate various events of the civil war. 31 In building memorials which were exclusively dedicated to the Nationalist dead like the Valle de los Caídos or Valley of the Fallen, which provided the final resting place for many of the bodies of Nationalists killed by the Republicans in battle or behind the lines, Franco symbolically displaced public acknowledgement of the Republican dead. 32 Propaganda produced by the regime, particularly during the years 1936-1945 constantly underlined the subhuman nature of the rojos (reds) and the idea that Spain had been saved from the triple threat represented by the communists, the Masons and the Jews. 33

In Mexico, the situation was different. President Lázaro Cárdenas (in office 1934-1940) lent very public support to the Republican government, the Republican government in exile moved from France to Mexico in 1940 and the Mexican government never recognised

29 Lucia Gómez is a pseudonym.
31 Josefina Cuesta Bustillo, La odisea de la memoria: historia de la memoria en España, siglo XX, (Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 2008).
33 See for example, Julián Casanova, ‘The Faces of Terror: violence during the Franco dictatorship’ in Unearthing Franco’s Legacy, pp.97-103.
Franco’s regime. With regards to the example set by the political class, therefore, Mexican society during the period 1939-1975 was the one place in the world where the moral high ground of the Spanish defeated was constantly defended. At the same time, as already stated, the collective memory of the Spanish exile in Mexico continues to shape the way people express, or frame, their personal memories. The image of the Spanish exile as a (male) intellectual, living in Mexico DF and distinct from the existing Spanish immigrant community, forms a significant part of this collective memory, although the only statistics available suggest that at most 14% of the exile population were intellectuals (using a generous definition of the term).34 This represents a far larger proportion of intellectuals than existed in the Spanish population in 1939 (which was less than 1%), or the Spanish refugee population in France, but it is not as large as one might imagine after conducting interviews with exiles or reading commemorative literature, which obsessively emphasise the high numbers of Spanish academics who arrived in Mexico in 1939, and their exceptional skills.35

Instead of focusing exclusively on ‘familial idioms’, therefore, this chapter asks how personal, familial and collective memory interact. Only a small number of sections of the interviews conducted will be included here, selected because they were particularly evocative examples of the ways in which memories were passed down. They will show how anecdotes, remembered and real objects and the shared activity of talking, crying and bedtime routines can all be examples of Hirsch’s term ‘postmemory’. Whilst these stories could only be heard in 2013 because ‘life histories, are never complete but shift with time and place according to the audience’, they provide a series of snapshots or, more appropriately, sound-bites, which show us how and why these historical events are talked about in the Mexican context.36 Paradoxically, it is only in allowing individual voices to be heard (or their words to be read) that we can begin to see how to position these personal accounts in broader historical and national contexts, or how to draw links between the individual and the historical.

34 Pla, ‘Características’, pp.218-231.
35 De Hoyos, La Utopía Del Regreso, p.150.
A note on methodology

The ‘sample’ of people I talked to was self-selecting. The interviews quoted at length were conducted with those who left Spain when they were children, or the children or grandchildren of those who had left as adults; the specific details of each informant’s experiences will be made clear when interviews are cited. I made contact with the people I interviewed through an association with the Ateneo, where I was conducting archival research, as well as through mutual friends and social connections I had identified before arriving. The fact that I found three interviewees through friends of my relatives was not a coincidence: I come from a middle-class and urban background, the people I interviewed now belong to a similar milieu, despite the struggle their relatives often had to survive during their first years in Mexico.

When attempting to identify further informants, I explained that my project was about the social history of exile, people’s family histories of exile and their experience of the public commemoration of both the Spanish civil war and the Spanish exile. I met people in person at particular events held at Colegio Madrid, one of the three schools founded by Spanish exiles on arrival in Mexico, and the Ateneo. These people then kindly provided me with the contact details for their friends. I talked to people in their own homes, relative’s homes, cafés or institutions like the Ateneo. After the first interviews, I was able to meet some of those I spoke to again in order to look over their personal archives – collections of objects, photographs and documents which they had kept to have something to remind them of particular events or family members.

The people I talked to came from different political and social backgrounds but they all agreed to the interview because they felt that the history of Spanish exile in Mexico was relevant to them in some way. This fact has fundamentally shaped my presentation of the postmemory of Spanish exile in Mexico: there are, without doubt, a large number of Spanish refugees’ descendants living in Mexico or Mexico DF who have no interest in these past events and who would have had no interest in talking to me. The fact that those I interviewed identify themselves, to a greater or lesser extent, as part of a community of Spanish refugees, provides us with insight into how, even within this group ‘collective memory’ is not homogenous, it is just one tool used by people to narrate their past.

---

37 For the information and consent forms used, see: appendix 3.
The population of Spanish refugees settled around certain streets in a relatively central area of Mexico DF in the 1940s, particularly around ‘Calle de López’, which was named ‘Vía del Exilio Español’ in January 2010, as the following photograph shows:

4:1: photograph of Calle de López, DF (taken by the author, March 2013):

Scholars have shown that this concentrated population of refugees began to disperse by the late 1940s. This was the product of increased economic prosperity, as refugees earned money and moved into larger, more comfortable apartments in different areas of the city.\(^\text{38}\) It was also the result of demographic change – as the oldest generation of refugees began to die and their children moved on.\(^\text{39}\) Throughout Mexico, as Dolores Pla has shown, the choice to marry inside or outside the refugee community had an important role to play in the maintenance or weakening of a Spanish refugee identity.\(^\text{40}\) Bringing up children born in Mexico, whose attachment to Mexico was there from the start, also meant that ties with Spain or Spanish culture became weaker as the twentieth century progressed. These general observations serve to provide a context for the stories which Spanish refugee families tell about themselves.


\(^{39}\) Spanish refugees displayed a high level of ‘social mobility’, in that even children of the poorest refugees were likely to obtain a high level of education and qualifications, what Gloria Artís refers to as an ‘adaptive strategy’ adopted by the Spanish refugees, see: Artís, ‘La organización social de los hijos de refugiados en México, D.F’, in *Inmigrantes y refugiados españoles en México (siglo XX)* edited by Michael Kenny, (México: Ediciones de la Casa Chata, 1979), p.308.

Personal histories

The introduction to this thesis explained that oral histories can be used to both describe or reconstruct the past, and show how and why people remember particular events. Once again, Portelli’s concept of ‘creative memory work’ is useful in providing a framework to analyse memories which may not be verifiable but which tell us something about how people ‘make sense of crucial events and of history in general’. First, we will return to a Spanish refugee I interviewed named Pilar Jiménez and her daughter Rocío, both mentioned above. Jiménez was born in March 1926, and she and her two brothers and two sisters grew up in Madrid in comfortable, almost luxurious, surroundings. Jiménez thinks it was when the bombardment of Madrid started, in November 1936, that the younger children and their mother moved to Valencia and later to Barcelona. Her older brother fought for the Republican army and they would later find out that he had died in battle. In what was probably late 1938 or early 1939, 11 members of the family and extended family left Barcelona in a car without Jiménez’s father.

Most of the passengers were ‘young children’, taking ‘nothing more than they could carry’ and at one point having to walk, although it is not clear under what circumstances. They travelled to Port Bou and crossed the border into France, where they were put onto a train by Senegalese guards and left in a cordoned off area for the day. Jiménez’s mother found condensed milk and water to drink but there was little else available. The family were waiting in this crowded public space, when, at about eleven at night, Jiménez related with a smile on her face, a man arrived, he had ‘a big beard and long hair’ and then she realised he was her father. From there, the children and their mother were taken to a refugio and her father, who worked for the Republican government, went to Paris, where he arranged for them to take the boat to Mexico.

This condensed version of Jiménez’s tale serves to put what she related later on in the interview in context:

[my parents], were always more nostalgic [about Spain] for example my mother, she had a good life in Madrid […] she had a lovely house in Seville, we had a beaaauuutiful house, she [went to] a kind of private school, my father…a patio with fountains and everything was very beautiful, then in Madrid we had an apartment, but they also had their car, my father visited London, I don’t know why, I wonder about this, it’s because, but I don’t know, but I do know that he brought me a sweet sweet little doll [her voice becomes very hoarse] and I always had it and when I couldn’t carry it any more during the exodus, I left it on the ground because they wanted to...

---

41 Author’s interview with Pilar Jiménez, 23 April 2013, Mexico DF, part 2, 1-5 mins.
42 They travelled to Mexico on the Sinaia, which set sail in May 1939.
carry a typewriter and by then he couldn’t, yes…and this yes, my father went to London a lot, a lot, he went to London, I don’t know why!\textsuperscript{43}

This is one version, probably rather truncated, of the anecdote to which Pilar’s daughter Rocío referred when she asked whether I had heard the ‘one about the doll’.

It is, of course, entirely plausible that Jiménez had to leave behind her doll, bought for her in London by her father, during the difficult journey from Spain and France, such non-essential items were surely the first to go. Equally, many refugees did indeed take typewriters with them to France, in fact some had access to typewriters in the concentration camps (as we can see upon reading refugee produced pamphlets and newspapers, or letters typed and sent from the French or North African camps).\textsuperscript{44} Nonetheless, it seems unlikely that Pilar, aged 11, would be charged with carrying a typewriter, or that a doll would be so heavy as to convince someone to decide between carrying a doll and a typewriter, an ambiguity which is underlined by Pilar’s abrupt changing of the subject back to her father’s trips to London.

The connection made, between the leaving behind or loss of the doll with the carrying of the typewriter, exemplifies the kind of creative and imaginative memory work which Portelli describes. One possible interpretation is that this exchange of the doll for the typewriter is linked to the broader presentation of the Republican exile, with which Jiménez has certainly come into contact over the course of her life. The Republican regime and the exile produced by the end of the civil war is often described, particularly in Mexico, as inherently \textit{culta} – or highbrow, cultured.\textsuperscript{45} Jiménez did not use this word but she did emphasise the superior education possessed by the refugees: ‘lots of people came in this boat, well qualified people from Spain…doctors, philosophers, mathematicians, biologists, people who were really capable, who led Spain at that time’.\textsuperscript{46} In her narrative we can see expressed an impulse to save the typewriter, a symbol of ideas and cultured expression which was in turn a symbol of Republican ideals.

\textsuperscript{43} Pilar Jiménez, part 3, 2-8 mins.
\textsuperscript{44} See for example: ‘La Web e-xiliad@s’, \textit{Diarios de Viaje}, <http://www.exiliadosrepublicanos.info/es/diarios-viaje>, [accessed 28 July 2014], which contains digitised copies of diaries and journals produced by refugees in camps and in transit.
\textsuperscript{45} A description which is very much linked to the desire to refute Francoist propaganda, see: Faber, \textit{Exile and Cultural Hegemony}, p.123.
\textsuperscript{46} Pilar Jiménez, part 2, 10-15 mins.
As Jiménez’s account ‘shuttlecocks’ between her parents’ former lives in Spain and London, then the exodus, then back again, the loss of the doll also draws our attention to her parents’ loss of their beautiful surroundings in both Seville and Madrid. At other points in the interview, Jiménez described how her mother had never worked in her life before she arrived in Mexico, where she nevertheless started to prepare and serve food at one of the schools set up for Spanish refugees. Fountains, cars and trips to London were replaced by the chaos of the exodus, the death of a beloved son and a painful adaptation to life in Mexico.

Other stories which were part of the family canon align with this particular interpretation of the doll story: Jiménez’s grandmother attempted to carry one part of the family’s prosperity in her skirts by sewing jewels into them and her grandfather had to divest himself of the fillings in his teeth in order to procure money. Jiménez’s doll left behind on the ground signified the end of her childhood and a sacrifice made for Republican culture but it was also part of a broader transformation of her family from people who owned houses with fountains, to refugees partially dependent on the beneficence of a foreign country.

The doll, as both a cherished object and a symbol of childhood, which is contrasted with the horrors of the Civil War, appears in other accounts of the Spanish exile from a child’s perspective as well. Gloria Rodríguez’ memoir recounts her family’s difficult journey through Spain, after they left Malaga in 1936, until they eventually arrived in Mexico in 1939. As a young girl (aged under 10, although the memoir does not state exactly when she was born), Rodríguez travelled on foot with her grandmother, mother, little sister and brother from Catalonia to France with the retirada in 1939. Following the injury of her grandmother on the path, the family were separated and Rodríguez was compelled to continue walking with the rest of the refugees. Having previously described how she had managed to carry her ‘ice-skater doll’ with her, despite how much she was already carrying, Rodríguez explains how the presence of the doll became increasingly important to her as she continued along the path without her family:

As we advanced further, the hope of finding my mother disappeared. In the deepest part of my child's self, something had begun to crack […] I could hardly say a word […] All things considered, mine was not an isolated case in that cruel war, just one more case. I remembered the comments my mother had made when she described the catastrophic flight of the inhabitants of Malaga to Almería, persecuted by five columns of the golpistas who had revolted against the Republic.

47 A term coined by one of Alessandro Portelli’s informants.
Families destroyed and sons who lost their parents and would remain alone forever. They killed so many people without pity..! They were machine-gunned and bombed from the sea, land and air..! How many Spaniards died in this wicked war..! The memory of her narration filled me with fear, and compelled me to hang on to the objects that my mother had entrusted me with and to my ice-skater-doll, as if they were capable of instilling me with some sense of safety.  

Faced with the devastating loss of her family, and the memories of her mother’s response to the invasion of Malaga, which took place in February 1937, Rodríguez attempted to find comfort in the slight figure of her doll. In her beautifully written account, she has also chosen to directly juxtapose the description of Nationalist atrocities with a powerful evocation of what her mother’s objects and her doll meant to her in these difficult moments, imagery which echoes the spoken memories I listened to in the way in which it positions the child refugee simultaneously in a wider, historical context and an intimate, familial context.

A young girl’s doll appeared in another border crossing story when I talked to Elena González, who was born in the mid-1940s in DF, to her Spanish parents. She was telling me about her first visit to Spain, in 1968 to see family members still living in Asturias and Madrid. Her account then switched back to the days during which her family had left Spain:

They had also crossed the frontier in the month of February, the whole family, my grandfather, he packed a suitcase, and my sister was only two years old, and she remembers, her doll that she had to leave in a hostel, because my dad said to her, they are going to look after it well, and because we can’t carry it anymore, and so they crossed over, well in February, and anyway they were coming up to the border […] they were separated, my father in the, they took him to Argelès [a French concentration camp], my uncle, he was a Mason and the Masons rescued him from the queue, and when he was going, coming up to, they put him inside a [inaudible], and just as well because he was very ill and so I think if they had not saved him…and in the end he arrived in Mexico and he lasted two more years, but also he was left with a horrible trauma because he went in an ambulance, in the street [inaudible] on the floor, or, like a psychosis, very severe, everything that they were going through during the war…[talking very quietly] so yes, but yes in Asturias, over there I loved it when I went, the truth is I had a great time, I liked the Asturian people, in general…

The doll was left in a hostel, and was not exchanged for a typewriter as in Jiménez’s account, or clung onto during the journey as in Rodríguez’s account. I believe that these three dolls existed and that they were discarded or kept hold of in the circumstances.

48 Gloria Rodríguez de Álvarez, El Éxodo de una Familia Malagueña en la Guerra Civil, (Málaga: Centro de ediciones de la diputación de Málaga (CEDMA), 2009), p.68.
49 Author’s interview with Señora Elena González (a pseudonym), 2 May 2013, Mexico DF, 40 mins.
described or circumstances similar to those described – but they have also come to play a symbolic role in these accounts of crossing the border into France. This is why the doll continues to feature in these family anecdotes passed down through generations or via written memoirs.

Previously in our conversation, González had described her parents as having told her about their experiences leaving Spain and coming to Mexico but emphasised that her father had left out the ‘horror’. The use of humour to detract from the horror of certain experiences has been noted by Jean Freedman in her work on memories of the Blitz in London and it was and still is deployed by Spanish refugees for the same purpose. González mentioned the novel *Los Rojos Del Ultramar*, about Spanish refugees in Mexico who plotted to kill Franco, which was published in 2005 by the writer Jordi Soler who was born in the ‘Mexican jungle’ to Spanish refugees. The book features vivid descriptions of the conditions in the French concentration camps. Through descriptions like these, González was able to place her father’s stories about life in Argelès camp, which she said mostly revolved around the deals he made with the Senegalese guards in order to procure cigarettes – he was a great smoker – into a broader context. She learnt about how cold it was, the lack of proper sanitation, the disgusting or non-existent food, the threat of death and the callousness of some of the guards. Aside from these written accounts, stories of her uncle’s death, which must have happened before she was born, will have conveyed something of the horror, if not the details of what had happened, as well. Whether or not he died as a result of trauma he suffered during the war is a moot point; for González, his illness, collapse and psychosis were intimately related with the violent and harrowing events he had lived through.

