



## ORBIT - Online Repository of Birkbeck Institutional Theses

---

Enabling Open Access to Birkbeck's Research Degree output

### A Spaniard in Hertfordshire : the intellectual exile of Arturo Barea

<https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/40291/>

Version: Full Version

**Citation: Nieto McAvoy, Eva (2017) A Spaniard in Hertfordshire : the intellectual exile of Arturo Barea. [Thesis] (Unpublished)**

© 2020 The Author(s)

---

All material available through ORBIT is protected by intellectual property law, including copyright law.

Any use made of the contents should comply with the relevant law.

---

[Deposit Guide](#)  
Contact: [email](#)

A Spaniard in Hertfordshire:  
the Intellectual Exile of Arturo Barea

Eva Nieto McAvoy

Birkbeck, University of London

PhD

2017

## **Declaration**

I, Eva Nieto McAvoy, declare that the work published in this thesis is my own. No portion of the work referred to in the thesis has been submitted in support of an application for another degree or qualification of this or any other university or other institute of learning.

London, 15 November 2017

## Abstract

This thesis explores the role of exile in the work of the Spanish Republican Arturo Barea (1897-1957). It suggests that, linked to the movements that exile generates (physical, social and intellectual), the concept of 'transnational' can be used as an analytical tool with which to interrogate Barea's work and its interpretations. It was during his exile in Britain that Barea became a professional writer, a literary critic and a broadcaster for the BBC. He published his autobiographical trilogy *The Forging of a Rebel*, edited by T.S. Eliot, in London between 1941 and 1946. This work was immediately translated into several languages, but was only printed in Spanish in its Argentinian edition of 1951, and was not published in Spain until 1977. Through a combined reading of the trilogy alongside a larger body of fictional and non-fictional work the thesis offers a detailed historical analysis of the first context of production and reception of Barea's writing in Britain, focusing on the period of 1938-1945. It highlights the challenges and opportunities of exile as a transnational and cosmopolitan experience, and demonstrates the different ways in which the homeland and the host state intersect in Barea's work. Barea's writings are read here as exercises of cross-cultural translation in which Spain, its people and the Spanish Civil War were construed for a British – and later international – public, while Britain, its people and their role in the Second World War were also interpreted for a Latin American audience. This thesis emphasizes the historical importance of the informal intellectual networks, the publishing landscape, and the 'corporate cosmopolitanism' of the BBC as the institutional sites in which Barea developed his work. A transnational and cosmopolitan approach can offer an avenue to analyse Spanish Republican exile cultural products in a wider historical setting.

## Acknowledgments

This thesis has been made possible by the financial support of the Arts and Humanities Research Council. It is also the result of the patience and generous guidance of my supervisor Mari Paz Balibrea, whose work on Spanish Republican exile has been an inspiration for my research. I further wish to acknowledge the stimulating environment of the Department of Cultures and Languages at Birkbeck and the support received by John Kraniauskas, Luís Trindade, Carmen Fracchia, Jessamy Harvey, Luciana Martins, María Elena Placencia and Ann Lewis. During the course of my investigations, I have also been lucky to have the chance to share my on-going work in different forums and research seminars where I have received invaluable feedback for which I am very thankful. I want to gratefully acknowledge the help and advice of Fernando Larraz, Sebastiaan Faber, Julio Ortega, Shafquat Towheed, Michelle Brown and Mercedes Fernández Valladares. Their contributions have all enriched this thesis – needless to say that all errors are my own. I want to particularly thank Nigel Townson, Michael Eaude and William Chislett for their generosity in sharing with me all things Borean; as well as Christian Ravina for his infatigable quest to commemorate the contribution of Spanish exile culture to British history. My heartfelt gratitude goes to Marie Gillespie, who has supported my work in a number of different ways, and whose research into diasporas at the BBC World Service has been central to this thesis. I have also had the chance to meet fellow postgraduate students who have helped me through this long process. Amongst them, I particularly thank Mark Stuart-Smith, Mercedes Cebrián and Rosy Rickett. I have benefited from fellowships at several institutions and libraries such as the Hispanic Studies Department at Brown University, the Centre for Research on Socio-Cultural Change at the Open University and the Harry Ransom Centre at the University of Texas, Austin.

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to Uli Rushby-Smith for allowing me to work with Arturo and Ilsa's private papers. Hers and Eugene Ludlow's generosity in sharing their time, memories, delicious food and coffee has had a profound impact on my work and life. The care of my friends has carried me through this thesis. Elena Veguillas's sense of humour has made the shared experience of writing a thesis as Spanish exiles in London more enjoyable. Above all, I cannot express enough my gratitude for the many different ways in which my family has lovingly put up with me, encouraged and supported me through this research. I want to thank my uncle Rafa for bringing *La forja de un rebelde* into our lives, as it reminded him of the childhood he shared with my father in Lavapiés. I thank Ildikó and Reinhard Biedermann for their patience and loving support. Without the love of my parents Jean and José and my sister Érica – whose help has included travelling across the world with me in pursuit of my research – my work would not have been possible. This thesis is dedicated to them, and to Zoltán and Hannah, who are the loves of my life.

## Table of Contents

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Declaration .....   | 2   |
| Abstract .....  | 3   |
| Acknowledgments.....  | 4   |
| Introduction .....  | 7   |
| Literature Review.....  | 10  |
| Barea and Spanish Republican Exile Studies.....   | 18  |
| Dialogizing Barea’s exile.....  | 25  |
| A cosmopolitan exile?.....  | 32  |
| Historicizing Barea’s exile.....  | 40  |
| Chapter distribution.....   | 46  |
| Chapter 1. The Making of the Bareas’ Transnational Network, 1937-41.....                            | 49  |
| A literary passport: Madrid, the Foreign Press Office, and the making of <i>Valor y miedo</i> ..... | 53  |
| The French interlude: remembering Paris in Britain.....   | 60  |
| Reaching a safe haven? The Bareas’ arrival in Britain.....  | 63  |
| Finding a place for the Spanish Civil War in Britain during the Second World War .....              | 71  |
| How to publish in a foreign tongue: The battle for <i>The Forge</i> .....                           | 77  |
| Becoming intellectuals of the British Left .....  | 79  |
| A true member of the non-communist Left: writing <i>Struggle for the Spanish Soul</i> .....         | 82  |
| The literary critic: Lorca for the Left .....   | 88  |
| Chapter 2. The Forging of a Writer: Barea’s Autobiographical Writing in Exile .....                 | 96  |
| On the question of autobiography in Barea .....   | 97  |
| Not Spain, but Barea .....  | 101 |
| A mediator and ‘An honest man’ .....  | 108 |
| Arturo Barea, a modernist ethnographer? .....   | 116 |
| An exile before exile .....   | 122 |
| A writer for (and of) the people .....  | 127 |
| Chapter 3. The Key to Victory is Spain .....  | 136 |
| The transnational Spanish Civil War .....   | 138 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| <i>The rear of a Fifth Column</i> .....   | 140 |
| <i>Spanish bombs</i> .....  | 142 |
| <i>A fight between World Democracy and World Fascism</i> .....  | 147 |
| <i>The Track from the Spanish Moroccan War to the Second World War</i> .....                              | 151 |
| <i>Who owns the Rock? Talking about Gibraltar and British non-intervention</i> .....                      | 155 |
| <i>'What Morocco Means to Spain' and Britain</i> .....  | 160 |
| <i>The limits of criticism: facing censorship in Britain</i> .....  | 164 |
| Chapter 4. Spain is (not) Different.....  | 170 |
| 'Othering' the Spanish caste and deconstructing the 'Hispanic myth'.....                                  | 175 |
| <i>The political Spanish Catholic Church</i> .....  | 176 |
| <i>Explaining the 'caste'</i> .....   | 181 |
| <i>Franco, the 'Monster-Caudillo'</i> .....   | 184 |
| <i>The 'Hispanic myth'</i> .....  | 186 |
| The people's war(s).....  | 192 |
| Chapter 5. Juan de Castilla: Broadcasting Britain for the BBC.....  | 202 |
| The 'corporate cosmopolitanism' of the BBC.....   | 204 |
| Aren't you glad you live in England? The politics of non-politics and the English National Character..... | 210 |
| The Battle of the potatoes or broadcasting the 'people's war'.....  | 222 |
| The Third Force and beyond: Barea's position in the Cultural Cold War.....                                | 230 |
| Conclusion.....   | 242 |
| Future directions.....  | 246 |
| References.....   | 251 |

## Introduction

‘If the fascists’ powers have done no other good, they have at least enriched the English-speaking world by exiling all their best writers.’ (Orwell 2001, 341)

Arturo Barea (1897-1957) arrived in England in February 1939, as one of many victims of the Spanish Civil War, ‘desposeído de todo, con la vida truncada y sin una perspectiva futura, ni de patria, ni de hogar, ni de trabajo... rendido de cuerpo y espíritu’ (2000, xx). When Barea and his wife Ilsa descended from the boat in Portsmouth in which they had crossed the channel from France, they had little more with them than his first book of war-time short stories, their acquaintance with British journalists and other European exiles, and their ‘symbolic capital’ as witnesses of the Spanish Civil War. As it turns out, they were not going to need anything else. By the end of 1941, aside from numerous articles on Spanish politics and a few short stories, Barea had contributed a political essay called *Struggle for the Spanish Soul* to the Searchlight Books series edited by George Orwell; he had published the first volume of his trilogy, *The Forge*, edited by T. S. Eliot; and he had shaken up supporters of the Spanish Republic by publishing a critical review of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* in Cyril Connolly’s modernist literary magazine *Horizon*, while broadcasting weekly for the BBC Latin American Service as ‘Juan de Castilla’. This thesis explores how this happened. The purpose of my investigation is to critically analyse the Spanish Republican Arturo Barea’s work and his role as an intellectual during his exile in Britain, focusing particularly on his production between 1939 and 1945, though with an epilogue following him till his death in 1957 and beyond.

This thesis explores Arturo Barea’s exile as a key to a better understanding of his cultural production. Specifically, I suggest that, linked to the movements that exile generates (physical, but also literary and ideological), the concept of ‘the transnational’ can be used as an analytical tool with which to interrogate Barea’s work and its interpretations. A study of Barea’s work as a ‘transnacional, plurinacional, cuanto menos binacional, o es posible que incluso extranacional’ (Balibrea 2007, 82) projects questions not only regarding the Spanish literary canon, but its (now mostly forgotten) participation in world literature, its role during the Cold War, and its recent (re)nationalization in the contemporary context of the

recovery of exiled Republican culture as a means of legitimizing the Spanish democracy (Balibrea 2007, 2012, 2014; Quaggio 2014a, 2015). Emphasizing the transnational dimension allows for alternative and complementary exploration of the, often static and monolithic, category of ‘literature of Spanish Republican exile’.

Barea’s career goes back into his Spanish years, to be sure. A socialist and active member of the UGT (the Socialist trade union) during the Spanish Civil War, Barea was the head of the Press Department of the Foreign Office in Madrid, dealing with foreign press correspondents such as Ernest Hemingway or John Dos Passos. During this time, he met and married his second wife, the Austrian socialist Ilsa Pollak, his life-long companion, collaborator and translator. He was a wartime radio broadcaster known as *La voz de Madrid*, and published his first collection of short stories, *Valor y miedo* (1938), based on his early radio scripts. But in 1938 he and Ilsa had to leave Spain. It was during their exile in France and very soon England that he became a writer, a literary critic, and then a broadcaster for the BBC. He published the first volume of his trilogy, *The Forging of a Rebel*, in 1941. The second volume (*The Track*) appeared in 1943, and the third (*The Clash*) in 1946. The trilogy was an immediate international success and was translated into nine languages during the forties. It was printed in Spanish in Argentina in 1951, and finally appeared in Spain after Franco’s death, in 1977.

Most of Barea’s production was written between 1937 and 1945, coinciding with the defeat of the Spanish Republican project in Spain and the gradual realization that Franco would survive the Second World War (Eaude 2011). There is also a large and heterogeneous body of texts especially after that date, including Barea’s literary fiction, essays, articles, and radio scripts, which document Barea’s thoughts about politics, literature, culture and exile, often produced to create a dialogue between Britain – a country of which Barea became a citizen in 1948 – and the Spanish speaking world. A close reading of Barea’s work reveals a complex articulation of the homeland (Spain) and the host state (Britain) resulting in a dynamic intertwinement of the two, along with wider connections across Europe and America. If Barea wrote about Spain to his Anglo-American and European readers, through his BBC broadcasts he spoke about Britain to listeners in Latin America. The relationship between the homeland and the host society is a complex one in Barea, and cannot be reduced to two separate moments in linear succession.

Although Barea's exile has been taken into account by all his readers, most existing studies have approached Barea's work from a Spanish perspective – that is, inscribing it primarily in Spanish literary and cultural history. This is a general tendency within Republican exile studies and has much to do with the fact that the violent detachment and loss involved 'often tilts the balance towards a focus on the relation of exile cultures to the absent nation' (Mari Paz Balibrea 2005, 6). The influence of Spain and Spanish literature in Barea's work is undeniable. However, this thesis will complement such readings by approaching Barea's production through the lens of exile, placing the emphasis not on the absent nation, but above all on the host society.

Without wishing to minimize the tragedy of exile in general, and the difficulties that the Bareas went through in particular, it is unquestionable that Barea's move to Britain was a catalyst for his cultural production. And it was not just because he found in the experience of exile a voice, but because as a witness of the Spanish Civil War he was given access to a new public. As Yossi Shain (2005, 9) explains, '[p]ersonal "opportunities", the receptiveness of the society, and policies of the host country are essential elements in refugees' adjustment and thus in their status'. If the Spanish refugees were not always automatically welcome in Britain, some benefited from their condition as privileged witnesses of a reality that had been important already in the discourse of the British Left. Barea's recognition as an intellectual and writer is linked to the importance of the Spanish Civil War narrative in British society in those years, and for the wider campaigns of the international Left against fascism during the 1930s-40s. Then, during the 1940s-50s, Barea broadcast for the BBC Latin American service, participating in the institutional wartime British antifascist propaganda. Finally, he embraced a pro-democracy and anti-communist Anglo-American discourse within the context of the Cold War, by participating in organizations such as the Congress for Cultural Freedom.

Barea's 'symbolic capital' resulted from his 'border crossing' not just out of one country but also into another one, where his testimony mattered. Barea did not only seek 'recognition' (Shain 2005) in relation to his condition of exile, but achieved it because of exile and through it. Barea's border-crossing placed him at the intersection of an important network of British writers on the Spanish Civil War (George Orwell, Cyril Connolly, Stephen Spender, Gerald Brenan) and other

European exiles mostly of the non-communist Left (such as Arthur Koestler or Franz Borkenau). I am interested in understanding how Barea negotiated his place within this cosmopolitan ‘contact zone’ (Pratt 1991), particularly at a number of London publishing houses and the BBC World Service, where many of these intellectuals collaborated and gained access to a ‘transnational public sphere’ (Gillespie 2010b). I focus on Barea’s literary and intellectual work in contact with British affairs. To better place the intervention of the thesis, the next section will give an overview of the main studies about Barea in relation to the historiography of Spanish Republican literature and Spanish Civil War literature.

### **Literature Review**

Perhaps the most important – and also most widely neglected – bibliographical reality informing this thesis is the fact that most of Barea’s work was published first in English, and not in Spanish.<sup>1</sup> Following a first collection of short stories published in Spain, *Valor y miedo* (1938), Barea’s work over a number of years was to be read first by English-speaking readers. *The Forge*, the first volume of what would later become the trilogy *The Forging of a Rebel*, was published in English in 1941. This *Bildungsroman* covers Barea’s childhood and youth. It follows his evolution from being the working-class son of a *lavandera* to a rebellious, UGT affiliated bank clerk, who eventually abandoned his job at the time the First World War erupted. In the second volume of his autobiographical trilogy, *The Track* (1943), Barea tells of his years as a soldier in Morocco during the Rif war in the early 1920s in what was already an anticipation of the tensions that would precipitate the Spanish Civil War. Finally, in *The Clash* (1946), his inner conflict between the bourgeois life he had come to have and his political commitment to the Republic was resolved in the violent clash that the Francoist rebellion sparked in July 1936. Barea’s role as a censor in the Foreign Press Office on Gran Vía and a radio broadcaster for the Republic placed him at the heart of the battle of Madrid and the Republican efforts to

---

<sup>1</sup> Aside from most stories in *Valor y miedo*, some articles and short stories appeared in other languages first and his novel *The Broken Root* appeared in Danish (1950) a year before the English version (1951) and four years before the Spanish (1954). The main exception is the radio broadcasts, all of which were written and made public in Spanish.

engage international support. The three volumes of *The Forging of a Rebel* appeared first in London, translated by Ilsa into English from Barea's manuscripts in Spanish.<sup>2</sup> During the Second World War, Barea also wrote articles, political essays and started his career as a literary critic for British readers. Years later, his first fictional novel *The Broken Root* (1951) explored the return of an exile, Antolín Moreno, to Franco's Spain in 1949. Again, this happened in English. None of these books were published in Spain until after the end of Franco's dictatorship, because Barea was one of the writers 'malditos para el Régimen' (Larraz 2014, 186).<sup>3</sup> In fact, his trilogy was deemed by the censors to be 'irreligiosa, inmoral y enemiga del Régimen' and therefore 'impublicable en España' (Censura 1951).<sup>4</sup> Only *El centro de la pista*, a collection of some of his short stories, was published in Spain in 1960, probably due to the fact that these pieces were perceived as being less political than other parts of Barea's work.<sup>5</sup>

Overall, the literature on Barea suffers from a certain scarcity when compared to other Spanish Republican exile writers (Larraz 2014, 63). Much of the work done even in recent years is still mainly concerned with recuperating Barea and giving his work more visibility, mostly by publishing and translating into Spanish for the first time some of Barea's 'unknown' texts like Nigel Townson's edition of *Palabras recobradas* (2000). Although since 1977 Barea's trilogy and short stories have been repeatedly republished in Spain, his novel *La raíz rota* was published for the first time in Spain in 2009, more than half a century after the Argentinian edition. The

---

<sup>2</sup> The Forge was initially translated by Chalmers Mitchell, but later re-translated again by Ilsa for the second edition (see chapter 1).

<sup>3</sup> For discussions about the possible reasons that could explain the fact that Barea's trilogy was not published until after Franco's death see Giménez-Frontín (1986), Eade (2011, 168-170), Herrera de la Muela (2012).

<sup>4</sup> I wish to thank Fernando Larraz for providing me with copies of the censorship reports on Barea's novels. This report was written in response to a petition to import 50 copies of the trilogy from Argentina by the Spanish bookseller Joaquín de Oteyza. However, Barea's trilogy, his later novel *La raíz rota* and his essay on Lorca, all published in Argentina, were smuggled into Spain. Robert Clements travelled to Madrid and Lisbon in 1953 and wrote to Barea that the Spanish National Library had a record of him and Ilsa for *Lorca*, and that Luis Rosales wanted to read this book as he had heard only good things about it. He also told Barea about how he had spoken about his essay to Lorca's sister: 'Hablé de ti y de tus libros no solamente en la Casa Americana de la Embajada, pero también en la Universidad y en muchas charlas personales. Todos te admiran' (Clements 1953). There is also photographic evidence of Barea's books being sold in Manuel Arce's bookstore Sur in Santander in 1959 (AIBP).

<sup>5</sup> The censorship report for *El centro de la pista* reads: 'Cuentos. El título del tomo es el de uno de ellos con tema circunstancial. Hay varios de ambientes madrileños de principios de siglo. Algunos de campo andaluz con una pizca de "vis" demagógica. Uno de negros: el biólogo que descubre un medio de blanquear, etc. etc. etc. Procede su autorización' (Dieta Pérez 1959).

shortage of Barea studies contrasts with, or is perhaps also explained by, the popularity of the reworking of *La forja de un rebelde* as a television drama series for TV Española in the nineties, directed by Mario Camus.<sup>6</sup>

Most studies on Barea explore his cultural production in relation to Spanish history and Spanish literary history. In terms of the corpus studied, academics have tended to focus on Barea's fictional writing – primarily the trilogy – whilst Barea's political writings and BBC broadcasts have only been studied in any depth by Michael Eade (2011) and Luis Monferrer Catalán (1998, 2007), two out of the three authors to have addressed Barea's exile in any depth (Townson 2000a, 2000b, 2001, 2014). This thesis builds on the work of Monferrer, Townson and Eade both in their exploration of Barea's exile and on their highlighting of Barea's work beyond the trilogy. Two other scholars offering valuable insights into the relationship between the different texts and genres in Barea's body of work are Marta Altisent (2003) and Mercedes Echevarría's (2004, 2013), the latter arguing for a socio-historical reading that transcends simplistic notions of propaganda. Before I focus in more detail on some of these studies, however, it is important to mention the existence of numerous earlier, not always substantial but often insightful studies of Barea's work.