Josefina Tome, who was born in Mexico in 1943, had never heard her father talk about any aspect of his time in a concentration camp in France and neither of her parents talked about the boat journey to Mexico. Following the death of her father, she, like González, learnt more about the details of his journey and the time he had spent in France by reading *Los Rojos Del Ultramar*, alongside accounts written by other exiles. She also encountered

---

52 Author’s interview with Josefina Tome, 29 April, 2013, 3-5 minutes.
material traces like her father’s wallet, kept in a box somewhere in his house. A small canvas pouch, it contains a collection of identity cards and his passport. Tome and her siblings believe that it was all he left Spain with, apart from the clothes he was wearing (see Figures 4.2 and 4.3)

4.2 and 4.3: Josefinia Tome’s father’s wallet and its contents

Other elements of family life, however, did provide some sense of continuity between Tome’s parents’ past and their Mexican present. Her parents had maintained a strong attachment to their Galician identity, in this way forging a connection to the past without verbalising certain memories. As a child Tome and her siblings attended events at the Galician cultural centres like the Patronata da Cultura Gallega (The Galician Culture Trust, which then became Irmandades), set up by refugees on their arrival. The Centro Gallego (Galician Centre) was founded and run by conservative immigrants living in Mexico, who did not allow refugees to join when they arrived, leading the refugees to set up their own independent centres. Photographs from the association’s newspaper depict Tome and her sister dressed in Galician folkloric dresses, smiling and dancing. A radio programme was also broadcast in DF, playing folk songs and announcements in the Galician language. Tome described to me her memory of being a child and seeing her parents cry as they listened to the Galician songs, not fully understanding what was making them so sad.

---

53 Meeting with Josefina Tome, 22 May 2013; photographs used with interviewee’s permission.
54 This did not happen in the case of the Orfeo Catalá (Catalan cultural centre), Casa Andaluza (Andalusian cultural centre) or the Casa Asturias (Asturian cultural centre). Refugees could join and mix with gachupines. On the extent to which refugees underwent a process of ‘gachpunización’ from 1939 onwards, in Mexico, see: Pla, Els Éxiliats, p.301.
55 Personal archive of Josefina Tome.
56 Josefina Tome, 20-30 mins.
Remembered objects, like the doll, or existing objects like the wallet, help people to structure their accounts of the past and people who have died. For the Spanish refugees in particular, personal archives, photographs, letters or tickets, provide proof that what happened did indeed happen; they also act as tactile reminders of the people who once owned them.

Objects on display in people’s homes serve another purpose; they can represent carefully curated message to anyone who might visit. Carmen Romero, for example, who was 20 when she left Spain for France and 93 when we met, made a collage of images and documents which she framed and put up on the wall of her apartment in Polanco, a smart area of DF.

Figure 4.4: Carmen Romero’s collage.

Figure 4.5: Detail from Carmen Romero’s collage, which shows the family hiding from the Gestapo.

---


58 A feeling which is particularly well captured by Olivia Dasté in a creative essay about her grandmother’s suitcase and what it meant to her after her grandmother’s death, see: Dasté, ‘The Suitcase’, in *Evocative Objects: Things We Think with*, edited by Sherry Turkle, (Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press, 2007), pp.245-249.
The display includes a copy of the menu on the boat – the *Nyassa* – in which she and her parents travelled from Casablanca to Mexico in 1942, sketches of the gestapo viewed from afar in Nazi occupied France which echo her own experiences (produced by an artist), a copy of the poem she wrote about arriving in Veracruz and her boat ticket, amongst other things. It serves as a talking point for visitors and is situated in plain view, in a communal area of her apartment: being a Spanish refugee is an important part of Romero’s identity, and she wants to share that with those who visit her home.

Returning to Josefina Tome’s account, we can see how her mother’s stories of the past, which combined symbolic objects, humour and vivid description, are retold today. Whilst Tome’s father remained reticent regarding what had happened to him in France and specifically in the concentration camps, her mother shared an account of her journey to France with her children. Tome recounted what her mother had told her as follows:

…so [my parents] didn’t leave Spain together, my mum went alone with a group of women and children – she said that at the moment they were going over to France, the border, a German plane bombed the, the bus, and they threw themselves on the ground, and fortunately for them it was an area of countryside where there were lots of sheep so they killed lots of sheep, but they didn’t kill [any of the refugees] […] for a long time she even kept a bullet casing that had gone through a small suitcase she had […] that had fallen into the suitcase. So anyway, she crosses the border with this group, and goes to a refugee camp, a camp in France, where they treated [the refugees] very badly, she had bad things to say about the French that looked after them, [she said] they [hardly] gave them any food, fortunately they found a – a room full of onions, raw ones, it looked as if they had a [large] crop, so they stole them, and ate – [when] we talked to her [about it] we said to her, that she was strong and very healthy because she had eaten a lot of onions [we laugh]…so she wasn’t malnourished, quite the opposite…

We are able to distinguish between which elements of Tome’s account are potentially verifiable or plausible and the parts which are more mysterious. German planes did attack and kill civilians leaving Spain because Hitler supported Franco’s war effort, and we know that women and children often travelled in expeditions separate from men (who were more likely to be soldiers for the Republican army travelling with their brigade). Groups of people were sometimes provided with vehicles like buses, or were able to gain access to a bus for some other reason. The French did, on an institutional level at least, treat the Spanish refugees badly. Considering the ease with which onions can be stored, it is safe to assume that rooms filled with onions were a relatively common sight in rural France all year round.

---

59 Josefina Tome, 1-3 mins.
Listening to the interview and then transcribing it, however, it is the other details which take on greater significance, the details which we should try to understand rather than verify. Tome said that her mother told her that everyone travelling in the bus ran out of the bus and threw themselves on the ground to try and avoid being killed by the plane, which was shooting at – or bombing – them. They were in a rural setting, probably near the Pyrenees and the field was full of sheep. The plane flew on and the people stood up, realising they were unharmed, all alive and reasonably well. Some of the sheep had died though: their bellies were (perhaps) bleeding onto the grass and their fleeces, thick because it was winter, were (perhaps) stained with red. Was there snow on the ground? Had the guns or bombs destroyed the dead sheep beyond recognition or were their bodies intact; did they look peaceful or ghastly?

The image of innocent sheep mown down by a German plane reminds us of the devastating effect that total war has on landscapes, animals and livelihoods, and the imprecise practice of aerial bombardment, which in 1939 was still in its infancy. We can think about the refugees standing up, getting back into the bus and driving away from the field filled with dead sheep, perhaps having to steer around their bodies. The themes of chaotic destruction, bringing about human and animal suffering, also echo one of the great artistic responses to the Spanish Civil War: Picasso’s Guernica. Painted in response to the bombing of the Basque town Guernika at the end of April 1937 and part of the Republican campaign to raise funds and sympathy for their war effort, Guernica is one of the best-known elements of republican iconography. It is not surprising that I have postcards of each stage of its production above my desk or that a historian of the Spanish exile I met in Mexico also has a large framed print of Guernica in her office. Emails sent to members of the Ateneo Español de México, which Josefina Tome would have received because she is a member, were sent on the anniversary of the attack on Guernika (just three days before our meeting) and of course they included reproductions of the painting. The painting (which also exists as a textile) has become an international symbol of the devastation of war on

60 Tome used the word ‘tirarse’, which means throw yourself down. But ‘tirar’ also means shoot, which lead me to conflate the image of the people throwing themselves on the ground with them being shot at. The only description of how they were attacked is ‘bombardeó’ – bombed or shelled – but Tome also talked about the ‘casco de una bala’ which is translated as ‘casing of a bullet or shell’. See appendix 1, p.224 for the full Spanish quotation.

61 Guernica was first exhibited at the Paris world exhibition in May-Nov. 1937; it then toured in tapestry form to the Whitechapel Gallery in London and to New York. ‘Guernika’, as opposed to ‘Guernica’, is the Basque spelling of the town’s name.
civilian populations. It depicts a screaming horse, and terrified human faces which seem to fly across the canvas, as well as limbs and bodies lying stricken on the ground. *Guernica* is one of the most universally recognised and commonly shared visual narratives available to refugees recounting family memories. Perhaps its powerful mixture of human and animal suffering inflected Tome’s narrative?

Individuals draw upon a huge range of potential sources to construct family memories: collective memory and prominent artistic representations being just two (interrelated) examples. Tome was telling me what happened to her mother, so although this story is part of a broader history of modern, mechanised warfare and the image of the dead sheep does echo the great painting created by Picasso, it is also about the nature of Tome’s relationship with her mother. Consequently, we should think more about the conversations which fed into Tome’s account and how the woman who had survived these events talked to her children, as she settled into a new life in a foreign country. The context within which stories were and continue to be told, clearly shapes their content: in this case, a mother telling her children what happened to her, why she was born in Spain but now lived in Mexico and why her children are Mexican, with an appreciation for Galician food.

Tome explained that the aerial bombardment was deadly by saying that ‘they killed lots of sheep’ so the threat was deflected from her mother by the sheep. The way she juxtaposed the survival of the people with the death of the sheep suggests that she saw a relationship between the two: the sheep seem to have drawn the threat from the people; they acted as a kind of sacrifice to the bloodthirsty plane. Was this the way her mother explained it, or how Tome made sense of it after listening to her? Most clearly, the narrative is about survival, something which is underlined again with the descriptions of the bullet casing and the onions. It is not clear whether Tome’s mother kept the bullet casing from the attack on the bus, or some other attack, but the two are heavily linked in the context of her story. The bullet casing stands as evidence of a near-miss – the bullet or shell fell on Tome’s mother’s suitcase not her – perhaps it was converted into a talisman, an object with protective powers, from then on.62

---

62 This object is also part of a near-miss narrative, see: Freedman, *Whistling*, p.99.
The illicit consumption of onions is proof again of Tome’s mother’s endurance. With regards to the sheep and the bullet casing, she survived because of luck or fate. In the case of the onions, Tome’s mother’s character played a stronger role: she looked for food and she ignored French authority to eat the onions (although Tome does temper the image of her mother as a thief, by emphasising the huge amount of onions in the room). Far from being punished for this transgression, she was rewarded with health and strength. Tome’s narrative does not highlight the starvation which drove her mother to search for and steal food, and which caused some refugees to die, instead she emphasised how well her mother did: ‘so she wasn’t malnourished, quite the opposite!’, she laughed. This is a warm, comforting statement, which again reminds us of the convivial familial context within which these stories were told.

It might seem obvious that a mother would focus on the possibilities for survival and humour, when talking to her children, rather than the presence of death and fear. But it only seems obvious to someone who has not lived through that kind of experience.

---

relationship between trauma and character is complicated; the way people describe the events which have marked them and shaped their lives must depend not only on how long and badly they suffered but also on what kind of personality they have, what their relationship with their children or listener is like, how life has treated them since then and how life treated them before the events in question.

**Generational memories**

Just as Tome’s mother presented her experiences in a way which consciously or unconsciously emphasised her strength and ability to survive, for many of the interviewees or their parents, the need to build a new life surpassed the urge to express memories in a way which caused sadness. All but two of the people I interviewed were women, this kind of strategy is therefore associated in this chapter strongly but potentially erroneously with women; it was described by my informants as the imperative to remain ‘strong’, juxtaposing the upright and forceful business of running a house and bringing up children with the vulnerable position of succumbing to powerful emotions. The social relations and functions of the family suppressed the expression of particularly painful memories; once a new life had been built, however, delayed emotional reactions to past experiences could be ‘released’.

Erandi Mejia-Arregui’s narrative is illuminating in this respect. She was born in 1988: a member of the third generation of Spanish exiles, her grandmother had left Spain in 1939 and travelled to the Dominican Republic before re-migrating to Mexico in 1945. Mejia-Arregui’s grandmother had a mother who she described as belonging to another era, citing the fact that she spoke French and liked opera, and a father who had joined the PCE. One of the great tragedies of Mejia-Arregui’s grandmother’s exile was that her brother Luis was left behind in the Francoist occupied zone of Spain, when the rest of the family left through Catalonia to France. The family tried for years to locate Luis and provide him with the means to leave Spain but they did not have what Mejia-Arregui called the ‘connections’, ‘money’ or ‘luck’ to do so. 64 They have been able to establish that he died in the 1950s, probably after years of incarceration in Francoist gaols.

As Mejia-Arregui pointed out, she and we cannot be sure whether her account of her grandmother’s life is based on discussions around the dinner table, the discussions she had

---

64 Author’s interview with Erandi Mejia-Arregui, 14 April, 1-5 mins.
with her grandmother when they were alone, or her own embellishment. Her testimony nevertheless provides us with a powerful example of how financial security and shifting familial circumstances shape the expression of memories and emotions:

I started to become really interested in [my grandmother’s] life, when there were the Barcelona Olympics in ’96, ’92, or four well, the Barcelona Olympics. she sat by the telly, it really made an impression on me, she sat by the telly and cried. She cried and cried and cried, and I said *abuela* [grandma] why are you crying? And she said well ‘I walked down there and that’s where…I walked through those streets’ and she was remembering, so I said tell me about it *abuela*, and she told me all about leaving Spain and, a bit about the Dominican Republic. And also there were things that she couldn’t say to me because I was only a little girl, but yes she did talk to me [about her life before Mexico] […] I think that being a mother [when her children were young] she had to be strong… [And], at that time it was very bad economically in Mexico [they had very little money], and my mother was the first to go to University. She’s a doctor. So I think that in a way it helped that my mother had a stronger economic position when my grandmother was old, there were things she didn’t have to worry about anymore…Above all, giving the impression, that ‘I can bring my children up’, or I don’t know, this meant in a way, I think, with me, it gave her permission to cry more, because she cried a lot.66

Mejia-Arregui’s grandmother was no longer expected to play the role of the strong mother, who set a good example to her children, and thus she was able to cry with her granddaughter. Equally, the trigger apparently provided by the Barcelona Olympics, as with the Galician radio programme heard by Tome’s parents, gives us some idea of the myriad ways in which the expression of particular emotions was prompted.

Grief and mourning for a lost city, then, need not be seen as representative of nothing but sadness and pain because these tears and stories were elicited by a sense of safety, comfort and a close relationship with a beloved granddaughter. Mejia-Arregui also recounted other elements of her grandmother’s life and behaviour which invoke different forms of postmemory and non-verbal communication: she was, for example, extremely unwilling to participate in any kind of queue, form-filling or bureaucratic process. In the Mexican state schools, which Mejia-Arregui’s mother and aunt attended, parents of pupils were required to sign a set of official documents every year and she hated doing this, a fact which Mejia-Arregui used to explain why her grandmother never worked outside of the home. Mejia-Arregui did not know whether there was any clear connection between this generalised fear and the kinds of forms her grandmother would have been required to sign as a Spanish refugee in France but the suggestion did not seem unreasonable to her.

65 The Barcelona Olympics were held in 1992, when Erandi Mejia-Arregui was only four or five.
A more direct link was drawn by Ana María Gaos’ daughter (also called Ana María) between some of her mother’s past behaviours and her experiences during the Spanish civil war and the journey from Spain to France in 1939. Gaos was born in Malaga in 1930, so she was six when she left with her mother, her father and her younger brother and sister, to stay in Valencia for (at least) three months, later moving (probably without her father) to various places in Catalonia. From there, her mother and the three children made for the frontier in late 1938 or early 1939, ‘you imagine it, my mother, a girl accustomed to everything going well, everything you might like [...] very young, leaving for the frontier with three children holding onto her skirts, without knowing what had happened to my father, if they had killed him, if they had got hold of him’.67

Her father had been taken to St. Cyprien, a French concentration camp, but he managed to leave (Gaos did not know how), procure a laissez-passé, travel to Paris and buy tickets for his family to leave Europe on a boat, which sailed to New York on the 10 May 1939. His wife (Gaos’ mother), Gaos and her siblings had been relocated to a small village near Paris and they were reunited for the journey to North America. From New York the family travelled via a ‘greyhound’ bus across the length of the United States to northern Mexico, initially settling in Santa Clara, Chihuahua, where SERE had set up a collective farm to be worked by Spanish refugees.

Throughout the time I spent talking to Gaos, she continually emphasised both her strong attachment to Mexico, her Mexican-ness and the fact that she was one step removed from the more acute homesickness suffered by both her parents. The universal resilience of children in the face of traumatic events is something she referred to several times. In less direct ways, she explained how her character, as well as the actions of several kind people, helped to keep her safe and well throughout the difficult months leaving Spain and the period during which she and her family were waiting to leave France. She emphasised her ability to eat anything, her willingness to eat ‘stones’ in fact, rather than go hungry, contrasting her no-nonsense attitude with two other children, her brother who was ten months younger than her and a girl she encountered in a French refugio. Both of these children were at least initially unable to eat foods to which they were not accustomed, or which they did not like, because in reality not all children are naturally resilient. Gaos remembers the girl saying to her mother that she could not eat and her mother urging her

67 Author’s interview with Ana María Gaos, Mexico DF, 27 May 2013, 5 mins.
to do so: ‘and this girl was crying because she could not eat, and I put it as, well ‘what an idiot!’ I didn’t put it in words but that’s what I felt. If you are hungry, eat, no?’