Barea was first positively reviewed in the UK by George Orwell (1941c, 1941b, 1946) and Arthur Koestler (1941), in the US by fellow exile Ramón J. Sender (1947, 1951), and in Latin America by the exile Guillermo de Torre (1951, 1967) and other Latin American intellectuals such as Mario Benedetti (1951) and Emir Rodríguez Monegal (1952, 1957), who offered feature articles on his work. Other early studies of Barea's work were also written outside Spain and focused on different aspects of it such as his literary criticism (Santamaria 1954), his anticlericalism (Devlin 1958, 1966), or his relationship to the generation of 1898 (Gillespie 1964). In fact, most monographs and articles dedicated to Barea alone have been written either by non-Spaniards or outside Spain (Ortega 1971; Lunsford 1990; Bertrand de Muñoz 1994; Bevan and Percival 1990; Altisent 2003; Echevarría 2004, 2006, 2009; Eade 2011; Herrera de la Muela 2012; Ribeiro de Menezes 2013), including Nigel Townson's studies, which represent the greatest effort to recuperate his work in Spain (2000a, 2000b, 2001).

---

<sup>6</sup> Other efforts to 'recover' Barea have included ceremonies to commemorate the cleaning of his gravestone, the putting up of a plaque in a pub in Faringdon where Barea often went, and an initiative to name a street after Barea in Madrid (all initiated by the journalist William Chislett).

If Barea's work was internationally praised for presenting an honest account of the Spanish Civil War – its criticism of the violence within the Republican camp being often singled out – Francoist criticism accused the author of being a partisan propagandist, anti-Spanish and ultimately 'resentido', within the terms that intellectuals of the Spanish regime often used to refer to Spanish literature in exile (Ynduráin 1953; Ruiz Ayucar 1957; Torrente Ballester 1956). At the time of these reviews in Spain, the criticism of Barea's work was among the most politicized in the corpus of Spanish Republican exiles (Larraz 2009, 2014). Barea was initially included in the first literary studies that addressed the writing of Spanish exiles, alongside what became the core of an established exilic canon – Ramón J. Sender, Max Aub and Francisco Ayala. Unsurprisingly, within the historiography of exile literature during Francoism, Barea's work was highly criticised by Luis López Aranguren (1953),<sup>7</sup> José Luis Ponce de León (1956), Juan Luis Alborg (1962), Antonio Iglesias Laguna (1970), and finally Francisco Umbral (1969). All, with the exception of Umbral, championed an ostentatiously 'inclusive' attitude towards exile literature, claiming to distinguish good from bad exiles by opposing those who had overcome Manichaeism and partisan interpretations of the war to those who remained anchored in said dichotomies, and whose 'resentment' purportedly turned them into demagogues who could not claim to take part in Spanish literature, or Spanish life for that matter. To such critics, Barea belonged without any margin for doubt to the category of resentful demagogues (Larraz 2009, 138-139, 142).

In contrast, other critics during the same period such as Domingo Pérez Minik (1957, 298–307),<sup>8</sup> Jose María Castellet (1958), Eugenio G. de Nora (1962) and José Ramón Marra López (1963), provided more positive critiques of Barea's work, the latter considering that whilst Barea's work was partisan and ideological, it was still worthy of appreciation as one of the most powerful testimonies of the Spanish conflict.<sup>9</sup> This view has been reinforced in recent times by critics who often highlight Barea's sincerity in portraying the conflicts within the Republican camp (Torres Nebrera 2002; Altisent 2003; Echevarría 2004; Eade 2011; Ribeiro de Menezes 2013;

---

<sup>7</sup> Aranguren, in fact, simply excluded Barea from his article 'La evolución espiritual de los intelectuales españoles en la emigración' on precisely those grounds, referring the reader back to Ynduráin's critique (1953, 152).

<sup>8</sup> Minik argued that 'es imposible mantener ninguna objetividad en esta clase de relatos' (1957, 299).

<sup>9</sup> Larraz notes that censorship took away an entire paragraph in Marra-López's study that explained Barea's anticlericalism (2014, 186).

Sánchez Zapatero and Guzmán 2015). Since 1976, Barea's work has been included in overviews of the literature of Republican exile (Kamen 2008; Gracia 2010; Monferrer Catalán 2007; Zapatero 2009b). Still, it can be said that Barea lost his place in the pantheon of exile literature and never recovered from the squalid two pages that Sanz Villanueva dedicated to him in Abellán's monumental *El exilio español de 1939*, published during the transition in 1976-78 (Ugarte 1989, 236).<sup>10</sup> Perhaps for this reason, the study of Barea's work has not been as profuse as that of other exile novelists. If a certain comeback has occurred through recent studies on Barea – or anthologies that include his work – this still often concerns his work as an example of Spanish Civil War literature rather than of exile literature (Sobejano 1975; Bertrand de Muñoz 1982; Fernández and Herrera 1988; Altisent 2003; Trapiello 2010).<sup>11</sup>

Barea's work has also been studied within the context of the literature of the Moroccan war, usually alongside Sender's *Imán* and Díaz Fernández's *El bloqueo* (Miller 1978, Millares 2005; Campoy-Cubillo 2012, Bender 2015). Historians of both the Spanish Civil War and the Moroccan War have also used Barea as a source (Bolloten 1991; Preston 1996, 1998, 2009; García 2010).<sup>12</sup> Studies on Lorca and Hemingway often refer to Barea's literary criticism on both authors. Barea's essay on Lorca, *The poet and his people* (1944), is one of the first full-length literary studies of Lorca's work in English (Sahuquillo 2007; Rae 2007; Delgado 2008; Allen 2014) and his article 'Not Spain but Hemingway' (1941) is often discussed in relation to his – unfair, in the eyes of most scholars – violent criticism of Hemingway's work (Asselineau 1965; LaPrade 2007; Bruccoli and Baughman 2006).

---

<sup>10</sup> Larraz (2014, 63) notes that nowadays the 'canon subalterno del exilio' is formed by Max Aub, Ramón J. Sender and Francisco Ayala. Aside from literary considerations, the fact that Aub and Sender have such extensive bodies of work and that Ayala was incorporated relatively soon into the Spanish literary scene might explain their centrality in Republican exile studies (63). Giménez-Frontín (1986), Eade (2011, 169) and Herrera de la Muela (2012) argue that the difficulty in categorizing Barea's work (aesthetically and ideologically) might explain the reticence of publishers and academics to engage with it. Eade also notes that Barea died relatively early and therefore could not promote his work in Spain (2011, 169).

<sup>11</sup> Barea's work has appeared in recent anthologies of the literature of the Spanish Civil War (Pisón 2009; Ayrton 2016). Amanda Vaill's Spanish Civil War semi-fiction *Hotel Florida* engages with Ilsa and Arturo as the Spanish counterparts of Gellhorn-Hemingway and Taro-Cappa. Vaill did in fact use documents from Barea's archive and has come up with interesting views on Ilsa's role in the war. Much of her work is inspired by Preston's *We Saw Spain Die* (2008).

<sup>12</sup> Barea and Bolloten in fact corresponded about details in Barea's work (Eade 2009; correspondence in the Barea archive).

As for the main themes addressed in Barea studies, Pablo Gil Casado (1997) has already shown how authors writing on *The Broken Root* have recycled many of the ideas in Ynduráin's original review of 1953 and Marra-López's study of 1963. This point, I believe, can be extended to the historiography of Barea's entire body of work. Similarly to what has happened with the historiography of the Spanish Civil War (García 2010, 234) the literature on Barea is plagued by the same repetitive ideas that are often the result of early reviews and, more often than is probably wise, of the descriptions of his work offered within the marketing strategies surrounding the first publications – for example, Barea's 'honesty' in confessing to the failures of the Republicans was already noted in the publishing house Faber's blurb advertising *The Clash* (1946).<sup>13</sup> Common debates – aside from the above mentioned of whether he is a partisan propagandist or an honest witness of the Spanish Civil War – concern Barea's autodidactic character (Townson 2000, XXVIII; Eade 2011) and whether he was an intellectual or not (Ynduráin 1953, 76); whether his trilogy was an act of self-justification (Fernández and Herrera 1988; Altisent 2003, 159) or not (Benedetti 1951); or whether his in-between position was ambivalent (Marra-López 1963, 291; Ortega 1971, 384; Lunsford 1990, 73; Townson 2000, XIV; Serrano Asenjo 2015, 339) or not (Benedetti 1951, 376; Echevarría 2004, Eade 2011, 75). Barea's autobiography has been analysed on the basis of its anticlericalism both criticizing it (Ynduráin 1953; Ruíz 1957; Alborg 1962, 230-231) or explaining and nuancing it (Devlin 1966, 162-165; Ortega 1971, 385-387; Lunsford 1990, 76; Rodríguez Richart 1992, 232-233); as an explanation of the ideological causes of the civil war (Ortega 1971; Lunsford 1990, 82; Eade 2011); in relation to its antimilitarism and pacifism (de la Cierva 1966, 293; Ortega 1971, 380; Fernández and Herrera 1988, 132; Sánchez Zapatero 2009a, 188; Eade 2011; Bender 2015, 55) and his critical position vis-à-vis Spanish colonialism (Marra-López 1963, 325; Fernández and Herrera 1988, 127; Echevarría 2004, 167; Sánchez Zapatero 2009a, 190; Eade 2011, 62; Campoy-Cubillo 2012, 30). Barea's sentimental journey and the fact that he abandoned his wife has also often been criticized, not only by Francoist intellectuals (Ponce de León 1956, 38-40; Alborg 1962, 234-235), but more recently too (Altisent 2003, 159). Recent monographs and articles that have focused on

---

<sup>13</sup> 'The propaganda struggle of 1936-39, in any case, conditioned from the first moment the historiography of the Civil War. [...] the words and images of those years have set the agenda for historical debate ever since the war's end, and the arguments constructed at that time have been revived and re-elaborated countless times' (García 2010, 234).

Barea's work from a Spanish literary perspective include those of Torres Nebrera (2002), Altisent (2003), M. Echevarría (2004) and Bender (2014, 2015, 2016).

More recently, the TV adaptation of *La forja de un rebelde* has been the focus of some scholarly attention, which has emphasized the de-politicization that the adaptation suffered because of the politics of recuperation of the Spanish Civil War during the 1980s, a matter to which I will briefly come near the end (López 2009, 106; Richards 2013, 311-12). Two recent articles have looked at Barea's trilogy as a testimony of war through affect, downplaying its political dimension as a narrative of the Spanish Civil War and rather approaching it as an alternative 'multidirectional memory' (Ribeiro de Menezes 2013, 46) and 'a participative epistemology of war' (Herrera de la Muela 2012, 92-93). Sánchez Zapatero has recently published two studies that connect Barea's work with that of Muñoz Molina and Chaves Nogales as an exploration of the Spanish Civil War from a perspective of a 'Tercera España' (2015, Sánchez Zapatero and Guzmán Mora 2015).<sup>14</sup> All of these more recent approaches tend to insist on a de-politicized reading of Barea in line with what Balibrea (2010) has identified as a key tendency of some contemporary readings of exile such as, for example, the work of Kamen (2008) and Gracia (2010). I will come back to these aspects in chapter 3.

It is important to emphasize that my work builds on all these studies, my greatest debt being to the scholarship of Nigel Townson, Luis Monferrer Catalán and Michael Eade. Nigel Townson has renewed Barea studies by undertaking the enormous task of editing a new revised version of the trilogy, a complete collection of his short stories – many of them unavailable in Spanish before –, and a volume of his non-fictional work previously unpublished in Spanish, including a sample of broadcasts from the BBC.<sup>15</sup> Monferrer Catalán's monumental work on Spanish exiles in Britain, *Odisea en Albión* – which covers Civil War exiles, but also later waves of migrants – is an excellent source of information containing numerous personal biographies and a highly useful overview of their cultural production. This author's extensive archival research is an invaluable starting point for anyone interested in Spanish exiles in the UK. Monferrer has also worked on Barea's

---

<sup>14</sup> The understanding that Barea belongs to a 'Tercera España' has become the basis for the journalist William Chislett's claim for a street name in Spain for Barea.

<sup>15</sup> This effort to recuperate Barea's work will be continued with an edition of Barea's radio broadcasts translated into English (edited by Townson and Nieto McAvoy, under preparation).

collaboration for the BBC Latin American Service (1998). Finally, Michael Eade's study *Triumph at Midnight of the Century* (2011), whilst written without access to Barea's personal archive, provides an impressive critical biography of Barea. Most importantly, Eade's investigation draws on a substantial number of testimonies of people who met and worked with Barea, from Martha Gellhorn to Margaret Weeden, a friend and one of Ilsa's aids in translating Arturo's work.<sup>16</sup> This has allowed Eade to reconstruct Barea's life in exile in much detail. The study is accompanied by a very complete bibliography, both of Barea's work but also of reviews and secondary sources, many of which were previously unknown. Eade provides insightful close readings of Barea's work which help him to critically explore his biography in relation to his work.

Building on all this, the present thesis expands the textual basis on grounds of a reading of the Bareas' extensive personal archive, preserved in a London family home by Ilsa and Arturo's niece Uli Rushby-Smith.<sup>17</sup> It proposes a new reading of Barea's written work by exploring the complexity of the experience of exile. It pays more attention than others have to some of the texts considered of secondary importance – namely the foundational essay *Struggle for the Spanish Soul* and samples from the very remarkable corpus of over 800 BBC scripts – and considers in depth the different non-Spanish contexts and discourses in which Barea's work was produced and received.<sup>18</sup>

Barea's place in literary historiography today can probably be explained by what Balibrea sees as the inherence of Francoism to the Spanish Transition to democracy and the de-politicization of exile products (or better still, their re-politicization within the 'apolitical' stance of liberal discourses). To be sure, the reincorporation of Barea's texts as commodities into the culture of a constitutional monarchy in Spain – particularly through the TV adaptation – is an example of what Balibrea calls 'the dream of a circular exiled time' (2007). It implies the loss of the alternative political

---

<sup>16</sup> For the remainder of the thesis, I will refer to Arturo Barea as Barea and only as Arturo when mentioned alongside Ilsa.

<sup>17</sup> During my research, I have organized and catalogued the archive, which is now going to be transferred to the Bodleian Library in Oxford. Although not all texts in the archive are included in the thesis, their reading has influenced and informed the reading of those texts that are.

<sup>18</sup> Excerpts of *Struggle* in translation into Spanish and a selection of broadcasts appeared in Nigel Townson's edition of Barea's non-fictional work, *Palabras recobradas* (2000). This thesis expands Townson's work with a close reading of these texts, including examples of unpublished broadcasts held in the Bareas' personal archive (AIBP) and the BBC Written Archives (WAC).

projects that vanished during Francoism. In the case of Barea, I will argue that it also implies a loss of the transnational and international dimensions of his work that this thesis aims to redress.

### **Barea and Spanish Republican Exile Studies**

Like most previous studies of Barea's work, this thesis belongs to the field of Spanish Republican exile studies.<sup>19</sup> Its main objective is aligned with current efforts within this area to rethink the parameters with which Spanish Republican exile culture has traditionally been approached in an attempt to recuperate and give visibility to exile products within the context of the Spanish nation and its (cultural/literary) history.<sup>20</sup> My work responds to Francisco Caudet's call to '*dialogizar*' (1998, 33) – that is to go beyond the inherited mystified discourse associated with exile in general and also Barea in particular (cf. Balibrea 2005, 3-4; Faber, 2002, ix).<sup>21</sup> It is my purpose to inquire into *why* and *how* exile in Great Britain was a 'catalyst of [Barea's] cultural production' (Faber 2002, 3), and a trigger of his role as a (transnational) intellectual. I aim to understand the ways in which Barea negotiated the new spatial-temporal coordinates and came to transcend exile, in Bakhtin's terms, as a chronotope of crisis (Balibrea 2005, 6). I aim to do so, not only through a symbolic reading of the importance of displacement in the exile experience 'as an opportunity for the intellectual to reach a new level of ethical awareness', but through the negotiations by which an exile, barely a writer at his arrival, might

---

<sup>19</sup> Fernando Larraz (2009) gives an overview of the Francoist and early transition historiography of exile, and through his work on Max Aub expands this to contemporary works. Also see Larraz (2014).

<sup>20</sup> Research groups in Spain GEXEL; CEME (Centro de Estudios de Migraciones y Exilios; Instituto de Filosofía of the CSIC) and abroad (The Centre for the Study of Hispanic Exile at University of Birmingham) have made important contributions to the renewal of this field in recent times. For a theory of the field, see Balibrea 2005, 2007, 2010, 2012.

<sup>21</sup> Caudet argues that '[l]a experiencia humana del exilio, una situación límite que tiene inevitablemente unas marcadas connotaciones políticas, suele despertar adhesiones o rechazos frontales. Así, queda poco espacio para el debate y el análisis ponderado. Por esa vereda reductora, el discurso se instala en la cuerda floja de la canonización o de la demonización. Una de las consecuencias de tal doble proceder es que el campo de estudio, de naturaleza tan diversa y compleja como es el caso del exilio republicano, se achica y empobrece.' (1998, 28). Broadening the category of Spanish Republican Exile includes, in Caudet's understanding, thinking of 'culture' as going beyond 'high culture' to expand to other cultural products, and more so, as a 'way of life' in Raymond Willimas terms; to link the experiences of intellectuals and the majority of Spanish non-intellectual exiles, and the experiences of exile with 'inner' exile. This expansion entails a broadening of the category of Spanish Republican exile from those who left Spain in 1939, to those who did so from the beginning of the war onwards and during Francoism. Barea, in fact, left Spain in 1938 and is still usually included in studies of Republican exiles of 39.

become an intellectual and thus ‘gain access to [the] public sphere’, both British and global (Williams 1997 cited in Faber 2006, 32).

From the profuse historiography of Republican exile, I wish to highlight here those more recent studies that place Spanish Republican exile culture and its study in a wider context both geographically and methodologically.<sup>22</sup> From a comparative perspective, in the ground-breaking study *Shifting Ground: Exile Literature from the Spanish Civil War* (1989), Michael Ugarte explores exile as a literary phenomenon and places the experiences and writings of Spanish Republican exiles – such as Max Aub and Luis Cernuda alongside other European exiles such as Thomas Mann, Bertolt Brecht and Vladimir Nabokov. Javier Zapatero’s comparative approach to Max Aub (Sánchez Zapatero 2009a) provides a good starting point to think about how intellectual production in exile can be linked to literary traditions beyond the Hispanic world (2009a).<sup>23</sup> It emphasizes a comparative methodology in order to establish the intercultural nature of the category ‘literatura de exilio’ (2009a, 27-28).

Three authors have contributed fundamentally to the conceptual framework of this thesis as they have opened new paths for thinking about Spanish exile in a transnational perspective. Mari Paz Balibrea’s work on exile, whilst being primarily concerned with its place vis-à-vis Spanish modernity, also constitutes a vigorous call to think of exile projects as transcending the limits of the nation. Her exploration of the ways in which cultural studies, post-colonial, Latin American and diaspora studies can offer insights into the best ways of approaching exile has provided a theoretical starting point for this thesis (Balibrea 2005, 2007, 2010, 2012). The renewal proposed by Balibrea and others has coalesced into the forthcoming collective work *Líneas de fuga. Hacia otra historiografía cultural del exilio republicano español* (2017).

---

<sup>22</sup> For a transnational history of exile see Rodríguez-López and Faraldo (2012).

<sup>23</sup> Also on Max Aub, comparing his work to André Malraux both in the Spanish and French context, see Ette, Figueras, and Jurt (2005). Ottmar Ette has suggested another approach to the study of literature beyond the limits of the nation in what he calls a ‘poetics of movement’ which he has applied to Max Aub’s work (2005). Ette defines what he calls Trans Area Studies as an effort to examine ‘transareal relations’, and to determine ‘the transcultural, translingual and transtemporal patterns of movement connected with them. The future of area studies is not in the Baedeker but lies in an opening where area-related competencies connect with transdisciplinary research practices. The literatures without a fixed abode, with their fascinating ways of Writing-between-Worlds that national literary studies notice only in passing, offer rich resources for such research and, at the same time, a boundless reservoir of knowledge (for living)’ (Ette 2016, 38).

Secondly, the work of Sebastiaan Faber (2002, 2006, 2008a, 2008b; Faber and Martínez-Carazo 2009) has been important for the methodological foundation for my project. On the one hand, his use of a Marxist – in particular Gramscian – approach to understanding the intellectual configuration of exiles in Mexico in *Exile and Cultural Hegemony: Spanish Intellectuals in Mexico, 1939-1975*, as well as his focus not only on the homeland but on the historical context of the host state, are a good example of Balibrea’s call for action and have guided my work. This debt will be visible in my frequent references to Faber’s studies on exile and the Anglo-American historiography of the Civil War. My emphasis on Barea’s British context of production and first reception, and my interest in understanding Barea both as an intellectual and a sort of ‘Spanish’ Anglo-American Hispanist, have been strongly encouraged by the reading of Faber’s work.