When I had been talking to Gaos for a couple of hours, her daughter returned to the house and came in to the room in which we were sitting, in a similar way to Pilar Jiménez’ daughter. Like Jiménez, Gaos senior mentioned my question about family anecdotes, which led to her daughter saying ‘well there’s the one about the burial, that’s a very famous one’. I had just heard about the burial, a story which also seems to exemplify Gaos’ ability to distance herself from the traumatic nature of particular experiences:

I remember that in a very small village in Catalonia […] I guess we were running around so many places, and we were in the doorway of an inn, a hotel or whatever it was, we were standing, and I saw a burial going past and I never saw this in my life, they were going up as the street rose like this [motions with her hands to suggest an upwards trajectory] towards a knoll, and it was a funeral thing, pulled by horses, well they must have been donkeys because the rest [the horses] had all been eaten, there wasn’t any meat. Dragging the wagon with black feathers here, everything very poor, [rural] and all [worn down by the] war, the poor little horses, little donkeys…And these were the [animals who were] still living. And look, it was very curious, and then more or less…there was another little boy, we could walk around freely, the children, I imagine, and there was a man, with the children, all in black and crying, and it must have been the burying of the mother…that was my impression, how curious, how strange, nothing more. And years later, talking about it with my brother, he said that when these people were passing by, he was thinking, in a little while they are going to take me like this, to bury me, because he was feeling very weak I think. So the same scene produces lots of very different impressions in you. He thought that in not too much time they would take him to be pulled by some black donkeys. And that never occurred to me. It also depends on your character, how you see things.

Taking our lead from Gaos’ analysis, we can see that anecdotes are used to convey different meanings, depending on who is doing the telling. Personality impacts upon the formulation of particular narratives: her brother used this story to explain how weak and afraid he felt, Gaos used it to explain how strange and enthralling these village customs were, how very little food there was (considering the horses had all been eaten) and how she had been a witness to death and burial but did not expect to be buried herself.

Yet, as her daughter said, experiences such as those Gaos experienced – having to run from aerial bombardment in Valencia, having to move from place to place with very little preparation, feeling the pressure to eat whatever food could be found – did have a profound impact on her life, in some respects at least. These are events ‘which mark you’.

68 Ana María Gaos, 2 hrs 10 mins.
69 Ana María Gaos, 2 hrs 10-15 mins.
Gaos (junior) gently suggested in her mother’s presence. She explained that as children she and her siblings had never understood why they had to go to sleep with a dressing gown and shoes ready by their beds – it was so they would be relatively well prepared if they needed to leave the house, in order to escape from some kind of danger. At 83 years of age, Gaos sr. had stopped doing this but she nodded when her daughter described these childhood routines, confirming that she had wanted her children to be ready for what could have happened. This is one way of passing memories down; laying out your clothes and shoes ready for a potential air-raid is certainly a powerful form of postmemory, once again demonstrating how memories can hang on or be orchestrated via particular objects.

One might also presume that having children focused Gaos’ protective instincts, or provided her with a more obvious way to exercise them. She was able to pass down her knowledge of the nature of humanity and the instability of a peaceful existence when she had reached a certain age and had become a mother. Just as Mejia-Arregui’s grandmother was able to reflect upon her past in a different way once her daughter had achieved financial security, the constantly changing nature of inter-personal relationships shape how people structure oral accounts of their life. The ways in which memories of another person are subsequently interpreted years after that person’s death are also the product of changing life circumstances and as the daughter becomes a mother herself, she may interpret memories of her mother differently.

Lucia Gómez’s narrative illustrates this point further. Gómez’s parents could not leave Spain in 1939. Unable to guarantee a suitable form of transportation, they did not want to risk the journey over the Pyrenees into France because her mother was eight months pregnant with her first daughter. Gómez’s father was subsequently imprisoned for political reasons by Franco’s regime. Throughout her father’s incarceration, her mother worked extremely hard to feed her first daughter. She was reliant, as well, on the help provided to her by her mother (Gómez’s grandmother) and the rest of her relatives: everyone gave everything they had to provide milk for Gómez’s sister, and luckily she grew up to be strong and healthy. Initially sentenced to 30 years of hard labour, Gómez’s father was released in 1943 on ‘conditional liberty’, significantly weakened by the poor prison diet, as well as the mental strain of imprisonment, a period of time which included seeing his fellow

70 See the discussion of Gina Herrmann and Pamela Sugiman’s work exploring this subject, on page 31 of this thesis.
inmates taken away to be executed, as well as the separation from his family.\textsuperscript{71} This may have been in 1944, as Gillespie notes that of those who were imprisoned for 30 years, many were released in that year on 'conditional liberty', which meant that their 'sentences still hanging over them in case of a fresh arrest'.\textsuperscript{72} Gómez was born a year later and when she was nine, in 1953, the family moved to Mexico after her father had finally procured a passport in 1952, following years of unsuccessful petitioning due to his 'conditional' freedom.

Reflecting on what this emigration and exile in Mexico meant for the family, Gómez emphasised the disparity between the relative (though not total) ease with which she and her sister were able to adapt to life in Mexico and the sustained sense of loss her mother felt as a result of leaving Spain.\textsuperscript{73} Stating that her mother had never really adapted to life in Mexico, Gómez described how she kept in close contact with Gómez’s grandmother, living ‘through the letters’ and photographs she sent and received from Spain.\textsuperscript{74} Gómez’s father died aged 53, three years after arriving in Mexico, which left her mother alone again but this time without the proximity of her family. Gómez recounted how, years later, her mother made ‘hot cakes’ (a popular Mexican version of pancakes) for her grandchildren. She exclaimed that she had never imagined a time in her life when she would be able to make food like hot cakes for her family, such were the limitations placed on her by the material and financial shortages she had experienced throughout her life.

Gómez’s account of her mother’s reaction to exile in Mexico was shaped by her own experiences of life and as a mother. At various points in the interview she draws her own connections between her life and her understanding of her mother:

> I didn’t understand everything that my family had been through, until I got to be their age, my father was 50 years old and my mother 42, with eight dollars in the wallet, so it was starting again but it was starting again from scratch…and older, with two young daughters […] it was very difficult, in a country that they didn’t know, and well, I never realised what this meant, why it [made them] so sad, so…and so when I got to be the same age [as my mother] and I put myself in her place, I said [to myself] ‘how brave! How brave!’\textsuperscript{75}

\textsuperscript{71} For more information on Francoist prisons, see for example: Juliá and Casanova, \textit{Víctimas de la guerra civil}, p.297.

\textsuperscript{72} Gillespie, \textit{The Spanish Socialist Party}, pp.135-6.

\textsuperscript{73} The family were not classified as political exiles by the Mexican government but immigrants. However, they received help from General Miaja, who petitioned Lázaro Cárdenas, no longer the President but still influential, to allow the family into México.

\textsuperscript{74} Author’s interview with Lucia Gómez (a pseudonym), 18 April 2013, Mexico DF, 37-40 mins.

\textsuperscript{75} Lucia Gómez, 12-15 mins.
Gómez’s own life experiences, which included bringing up several children on her own, provided her with a stronger sense of empathy for her mother’s experience of leaving her home to live in a strange country. Elsewhere in the interview, she describes her own difficulties with money and having to make the same kind of sacrifices which years earlier had been made by her mother on her behalf. She does not explicitly describe these experiences as echoing her mother’s. Nevertheless, the way in which she structures her narrative, emphasising the themes of scarcity and sacrifice for one’s children, as well as her assertion that she understood completely what her mother had been through only when she reached the right age, allow us to see how Gómez’s memories of her own motherhood have shaped her understanding of, and therefore the way she expresses, the childhood memories she has of her mother.

The loss experienced by Gómez’s mother upon leaving Spain and the strong attachment she maintained with her mother and the rest of her family who had stayed in Spain, has produced a happy legacy for both sides of the family. Gómez first visited her maternal aunt’s family, in Santiago de Compostela, in 1964, when she was 20 and her first cousin Concepcion Ruiz was 14 years old. She now visits Spain every year or every other year and usually stays with Ruiz if she can. In September 2013, I interviewed Ruiz and she talked about her contented childhood growing up in Francoist Spain, the school she attended which was run by nuns and her attendance, as a child in the late 1950s and 1960s, at the women and girl’s Falangist organisation, Sección Femenina (Women’s Section).76 She also described the great respect and love she had had for her father, who was knowledgeable about many subjects and a devotee of great literature, art and learning. Ruiz’s father was also an ‘Inspector’ of the movimiento – a word which encompasses the Francoist dictatorship’s political wing and into which the Falange had been incorporated. Ruiz and her four siblings were therefore privileged; they lived comfortably and on the right side of the dictatorship. It should also be noted that Ruiz experienced the Francoism of the late 50s, 60s and 70s, which was characterised by economic development, the rise of consumerism, international tourism and a more open attitude to the rest of the world.77

76 For more information on the Sección Femenina mostly in the years before Ruiz joined, see: Kathleen Richmond, Women and Spanish Fascism: The Women’s Section of the Falange, 1934-1959, (London: Routledge, 2003).
77 Nigel Townson argues that historians like Michael Richards too often conflate the repression and hunger which characterised the early dictatorship with Francoism 1959-1975, see: Townson, Spain Transformed, p.9.
In Ruiz’s household they only spoke about the Civil War in vague terms; she knew that her father’s brother had died fighting for Franco’s forces but her father had not fought for either side. Partly because of my research topic, Ruiz started our conversation by talking about the significance of the packages her family received from Mexico from her aunt, uncle and cousins:

And that made me think a lot, why these people had gone, so far, and when you ask, when we were small, there was never an answer, they are there because our uncle went to work there and all this, so it led me to ask myself a question, to say why are these people so far away…

This question would only be answered through later conversations with Gómez and through a gradual expansion of Ruiz’s world to include going to University in Santiago in 1968, witnessing workers in the University strike for months, reading new books and meeting new friends. Ruiz marks the beginning of this process with a description of how when she was 17, she consciously chose not to become an adult member of the Sección Femenina. She explained this decision as being driven by concerns for her social life because none of her friends were going, rather than any political consciousness, saying: ‘at that time my political education was Franquismo, there was no other’. But of course there was another, particularly considering the growing visibility of various forms of opposition to Francoism throughout the 1960s but it was much harder to access than the politics of her family life. Since then she has become a supporter of Galician nationalism, the recuperation of historical memory and leftist politics.

It is difficult for Ruiz to reconcile the different facets of her family’s past. On the one hand, her father, who never told his children what to think and who was a kind and amiable man but a member of the Falange. On the other, her Republican relatives:

Something I have thought about lots of times is why was my father in the movement and a Falangist, this is something I’ve thought about lots of times…and clearly sometimes [Lucia Gómez] has said to me as well, in the mode of an older [wise] cousin, she said ‘well because it was the era, and it was the way to get on’…a good strategy to survive.

A related sense of unease brought on by these unanswered questions was sometimes noticeable throughout our two meetings and Ruiz expressed this very clearly in the last minutes of our final recorded discussion:

---

78 Author’s interview with Concepción Ruiz (a pseudonym), Sept. 2013, opening phrases.
79 Concepción Ruiz, 20-25 mins.
80 Concepción Ruiz, 28 mins.
Sometimes I have been afraid to think that someone in my family was a murderer, I’ve thought about this too, because I think that it would be a – although it’s not your responsibility because you are not your father, your mother, your uncle, or – um, because we’re in the winning side, it makes me uncomfortable, it makes me uncomfortable precisely for this reason, because, there is another part of my family that was on the losing [side], and in some way I want, as far as I can [to make them feel] like part of the family…[to make them] know that we love them here.  

The difficulty of recovering historical memory and the ways in which knowledge of the past can weigh on individuals are rendered here as one person’s feelings of fear at the possibility that a relative of hers was a murderer who had not been brought to justice and the debt she feels towards her older cousin. To an extent, the latter half of the Spanish twentieth century is embodied in the stories of Ruiz’s aunt, her uncle in law who was imprisoned for being a Republican, her father who was a member of the Falange and her cousin, a nine year old girl who had to leave her home through no fault of her own and for whom she feels a huge sense of responsibility and protective love.

**Conclusion**

The relationship between the past and family relationships is also at the heart of Javier Cercas’ book *The Anatomy of a Moment*, which is a historical account of the events of ‘23F’ in Spain, Colonel Tejero’s failed military coup which took place on 23 February 1981. Much of the book, which is written in Cercas’ characteristically frank and sometimes rhetorical style, focuses on the precise moment when Tejero burst into the Spanish parliament accompanied by an estimated 200 armed guards, ordered all the members of parliament to get down under their seats and opened fire. Only three men remained seated: the by then much maligned acting president Adolfo Suárez, the Minister of Defence and one time supporter of Franco’s military coup, General Gutiérrez Mellado and the head of the PCE, Santiago Carrillo. The book aims to historicise Suárez’ role and to explain why, in the months prior to the coup, he had been accused of betrayal by both the Left and the Right.

The book finishes, however, with Cercas recounting a conversation he had with his father, who was trying to explain why he had supported Suárez:

“Because he was like us”, he said with what little voice he had left. I was about to ask him what he meant by that when he added: “He was from a small town, he’d

---

81 Concepción Ruiz, part 2, 42 mins.  
been in the Falange, he’d been in Acción Católica, he wasn’t going to do anything bad, you understand, don’t you?”

Cercas’ father was a vet, a family man and a member of the Falange, who had inspired a healthy disdain in his son, who thought of him as a man with no principles or moral fibre. Thus, Cercas’ historical analysis of 23-F is a forensic analysis of what had happened that day and the politics of the transition to democracy but it is also about Cercas’ relationship with his father, a man who had lived through the dictatorship without resisting or condemning it. He writes: ‘I’d wanted to finish [the book] so my father could read it and know that I’d finally understood, that I’d understood that I wasn’t so right and he wasn’t so wrong, that I’m no better than him, and that now I never will be’. 83

This chapter has presented the memories and inherited memories of Spanish refugees living in Mexico as representations of the past which seem important to people today. The longevity of particular stories depends on the significance they hold for the people who tell them, whether that significance is related to how well these stories conform to collective memory or how well they seem to chime in with somebody’s character, their long beloved nature, their role as a mother, grandmother, father, grandfather, brother or sister. These memories were not presented as evidence, proof or testimony that could be drawn upon in a court of law. They do, however, feature descriptions of terrible miscarriages of justice: for example, Tome’s mother was bombed as a civilian escaping Spain. Surely this should be classed as a war crime? 84 Accounts of past lives in Spain remind us that many refugees lost their houses, money, cars; Jiménez’s grandmother may have been able to sew jewels into her skirts but she presumably lost much more than she was able to save. None of the people I spoke with, however, expressed a desire to have their erstwhile properties returned; María-Luz Díaz Marta explained that her parents had left Spain because they were ‘idealists’, so they accepted the consequences of their decision. 85 Gaos thought it absurd that following the legislation passed in Spain on 18 March 2005, ‘niños de guerra’, like her, receive a pension from the Spanish state. 86

83 Both quotations, Cercas, Anatomy, p.383.
84 For a more in-depth discussion of the blurred lines between aerial bombardment, total war, genocide and war crimes, see: Eric Markusen and David Kopf, The Holocaust and Strategic Bombing: Genocide and Total War in the Twentieth Century (Boulder: Westview Press, 1995), pp.55-78.
85 Author’s interview with María-Luz Díaz Marta, 23 May 2013, 15-20 mins.
86 ‘Ley 3/2005, de 18 de marzo, por la que se reconoce una prestación económica a los ciudadanos de origen español desplazados al extranjero, durante su minoría de edad,
In the same way, not all of the interviewees were concerned about the ‘recuperation of historical memory’ within Spain or were necessarily familiar with that terminology, so their accounts of the past were very much set in the Mexican context and the family home. Three women were interested in these questions, however, and they all had a far stronger relationship with Spain and Spanish politics than the other interviewees. Tome is a member of the PSOE in Mexico; Lucia Gómez wrote a Masters dissertation which touched on the issues surrounding the memory of Francoism and Elena González worked for a Spanish institution in Mexico.87

They all drew on specific examples which demonstrate how passionate they are about particular issues. Tome described going to visit her family in Madrid whilst Franco was still alive and being asked if she would like to watch the annual Nationalist victory march through the city on 18 July, which understandably prompted a family argument. Gómez eloquently explained her horror at particular articles she had read about the Valley of the Fallen and her desire that the Republican prisoners who had been forced to build it receive some kind of justice. Elena González, in a story which mirrors Gómez’s distress, was asked by her Spanish family during a visit whether she wanted to go and see the Valley, which provoked an outraged response. Despite their anger, these women did not make specific demands of the Spanish state, their attitude was, I think, summed up by something Gómez said about what should be done to punish those who had forced Republican prisoners to build the shrine at the Valley of the Fallen: ‘I am not saying you should put them [the perpetrators] in prison, not at all, simply that they recognise that this person did this and that the history of Spain is history, not a fable!’.88

Over the course of this chapter, I have referred to ‘memories’, ‘postmemory’, ‘narratives’, ‘accounts’ and personal, familial and collective memories; I have also sought to show that these are not fables, as Gómez said, they are history. The questions that this history raises are yet to be resolved within Spain and are brought up by different events, anniversaries and contemporary political struggles. As Vincent has argued, the recovery of the memory of the Spanish Civil War and Francoism often amounts to another re-writing of the past from a partisan perspective, “[discovering] certain facts and stories from the past and


87 An institution I will not name so as to protect her identity.

88 Lucia Gómez, 1 hr 30 mins.
consign[ing] others to oblivion’. In a similar vein, Jo Labanyi noted that ‘the problem’ with the urge to recover historical memory ‘is the […] assumption that it is enough to recover what happened and that the recovery process is unproblematic’.89

This chapter has shown how the memory of cataclysmic events has been lived and passed down within families. The role of real and imagined objects in structuring narratives, as well as the significance of objects on display, has been explored. A detailed analysis of the ‘creative memory work’ which we have encountered, exemplified in the recurrent descriptions of a young girl’s doll, has shown how collective memory and personal relationships, or identities, shape the content of personal memories expressed in interviews. Descriptions of where stories were told and the intense emotional responses which narrators were able to share with their children and grandchildren have helped to convey the impact which particular experiences had on refugees and their descendants; moments in which family members cry together over the past remind us that shared grief is paradoxically a sign of stability and strong relationships. Finally, in juxtaposing the memories of Lucia Gómez living in Mexico and her cousin Concepcion Ruiz, living in Spain, the chapter has shown how familial memories can bridge the Atlantic but that the reencounter between these two sets of memory, on a personal and national level, is rarely straightforward.