More recently, Olga Glondy’s (2012) work on Spanish Republican exile culture and its relationship to the politics of the Cultural Cold War through their collaboration with the Congress for Cultural Freedom (CCF), has also become extremely important for an understanding of how transnational dynamics – from the polarized discourses of the Cold War to the role of (secretly state-funded) institutions as spaces for cultural encounters and exchanges – had an impact on Spanish Republican exile culture. One of the most important insights of the study is how the Republicans tapped, both individually but also collectively, into different networks of exiled and non-exiled intellectuals – for example what has been termed the non-communist Left – and how their role within covert Cold War operations – financed by the CIA – was more often than not determined by a coincidence of aims rather than by coercion or co-optation (Wilford 2003). These ideas have proven central in my exploration of Barea’s connections with other intellectuals and his collaboration with state-sponsored ventures – such as the BBC, but also the Congress for Cultural Freedom.

The first of the traditional readings of exile – and particularly Barea’s exile – that this thesis takes issue with is the general tendency to understand exile cultural production only or fundamentally in relation to the absent nation, to Spain.<sup>24</sup> As Mari

---

<sup>24</sup> Contemporary debates around Spanish Republican exile culture rephrase of the historical memory debate and the role played by the transition (Naharro Calderón 2005). Recent scholarship has been concerned with tracing the relationship between exile and national culture, with the latter considered as belonging to the territorial limits of the nation-state (Balibrea 2005, 2007, 2010, 2012, 2017; Larraz 2009, 2014a, 2014b; Naharro Calderón 2005; Glondys 2012; Quaggio 2014a, 2014b), as well as

Paz Balibrea has suggested, any interpretation of exile products should be at least a bi-national project. Therefore, the first objective of this thesis is to reconsider the importance of not only the homeland but also the host state for Barea's production and to analyse the traditionally ignored context of Anglo-American institutions, publishing market and cultural and political discourses. Although my approach challenges the limits of the nation(s), it nonetheless does so by feeding into and from national discourses and the ways in which they intersected with each other as well as with international and transnational ones. Focusing on Britain in dialogue with Spain is the first step towards starting to unravel the threads that connect these different levels.

Secondly, this thesis argues for a move beyond readings of exile that are usually 'haunted by the pathos of melancholia and the shadow of nostalgia' (Balibrea 2005, 6). As Noël Valis notes, nostalgia and exile are not synonymous, even if the former is often a consequence of the latter (2000, 117). In fact, attempting to equate both as states of mind ultimately empties out 'the historical nature of exile, turning the exile's mind into a metaphor of exile' (17).<sup>25</sup> I will argue that it is not the nostalgic idealization of the past (Faber, 2003) that motivates Barea's account of the roots of the Spanish Civil War (Gracia and Ródenas 2011, 366), but a resort to history as memory with which he aims to explain the present, and furthermore, to fight for it in the belief that there was still hope for the Republican project in the near future. As Boyd (2006, 79) argues, without memory 'los individuos y los grupos no pueden dar sentido a su existencia presente ni tramar su futuro de forma razonable'.

In this sense, Barea's trilogy becomes a history of the victims – of the Spanish people in opposition to the ruling classes; of those who 'don't normally have a voice' (1943a, 6) – and can be understood within a Benjaminian critique of History as

---

trying to provide a new framework to understand exile as a plurinational project (Balibrea 2005, 6; 2007).

<sup>25</sup> Nostalgia, argues Valis following Max Aub's *Diario de Djelfa*, far from being always a 'sign of impending death or of emptiness, can be essential for survival' (Valis 2000, 130). In fact, nostalgia has been proven to be more of a positive emotion that can boost 'perceptions of life as meaningful', assuaging 'existential threat' (Sedikides et al. 2008, 306). Nostalgia can also foster social connection and empathy, because when it is felt, 'the mind is "peopled"' (Hertz, 1990, 195 as cited in Sedikides, Wildschut, Arndt & Routledge 2008, 306). More relevant to my point, while nostalgia can stall motivation or the individual who is fixated on better days gone by, it also 'may facilitate continuity between past and present selves' bolstering 'meaning in one's life' and thus motivating us to hope and work towards a better future (Sedikides, Wildschut, Arndt & Routledge 2008, 306). It counteracts discontinuity between the past and the present, and has an adaptive function (Sedikides, Wildschut, Arndt & Routledge 2008).

progress. Written during the Second World War – as was Walter Benjamin’s *Theses on the Philosophy of History*, in an ‘emergency situation’ (Benjamin 1968, 257) – Barea’s memoir can also be seen as an attempt ‘to brush history against the grain’ (Benjamin 1968, 256). In his introduction to the second volume of the trilogy, Barea explains that his intention was to explain the past subjectively, giving credit to the fact that ‘[t]o articulate what is past does not mean to recognize ‘how it really was’. It means to take control of a memory, as it flashes in a moment of danger’ (255). An alternative construct of Spain that opposes the history of the victors, Barea’s autobiography was written in a moment of globalized war in which Spain was in danger of quickly retreating into the past. As such, his trilogy can be placed among the narrative efforts of many Spanish Republicans such as Max Aub and Ramón J. Sender. Barea’s work is an alternative narrative to a Francoist version of events, which searched for a place within a broader antifascist discourse of war in Britain that was both nationalistic and inward looking but also highly international(ist).

While the Republicans lost the war in Spain, they won the discursive battle abroad as the Spanish Civil War remained the ‘Last Great Cause’ for many in the transnational Left (Weintraub 1968; García 2010, 234). Barea’s work can also then be seen in dialogue with the accounts by Ernest Hemingway, André Malraux, Georges Bernanos, or Arthur Koestler – this relationship being noted not only internationally at the time, but also in Francoist Spain by Francisco Ynduráin and José María Gironella (Ynduráin 1953; LaPrade 2007, 71). These ‘voices from without’ became, in cases like Barea’s, perhaps not the voices heard at home in Spain, but the voices heard abroad among a public deeply concerned with Spain. In this sense, we need to explore whether Spanish exile cultural production, as excluded as it was from the culture of the Spanish nation-state, was integrated into other traditions. As Shain notes, for most exiles ‘exit’ is not an alternative to internal ‘voice’ (opposition) against the regime, but indeed a *sine qua non* for the exercise of the ‘voice’ (2005, 164; cf. Loureiro 2000).

Furthermore, if after the Second World War many exiles retreated into a state of *aporia* (Faber 2002), I will also suggest a nuanced use of the term when applied to Barea’s work, contrasting it with the author’s political reorientation after 1945 and his negotiations with the ideological discourses of the British Left during the Second World War and the Cold War. Francoism was not defeated, but other fascisms in

Europe were and a socialist democratic project in the spirit of a humanist socialism that Barea and Orwell (and even Max Aub) had hoped for was happening as a consequence of the efforts of many, including intellectuals, British and foreign. As much as Barea's endorsement of a 'third force' as represented by post-war Labour Party politics could be interpreted in the light of what Shain calls 'exile pragmatism' (2005, 97), it shows that Barea was engaging with the present in Britain and not only reminiscing melancholically about the past. Barea embraced this new political project which he could now use as a motivating tool to re-think his relationship to Spain. In fact, Barea's progressive abandonment of Spain – and particularly the Spanish past – in his writings as the years went by mirrors his ideological evolution towards a social democratic stance. This future-oriented project is present in Barea's work during the fifties, highly permeated by the conflicts of the Cultural Cold War.

Although Barea's ideological temporalities present themselves mostly diachronically, they can also be found in texts written simultaneously in different media for different audiences. One would hope to define them as a result of a 'contrapuntal' awareness and an 'originality of vision' which is inherent to exiles' experience of at least two cultures, two settings and two homes, as expressed by Edward Said in 'Reflections on Exile' (2000, 186).<sup>26</sup> On the other hand, Barea is also a testimony of how exile 'is fundamentally a discontinuous state of being' (Said 2000, 177) and how the need to 'reassemble an identity' (179) easily dissolves into representation (Faber, 2002, 6). It is in this sense that we can consider Barea's work to be also an autobiographical project, in which he constantly negotiated through his writings his place within different contexts – different places, times and even institutional settings – often exploiting his cultural difference (Said 2000, 182).

This thesis then falls into the category of studies that look at the cultural production of Spanish Republican exiles, taking the view that this descriptive category – those who left Spain as a consequence of the Spanish Civil War – is both a useful category of analysis, but also a restricted and limited one as there were not just one, but many exilic experiences and many ways of mediating them through different cultural products (Naharro Calderón 2005). However, I still concur with recent studies that call for the study of Spanish Republican exile (culture) as a productive analytic

---

<sup>26</sup> Clifford suggests that '[d]iaspora consciousness lives loss and hope as a defining tension' (1997, 312).

category (Larraz 2014, 250; Naharro Calderón 2005; Balibrea 1999; 2005; 2007; Balibrea et al. 2017), particularly in its (non)relationship to the Spanish-nation state and in its potential to be read not as a ‘proyecto fracasado’ but a ‘memoria crítica útil de la España franquista’ (Balibrea 2007, 31).<sup>27</sup>

My approach to exile is therefore rooted in its historical nature, rather than – as mentioned already – in essentialist notions of exile as a metaphor for displacement. It takes into consideration the fact that Spanish Republican exiles – Barea among them – defined themselves as such, in the sense of identifying with an ‘imagined community’ (Anderson 2006) excluded from the geographical borders of the nation-state – whether they specifically used the term exile or refugee or any other such as Gaos’ *trasterrado* – and that they viewed their literature in relation to the corpus of Spanish literature produced in exile and in (tense) relation to peninsular literature.<sup>28</sup> This emic (or insider) approach is in dialectical relationship with an etic (outsider) approach (Gillespie 2007; Gillespie and Nieto McAvoy 2017), through the validation of the exilic collective by other members and institutions in their respective – and often successive – host states, as much as by the home state. It must be noted here that the way in which exiles described themselves, but were also viewed by others, often determined their fates well beyond the realm of literature and identity, having a direct impact on their chances of survival (Rickett 2014, 46).

---

<sup>27</sup> While this category is mostly applied to exiles of 1939, other waves of exiles from Francoist Spain as well as second and third generations of exiles need to be added to the many experiences of those who left Spain as a consequence of the Spanish Civil War. This corpus needs to also be looked into in relation to the experiences of those who were left behind, as is the case in Rickett’s recent study (2014).