89 Vincent, ‘Breaking the Silence? Memory and Oblivion since the Spanish Civil War’, p.66.
Conclusion

On holiday in Asturias, Northern Spain, in 2012, I bought a copy of the local paper: *La Nueva España*. Alongside articles which discussed Spain’s economic problems and a farmer’s ongoing battle with wild boars, there was an account of a 95 year old Spanish refugee’s visit to Oviedo (from his home in Mexico), the town in which he had grown up.\(^1\)

The nephew of the famous General Miaja – often credited with leading the Republican defence of Madrid – Rodríguez Miaja found a city that had grown but whose centre retained its original ‘flavour’. His daughter travelled with him and one of his grandsons, a high ranking executive at Barclay’s bank in London, was also due to join the homecoming. All this felt like a surprising coincidence (it was about exiles and one exile’s relationship with Spain) but the probability of reading a piece like this was doubtless higher than it seemed. Similar accounts regularly appear in the British press about some aspect of the Second World War, not to mention the current almost continuous coverage of the First World War as a result of the centenary commemorations or ‘celebrations’. In Spain, the Civil War is evoked by anything from archaeological evidence, contemporary political debates or an application for a military pension. But as the article in *Nueva España* and this thesis have shown, people who experienced the war and subsequent exile also travelled across the world, taking their memories with them.

This thesis began by making several observations about the history of the Spanish Civil War and republican exile. I cited Michael Richards’ remark that the historiography of the Civil War has been complicated by ‘competing mythologies’, and suggested (along with several scholars) that the same was true of the historiography of Spanish republican exile. ‘Civil war’ is an umbrella term for a localised violent conflict, or collection of conflicts, driven by a range of political, economic and social problems. So it was in Spain, where societal structures, the demands of elites or workers, and standards of living were vastly different in the Basque country, for example, than they were in Andalusia. The levels of political affiliation to the various right and left-wing parties and organisations were not consistent across Spain, just as the social revolution which took place in Catalonia was not replicated across Spain. The intensity of military conflict depended on which zone or front you found yourself in, and on what date. Equally, the severity of the violence conducted behind the lines was often determined by local conditions and power relations. This uneven
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\(^1\) ‘Miaja, reencuentro con Oviedo’, *La Nueva España*, 7 June 2012, p.8.
overall picture has been well conveyed by historians, and details of the ways in which people conceived of their own role in the war, whether that was through being conscripted as a soldier, volunteering for war work, joining political organisations, or attempting to avoid any engagement whatsoever with the hostilities, are becoming increasingly clear with the publication of new studies and the adoption of novel methodologies.

However, whilst historians have questioned the utility of binary political categories and developed more sophisticated understandings of the ways in which Spaniards engaged with the conflicts which divided their country, these approaches have not often been applied to the study of the republican exile. The departure from Spain of this large group of people has a symbolic value, and it is part of a standard evocation of the Spanish tragedy; the fall of the Republic is seen to be embodied in the half a million refugees. We often read about how they walked over the Pyrenees, that they went with heavy hearts, leaving houses, villages, and furniture behind but what of their lives, feelings, beliefs or futures? In concentrating on the details of individual narratives, I hope this thesis has demonstrated that each person walking over the border (as well as the thousands who left during the war, or by boat from Southern Spain) had an inner life, possessed a range of motivations and went on to negotiate their displacement in radically different ways.

The approximately 500,000 refugees who had left Spain by mid-1939, and the estimated 200,000 who remained outside of Spain in various different countries, responded to a variety of internal and external motivations. As oral history interviews suggest, alongside letters written by refugees to friends, family or the Mexican embassy in France, refugee identity was a product not only of deeply held ideological convictions, it was also constructed in conditions of chaos, danger and uncertainty. Systems of categorisation which draw sharp distinctions between on the one hand ‘political exiles’ and on the other ‘refugees’ fail to acknowledge that refugee identity was not something that was necessarily ‘inherent’ to someone, or defined from within, it was also a reaction to bureaucratic processes and to the violent state policies which were pursued by host countries and the Francoist regime. Thus, it is not surprising that ‘being a refugee’ was often anathema to the person who had to live through these events and the ways in which people disassociate themselves from particular labels should not be written off as the foibles of a quirky, atypical or difficult character, they should be incorporated into our historical analyses. More basically, focusing on the details of individual testimonies also demonstrates how different
refugees’ experiences could be: Florinda San Agustín attempted to leave Spain but was unable; individuals like Llorens wished to return but were informed by family members that it was too dangerous; whereas others returned to Spain in safety, or like Jose Marull’s father, returned to Spain thinking they would be safe, only to be imprisoned (to summarise just a few).

Outside of Spain, refugees in French territories from at least 1939-1945 were vulnerable to the inhumane policies pursued by the French state, the material limitations of the Mexican ‘welcome’ and the threat posed by the advancing Nazi army or later the German/Vichy occupation. In some cases and in a bid to improve their chances of obtaining better treatment or passage to Mexico, refugees are seen to have defined themselves not only as ideologically motivated (as opposed to economically motivated) but also, and somewhat ironically, as possessing valuable skills, qualifications or experiences, which would be of economic benefit for their host countries. To use a lexicon developed by Bourdieu, refugees sought ‘recognition’ for their existing identities and they fought to ‘be perceived’ and to be treated as individuals, rather than as part of a threatening mass. At the same time, some of the refugees who went to Mexico were later able to reclaim their sense of self in their spoken and written narratives about the past. These triumphant narratives show how individual refugees were able to retain a sense of agency, or control over what had happened to them.

To some extent then, these personal testimonies allow us to complicate not just the symbolic meaning of the republican exile but also, in a broader context, the image of the ‘de-historicised’ or eternal refugee who is the victim of the sweeping powers of war, state, nation, ideology and institutions. Having said that, there is no doubt that many refugees identified themselves as belonging to a group or a mass united in their opposition to Franco’s regime, and that the flight of these people should not be divorced from that important political context. Nevertheless, when the ‘exile’ is viewed only as part of this framework, he or she ceases to possess specific motivations, desires and needs. I think this is why the historiography of Spanish republican exile has only rarely considered the connections between those inside and outside Spain, the letters and money which were sent, and the bonds of familial love and friendship which were maintained. These links
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with Spain undermine the image of the ‘exile’ as isolated and alienated from their home
country, and thus they are seen to undermine the power that these people have to
symbolise the slow death of republican Spain.

In the same way, refugees did not always wait until the symbolically appropriate moment to
return to the country they had left behind. Aside from the return to Spain of approximately
300,000 refugees months after they had first left in 1939, the historiography of Spanish
exile is relatively silent on the refugees who returned prior to Franco’s death. Again, this is
because the actions of individuals disrupt politicised historical narratives. At the same time,
the experiences of those who returned prior to 1975, and prior to 1969 when the last major
pardon was granted by Franco’s regime, suggest that refugees nonetheless shaped their
spoken and written accounts of returning in ways which responded to the labels which had
been attached to them. They were ‘red’ and ‘criminal’ according to the Spanish state or
society, and they were ‘traitors’ or ‘repentant reds’ according to more ‘orthodox’ groups of
refugees in France and Mexico and elsewhere. This kind of language is employed by
refugees describing their own experiences of return, in ways which show how oppressive
these labels and discourses could be both within Spain and in the transnational space of
exile.

In a variety of circumstances then, refugees had to (and to some extent still need to)
negotiate their ‘refugee-ness’, and to filter their experiences through not just the fact that
they were displaced but the range of characteristics this was supposed to confer upon them,
whether that was being political in specific ways or not doing certain things like contacting
those in Spain or returning to Spain. The requirement to respond to, play with or dismiss
these labels or this identity is also manifest in the ‘postmemory’ of Spanish exile in
Mexico DF. Whilst the ‘collective memory’ of the Spanish exile in Mexico DF, or what
some scholars have referred to as the ‘myth’ of Spanish exile, is strong, the ways in which it
is replicated in family histories are subtle and ambiguous. The discarding of a doll in favour
of a typewriter on the road to France, for example, could speak of a desire to preserve the
ideas and intellectualism that characterised the Republic, but it is also indicative of a
particular cosmopolitan family history: a doll bought from London and the loss of objects
of great material value as a result of the forced departure from Spain. The thesis has sought
to demonstrate, using a range of different examples, how dominant historical narratives are
constantly adapted, subverted, adopted or ignored in the context of individuals’ spoken narratives.

Spoken narratives are always ambiguous and we should embrace this ambiguity and incorporate it into historical analysis, rather than ignore it. Jennifer Wood, in an essay on Carmen Martín Gaite, discusses this wonderful Spanish writer’s preference for spoken over written language: ‘in its very need to categorise and pin down meaning, written language obfuscates in its certainty because it lacks the ambiguities inherent in the interaction and negotiation of meaning found in oral discourse’. Martín Gaite also emphasised the importance of the ‘other’, namely the ‘interlocutor or conversational partner’, in modifying the story, both because the ‘other’ will recreate the story in their mind and also because of the ‘self-conscious desire to project a version of oneself’. Consider this a salutary reminder: there are two types of ‘other’ here, the historian who has modified the stories told by refugees and the reader, who modifies the story told by the historian.

There may also be one more ‘other’, called something like ‘the market’. Haike Scharm has argued that the ‘recuperation of memory’ in the 2000s has become both a ‘literary phenomenon and a lucrative business’, and Naharro-Calderón identifies what he calls the ‘exilio-business’, or the marketing of the tragic history of Spanish exile to consumers. Spain’s past becomes a ‘product reaching brand-like status’, which can also be exported from Spain to inspire the ‘artists and producers of other countries’. These critical contributions are important: any historian studying refugees from the Spanish Civil War, and the related debates surrounding historical memory, should question both their motivations and the ways in which they present their work. Chapter four of this thesis ended with a brief description of the experiences of Lucia Gómez who left Spain in 1952, aged nine, after her father had been incarcerated by the Francoist regime in 1939 (and released in 1943), and her cousin, Concepción Ruiz, who was born in Spain in 1950 and whose father was a high-ranking member of the Falange. The two women did find it
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5 Scharm, ‘El cuarto de atrás’, p.274.
difficult to express what they felt, particularly when it referred to the suffering of close family members. But I could still be accused of constructing a narrative which perpetuates a myopic, and highly marketable, version of the Spanish past. In focusing on emotions like guilt and sadness, I risk obscuring the humour, cynicism and flippancy which also characterised not just Ruiz and Gómez’ narratives but the narratives of all the refugees and refugees’ descendants I spoke to in Mexico. Why did I focus on the expression of these feelings? Because they were striking to me and I could see that they were important to my informants, but I may also have been influenced by what we could term the brand ‘Spanish tragedy’. I hope my thesis has also shown that unlike characters in a tragedy, many Spanish refugees, along with their children and grandchildren, were not cast adrift on the tides of fate, instead they faced what had happened and went on to participate in the making of their own lives.
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Appendix 1: List of Spanish Quotations

Original Spanish quotations (over 40 words in length or part of a longer quoted section) cited in the main body of the thesis in English. The quotations are ordered under each chapter and the footnote number (FN) given in the left-hand column should be used to cross reference the English quotation with the Spanish original. A partial reference has also been given to facilitate cross-referencing of the Spanish original with the bibliography.

Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FN no.</th>
<th>Original Spanish quotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Es que estaba gente que peleaba conmigo…es que como el hecho de haberse marchado de España – eso que llaman refugiado era el haberse marchado de España, fuera un mérito, yo nunca lo consideré un mérito; era una desgracia, era una circunstancia, […] Pero el de una desgracia, que porque está lloviendo se pone uno debajo de un portal o de un balcón y que eso tiene que ser un mérito, una colectividad, no gracias.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>¿Qué significa ser refugiado? Pues ser refugiado, es decir, este, significa que somos los que perdimos, que somos los perdidos ¿no? Pero tenemos, tenemos la, ¿Cómo se llama? La conciencia muy tranquila porque nosotros, eh, nosotros defendimos a un gobierno legalmente constituido en España hasta última hora.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FN no.</th>
<th>Original Spanish quotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mi abuelo paterno estuvo en Cuba; un hermano mayor, Manuel, que se murió también en Buenos Aires, y todavía hay un hermano […] que sigue en Buenos Aires […] cuando había unas tierras, el que tenía algunas economías en el banco pues sacaba sus tres o cuatro mil pesetas y mandaba a sus hijos a América de quince anos a veinte años ¿no?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 61     | Muchos de los españoles que llegaron a la frontera francesa en 1939 eran simples refugiados, empujados al éxodo por el deseo de escapar de la furia de los combates, y no opositores declarados, objetivamente amenazados Dreyfus-Armand, (trans. Dolors Poch), El exilio de los
por el franquismo triunfante. Ello explica, en parte, el gran número de regresos inmediatos, pero ha engendrado también una polémica tenaz, aunque sin fundamento real, sobre el verdadero significado de las cifras.

Fracasado mi primer intento de emigrar a México. . . resulta que México ha decidido hacer poco cerrar sus puertas totalmente a la emigración española. . .El caso es que México me es inabordable, y que Chile ya no admite más que a obreros manuales, en reducidos número. [...] Pero no hice más que sugerir mis intenciones, cuando mi padre, que es hombre conservador como sabes, con muy buenas relaciones con elementos del régimen actual, y que ha sido mantenido en su cargo oficial después de rigurosa depuración, me hizo saber inmediatamente que no me moviera de aquí, aunque hubiera el peligro de guerra, y aun deseando por su parte que no llegue la hora de morir sin volverme a ver. Poco después sabía que al cabo de siete meses de paz en España habían empezado a perseguir a uno de mis hermanos, y que para intentar salvarlo me veo obligado a fingir que está conmigo en Francia. Todo su crimen consiste en haber sido oficial como yo del ejército republicano.

CP –todavía tengo el registro al partido. [...] pertenecía al Estat Catalá, o sea Estado Catalán, que participó en el movimiento del 6 de Octubre; pero yo ya entonces era del Bloque. Y como que en Estat Catalá la cuestión social lo dejaban de lado, no les interesaba mucho, y el Bloq Obrero y Camperol (BOC) [...] al mismo tiempo que la cuestión catalana, también tenía la cuestión social. Eso fue lo que me motivó a [...] entrar en el BOC.

Pero entonces empecé a luchar por una beca a París a estudiar con Nadia Boulanger, o con otra, otro profesor connotado, ¿no? porque mi idea era volar, volar, volar, volar, pues huir un poco de esa cosa familiar que me ahogaba.

Le pregunté porque me había involucrado en todo aquello si yo no tenía nada que ver, y dijo que no quería que yo estuviera cerca de la familia de su novia, porque como me querría mucho, temía que yo fuera a influir para que la niña lo dejase.

Ahora bien, por la situación despreciada en que nos encontramos y ante la imposibilidad de ponernos en contacto con nuestros familiares, carecemos en absoluto
de toda clase de recursos, lo que nos [illegible] el poder
costearnos el viaje a aquella República, que podía llenar
mi [illegible] alguna nuestros anhelos de paz, libertad y
trabajo.

117 No crea que pensemos vivir como parásitos en el País
que Vd representa, ni que tengamos ideas de aventuras.
Somos trabajadores honrados que por tener criterio
dispar de la España inquisiternal [sic.] retrograda y
miserable somos perseguidos | Nada más y nada menos.

120 Soy la mayor de siete hermanos huérfanos de un
antifascista fusilado en Pamplona en los primeros días de
la guerra y, tanto yo como la mayor parte de mis
hermanos estamos sometidos a procese por nuestra
actuación sindical y política. | Ante el temor de una
evacuación forzosa a España, quiero que nuestros buenos
hermanos de Méjico tengan en cuenta nuestro caso y
sepan que nuestro mayor deseo sería vivir al lado del
pueblo que ha sentido como propia nuestra tragedia y con
el cual nos unen lazos de agradecimiento. | Soy maestra,
contable y próxima a licenciarme en Filosofía, y mis
hermanos además del bachiller (lo tienen la mayor parte),
han trabajado en oficinas durante la guerra y están
dispuestas a seguir trabajando.

131 Habló con dos senegaleses y le…y dice: “Dénle el señor a
la señora, a su hija, p’que se lo lleve”. Y a mí en catalán
me dice – eso lo explicó en órdenes en francés a los
senegaleses y a mí en catalán; resultó que el señor era
catalán, catalán de la Cataluña francesa.

136 Y estaba […] en la cama con, con Sole, por la mañana,
muy temprano y de pronto, llamaron a la puerta, y era la
policía que venía a buscarme. Y entonces, pues, claro, me
levanté medio dormido, y me, y aquella gente me sacaba a
rastras. Pero Sole me decía: “¡La carta del mariscal! ¡La
carta del mariscal!” Y aquellos que se quedaron
sorprendidos, y yo, como estaba medio dormido, no me
acordaba, digo: “¡Ay es verdad!