<sup>28</sup> Paul Tabori already recognized in his *Anatomy of Exile* (1971) the lack of clarity of exile definitions. Shain notes that ‘[t]he definition of the exile varies with the disposition in the host country. Circumstances constantly change the exile’s attachment toward the homeland and new society, and determine the mobility of the exile’s self-definition from an exile to an emigrant and vice versa’ (2005, 14). For an overview on the terminology of exile versus other terms such as diasporas, refugees, immigrants etc. see, for the Spanish context, among others Rickett 2014, 17-21. The debate between the terms refugee, exile, diaspora and their differences has been the focus of much scholarly attention (Said 2000, Shain 2005, García-Obregón 2009). As García-Obregón, I use the term exile primarily as defined by the DRAE: ‘separación de una persona de la tierra en que vive. Expatriación, generalmente por motivos políticos’ but with an emphasis on the possibility of attachment to the host state (García-Obregón 2009, 8). Barea described himself interchangeably as an exile and a refugee in his correspondence and work. Because much work on transnationalism and cosmopolitanism is concerned with diasporic configurations, the term ‘diaspora’ is used in this introduction as it is used in the secondary literature. While not synonymous with exile, insights from the field of ‘diaspora studies’, particularly regarding the theoretical frameworks of transnationalism and cosmopolitanism, can be used to explore other avenues in the field of Spanish Republican exile – this is what Balibrea has called ‘diasporizing Spanish Republican exile’ (2005, 16).

In Barea's case, his belonging to a Spanish exiled community was complemented by his belonging to a wider network of European exiles in Great Britain and other countries, and many British journalists, writers and other members of the London intelligentsia.<sup>29</sup> These were in fact the people who provided him with a social capital that allowed him to settle and start working – and then validated his symbolic capital as a Spaniard who knew Spain better than anyone else and thus needed to be heard. As Yossi Shain has argued, the struggle of political exiles to gain international recognition and legitimacy to speak on behalf of the nation that has expelled them, is central to their condition (2005, xiv). Barea's efforts to seek recognition, legitimacy and credibility can be seen within this political context. However, similarly to Rosy Rickett's recent study on Spanish Republican exile, I will also draw on Bourdieu's analysis of the 'social space', particularly on his concepts of social, cultural and symbolic capital in order to articulate Barea's struggle to find a place in exile – in terms of location, but most importantly in terms of a voice within the literary field and public sphere. Using Alejandro Portes' description of the term, I will be referring to social capital as 'the ability of actors to secure benefits by virtue of membership in social networks or other social structures' (Portes 1998, 6) and 'cultural capital' as the 'resources that an individual controls by virtue of evidencing greater attainment of knowledge' (Calhoun 2002). I will be using the concept of 'symbolic capital' to refer to the 'prestige, reputation, renown' by which 'the different forms of capital are perceived and recognized as legitimate' (Bourdieu 1985, 724) and which is 'acquired in previous struggles' (731). Barea's symbolic capital as a Republican exile was intertwined with his social and cultural capital within the social space that was the cosmopolitan contact zone of the non-communist Left in Britain.

### **Dialogizing Barea's exile**

Barea's work has often been studied within boundaries (disciplinary and geographical). This thesis aims to interrogate the limits of both. As Balibrea has noted (2005), Cultural Studies is a field that bases its category of analysis on the fact that varied cultural artefacts can reveal something about a particular culture, often

---

<sup>29</sup> For an overview of Barea's relationship with Spanish Republican exiles in Britain see Monferrer Catalán 2007.

understood as belonging to the territorial limits of the nation-state (2005, 4). As exiles are ‘by definition *desterrados*’ (6), the national paradigm reduces their cultural production to an excess from the nation that one cannot incorporate, but neither ignore – particularly because insofar as the cultural canon helps the hegemonic discourse to prevail and contribute to the formation of the nation, the dialectic relation (Said 2000, 177) established between nationalism and exile seems to explain the necessary negotiations between the ‘national’ and canonical literary historiography and the cultural products of exile (Balibrea 2005, 2007, 2012).

However, if exile exceeds the limits of the nation so should its study, in ways that go beyond the dichotomy of insider/outsider. In this thesis, I have drawn on two complementary approaches, building on the concepts of transnationalism and cosmopolitanism, which fall within a move that Balibrea has called ‘diasporizing Republican exile’ (2005, 16).<sup>30</sup> First, I will ‘dialogized’ Barea’s exile within a ‘transnational’ framework, which places the emphasis on connections, border-crossings, networks, communications, interactions and cultural transfers.<sup>31</sup> Rather than focusing only on the relationship of Barea’s work to one nation or another, this thesis shifts towards an emphasis on the ways that his work crosses national borders and connects to and from several (national and transnational) discourses, while

---

<sup>30</sup> As Balibrea has shown, insights from postcolonial theory and Latin Americanism are useful in thinking about the relationship of Spanish Republican exile culture in relation to the nation and modernity (Balibrea 2005, 2007, 2012).

<sup>31</sup> Cultural historians interested in relational and connected approaches have favoured concepts such as cultural transfer and *histoire croisée* (Ther 2012, 204; Werner and Zimmermann 2006; Seigel 2005). In global and imperial history, particularly for the early modern period, the concept of connected histories has been successful (Subrahmanyam 1997). Sanjay Subrahmanyam argues that we should ‘not only compare from within our boxes, but spend some time and effort to transcend them, not by comparison alone but by seeking out the at times fragile threads that connected the globe’ (1997, 761). For an example of transnational biographies, see Desley Deacon, Russell, and Woollacott (2010). For a transnational intellectual networks see Charle, Schriewer, and Wagner (2004). The influence in Spanish history can be seen in a recent number of *Ayer, La historia transnacional*, 94.2 (2014). For a transnational approach to Spanish literature, see Campoy-Cubillo (2012) and for a ‘transnational history’ approach to Republican Exile through Francisco Ayala, see Quaggio (2015). The ‘transnational turn’ has had an impact on literary studies, often hand-in-hand with the spatial turn (Fisher and Mennel 2010) related to – and in tension with – the fields of comparative and world literature (Thomsen 2008). Approaches to literature beyond the national framework have come primarily from the fields of comparative, global and world literature (Damrosch 2003; Damrosch 2013; Casanova 2004). Franco Moretti calls for a ‘distant reading’ that goes beyond the text as the unit of analysis in order to understand the world literature system as variations ‘against the grain of national historiography’ (Moretti 2004, 157, 155). The ‘trans’ has also been increasingly applied to study other border-crossing phenomena in the fields of gender, queer and postcolonial studies (Holub 2007; Janz and Schönplflug 2014). For a framework that goes beyond the comparative and world literature approach from a trans-areal perspective, see Ottmar Ette’s (2016).

tapping into networks and spaces of cultural exchange (Ther 2012, 214).<sup>32</sup> Second, I will also explore the possibilities of thinking about Barea's exilic writing as not only transnational but as cosmopolitan. Although the two terms are part of the same family of terms concerned with the ways in which peoples relate to each other, transnationalism and cosmopolitanism should not be conflated (Delanty 2006; van den Anker 2010). The relationship and distinction between these terms also depend on what definition of both transnationalism and cosmopolitanism we choose to work with (van den Anker 2010). These theoretical choices will be explored in the following paragraphs, but as an introduction to the discussion to come, this thesis proceeds on the assumption that if transnationalism refers to connections across borders of nation-states, the cosmopolitan is concerned with the different ways in which such connections open spaces in-between and enable relationships between the local/national and the global based not only on tolerance and coexistence, but on curiosity and cross-fertilization (Cheesman 2007, 40). I aim to explore whether a transnational mode of consciousness that places Barea between the 'here' and 'there' – and 'neither here, nor there' – also engenders 'world openness' as the way in which to perceive, experience and/or behave towards 'the other' (be it places, peoples, or cultures). Transnational configurations, such as diasporas, have not always had a 'cosmopolitan' effect, as we learn from the increasing number of anti-immigration discourses. Multiculturalism as one of the possible scenarios of transnational encounters can – and does – often reinforce nationalist sentiments and identities, for example in what Gilroy identifies for the UK as a post-colonial melancholia (2005a). One of the main elements of a cosmopolitan commitment is a sustained effort to be open to the world as suggested in the term *Weltoffenheit* coined by the German historian Kai Kresse (2012, 33; see below). Throughout his exile, Barea's work becomes a journey of constructing and deconstructing a 'self' in relation to an 'other' that aims to transcend the limits of the nation(s). His work strives to find points of commonality with the foreign other; even if at times it builds on stereotypes or oppositional language. It is in this sense of Barea's self-aware efforts to negotiate and bridge culture(s) that we can think of his work not only as

---

<sup>32</sup> What has been called 'cultural spaces', which could provide for a different mental mapping that does not consider territorial units as the basis for the analysis (Ther 2012, 214). Another option that would transcend the national, although not the territorial approach, would be to think of Barea's exile as unfolding primarily, though not solely, within a transatlantic geography, in what has been termed a 'triangulación de ida y vuelta' (Ortega 2005, n.p.).

transnational but also as cosmopolitan. The following paragraphs will expand on the theoretical choices made for these two concepts and their possible lines of connection, starting with the transnational and then turning to the cosmopolitan.

The ‘transnational turn’ is particularly relevant to the study of exile. The term ‘transnationalism’ has been the focus of much recent debate in different disciplines well beyond the scope of history and literature, and it is often related to the concept of migrations and diaspora (Vertovec 2009; Quayson and Daswani 2013).<sup>33</sup> I use ‘transnationalism’ to broadly refer ‘to multiple ties and interactions linking people or institutions across the borders of nation-states’ (Clavin 2005, 421) or, as Steven Vertovec put it, as an approach that is ‘about exploring connections (whether they are of attraction or repulsion)’ (2009, 427). While I agree with Patricia Clavin that probably ‘[t]he value of transnationalism lies in its openness as an historical concept’ (2005, 438), in order to explore the ways in which Barea’s exile can be studied from a transnational perspective I have found useful Vertovec’s categorization of approaches to transnationalism that view it as ‘a social morphology’, ‘as a type of consciousness’, as a ‘mode of the cultural reproduction’ and ‘a site for political engagement’ (2009, 4).<sup>34</sup> A hallmark in thinking about diaspora as a transnational social form is through the ‘triadic relationship’ (Sheffer 1986, Safran 1991; Cohen 1997 cited in Vertovec 2009, 4) and the configuration of relationships as networks. This can also be applied to the study of exile, Spanish Republican exile, and Barea’s exilic experience. The latter can be interpreted as a relationship between a) ‘the dispersed yet collectively self-identified’ Republican exiles in other countries, namely in Latin America; b) the host state in Britain and c) the homeland, Spain, with which he establishes a dialectic relationship through his texts. Thinking in terms of networks allows us to view Barea as both dependent on and autonomous from its ‘complex system of relations’ (2009, 5). Chapter 1 will deal with this transnationalism of Barea’s exile by tracing these networks and connections.