142 Y además yo tuve la, la he tenido siempre la sensación de
que la he maltratado, porque yo no tenía ningún derecho
haberle hecho los viajes que le hice y las cosas que le hice
y llevarla a Francia y luego a Cuba y luego…La he tratado
como, no sé, como una cosa ya de, si yo le hubiera
podido preguntar: “Quieres esto o quieres lo otro?”
214
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1 Que teniendo un hermano desaparecido durante la Guerra civil Española y habiendo llegado a mi conocimiento que entró en Francia por Figuera (Gerona) el día 9 de Febrero del año 1939 pasando al campo de Concentración de San Siprien, donde permaneció 2 meses, siendo trasladado a Bacaret, habiendo según noticias solicitado el pase a un campo especial, desde donde salió para México, donde según noticias reciente se encuentra en la actualidad; si bien se ignora localidad y domicilio actual, es por lo que a VE humildemente suplica si a bien lo tiene me comunique, si en esa Embajada está registrada la salida de dicho humano para México, y donde hay que escribir para poder encontrarlo en la seguridad de que le quedara eternamente agradecido. […] Teniendo como señas 2 diente de oro y tatuado los brazos, uno un barco y el otro una mujer. AEMF, Leg 513, expediente 1.

45 I - ¿Y viviendo usted aquí en México, qué relación tenía con su familia en España? | AN – Pues era una relación, al principio, muy mala, muy mala porque yo estuve como dos años sin tener correspondencia, después la correspondencia tardaba horrores, este, eh, muy poca, muy poca correspondencia. […] Y ahora mismo, ahora mismo recibo cartas y escribo y todo, pero este, no, no, no con la frecuencia que uno quisiera, tampoco, tampoco. Pero ahora no es culpa de nadie, ahora es culpa de los que me pueden escribir, antes era culpa de las censuras que habían y todas las cosas ¿no?’ Entrevista realizada a Antonio Navarro, pp.216-7.

46 FG – En cambio, quienes más me han ayudado a mí, incluso en México con ayuda económica, han sido los hermanos y parientes de mi primera esposa, a los cuales los quiero como hermanos y les tengo mucho más afecto y más agradecimiento que a mi propia familia, esa que tiene esa tendencia de tipo franquista | I - ¿Estos hermanos de su esposa, de su primera esposa viven en México? | FG – Ya murieron, vivían…no, en España. | I - ¡Ah! Vivían en España’ Entrevista a Félix Galarza, p.163.

53 Si se “empastelara” nuestro medio de comunicación, utilizaría el de un compañero del Daily Herald, de Londres, aunque sólo fuera para enviar cosas a vosotros, ya que la correspondencia por avión de cada cien letras sólo suelen censurar ocho o diez a lo sumo y lo haría sin firmar y del mismo modo que me escribo con él. Letter from José López y López to Ramón Lamoneda, 29 April 1947, ARLF-166-14-08.

58 La política a través de I.R. es el amor de mi vida. Ella me ha costado muchísimos sacrificios, y el más patente y siempre vivo en mi corazón, es el estar más de 7 años separado de mi señora y de mi hija, las cuales se encuentran en España, en situación muy angustiosa. No creo que mi caso es una excepción; por lo contrario, y, desgraciadamente, existen miles de españoles que están en peor situación que yo. Sigo, a pesar de todas las calamidades, fiel a mis Letter from Fermín Astudillo in Middlesex, to Carlos Esplá in Mexico, DF, 24 Dec. 1945, CDMH, Esplá,
ideales, y si se repitiera la Historia, actuaría idénticamente, con la misma fe y convicción que lo hice en Julio de 1936, es decir, como en toda mi vida.

63 Pues mandaba un giro de cien dólares, ciento cincuenta dólares […] Y lo mandaba a España, allá lo negociaban y mi difunto padre, campesino, pues iba por las tabernas y lucía el giro y decía: “A ver si lees, porque yo ya no puedo leer. ¿Qué es eso que me mandó el hijo?” Esto mayormente lo hacía con los individuos que seguían la política franquista. ¿No? Resulta que decían: “¡Coño! pues esto es formidable porque son ciento cincuenta dólares!” “¡Hombre! pues entonces […] quiere decir que mi hijo debe de estar muy bien en América” ¿No? Total, para hacer sufrir a aquellos tipos que no pensaban como pensaba su hijo. Y no había de ser porque mi difunto padre fuese un hombre de izquierdas, porque no lo era; él era un hombre que militaba en un partido de derechas. Pero claro, antes que nada, era de su hijo.

66 Hoy mismo, reintegrado al hogar de los míos después de tanta amargura y triste soledad, de tanta injusticia y crueldad, de tanto olvido, mi pensamiento está con los ausentes por el delito de pensar que la libertad y la democracia es mejor y más conveniente que la tiranía, y también más elegante; por ello me permito encarecerle haga presente a todos los que sufren el dolor de la ausencia patria, el sentimiento de mi adhesión y de mis sentido afecto, sea cual fuere su particular forma de pensar.

67 En España hay un malestar, producido principalmente por la situación económica que se va agravando. Pero los Españoles tenemos una cultura y una sensibilidad y que vivimos de cara a Europa no podemos olvidar aquella frase bíblica de que “no solo de pan vive el hombre” y esperamos y sufrimos.

68 No hay ahora vida política y social sino una ficción dolorosa. El pueblo va perdiendo su facultad de pensar y de actuar.

70 Tu carta del 17 me ha producido viva alegría y satisfacción grande: alegría al saber directamente que estás ‘vivito coleando’ y satisfacción al comprobar que no te aliviadas[olvidas?] de este viejo amigo. ¡Yo tampoco te he olvidado y sabía por tu hermano, a quien pregunté por ti las dos veces que tuve ocasión de verle, que estabas bien. Como él no me conocía bien, seguramente no se daría cuenta del interés con que yo inquiría noticia tuyas.

71 Si sabes el paradero de Mauri, haz el favor de facilitármelo, pues hace mucho tiempo que no ha contestado a mis escritos. De vez en cuando me veo con Arroyo, en sus viajes a ésta; por cierto que también está por contestarme. De los amigos de Madrid sólo sé de Freire, y del pobre Tutor, tuve oportunidad de hablarle telefónicamente dos días antes de fallecer. Parece que me dictó el corazón que aquella llamada sería la última ocasión de hablarle.
76 Muy agradecida por tus atenciones y demás familiares, pues el dinero que mandas [¿conviene?] falla una hace para hacer frente a la vida, pues los artículos de comer, vestir y calzar están por las nubes y no digamos de las ventas de las viviendas eso raya ya en locura, pasa decirte que en una casa al lado de la mía los [inquilinos] pagaban 800 pts al mes y al marcharse los nuevos que han entrado pagan ahora 2000 pts y sin hacer ningún arreglo. Con este botón de muestra te ibas dando cuenta lo que hay que batallar para poder [mal] vivir.

79 Nuestro orgullo y nuestra gran satisfacción, es, que la causa, de unos cuantos calificada hace muchos años por los mías como empresa de “locos”, esa locura de unos miles, es la demencia de centenares de millones de personas.

83 No, les robaron totalmente todo, pero todo les robaron; les saquearon, les saquearon, cualquier cosa allí a buscarla, allí a buscarla, hasta los conejos se los robaron, todo, todo, todo. Yo les estuve mandando dinero todo el tiempo que estuve aquí, les mandé dinero; le amputaron una pierna a mi padre, también le mandé dinero; yo, mejor dicho, yo desde el primer…dos meses de estar aquí, o tres, les mandé los primeros trescientos pesos y cada mes les mandé dinero.

84 I- ¿Y diez años de separación entre, entre su esposo y usted no habían alterado mucho la relación entre los dos? | FS – No porque cuando nos escribíamos, que por cierto quemé hace poco las cartas, todas; pues nos escribíamos como si estuviéramos aquí a la vuelta. Las relaciones…lo único que eso sí…claro, esto ya es una cosa un poco íntima ¿no? De…que cuando llegué, le dije [p.114] “Mira: no te voy a pedir más que una cosa, que no te, no te me acerques hasta que pase un, unos días”. Porque claro, yo sabía que él había tenido que estar aquí con mujeres ¿no? Y claro, pues para mí era un poco duro, y sí, él me respetó.

89 CB – […] Cuando mi madre tenía una emergencia muy grande, de que mi hermano se enfermaba o, o, no sé, pues con un esfuerzo grande le ma…le mandábamos más, y le estuvimos mandando, pues, hasta que…bastante tiempo.

[…] porque yo no siento que mi madre es mi madre […] somos dos extraños. Nos encontramos, no sabemos qué decirnos, siempre hablamos de lo mismo y, y no hay nada, nada, nada.

93 Quiero decirte que todas las carencias de todo lo que habíamos tenido en nuestra educación burguesa y eso, no nos importaba en lo más mínimo. Estábamos en un país libre: estábamos solos, tranquilos, sin la presión también y fiscalización de mamá y papá de que esto es bueno, malo, y de la sociedad, no solamente mamá y papá, sino lo que es todo el entorno […].
No queríamos echar muchos lazos en este, en esta tierra [...] pensábamos que no era nuestro porvenir, que en muy poco tiempo íbamos a regresar a España porque las condiciones políticas iban a cambiar de un momento u otro.

[La] situación se fue lógicamente modificando poco a poco, cada vez se iba uno integrando más.

Bueno, yo me veo con ellos, pero les nota un poco – claro, la mayor parte de ellos son gente, republicanos, ¿verdad? Así como Roso que era republicano y naturalmente pues sufrió bastante, estuvo en la cárcel, etc., un poquito como que se enconcharon, ¿verdad? Se quedaron un poquitito así, reconcentrados, ¿verdad? Sin volar muy lejos, sí. Por eso sí me permito pensar que yo hubiese sido muy distinto hombre en España.

Yo poco que contaros a no ser miserias y calamidades y esto no vale la pena contararlo. Únicamente os diré que después del campo de concentración, trabajo en la agricultura y deportación en Alemania, actualmente me encuentro en Paris desde hace tres meses para asistir a un curso de electricidad en las escuelas que tiene organizados el Ministerio de Trabajo. Aquí estaré hasta último de enero que termino el curso y después ya veremos.
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54 [En] el que aparece en el fichero general de acusado denunciado X, como participe en los asesinatos y hechos delictivos cometidos en esta localidad durante el dominio rojo, Al folio X de la X de Checas de la mencionada Causa General de Huesca, aparece un escrito de La Alcaldía de Ballobar el que se dice que los dirigentes rojos no interrogaban ni juzgaban a las víctimas, los asesinaban cobardemente en sus propios domicilios.


59 Se dirige a esa Representación de España en súplica de que se le notifique formalmente si, por su conducta en relación con el Alzamiento Nacional, tiene responsabilidades pendientes en España, y si está comprendido en los Decretos de indulto general últimamente

AGA, (02) 081.000, section 61/19636, 0269: 84.
promulgados. Y a este efecto, DECLARA: (2) “No tener responsabilidad penal de ninguna clase, antes, durante ni después del Movimiento Nacional/La solicitante salió de España para cuidar de la educación de sus hijos en Francia y para establecerse posteriormente como comerciante en México. Salía en barco desde Santander.” “Bernadina Domínguez”.

62 BM […] Se levantó, me besó la mano, todo se hizo pan con miel; “Y que la pasen muy bien en España…” […] [p.60] así pasó. Fijate, porque no sé quién era. Y es una persona muy importante.

64 BM – Ah pero el recibimiento que nos hicieron en la Estación del Norte, que llegamos en el Talgo; no te puedes imaginar todos los andenes llenos de gente [p.62] de familia y amigos. […] BM – Todos abrazándonos y todos: “¡Diecisiete años, 17 años, 17…!” Y toda la gente que estaba en la estación…nos miraba aquel grupo y pues: “¿Qué les pasa a éstas…”…¿quién son?” Y los guardias y todos los que estaban llegando, al ver…nos miraban. […] Y nosotras…no creas que se cohibían y todos aquellos, sí. “17 años” era una algarabía todos, nuestra casa, ¿qué te parece? [risa] Así fue. Y luego me he enterado que quería ir una comisión de Hacienda a recibirme.

67 Mira, cuando nos despidieron en la estación debieron dar un suspiro de satisfacción toda la familia [risa].

69 LS – Sí mi decisión [de venir a España] siempre ha existido; fue en el ’56. Yo quiero decir que yo de México tengo un recuerdo muy agradable, que yo me he sentido muy a gusto en…viviendo en México, pero que no es un problema de México, es un problema de mi país, de España y nada más. Y yo he vuelto a mi país y he vuelto a donde yo vivía antes de, de irme, que era aquí en Barcelona, incluso vivo en el mismo barrio, porque yo vivía en la Sagrada Familia y, y, y el piso que tengo, lo tengo en la Sagrada Familia, ¿comprendes? No, no hay ni doscientos metros al, al piso que yo tenía [p.65] en el año treinta y seis treinta y siete, treinta y ocho.

72 Hace días que quiero escribirles la carta prometida con mis impresiones sobre España […] casi todo lo que he visto ha venido a confirmar lo que tantas veces hemos oído. […] Me chocaba mucho ver que eso de vivir en América me daba cierta categoría, casi todo el mundo me tenía envidia y me decían qué suerte la mía, y hasta ha habido falangista, así como os digo, que me ha pedido si puedo
conseguirle algo para venirse. La cuestión refugiados, es triste pero es así – ya no existe, ocurre lo peor que podía pasarnos y es que la gente, incluso de izquierdas, no comprende, mejor dicho ni se les ocurre pensar que no se vuelve por dignidad […] A los que han regresado no los tratan mal ni bien, ni les molestan, ni nada, lo encuentran normal. […] Claro, los que han entrado desean que lo hagamos todos y quieran justificarse y yo les decía que si lo pasaban tan mal en Francia lo comprendía perfectamente, pero que nosotros no teníamos justificación alguna, salvo algún caso excepcional. Pero da pena ver que hemos caído en la mayor indiferencia.

85 Yo ha habido pues gentes con las que he hablado yo de, de su llegada por ejemplo a España, después de un periodo tan largo y tal, y yo ha habido gente que yo he oído que decían casi que no me lo he creído nunca – decían que no, que no se emocionaban ni nada de esto. Yo francamente eso no me lo he creído ni, ni… no cuando vine yo, entonces ya pasé yo la experiencia por mí mismo, sino antes de venir yo, y pasar esa experiencia, nunca me lo había creído; pero, pero es que luego, cuando he venido, vamos, yo no, no lo concibo, no concibo después de tantos años de llegar allí, pues bueno […].

86 HS – Hombre, sí, emocionado de venir a…hombre, yo no le voy a decir a usted que seguí con las tonterías que hace el Papa, de para tratar de ganar la voluntad española, arrodillarme y besar la tierra española, ni de llevarme un bolsillo de tierra de España a México cuando volví, no, pero sí le emociona a uno volver a su tierra, salir de diecinueve años y volver de cuarenta, claro que emociona, y ver a la familia y ver a los padres que no los veía desde niño, emociona, a los amigos […] Hombre, pues estos siempre…Siempre es emocionante que el volver a ver a los amigos de lucha que pudieron salvar la vida y contarnos las penas y las alegrías de ambos, en el exilio o aquí en el interior, Y me recibieron muy bien, muy bien. Además, esto es un problema, el pueblo español es muy efusivo, usted lo sabe, y siempre se acaba en comilonas y en copas y en juergas; tres meses estuve, la primera vez que volví, de junio a octubre (sic).

87 AB – …Iba a decirte que son muy gritones, la primera impresión ¿no? Pero sí se siente uno afín a ellos en muchas cosas, y es natural, somos de aquí, es natural; que nos sintamos afines; pero, desde luego, nos sentimos un poco desplazados, como si ya la gente joven no quisiera nada con los viejos, es posi[p.127]ble que con razón o sin razón; pero, en realidad, nos sentimos desplazados algo. | EA – Pero ¿por jóvenes o porque estuvisteis fuera de España? | AB – Por falta de conexión. Estábamos fuera de España y hemos evolucionado de otra manera; pero, poco a poco, esa falta de afinidad va consiguiéndose con el tiempo a una afinidad mayor.

88 Me ilusionaba al estar aquí con la familia. Había, ya digo, había idealizado mucho creyendo que iban a volver los años que dejé, pero esos no vuelven.
92 Pues, a vivir, francamente no, porque sería un arrancón muy grande dejar aquí a la familia. Y además, pues, no sé, tenía que volver, volver a quemar mis naves y ya son muchas quemadas de naves.

93 [Al] llegar lo único que sentí es que encontré a mi madre, siendo una mujer tan bonita y tan alta, la encontré…bonita seguía siendo, ¿no? Y su carnita seguía siendo tan, tan agradable – una mujer de campo con, catorce hijos que tuvo, diez que hemos vivi [p.127] do – la veías: su tez rosada, bonita; nada más que la sentí muy chiquita. Sí, y era una mujer muy alta. Y esto, la sentí yo como que la…la sentí muy chiquita, ¿no? Y me impresioné.

94 […] porque solté mi porrón de lágrimas en la esquina donde yo iba a comprar churros con mi padre…en la esquina donde mi madre me llevaba de la mano, íbamos a…en la esquina de donde…En fin, fue una cosa muy emocionante, desde el punto de vista emocional, sólo […] de acordarme de mi infancia, mis padres que habían fallecido y que ya no los tenía, todas esas cosas de recuerdo.
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12 […] el exilio significó el gran reencuentro de España y México, y el comienzo de otro episodio en la historia que comparten ambos pueblos. El exilio devino en un factor de renovación a favor del desarrollo y la creatividad que repercutió de manera muy destacada en la vida cultural, artística e intelectual de México, pero también en ámbitos como el comercio, la industria o la vida cotidiana.

Convocatoria para participar en el diseño de la Marca conmemorativa del 75° Aniversario del Exilio Español en México’, email sent on 8 Jan. 2014 to the members of the Ateneo Español de México.

43 Si ellos, sí, siempre tenían mas añoranzas por ejemplo mi mama, tenía muy buena vida allí en Madrid. . .tenía una casa bonita en Sevilla, teníamos una casa preciososa, tenía allí una como, academia, mi padre, muy bonito, de, un patio con fuentes y todo muy bonito, luego en Madrid llega un departamento que tuvimos, pero tenían su coche mi papa, y hacia viajes a Londres, no sé porque eso si me pregunto, es porque, pero no sé, pero sé que me trajo de Londres un muñeco precioso [voice very hoarse] y lo tenía siempre y cuando ya no podía mas llevarlo en el exodo, lo deje en el suelo…Porque querían

Interview with Pilar Jiménez:
que llevaron una maquina de escribir y ya no podía, sí... y, eso sí, mi padre iba mucho a Londres, mucho mucho, iba para Londres, no sé porque!


46 [...] en ese barco vino mucha gente, mucha gente preparada de España, era verdaderamente gente... médicos, filósofos, matemáticos, biólogos, gente sumamente capaz que era lo que más, mandaba en España en aquel momento.

Gloria Rodríguez de Álvarez, *El Éxodo de Una Familia Malagueña En La Guerra Civil*, p. 68.

48 [...] a medida que avanzábamos se iba desvaneciendo la esperanza de encontrar a mi madre. En lo más profundo de mi ser de niña se iría resquebrajando algo [...] Apenas pronunciaba palabra, [...] Al fin y al cabo yo no era un caso aislado en aquella guerra cruenta sino un caso más. Recordaba los comentarios de mi madre cuando se refería a la catastrófica huida de los habitantes de Málaga hacia Almería, perseguidos por cinco columnas de los golpistas sublevados contra la República. Familias destrozados e hijos que perdieron a sus padres y se quedaron solos para siempre. ¡Mataron a tantas personas sin piedad...! Fueron ametrallados y bombardeados por mar, tierra y aire...! Cuantos españoles murieron en esta maldita guerra! El recuerdo de aquella narración me llenaba de miedo, y me impulsaba a aferrarme con fuerza a los objetos que me había confiado mi madre y a mi pequeña muñeca patinadora, como si ellos fueran capaces de infundirme cierta seguridad.

Author’s interview with Elena González*, May 2013, approx. 40 mins.

49 [...] también ya pasaron la frontera en el mes de Febrero, toda la familia, mi abuelo, hizo toda una maleta y mi hermana tenía dos añitos, y se acordaba de su muñeca que tuvo que dejar en un hostal, porque mi Papa le dijo, este que iban a cuidarme bien, que porque ya no podía cagarla, ya entonces si pasaron, [desplegarsel?] bien en ese febrero, total que esté llegando a la frontera, te digo, los separaron, mi padre en este, lo llevaron a Argelès, mi tío... este era Mason y los Masones los rescataron de la fila, y cuando iba, ya llegando le pusieron en una [?] encima, y menos mal porque tenía muy mala salud, entonces creo que si no hubieran salvado... y ya finalmente llegó a México y duro muchos años más, pero además se le quedó como, un trauma horrible porque lo iba en una ambulancia, en la calle y [?] al piso, o sea, como un psicosis, muy fuerte, en todo lo que iban durante la guerra... entonces, este, [talking very quietly] pero sí en Asturias, allí me encanto cuando fui, la verdad es que me disfruto muchísimo, me gusta la gente Asturiana, *en general*... general abiertos.

Interview with Josefina Tome
dónde les trataron muy mal, ella hablaba muy mal de las franceses que las cuidaban, que les daban muy mal de comer, afortunadamente encontraron un -un er- una habitación llena de cebollas, crudas, se ve que tenían cosecha, entonces las robaban, y comían, nosotros [hablamos] con ella y [le decíamos] que, que ella era fuerte y muy sana porque había comido muchas cebollas [risa] .. Ent--no [había estado] mal alimentada, sino al contrario, ¿no?

Empecé mucho interesar por la historia pues de su vida, cuando fueron los Olimpiadas en Barcelona en el noventa seis, noventa dos, o cuatro, bueno los de Barcelona, porque ella se sentaba en la Tele, para mí fue muy impresionante, sentaba en la tele a llorar, no? Lloraba, lloraba, y yo decía, 'abuela, ¿qué lloras?' no? Y entonces ya es que 'yo camine por cuando acaban...yo camina por esas calles y se acordaba entonces abuela cuéntame, y contaba todo de la salida de España este, de...de un poco la Dominicana. También hay cosas que una niña muy pequeña no, no le podía decir no, pero sí, me contaba. [...] pues yo creo no sé si me contaba más o me contaba distinto, no, yo creo que pensando en que las abuelas se relacionan con sus nietas que con sus hijas, creo que siendo pues madre ella tenía que ser fuerte, no? Además la época este les fue a ellos muy mal económicamente en México, y mi mama es la primera universitaria de la familia, ¿no? Es médico, doctora. Entonces creo que en poco ayudaba o ayudó que pues mi mama tenía una posición económica más [holgada] cuando mi abuela ya estaba grande, había cosas que no tenía que se preocupar ella ¿no? Sobre todo, dar una imagen, pues puedo sacar mis hijos adelante, no sé qué, en ese sentido creo que conmigo se permitía por ejemplo llorar más, no...porque lloraba mucho, ¿no?'

Tú te imaginas, mi madre- niña bien acostumbrada siempre ido está bien, todo tú quieras. ..Muy jovencita, saliendo a la frontera, con tres niños [inaudible] sus faldas, sin saber que había sido de mi padre, si lo habían matado, si lo habían pescado...

Y esa niña llorando porque no podía comer, lo me pusiera pues 'que idiota!' No lo puse en palabras, pero es lo que sentí. Si tienes hambre, come, no?

me acuerdo que en un pueblo de Catalunya, chiquito, supongo que [ibamos] corriendo tantos lugares, y estamos en la puerta del, la pensión, el hotel lo que fuera, que estamos parando, y vi pasar un entierro, yo nunca la vi esto en mi vida, subían como la calle sube así [motions with hands] hacia una loma, y era una cosa funeral, halada por caballos, bueno [debían ser] burros porque lo demás habían comido todos, no había carne. . . Arrastrando la carroza con plumaje aquí negro, todo muy pobre como de pueblo y demás, en guerra, los pobres caballitos, burritos. . . Pues estos estaban vivos. Y mire, que curioso, y luego más o menos. . .era otro chiquito que podemos andar libres los niños, me imagino, y estaba un señor, con los niños, todos de negros llorando. Y debe estando enterrando a la mama. . .Esa fue mi impresión, que curiosa, que extraños, nada más. Y años después,
comentándoselo con mi hermano decía, que el haber pasar aquellos pensando, dentro de poco me van a llevar a mí así, a enterrar, porque esa sentía muy débil yo creo. O sea, la misma escena te produces - muchas impresiones muy distintas. Él pensaba que no iba falta mucho para que él lo llevaron también arrastra por unos burritos negros. Y a mí nunca se me ocurrió. También depende del carácter, como se ve las cosas.

75 [...] y es que además no entendí todo lo que paso en mi familia, hasta que yo cumplí la edad que ellos tenían, mi padre llevo cincuenta años y mi madre cuarenta dos, con ocho dólares en el bolsillo, entonces, era volver a empezar pero volver a empezar desde cero...y con un edad, dos niñas con pequeña y otra adolescente, que era muy difícil, en un país que no los conocían, y este, y yo nunca me di cuenta de lo que pasaban, porque tanta tristeza, tanta...y bueno cuando cumplí mi edad de ella y me puse en su lugar, dije 'Qué valiente! ¡Qué valiente!''

78 [...] y a mí aquello me hace pensar muchísimo, por qué estas personas se habían ido tan lejos, y cuando preguntabas, cuando éramos pequeños, nunca había una respuesta, están allí porque el tío se fue a trabajar allí, y eso, como que me plantaba un interrogante, dice porque estas personas están fuera - no?

79 [...] mi formación política en aquel momento era Franquismo, no había otra.

80 Lo que si he pensado muchísimas veces es por qué mi padre estaba en el movimiento y era Falangista, eso es lo que pensaba muchísimas veces ... y claro a veces cuando me contaba incluso Alicia, como prima mayor quizás, tal, me decía, 'pues porque era la época, y era la forma de salir adelante'...una estrategia bueno pues de sobrevivir [...].

Algunas veces he sentido también el miedo de pensar que alguien de mi familia era un asesino, de eso también me había pensado, porque creo que sería una - aunque no es responsabilidad tuya porque tú no eres tu padre, tu madre, tu tío, o sea - un, como si éramos parte de los vencedores, me hace incomodo, me hace incomodo precisamente por eso, porque, hay otra parte de mi familia que fue la perdedora, y de alguna manera me gusta hasta donde yo puedo...se sienta como parte de la familia que está aquí...que sepan que aquí los queremos.

88 [...] tenga la edad que tenga, yo no digo que lo meten en la carcel, ni mucho menos, simplemente que reconozcan que esa persona hizo eso, y que la historia de España es una historia, ¡ni una fábula!
Appendix 2: Biographical details

1. Brief biographical details of the people interviewed by the author in Mexico and Spain.

2. Brief biographical details of the archived interviews with Spanish refugees who went to Mexico, interviewed by several researchers and historians in both Mexico and Spain, in the late 70s and late 80s. This project was funded by the Instituto Nacional de Antropología y Historia (INAH) and the Ministry of Culture in Spain. Transcripts of the 117 interviews conducted are kept in the CDMH in Salamanca, and the Archivo de la Palabra, Centro de Estudios Históricos, in Tlalpan, Mexico, DF. 22 interviews have been consulted in depth for this PhD, some of which have been quoted at length.

3. Brief biographical details of the archived interviews with people living in Spain, for the Spanish Civil War Memory Project (SCWMP). The interviews were conducted by researchers from the University of San Diego, and are stored online in downloadable video files. Approximately 107 interviews have been conducted. I have watched and made notes from ten interviews, and include biographical details of these individuals. For reasons of space, I have not been able to include in-depth analysis of these interviews but they have informed my conclusions.

With regards to all of the information included below, the type and exact details differ from interview to interview. Even for the ‘EM’ project when researchers were working to a fixed set of questions, the interviewee may have answered questions in different ways.

1. Interviews conducted by the author

Notes:

(i) Pseudonyms are used in some cases and indicated by the use of an asterix (*)

(ii) I have decided to provide a brief summary not only of the biographies of each person but also how I was able to come into contact with them and arrange the interview, so that the institutional background of some of the interviewees will be clear to the reader.

(iii) Where relevant I have also included references to memoirs or further interviews, some of which are available online or in UK libraries.

In Mexico:

**María Luz Díaz Marta**

**Born** 1946, Veracruz, Mexico

**Parents** Spanish refugees who both arrived in Mexico in 1939 on the boat *Mexique*; her father, Manuel Díaz-Martínez was a member of PSOE and he
worked for the UN for several years so the family lived in Washington for a time as well.

**Education**

Public school in Veracruz; school in Washington.

**Work**

Administrator for the UN.

**Family history**

Her mother (originally from Malaga) and father (originally from Toledo) met in Mexico, in Spain both their families had been well-off; her mother left Spain when she was 15, her father was 30.

**Further sources**

Entrevista realizada por Elena Aub a Don Manuel Díaz-Marta, (Junta de Comunidades de Castilla-la Mancha, 2001); the Mexique’s on-board newspaper (See bibliography).

**Contacted through**

A mutual friend of my (English) aunt’s.

---

**Elena González***

**Born**

1946, Mexico.

**Parents**

Spanish refugees originally from Asturias; father worked as a judge, mother did embroidery.

**Education**

English school in Mexico DF.

**Work**

Administrator/public servant.

**Family history**

Her parents came to Mexico in 1939 on the boat ‘Flandre’ with her sister who was very young at the time; her uncle also came to Mexico and died young. Her father was a member of a Republican party.

**Further sources**

--

**Contacted through**

Friend of another informant.

---

**Ernesto Casanova**

**Born**

1961, Mexico.

**Parents**

Father worked as a labourer in farms and factories; mother ran a canteen.

**Education**

Colegio Madrid, school founded by Spanish exiles (JARE)

**Work**

Accountant; does voluntary work for the Ateneo.

**Family history**

Paternal grandparents arrived in Mexico in 1939 on the Sínaia, his father was two; his maternal grandparents left France for the Dominican Republic in 1939, and later arrived in Mexico in about
1942, his mother was two when she left France.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Further sources</th>
<th>Through my work in the library and archive of the Ateneo.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Rosa María Catalá Rodes**

**Born**
c.1955, Argentina.

**Parents**
Emigrated from Spain (Tarragona) to Argentina in 1953, her father was a chemist.

**Education**
Primary school Argentina; Colegio Madrid; UNAM.

**Work**
Science teacher; headmistress of Colegio Madrid.

**Family history**
Her family in Spain were divided, her parents wanted to escape the post-war atmosphere in Spain, both in terms of the economy and the political repression.

**Further sources**

**Contacted through**
Ernesto Casanova, who invited me to the commemoration of the proclamation of the Second Republic, taking place at the Colegio Madrid.

**Ana María Gaos**

**Born**
Malaga, 1930.

**Parents**
Father: a Republican (supporter of Manuel Azaña) and an engineer; Mother: a housewife, Andalusian, half German.

**Education**
Some schooling in various parts of Spain but disrupted by the Civil War; later North Mexico and then Veracruz; degree in science at UNAM.

**Work**
Housewife.

**Family history**
She and her parents were Spanish refugees who left Spain in 1939. Her father's work as an engineer meant that they spent some time at Santa Clara, an agricultural colony set up by the Mexican government for refugees which soon collapsed. They then moved to Veracruz where her father worked as an engineer.
**Pilar Jimenez**

**Born**
1926, Seville.

**Parents**
Her father was a Republican, academic; her mother was a housewife who worked in a school canteen in Mexico.

**Education**
Primary school in Spain (Seville, Madrid); secondary in Mexico – Luis Vives, school set up Spanish exiles (SERE)

**Work**
Administrator at various Universities; costume design/making for cruise ships, with her son.

**Family history**
Following their departure from Spain, the family gained passage on the *Sinaia* to Mexico; settled in Mexico DF.

**Further sources**
The *Sinaia*’s on-board newspaper, see bibliography.

**Contacted through**
Mutual English friend of my parents’.

---

**Lucia Gómez**

**Born**
1944, Madrid.

**Parents**
Her father was a civil servant for the Republican government; her mother undertook various jobs (including selling home-baked goods) in Madrid and Mexico.

**Education**
Non-state school in Madrid (with a non-Francoist teacher); Colegio Madrid in Mexico.

**Work**
Science teacher, then headmistress, Colegio Madrid.

**Family history**
Her parents could not leave Spain in 1939, as her mother was 8 months’ pregnant. Her father was imprisoned and sentenced to 30 years’ hard labour, later released on conditional liberty in 1943. The family moved to Mexico when he was able to procure a passport in 1954.

**Further sources**
Her father wrote and a beautiful illustrated book whilst he was in prison, it is going to be published as a facsimile in Mexico (forthcoming).
Erandi Mejía Arregui

Born 1988, Mexico DF.

Parents Her mother is a doctor. Her mother and aunt both protested as students during 1968 in Mexico, and witnessed the government sponsored massacre in Tlatelolco [no information on her father].

Education State school, Mexico; degree at Colegio de México.

Work Research/administrative assistant, Colegio de México.

Family history Her grandmother was a Spanish refugee, who left Spain with her parents but lost her brother, who died or was killed in Spain. Her grandfather was a Nicaraguan refugee.

Further sources --

Carmen Romero de Rayo

Born 1920, León, Spain.

Parents Her father was a military officer who had been imprisoned for organising an uprising against Primo de Rivera; her mother was a housewife.

Education Moved around Spain during her childhood; secondary school in Madrid.

Work Secretary, then ran a factory making clothing.

Family history The family left Spain after the Civil War; her brother went from France to the Dominican Republic, as he had enlisted to fight for the Republic in 1937; her mother, father and she were in Algeria, then France, where her father was imprisoned by the Gestapo. They then found passage to Mexico on board the Nyassa from Casablanca in 1942.

Further sources Her memoir: Carmen Romero, Nuevas Raíces, (2011); Father’s memoir: Carlos Romero Giménez, Bajo las garras de la Gestapo (Mexico DF: Sociedad Mexicana de Publicaciones de RL, 1943).
through

Carmen Tagüeña

Born 1938, Moscow.