Thinking of transnationalism as a type of (diasporic) consciousness involves ‘dual or multiple identifications’ binding people to the social formations or networks (Vertovec 2009, 6), that has often been expressed in terms of ‘the here’ and ‘there’

---

<sup>33</sup> See however Shain, who has questioned whether the concepts of transnational and exile can in fact be easily associated (2005, xv).

<sup>34</sup> Vertovec also describes transnationalism as an ‘avenue of capital’, an aspect I will not be engaging with here (2009, 9).

(Clifford 1994, 322) or of connections through ‘roots’ and ‘routes’ (Gilroy 1993, 19, 190). This Saidian contrapuntal awareness has in the Spanish context found expression in Paulino Massip’s formula of being ‘a caballo entre dos mundos’ (cited in Aznar Soler 1999, 58) and Marra-López’s remark, in relation to Barea, of being ‘a caballo’ between two extremes (1963, 291). I want to note here that the in-between status of a transnational consciousness – which I will later argue can also be termed cosmopolitan – cannot be taken, at least in Barea’s case, as a total abandonment of other types of attachments, particularly to nation and class (Grillo 2007, 201). For this thesis, I take the approach that Barea fashions an identity through his writings that is very influenced by his experience of exile, by his chronotope of crisis, in various different, at times apparently eclectic or even contradictory, ways. On the one hand, he construes himself as having a sort of pre-exilic transnational consciousness, a consequence of his proclaimed ambiguous position within society – particularly in terms of class – during his life in Spain (Lunsford 1990, 92; Ortega 1971, Echevarría 2004). Barea portrays himself as being in-between at different levels (Bhabha 1994, 2; see chapter 2). He claims to not have been at home in Spain, where he already saw himself as a sort of exile before exile – a position which was then reinforced by his role as cultural mediator in Britain. However, as much as Barea might have felt and written like he belonged both here and there, his exile, and the encounter with the other, also had the effect of reinforcing his Spanishness. Barea liked to play the part of the eccentric foreigner and most Spanish Spaniard, and appreciated being regarded by others in Britain as unconventional in a sense that often comes close to very basic stereotypes. It was once said of him that ‘[h]e seldom wears a tie, dislikes shaving, makes a habit of spotting English peculiarities and, in his own words, speaks ‘frightfully bad English’’ (R.B. 1952). Despite this, as we will see, Barea’s work is permeated by a self-reflecting act of questioning not only the other, but also the self in contact with the world. As a commentator of Spain and Britain from within and without, Barea deserves a conceptually complex approach to his authorial voice, as I will show particularly in chapter 2.

This brings us to think of Barea’s writing as constantly moving between cultures in the form of translations, abridgments, adaptations and the material border-crossing of his work, by means of imports and smuggling. The transnational is here a ‘mode of cultural reproduction’, which can be seen as a ‘shorthand for several processes of

cultural interpenetration and blending’ (Vertovec 2009, 7-8). Such transnational cultural practices are often described in terms of ‘syncretism, creolization, bricolage, cultural translation and hybridity’ (7), as in the works of Homi Bhabha (1994), Stuart Hall (1990) or García Canclini (1990), among others. Following a suggestion by the historian Peter Burke (2009, 55), I will use in this thesis the concept of ‘cultural translation’, as I believe it best describes Barea’s agency in interpreting both Spain to Britain (and the world), and Britain to Latin America, but also because it relates to the field of ethnography, a topic that I will explore at some length.<sup>35</sup> Whilst Barea was not directly involved in translating his work – his wife Ilsa was the accomplished linguist and translator – he nonetheless engaged in several forms of cultural translation and mediation. The different ways in which Barea negotiated discourses in exile – feeding into and from, but also countering, cross-perceptions within complex intellectual and material networks of cultural exchange in Europe and across the Atlantic – challenge the essentialist and monolithic label of ‘Spanish’, but also of ‘Spanish Republican exile’.<sup>36</sup>

The way in which Barea’s texts feed into and from British discourses but also transnational internationalist ones such as anti-fascism and socialism – and anti-communism for that matter – take us finally to an understanding of ‘transnationalism as political engagement’ (Vertovec 2009, 10).<sup>37</sup> However, as Vertovec reminds us (11), there is a danger in assuming that all diasporic (home) politics are ‘anti-essentialist and subversive of dominant hegemonies of race and nation’. Faber has noted this problem for the case of many Spanish Republican intellectuals in Mexico (2002).<sup>38</sup> Ethno-nationalisms are as common in diasporic politics as are

---

<sup>35</sup> Burke defines ‘cultural translation’ as a phrase employed to describe the mechanism by which ‘cultural encounters produce new and hybrid forms’ (55). The idea of (cultural) translation is also central for critical cosmopolitanism as I will discuss below. Burke cites Bronislaw Malinowski (1884-1942) as one of the first ethnographers to use the expression, which is relevant to this thesis as Malinowski features in Barea’s work in several ways.

<sup>36</sup> For a questioning of these labels and a highlighting of their limitations, see Rickett (2014).

<sup>37</sup> As with most descriptions of these modes of transnationalism, Vertovec limits the examples to the contemporary digital age, in this case referring to mainly NGO’s as institutions that transcend the limits of the nation-state. However, from the COMINTERN and the International Brigades to the CCF, transnational institutions and discourses were as common – if perhaps not as connected – as they are today.

<sup>38</sup> Indeed, some critics have noted that scholarly categories of transnational and cosmopolitan often yoke together very different border-crossing experiences such as, for example, those of ‘migrant workers, nomads, and members of the transnational business and professional elite’ (Gupta and Ferguson 1997, 34 cited in Grillo 2007, 205). In addition, ‘[h]ybridity, like transnationalism or cosmopolitanism, is not inherently virtuous or progressive’ (Grillo 2007, 207). Gillespie and Webb argue similarly (2013, 9).

cosmopolitan anti-nationalist attachments (11). In this sense, this thesis will explore Barea's complex negotiations with hegemonic discourses, exploring these 'forms of linkage [...] at both ends of the diasporic process' (Appadurai 1995, 220), not only with Spanish politics, but also with British and transnational Cold War ideologies. Barea challenged Spanish hegemony with a counter-narrative to Francoist discourse, but in doing so also inserted himself in a more hegemonic discourse of the post-war settlement in Britain, particularly through his work for the BBC. This is not to say that Barea was clearly aligned with the discourses of what became the Atlanticist camp during the Cold War, but his pro-British discourse was often perceived as doing precisely that, particularly by sectors of the Left in Latin America. This reception contrasts with the reception of his work in Francoist Spain, as we have seen above. Barea's position concerning British hegemonic discourses of war and post-war will be explored in chapter 5.

Finally, I would like to reflect on the way in which transnationalism does not preclude, at least in Barea's case, a (re)construction of 'place' or locality (12). It seems that even if '[w]hat distinguishes political exiles from other diaspora members is not only the exiles' continuous struggle to facilitate the conditions for their return but also their determination not to establish life abroad as a comfortable option, even temporarily' (Shain 2005, xix), Barea managed in exile to (re)build a place. In fact, Barea travelled little and enjoyed a relatively sedentary life in exile in rural England – scene of most of his talks for the BBC – where he negotiated the tensions between the transnational dimension of exile and the importance of Spain in his life and work. Barea became a British citizen in 1948 and never returned to Spain. In light of Shain's assertion that '[f]or militant political exiles, possession of foreign citizenship can become the kiss of death compromising credibility among other active exiles or with the inside opposition to the home regime's charges of national betrayal' (2005, 153), it is worth asking how Barea managed to survive as an exiled writer.

As we have argued, the work of Barea can be read from a transnational perspective, on the one hand, for its participation in networks and institutions with a global outreach at the intersection of the national and the transnational. On the other hand, it is also transnational for the ways in which it relates to discourses that go beyond the limits of the nation (anti-fascism, socialism and anti-communism) and are configured

through the exiles in transnational spaces of political debate. The next section explores if it may be also seen as ‘cosmopolitan’.

### **A cosmopolitan exile?**<sup>39</sup>

In “Dialogizar el exilio” (1998), Caudet highlights that one of the possible outcomes of the terrible experience of exile is that it forces the individual to come into contact with the self and the other. He notes that:

En el exilio, escribir o trabajar en no importa qué oficio son maneras de hacer frente al infortunio, de dignificarse humanamente, de negarse a aceptar la derrota, de resistirse a tener que morir en vida – aunque a veces no se sienta la vida, como si vida y exilio fueran antitéticos, incompatibles. También es una manera – pisamos un campo minado por la paradoja – de abrirse, abandonada la certeza del feudo familiar, al mundo y a los demás. Y a uno mismo. Estas aperturas suelen a veces – menos, por desgracia, de lo deseable – propiciar el encuentro con el otro. (1998, 53)

It is this kind of encounter with the other or others that, I argue, permeates Barea’s work. The thesis therefore explores the ways in which Barea negotiates his exilic self against, but also alongside, different others in terms of class, national identities and ideological positions. It traces how Barea is forced by the experiences of exile to redefine the terms of engagement with the other and, in doing so, how translational and transnational practices become the linchpins of his intellectual journey. Writing on the Spanish Civil War during the Second World War in Britain demanded of him to negotiate nationalist and internationalist wartime discourses. His efforts to position himself within a new public sphere forced him to build on, but also challenge ethno-nationalist identities based on ideas of national characters, not least of all his own. Despite the many ways in which Barea’s discourse relies and reinforces an oppositional discourse, it is in his struggle to understand – and not just appreciate – the other, in his self-conscious relation to foreignness, in his inter-play of national and transnational discourses, and in his efforts to overcome differences

---

<sup>39</sup> As Balibrea notes, the concept of cosmopolitanism has been usually used to describe the character of the anti-Francoist literature within Spanish borders, but surprisingly not for the production in exile (2007, 58-59).

repositioning himself within different context, that his exilic experience – and his work – can be considered cosmopolitan.