Parents Her parents were middle class members of the PCE, her father was a physicist and her mother taught Spanish.

Education Czechoslovakia, Mexico, degree at UNAM.

Work University administrator, now President of the Ateneo Espanol de México

Family history Parents emigrated to the Soviet Union at the end of the Civil War; family were displaced several times during the Second World War, travelling through and living in areas of rural Russia and Uzbekistan; Carmen Tagüeña spent her early childhood in Czechoslovakia before the family emigrated to Mexico in 1955.

Further sources Mother’s memoir: Carmen Parga, Antes que sea tarde, (XXX)
Father’s memoir: Manuel Tagüeña Lacorte, Testimonio de dos guerras, (Barcelona: Planeta, 1978)

Contacted through Through my work in the library and archive of the Ateneo.

Josefina Tome

Born 1943

Parents Her father worked in an office, her mother was a factory labourer.

Education Colegio Madrid.

Work Teacher.

Family history Her parents were both from Galicia; her father fought during the war; her parents both left Spain in 1939, reuniting in France; they travelled to Mexico on board the boat in May/June 1939 Ipanema.

Further sources On-board newspaper, Ipanema. (see bibliography)

Contacted through We met at an event at the Ateneo.

Spain:

Concepción Ruiz*
**Born** 1950, Galicia (Spain)

**Parents** Her father was a member of the Falange, and worked as Inspector of the *movimiento*. Her mother was a housewife.

**Education** Privately educated in a school run by nuns.

**Work** Secondary school teacher.

**Family history** Her mother’s sister (Lucía Gómez’ mother) was married to a republican, who was imprisoned post-Civil War. Her aunt, uncle by marriage and two cousins, including Lucía Gómez, emigrated to Mexico in the early 50s.

**Further sources** --

**Contacted through** Lucía Gómez.

---

### 2. Interviews conducted by researchers and historians for the INAH and Spanish Ministry of Culture.

Details of the 22 interviews consulted in depth, though not necessarily quoted at length. For full references see footnotes.

**Carmen Bahi de Parera**

**Born** 1909.

**Year interviewed** 1988.

**Originally from** Rural Catalonia.

**Occupation in Spain/Mexico** Shop assistant/shop owner.

**Overview of interview** Bahi left Spain with her parents and brother with the retirada. She was reunited with her husband in France. They travelled to Mexico on board the Ipanema in June 1939. In Mexico, she worked in a chicken processing business before setting up a shop with her husband. She lived in Mexico DF.

**Political affiliation** BOC/POUM

**Concepcion Baixeras:**

**Born** 1925.

**Year interviewed** 1974.

**Originally from** Barcelona.
Occupation in Spain/Mexico
--/housewife.

Overview of interview
Baixeras grew up in poverty in Spain. She was 12 when evacuated from Barcelona and transported with three siblings to Mexico as part of a group of 463 children. Housed in a boarding school in Morelia, which was a very difficult experience. Her parents and younger brother sought refuge in France following the Nationalist invasion of Catalonia, returned to Spain in 1940. Her father died soon after.

Political affiliation
--

Antonio Ballester

Born 1910
Year interviewed 1980
Originally from Valencia.

Occupation in Spain/Mexico
Artist.

Overview of interview
Ballester was unable to leave Valencia in 1939 and was incarcerated in the Modelo prison. Released on conditional liberty in 1944. Emigrated to Mexico in ’46 and later to the United States. He returned to Spain in 1963, because he missed the country and his family/friends but also because he wanted to try and improve the political situation.

Political affiliation
PCE.

Jose Luis Benlliure Lopez de Aranda

Born 1898
Year interviewed 1980
Originally from Madrid

Occupation in Spain/Mexico
Architect/architect.

Overview of interview
His father was a sculptor, his mother was a staunch Catholic. He worked as an engineer for the Republican army, building bridges etc. Travelled to France in 1939 with his regiment, spent a few days in St Cyprien, travelled without papers to Paris. In April 1939, travelled to Mexico on the Flandre. Returned to Spain in 1950.

Political affiliation
Described himself as a ‘liberal’ and a democrat. (p.19)
Jaime Camarasa

Born 1909
Year interviewed 1979
Originally from Valliramo (Barcelona)/

Occupation in Spain/Mexico Pilot/set up a glass factory.

Overview of interview Camarasa’s father worked in a glass factory, his mother did not work. He joined the air force aged 19, by 1930 he had qualified; he instructed pilots during the war and fought on the Aragon front in 1938. In 1939 he travelled to Toulouse, he worked as a chauffeur, mechanic and ‘avalado’ for Air France; in 1942 got the Portuguese boat the ‘Nyassa’ from Marseille to Mexico, where he worked in glass factories. In 1946 his parents arrived in Mexico: they went to Tlaquepaque. 1946-7; he set up glass factories in Guadalajara, Mexico DF and Puebla.

Political affiliation None, aside general support of the Republic.

Ernestina de Champourcin

Born 1905 (died in Madrid in 1999).
Year interviewed 1979 and 1981.
Originally from Vitoria, Basque Country.
Occupation in Spain/Mexico Writer and Poet.

Overview of interview Born to an upper class, traditionalist Catholic family in Vitoria, Ernestina moved with her family to Madrid aged 10. She received a high quality education, mastering French and English at a young age and writing poetry. She wished to study at University but despite her mother’s support, was forbidden by her father. She nonetheless became part of the literary scene in Madrid and was particularly influenced by Juan Ramón Jiménez. She began publishing poems from 1923. In 1930 she met Juan José Domenchina, a poet and personal secretary to Azaña, they married in November 1936. During the Civil War, she worked as a nurse. In 1939, she left Madrid, living briefly in Toulouse and Paris before being invited to Mexico by Alfonso Reyes, the founder of the Casa de España in Mexico City (which became El Colegio de México). In 1973, she returned permanently to Spain.

Political affiliation (Married to Manuel Azaña’s personal secretary.)

Bernadina Domínguez Gomez

Born 1897
Year interviewed 1974
Originally from Madrid
Occupation in Spain/Mexico --/Shop owner-manager

Overview of interview Domínguez went to France with her children and maids in 1937, and lived in Toulouse till 1939. Married to Francisco Méndez Aspe who worked for the Republic. Travelled to Mexico by boat to New York and over land to Mexico. Started work in Cuernavaca and later set up her business in Mexico DF. Her husband had travelled to the UK to continue working for the Republican government in exile, which meant Domínguez was essentially supporting her children alone. They expected to return to Spain within 3 or 4 years. Her husband travelled to Mexico in 1949. He suffered from throat cancer for several years and died in 1954.

Political affiliation None.

Carmen Dorronsorno de Roces
Born 1909
Year interviewed 1980
Originally from Madrid
Occupation in Spain/Mexico Worked for the PCE/arts administration/piano teaching

Overview of interview Dorronsorno studied piano in the conservatoire and married Wences Roces in 1933; they had a daughter. Between 1934 and 1935 de Roces was incarcerated for his involvement in the Asturian uprising. In 1935 Carmen went to Moscow where she worked till returning to Spain in 1936. In Spain she worked in the ‘Association of friends of the USSR’ and as secretary to the Soviet ambassador. She sent her daughter to the USSR in 1937. In 1939 she and her husband went to France, and then to Chile in 1941 in the boat Masilia. In 1942 they left for Chile and went to Mexico. In 1944 she had her second child. In 1945 she was able to arrange for her first daughter to leave the USSR and come to Mexico. In 1947 she began to work in the conservatoire as a librarian, and for the PCE helping Spanish political prisoners. She also worked as a piano teacher. She visited Spain several times but did not return permanently.

Political affiliation PCE.

Jose Duque
Born 1908.
Year interviewed 1979.
Originally from Villalba (Madrid)
Occupation in Construction worker/bookshop owner.
Spain/Mexico

Overview of interview
Duque came from a poor family and he was one of many children. He could not go to school but he did teach himself to read, which he loved. Started work at 14. During General Berenguer’s government was distinguished as a militant in the Construction union and was imprisoned during that time. He joined PCE in 1934. Married in 1937, and had two children. Joined the Republican army; left Spain with his regiment and crossed the border on 13 Feb, 1939. He was in Prats de Molló for a month, based with various regiments from the Eastern front, and was then transported to Agde concentration camp. Travelled to Mexico in the boat Mexique in June 1939. Arrived in Veracruz, went to Mexico DF, then Guadalajara, where he lived for 32 years. Left the PCE in 1945. Owns a book shop. He was not politically active in Mexico, so as not to interfere. Low opinion of the Republic, which he considered to have been inefficient.

Political affiliation
PCE.

Ramón Estaura

Born
1909.

Year interviewed
1979.

Originally from
La Coruna.

Occupation in Spain/Mexico
Lawyer/business, then shop owner-manager.

Overview of interview
Born to a family of campesinos Esturau nonetheless studied to be a lawyer in Santiago de Compostela. In 1931 he joined Izquierda Republicana. Went to Cuba and returned in 1934 to join the Republican army. Between 1936-1939 he fought between the Aragonese and Catalan fronts under Colonel Lister. 1939 he went to France through Col de Bonyuls, he was then in prison in Perpignan for 3 months, and in prison in Montpellier for 3 months and then he entered a concentration camp, Agde. In May/June 1939 he travelled to Mexico with the help of SERE and Fernando Gamboa on board the Ipanema. Worked in various Spanish businesses in Mexico, then for Remington Rand. Married in 1957 and had two sons. Moved to Guadalajara in 1954. Visited Spain in 1976.

Political affiliation
Izquierda Republicana.

Felix Galarza

Born
1898.

Year interviewed
1979.
| Originally from | Madrid. |
| Occupation in Spain/Mexico | State lawyer/business agent. |
| Overview of interview | (Brother of Angel Galarza, Director General of Security, during the Republic). Galarza started his studies in the College of San Isidro, then went to England to study in 1914 before returning because of WW1. Between 1914-1919, Galarza studied for lawyer qualifications. In 1921 he passed his exams and began practicing as a lawyer in Madrid, then Civil Governor in Guipuzcoa. Sent to Vigo in 1933 as Comisario. Joined PSOE in 1936. In 1937 sent to Tangiers and Fez as a consul. 1939 he is exiled in Casablanca. Travelled to Mexico on board a Portuguese boat, Quansa, with his first wife and 8-year old son in 1941. Worked in different Mexican companies as a business agent. Married for second time to a Mexican woman (first wife died). Visited Spain in 1979, post transition, received a pension for his work as lawyer for the state. |
| Political affiliation | PSOE. |
| Francesca de Linares de Vidarte | |
| Born | 1911. |
| Year interviewed | 1988. |
| Originally from | Gerona. |
| Occupation in Spain/Mexico | Journalist/journalist. |
| Overview of interview | De Linares grew up in an upper middle class family. She studied in the Damas Negras and the Sagrado Corazon in Barcelona. In 1929 went to the Residencia de Estudiantes and was a member of Asociación de Mujeres Universitarias, promoting women’s right to vote. Studied Filosofía y Letras. Studied in Paris between 1931-33. In 1936 she married Juan Vidarte, Secretary General of the PSOE. Worked as journalist for El Diluvio, a Barcelona newspaper. Travelled constantly throughout the war with her husband, who was procuring arms for the Republican war effort. In 1938 she and her husband were in Tangiers, in 1939 they travelled to Casablanca and later Algeria. She managed to gain passage on an American cargo boat from Abidján to New York. In 1941 the family arrived in Mexico. Had three children. Mexican citizen. Visited Spain in 1979, invited by PSOE. Also went in 1984. Recovered Spanish nationality when PSOE were voted in under León Felipe. |
| Political affiliation | PSOE. |
Jose Marull

Born 1912.
Year interviewed 1979.
Originally from Navata (Gerona)

Occupation in Spain/Mexico Family business/waiter-business owner.

Overview of interview Marull joined the Republican army in 1937 and fought on the Aragonese front. In 1939 went to France through the Pyrenees. He travelled on board the Sinaia to Mexico. Started to work in a canteen (as soon he arrived in Mexico) and later set up his own furniture shop. Married in 1949. Had 4 children. His business grew till it was employing 150 people and was very successful. Has returned to Spain many times and is disappointed by it; in 1958 his father died and in 1962 he brought his mother over to Mexico to live with him. His children all speak Catalan. Still a member of the Esquerra Republicana de Cataluña in 1979. Voted for the PRI and felt like Mexico was his first country.

Political affiliation Esquerra Republicana de Cataluña.

Llanos Navarro Ballasteros

Born 1916.
Year interviewed 1980.
Originally from Albacete.

Occupation in Spain/Mexico Baker/dress maker.

Overview of interview Navarro grew up in a poor family, as one of ten siblings. The family moved around a lot as her parents searched for work. She later worked as a travelling baker. Joined the PCE and supported the Republican war effort. She left Spain for France in 1939 and gained passage to the Dominican Republic, where she remained until 1944. Divorced her first husband in the Dominican Republic. Travelled to Mexico in 1944 and returned to Spain in 1968.

Political affiliation PCE.

Adrian Olmedilla Navarro

Born 1910.
Year interviewed 1981.
Originally from  
Honrubia (Cuenca).

Occupation in Spain/Mexico  
Teacher.

Overview of interview  
Olmedilla’s father was a vet, his mother was a house wife. He had 3 siblings, with whom he had political differences but a good relationship. He joined the JSU. He intended to volunteer for the defence of Madrid but his brother was murdered by Republicans, who mistook him for a Fascist reactionary, so he remained in his village. He then became a ‘cultural militant’, teaching soldiers on different fronts, including Barcelona in June 1938. Travelled to France on 7 February 1939; sent to Argelès-sur-mer concentration camp, and later Barcares where he taught soldiers how to read. He lived in France till 1957: worked as a miner during WW2 and for the resistance as a member of the PCE. He was put in prison for his political activities. At the end of WW2 he was employed by the French state to work as a teacher in a school for Spanish ‘mentally deficient’ children. Married in 1949. He went to Mexico in 1957 to found a school, a project which failed; found work as an accountant. Returned to Spain permanently in 1969, unemployed, found work as a proof-reader.

Political affiliation  
JSU/PCE.

Isabel Richart Sotes

Born  
1914.

Year interviewed  
1980.

Originally from  
Madrid.

Occupation in Spain/Mexico  
Various.

Overview of interview  
Richart grew up in a traditional, comfortably off family. She was well educated. Completed a course in dress making in 1934. Married her husband Álvaro in October 1936, in a civil ceremony, against her family’s wishes. Had her first daughter a year later in Valencia, during bombardments. Left Barcelona before the Nationalist invasion, travelled to France with her daughter with the retirada. She returned to Spain, travelled to Cuba in 1941 to reunite with her husband. They travelled to Mexico in 1942. She worked as a dress maker, masseuse and made radio programmes about women’s beauty. Her husband worked as a theatre director and they returned to Spain for his work in 1973, although Isabel wished to remain in Mexico.

Political affiliation  
None.
Ramón Rodríguez Mata

Born 1896.
Year interviewed 1979.
Originally from Madrid.

Occupation in Spain/Mexico Public health/private doctor.

Overview of interview Rodríguez was one of 14 children, 12 of whom lived. His father was a homeopathic healer, who had rich clients. He was the fifth sibling; he had three sisters – one was a nun, one a republican who became a teacher in the USA, one was evacuated as a child to Russia during the war and married a Russian pilot. He trained as a doctor, spending some time in Paris studying in 1921. In 1925 he went to work in Bilbao and was a very successful clinician and researcher. Married in 1932; had two children. Worked as a medic during the war. When Bilbao fell he went to Santander. Founded a hospital en Solares, where he was director. Saw the Italians enter Santona and fled hidden in an English boat in 1938. In 1938 ordered to Barcelona to work as a doctor. Head of San Gervasio Hospital. Exile in France, near to Paris. Wrote to Negrin to ask for help in going to Mexico. In May 1939 leaves Paris to get the Sinaia to Mexico. Worked for 25 years in ‘La Benéfica’. Also worked privately and translated medical texts. In 1943 he recovered his children who were living with his mother in Madrid. In 1945 worked for 6 months in US lab. Never returned to Spain.

Political affiliation PSOE.

Luis Salvadores

Born 1910.
Year interviewed 1979.
Originally from Madrid.

Occupation in Spain/Mexico Civil servant/manual labour/Political activist-Lawyer.

Overview of interview Salvadores was born to a middle-class family in Madrid. Member of JSU and PSOE, later joined PSUC. Worked in Lerida. In 1935 went to work in Barcelona. Married in September 1936, had 3 children. During the war he fought in Durruti’s column. Joined the ‘Comisión Política-Militar of the PSUC. Went to France on the 14 February 1939. Time in 3 concentration camps. Goes to Santo Domingo with his family in 1939. There they worked in the commune ‘Granja Ebro’. In 1943 they went to México. Worked in 3 different Jewish companies. Lived there till 1962, when he returned to Spain permanently (two visits in 1959, 1961) Left the PCE in 1950-
51. In 1964/65 returned to University to study law. Worked to support political prisoners under Francoism.

**Political affiliation**  
JSU-PSOE-PSUC-PCE.

**Heliodoro Sánchez**

**Born** 1919.  
**Year interviewed** 1980.  
**Originally from** Avila.  
**Occupation in Spain/Mexico** Factory worker/salesman.  
**Overview of interview** Sánchez was born in Medina del Campo, lived in Avila as a child. His father worked as a labourer for RENFE. Went to live in Madrid at 12 years old, finished school there and started work in a soap factory, joined and became a leader within the socialist youth, enlisting in the militia during the Civil War in Extremadura. Went to France at the end of the war, incarcerated in St Cyprien, Argelès and Barcares. Joined a work group to leave the camps, went to Casablanca. Gained passage to the Dominican Republic, where he worked in a Jewish refugee colony (Sosúa). Married a Dominican woman. They travelled to Mexico in the 1940s. Worked as a salesman in Mexico. Returned to Spain in 1972.

**Political affiliation** PSUC

**Florinda San Agustín Labrada**

**Born** 1902.  
**Year interviewed** 1979.  
**Originally from** Gijón.  
**Occupation in Spain/Mexico** Beauty salon.  
**Overview of interview** San Agustín was born to lower middle-class family in Gijón. Her father ran a hairdressing salon; she trained to become a beautician and joined him. Married Germán Horacio, an artist who produced propaganda for the Republican war effort in Asturias and went to Mexico in 1939 on the *Sitaia*. They had a son in approx. 1928. Florinda remained in Spain in 1939, and was imprisoned several times, although she was never politically affiliated. Travelled with her son to Cuba, then Mexico in 1946, to be reunited with her husband. Set up a salon in Mexico.
Political affiliation None.

Enrique Segarra Tomas

Born 1908.
Year interviewed 1980.
Originally from Valencia.

Occupation in Spain/Mexico Architect.

Overview of interview Segarra belonged to an upper-class family. He was well educated: in 1934 he completed Architect’s training in Madrid. Lived the Madrid intellectual scene of the 30s: friends with García Lorca, Pablo Neruda. In 1935 he entered the ‘Concurso Nacional de Arquitectura’ with 3 other architects and they won the first prize. In 1936 joined the PCE. During the war he joined the Engineering corps. In 1940 after spending some months in Saint-Cyprien concentration camp, he got the boat to Mexico, paid for by SERE, in a boat belonging to the ‘Compagnie Generale Transatlantique’. His wife arrived in 1942. They had a son. He was the first qualified architect to work in Veracruz. Between 1941 and 1950 works for a company called Eureka, then independently. At the same time he also worked as a professor of engineering in the university. Nationalised Mexican in 1947. Considers himself just as Mexican as Spanish. Returned to Spain for the first time in 1970. Lived with his Spanish wife, with whom he has one son but also had a Mexican girlfriend, with whom he had another son.

Political affiliation PCE.

Cristina Ulibarri

Born 1917.
Year interviewed 1980.
Originally from Santander (rural)

Occupation in Spain/Mexico Servant/catering.

Overview of interview Ulibarri was born to a poor family and was the eighth of ten children. She worked as a servant from aged 10 and as a nurse for the UGT during the war. Went to France with her husband, Santiago Vigera who was a militant for the PSOE. They gained passage to Santo Domingo and re-emigrated to Mexico in 1944. They had at least one daughter. Her husband had been badly injured during the war and died in January 1954. She worked in various restaurants/canteens and in a hotel till 1972.
Visited Spain two times.

**Political affiliation**  UGT.

3. Interviews conducted by researchers for the SCWMP, University of San Diego.

The website where all files and further information and summaries of interviews, some of which are quoted below, can be found here: [http://libraries.ucsd.edu/speccoll/scwmemory/cat-alpha.html](http://libraries.ucsd.edu/speccoll/scwmemory/cat-alpha.html), accessed 12 Jun. 2014.

### Isabel Aillón Murgi

**Born**  1917, Barcelona  
**Year interviewed**  2009  
**Overview of interview**  Aillón worked to support the Republican war effort in Barcelona, making clothes for soldiers. She left Spain in 1939, refugee in France, her baby died in the refugio; reunited with her husband and returned to Spain in 1940; her husband was then murdered by Falangists in 1945 (the regime claimed he had died of a heart attack in custody); she went to France in '53; worked as a seamstress and brought up her children; eventually returned to Barcelona.  
**Political affiliation**  PSUC  

### Jose "Pepe" Alarcon García

**Born**  1930, Malaga or environs.  
**Year interviewed**  2009  
**Overview of interview**  Alarcon was born to a family of six children and was six years old at the start of the Civil War. He explained that his family fled on the highway from Málaga to Almería. His father turned himself in when the Falange falsely promised amnesty and was placed in a concentration camp in Granada for a year. Alarcon’s father was then imprisoned in Málaga and was executed in 1940. Alarcon recalls the hardships that accompanied the loss of his father and the abuse suffered as the child of a rojo (red). He noted that in 1952 he joined the Communist Party of Spain in Barcelona.  
**Political affiliation**  PCE.  
**Link to**  [http://libraries.ucsd.edu/speccoll/scwmemory/catalog/eng-](http://libraries.ucsd.edu/speccoll/scwmemory/catalog/eng-
### Jose Barrio

**Born**
1917, Segovia  

**Year interviewed**
2009  

**Overview of interview**
Barrio and his brother volunteered for the Republican army, his brother died in battle. After the war he was incarcerated in a Francoist concentration camp and Ocaña prison for a month. Stated that no one was shot whilst he was in prison. Worked for Standard Electric till his retirement.  

**Political affiliation**
None stated.  

**Link to summary**

### Pere Basté

**Born**
1921, Barcelona.  

**Year interviewed**
2009  

**Overview of interview**
Basté joined the Red Cross as a voluntary rescue worker during the bombardments of Barcelona (1937–1939). He recounted his experiences, discussing the situations he encountered, the personal repercussions of his work, and the general atmosphere and destruction of the city during these years. Worked in Cuba for his company '52-'63; describes the Cuban revolution.  

**Political affiliation**
None stated.  

**Link to summary**

### Ana Fernández Morelo

**Born**
[not stated, she was a child during the Civil War].  

**Year interviewed**
2009.  

**Overview of interview**
Fernández narrated that when the Civil War began, the Nationalists expelled her family from the country, confiscated their animals, and led them to the town of Céspedes at gunpoint. She recounts that her family slept at the old schools but felt immense fear upon seeing worm and blood-drenched clothes hanging there. Hardship of life after war; mother taking on the burden of the family and work; mother's death possibly worsened by doctor's
refusing to treat her; Ana's husband worked in Switzerland for 6 years.

**Political affiliation**
None stated.

**Link to summary**

**Maria Magdalena García Hernandez**

**Born**
1928, Spain.

**Year interviewed**
2009

**Overview of interview**
García recalled being a child during the war, near the border with France. She remembered that in the mornings they were picked up and taken to France, and at night they were returned to Spain. She and her family sought exile in France in 1939 and were placed in the Arge\lès-sur-Mer concentration camp. She noted that later the mothers and small children were taken to a refuge in Cordes-sur-Ciel, and the men were placed in a concentration camp. Drawings made by children in France and digitised by the University of San Diego included hers; she lives in France but considers herself Spanish by blood.

**Political affiliation**
None stated.

**Link to summary**

**Angel Herrero Álvarez**

**Born**
1924, Spain.

**Year interviewed**
2009

**Overview of interview**
Herrero witnessed the outbreak of the Civil War in Madrid. In 1937, he was evacuated from Madrid. He spent time in Alicante and then fled with hundreds of children from Barcelona to Brest, France. He boarded a ship that took him from France to Leningrad. He studied in the Soviet Union. Herrero later fought against the Nazis during World War II. He described being captured and then detained in a Nazi concentration camp. Herrero related that after being released from the camp in 1943, he was transported back to Spain under the Falange’s surveillance.

**Political affiliation**
None stated.

**Link to summary**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Francisco &quot;Paco&quot; Marin</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Born</strong></td>
<td>1923, Seville.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year interviewed</strong></td>
<td>2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overview of interview</strong></td>
<td>Marin described his father’s abduction by Francoist forces and the discovery of his murder years later. He explained the trauma that Francoist repression wrought on family; he is the oldest of 7 children and he avoided being politically involved to protect his family; talks about problems Spain continues to face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political affiliation</strong></td>
<td>Involved in the recovery of historical memory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Link to summary</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://libraries.ucsd.edu/speccoll/scwmemory/catalog/eng-bb3107018k.html">http://libraries.ucsd.edu/speccoll/scwmemory/catalog/eng-bb3107018k.html</a>, last accessed 12 Jun. 2014.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>José María &quot;Pepín&quot; Ruiz García</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Born</strong></td>
<td>1936, Toledo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year interviewed</strong></td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overview of interview</strong></td>
<td>Ruiz recounts that his family travelled to Alicante to board a French boat and flee the Civil War. The boat was not allowed to dock in Spain and the majority of those who intended to escape, including his uncles, were sent to concentration camps. Ruiz’ grandfather was imprisoned in Burgos until 1945, and died in 1953 due to severe psychological trauma and complications from torture during his incarceration. His family moved to Seville and struggled to survive. He became a train operator for Renfe (the Spanish national railway network) in 1956 and joining the PCE. In 1963 Ruiz was arrested, convicted, sentenced to two years in prison, and fined 23,000 pesetas. He was released provisionally with the agreement to finish serving his sentence later. Ruiz was denied his previous employment and sought work outside of Seville. In 1977, he was forced to complete his sentence in Seville while his wife was pregnant. He was a founding member of Andalucía’s Comisiones Obreras (Labor Commissions) and, with other former political prisoners, of the association Memoria, Libertad y Cultura Democrática (Democratic Memory, Liberty, and Culture).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political affiliation</strong></td>
<td>PCE; COO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Link to summary</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://libraries.ucsd.edu/speccoll/scwmemory/catalog/eng-bb1980590t.html">http://libraries.ucsd.edu/speccoll/scwmemory/catalog/eng-bb1980590t.html</a>, last accessed 12 Jun. 2014.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Guillermo Vignote Mignorance</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Born</strong></td>
<td>1934, Madrid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Year interviewed 2009.

Overview of interview Vignote’s parents were political activists who met in the JSU and were only married a short time. His father was a doctor and fled from Spain on the last boat to depart from Alicante. His mother, a divorced woman with few work options, supported him by managing a guesthouse where they resided with six other families. His mother was in the PCE and, as a result of her militancy, was detained for two or three years during his adolescence. Vignote noted that his uncle and grandfather were both imprisoned for their political activities and his great uncle spent fourteen years in prison. In the early 1960s he reconnected with his father by chance, as they were both working as doctors in Morocco.

Political affiliation PCE.

Appendix 3: Consent and information forms given to author’s informants

Information Sheet

The commemoration and memory of the Spanish civil war and republican exile
You have taken part in a research study as part of a student project looking at the ways in which the Spanish civil war and republican exile are commemorated. The student, Rosy Rickett, would like to use a quotation from your oral interview in her PhD thesis. If you consent to this, please read and sign the form.
Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Please ask if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Take time to decide whether or not you wish to have your interview quoted in the thesis.
Thank you for reading this.

Who has conducted the research?
Rosy Rickett, History department, University of Manchester , M13 9PL

What is the aim of the research?

- To document the ways that different individuals remember the Spanish exile
- To document the impact of the civil war and exile on the lives of the exiles themselves
- To document to what extent or in what ways the exiles and those who stayed within Spain maintained contact with one another

Why have I been chosen?
[insert reason here]

What happens to the data collected?
All data is stored securely

How is confidentiality maintained?
Data is stored in a locked drawer; data on my computer is encrypted and password safe

What happens if I do not want to be quoted or I change my mind?
It is up to you to decide whether or not you would like to be quoted and whether or not you wish to remain anonymous. If you do decide to take part you will be asked to sign this consent form. If you decide to take part you are still free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason and without detriment to yourself.

Will I be paid for agreeing for my interview to be quoted?
No

Will the outcomes of the research be published?
Interviews will be quoted in a PhD thesis submitted to the University of Manchester; they may also be quoted in academic articles or book chapters, which will be publicly available either in print or on the internet. There will be no restrictions on who is able to access the printed or electronic copies of the thesis or other articles.

Contact for further information
Rosy.Rickett@manchester.ac.uk
School of Arts Histories and Cultures, University of Manchester, M13 9PL

What if something goes wrong?
If a participant wants to make a formal complaint about the conduct of the research they should contact the Head of the Research Office, Christie Building, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL.
CONSENT FORM

If you are happy to participate, please read and sign the form

Please put your initials in the relevant boxes to register your preferences

1. I confirm that I have read the information form about the aforementioned research Project and that I have had time to consider the information and ask about details, and that I have received satisfactory answers to my questions, where relevant.

☐

2. I understand that if I agree to participate I can still cancel my permission at any time, without giving any reason, without incurring any damages.

☐

3. I agree to the citation of my words in the thesis and I agree to the use of my name; I agree to the citation of words attributed to me.

☐

4. I agree to the citation of my words in the thesis but I do not agree to the use of my name; I agree to the citation of my words only when anonymity is maintained.

☐

5. I understand that the information (the interview and the citation of my words) could be published and available to read in academic journals and/or on the internet.

☐

I agree to the citation of my words in the doctoral thesis of Rosy Rickett and in whichever publications that could use these citations in the future.

________________________________________  __________________________  __________________________
Name of participant                          Date                                Signature

________________________________________  __________________________  __________________________
Name of researcher                           Date                                Signature (Rosy Rickett)
La memoria de la Guerra Civil Española y el exilio republicano
Hoja de información

Estás participando en un proyecto de investigación sobre la forma en que están recordados y conmemorados la guerra civil de España y el exilio republicano. Este proyecto constituye una sección de una tesis doctoral. La estudiante, Rosy Rickett, quisiera utilizar una cita de su entrevista en su tesis doctoral. Si accedes a la cita de sus palabras, por favor lea y firme el formulario.

Es importante que te des el tiempo de leer la información siguiente cuidadosamente y si quisieras, discúltela con otros. Pregúntame si hay alguna cosa que no está claro o si quisieras más información. Tómese el tiempo para decidir si usted quisiera tener su entrevista citada en la tesis. Muchas gracias por leer esta información.

¿Quién ha hecho la investigación?
Rosy Rickett, departamento de historia, Universidad de Manchester, M13 9PL

¿Cuáles son los objetivos de la investigación?
- (Para) documentar la forma en que diferentes individuales recuerdan al exilio España
- (Para) documentar el impacto de la guerra civil y el exilio sobre las vidas de los exiliados mismos
- (Para) documentar hasta qué punto y/o en qué manera los exiliados y los que se quedaron en España mantenían contacto

¿Por qué me ha contactado?
[insert reason]

Como están guardados los datos acumulados
Todos los datos (la entrevista) están guardados seguramente

¿Cómo está la confidencialidad mantenida?
Los datos están guardados en un compartimiento bajo llave; los datos que están guardados en el ordenador están protegidos con contraseña

¿Qué pasaría si no quiero que mis palabras estén citadas o si cambio mi opinión?
Es su decisión si accede o no a la cita de su entrevista/sus palabras en la tesis. También es su decisión si prefiere conservar el anonimato o no. Si accede a participar todavía podrá cancelar su permiso en cualquier momento, y sin obligación de dar razón cualquiera, completamente sin perjuicio.

¿Recibiría algún dinero por acceder a la cita de la entrevista?
No

¿Estarán publicados los resultados de la investigación?
Su entrevista se citará en una tesis doctoral presentada en la Universidad de Manchester, en el Reino Unido; sus palabras citadas podrán estar citadas en artículos académicos o capítulos de libros. Estos artículos o capítulos podrían estar citados por el internet o en papel. No habrá ninguna restricción con respecto a quién podrá obtener acceso a las copias electrónicas o en papel de la tesis o las citas de la tesis.

Por más información, se puede contactar a la investigadora:
Rosy.Rickett@manchester.ac.uk
Celular de México: 553451-5267

¿Y si quiere presentar una queja?
Si usted quiere presentar una queja sobre la manera en la que se ha desarrollado la entrevista o la investigación por favor contacte con el:
Head of the Research Office, Christie Building, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL.
FORMULARIO DE CONSENTIMIENTO

Si usted está contento/a participar, por favor lea y firme el formulario

Por favor ponga las iniciales en las casillas relevantes para registrar sus preferencias.

1. Confirma que he leído la hoja de información sobre dicho proyecto de investigación y tuve el tiempo a considerar la información y preguntar sobre las detalles y he recibido contestaciones satisfactorias a las preguntas (según sea relevante)

☐

2. Entiendo que si accede a participar todavía podrá cancelar mi permiso en cualquier momento, y sin obligación de dar razón cualquiera, completamente sin perjuicio.

☐

3. Accedo a la cita de mis palabras en la tesis, y accedo al uso de mi nombre; accedo a la cita de mis palabras asignadas a mí.

☐

4. Accedo a la cita de mis palabras en la tesis pero no accedo al uso de mi nombre; accedo a la cita de mis palabras cuando el anonimato esta conservado.

☐

5. Entiendo que los datos (la entrevista, la cita de mis palabras) podrían estar publicados y disponible a leer en las revistas académicas o/y por el internet.

☐

Accedo a la cita de mis palabras en la tesis doctoral de Rosy Rickett y en cualquier artículo o publicación que podría usar estas citas en el futuro

_________________________________________  __________________________  __________________________
Nombre del participante                  Fecha                          Firma

_________________________________________  __________________________  __________________________
Nombre de la investigadora               Fecha                          Firma (Rosy Rickett)