The term ‘cosmopolitanism’ has drawn much scholarly attention in the humanities and social sciences in recent years, particularly as it invokes some notion of world openness that has become more meaningful in a globalized and interconnected post-Cold War world. However, most critics agree on the difficulty, or even question the desirability, of defining the term. Well-known is the opening remark in Pollock, Bhabha, Breckenridge and Chakrabarty’s essay ‘Cosmopolitanisms’: ‘specifying cosmopolitanism positively and definitely is an uncosmopolitan thing to do’ (2002, 1). More often than not, studies on the concept argue that it is best to talk about cosmopolitanisms in the plural (Pollock et al. 2002) and of many different practices of cosmopolitanism, each of them with their ‘own historicities and distinctive world-views’ (Werbner 2006, 497). As a consequence, in disciplines from anthropology to political theory to literature, classifications of types of cosmopolitanism(s) abound.<sup>40</sup> In fact, different disciplines understand the concept differently, ranging from the more normative approaches usually taken by political philosophy to the study of actual cosmopolitan practices in anthropology or sociology (Delanty 2012, 1).<sup>41</sup>

Whilst the literature often refers back to the Stoics, modernity and the notion of the nation-state are at the heart of a widely accepted line of thought that traces ‘western’ cosmopolitanism back to the Enlightenment and Kant’s *Perpetual Peace* (1795). Walter D. Mignolo calls this – and other traditions of cosmopolitanism like Marxism – Eurocentric (2012, 85). Paul Gilroy, in fact, rejects the term ‘cosmopolitanism’ precisely because it was ‘entangled with and tested by the expansion of Europeans into new territories and compromised, if not wholly discredited, by the consolidation and management of the resulting imperial orders’ (2005a, 4). Gilroy proposes instead to think in terms of ‘conviviality’ – as a new term to replace ‘multiculturalism’ – by which he shifts the focus from reified identities to the practices and processes of ‘cohabitation and interaction’ (2005a, xv). The opposite of conviviality is ‘civilizationism’, which Gilroy uses to describe the post-Cold War battle of

---

<sup>40</sup> Of the many attempts at classifying the term, Vertovec and Cohen (2002) identify six perspectives of cosmopolitanism, Ulf Hannerz (2007) distinguishes in between cultural and political cosmopolitanism, Tom Cheesman (2007) also identifies seven types, and anthropologist Prina Werbner (2008) identifies three strands as does van den Anker (2010).

<sup>41</sup> As Gerard Delanty has recently suggested, a more interdisciplinary approach would perhaps help redefine the emergent field of Cosmopolitan Studies (2012, 1).

civilizations that presents a geo-political conflict as ‘essentially cultural in character’ (2005a, 23). Despite Gilroy’s concerns with the term cosmopolitanism, he has nonetheless embraced a critical new cosmopolitanism that re-locates the term in non-western traditions (e.g. 2005b). Similarly, Mignolo argues for a de-colonial cosmopolitanism that can complement but also challenge other cosmopolitanisms: liberal, Marxist or post-modern (2012, 85) and in clear opposition to neoliberal globalization (86). Furthermore, the notion of ‘universalism’ – sometimes regarded as synonymous with cosmopolitanism – is eschewed by many critics in as much as it fails to recognize that there are ‘a diversity of universals’ that are often ‘quite particular’ (Pollock et al.2002, 7). Another key criticism of cosmopolitanism has been to consider it as an elitist and rootless phenomenon that disregards the local (Delanty 2012, 3).

However, new theories of cosmopolitanism no longer see the concept in zero-sum terms of either/or (Delanty 2012, 4). As Bruce Robbins (1998, 2) already noted, nationalism and cosmopolitanism do not oppose each other, but often work together alongside each other in different ways. Cosmopolitanisms, Robbins argues, are both ‘plural and particular’, ‘European and non-European’, ‘weak and underdeveloped as well as strong and privileged’, but above all, they are ‘habits of thought and feeling that have already shaped and been shaped by particular collectives, that are socially and geographically situated, hence both limited and empowered’ (2). As nations, worlds are also ‘imagined communities’ (2). Examples of these new cosmopolitanisms are Appiah’s ‘rooted cosmopolitanism’ (1998) and its reinterpretation as a marginal cosmopolitanism on the borders in Bhabha’s ‘vernacular cosmopolitanism’ (1996). Rather than seeing cosmopolitanism as a rejection of locality or the nation, Appiah sees the figure of a ‘cosmopolitan patriot’ as someone who feels ‘attached to a home of his or her own, with its own cultural particularities’, but taking ‘pleasure of other, different, places that are home to other, different people’ (1998, 91). Appiah’s father often noted that ‘there was no point in roots if you couldn’t take them with you’ (1998, 91). Cosmopolitanism is therefore rooted geographically and emotionally, and can provide an (humanist liberal) ethical answer to conflict in a ‘world of strangers’ (Appiah 2007).

Cosmopolitanism has indeed also been understood as an ‘ethics of hospitality’ from Kant to Derrida (van den Anker 2010, 84-85; Balibar 2012, 196). Hospitality, a

prerequisite of Kant's world citizenship, is the foundation of Derrida's ethics, which goes much further than the notion of 'human rights'. For Derrida, it is not about the rights of the foreigner, but about the duty of the host: 'The law of absolute hospitality commands a break with hospitality by right, with law or justice as rights' (2000, 25). In ethical and political terms then, cosmopolitanism is seen as a duty 'to unknown others across borders' (van den Anker 2010, 75).

Cosmopolitanism has traditionally been a contentious term as applied to cultural history, partly because interculturality has been often taken as a rather unexceptional phenomenon in literary culture (Cheesman 2007, 40). While the term goes back to Goethe who, in writing about *Weltliteratur* famously noted that '[p]oetry is cosmopolitan', cosmopolitanism has generally little bearing in world literature discussions. It remains a key concept, in contrast, in the field of comparative literature (Domínguez 2011, 244). David Domínguez (2011) traces the possible connections between the different understandings of cosmopolitanism and world literature, between aesthetics and ethics (248).

What many of these philosophical calls for an ethical cosmopolitanism share is a normative and aspirational dimension. There is an increasing body of literature that challenges essentialist understandings of cosmopolitanism with situated, ethnographical and historical everyday practices of the cosmopolitan condition, individuals and places from a variety of disciplines. They tend to focus on peoples, places and past times that are often absent in western lineages of cosmopolitanism (e.g. Pollock et al. 2002). They also often challenge the idea that cosmopolitanism is an effect of modernity or post-modernity. Such are the studies of cosmopolitanism in the Muslim world, (e.g. MacLean and Karmali Ahmed 2012), the expansion of Sanskrit as a literary language in premodern India as a cosmopolitan endeavour (Pollock 2006), the cosmopolitan novels of Turkish-German writers (Cheesman 2007), Chinese writing as world literature (Volland 2017), the relationship between cosmopolitanism and war in Europe and beyond (Gusejnova 2017) or the cosmopolitan encounters in the Indian Ocean island of Sri Lanka from pre-modern times on-wards (Biedermann and Strathern 2017). The fact that cosmopolitanism(s) can coexist with, and is often a result of, war and conflict (Gusejnova 2017) or that it is not – despite claims to the contrary – free from politics of power (Biedermann and Strathern 2017) are some of the issues raised by these recent studies that can be also

found in this thesis. The other key point is that, precisely because of the unequal power relations throughout the globe and throughout history, these studies question whether the ‘meanings and implications of cosmopolitanism can everywhere be the same’ (Hannerz 2007, 70).

This thesis follows the path opened by many of these studies in that the approach to exploring Barea’s cosmopolitanism is historically contextualized and grounded in a minute examination of his practices of cross-cultural translation. I have found that Delanty’s (2006) ‘critical cosmopolitanism’, which places the emphasis on translation as the main practice that defines cosmopolitan cultural practices, is a useful tool to understand Barea’s cosmopolitan experience. Delanty (2006) argues for a ‘critical cosmopolitanism’ that unlike ‘normative political and moral accounts of cosmopolitanism as world polity or universalistic culture’ (25) or even global flows (43), understands ‘cosmopolitanism’ as a ‘socially situated’ process and ‘a form of cultural contestation in which the logic of translation plays a central role’ (25). It is an answer to Ulrich Beck’s and Natan Sznaider’s ‘methodological cosmopolitanism’ (2006, 2010).

I suggest that Balibrea’s (2005, 2007, 2010) proposal of a transnational, multinational, binational or even extra-national study of exile ties in with Beck and Sznaider’s methodological cosmopolitanism (2006a, 2010). Beck and Sznaider call for a shift in the social sciences and humanities that, far from denying the importance of the nation-state, re-evaluates the category of the nation as the main parameter of analysis (Beck and Sznaider 2006a). They argue that the globalization turn is not enough as it still emphasizes binaries such as national-international and is often based on the onion model (e.g. local-national/international-transnational-global). For them, cosmopolitanism happens not from without but from within (2010, 389). Moving beyond dualities, cosmopolitanism should be understood as the processes that unfold in the many possible interactions between the local and the global (Delanty 2006, 36). This framework might be useful to understand the tensions between the national and the transnational in Barea’s work as a manifestation of the complex interplay of (national) attachments. As applied to the cosmopolitan imagination, it suggests that rather than thinking in terms of substitution of one identity (the national) by another (the supranational), it is best to think in terms of transformation as a result of ‘reflexive kinds of self-understanding’ (42). It can also

be said that ‘if the cosmopolitan moment arises in the construction and emergence of new identities or forms of self-understanding, cultural frames and cultural models, then mediation is the key to it’ (42). In this sense, we can think of Barea’s negotiations between cultures, between different localities and national attachments as key to consider his work as cosmopolitan in as much as it entailed ‘an openness toward divergent cultural experiences, a search for contrasts rather than uniformity, but not simply as a matter of appreciation’ (Hannerz 2007, 70). Barea’s work does not necessarily aim to overcome all (cultural) differences – although there is some of that as well – but to explore them and problematize the other as much as he is exploring and problematizing the self.

Using a ‘critical cosmopolitanism’ as a framework can also help us go beyond the fixed duality of self and other, in that it considers that it ‘is in the interplay of self, other *and world* that cosmopolitan processes come into play’ (41, my emphasis). To be sure, the dialectic relationship between self and other is in flux in Barea’s work, as both self and other change in contact with each other, but also with the historical context in which these negotiations take place.<sup>42</sup> Barea’s materialist interpretation of the national character(s), for example, can be seen as a specific articulation of both a recognizable – in its playful stereotyping – but mutable – in its contingency – construction. It is in this sense that we can also explore Barea’s cosmopolitan practices as socially situated and historically contextualized.

To be sure, the process of self-exploration is not in itself sufficient to indicate that there is a cosmopolitan commitment. Gilroy (2005a, 67) reminds us that there is a need of a ‘principled and methodical cultivation of a degree of estrangement from one’s own culture and history’. Gilroy traces this commitment to many refugees from Nazi Germany in whom he sees a process that ‘culminates in a new way of being at home in the world through an active hostility to national solidarity, national culture, and the privileging over other more open affiliations’ (2005a, 68). For Barea, as for many Spanish Republicans, whilst they did not fully reject a national solidarity, this process was a complex one that entailed negotiating and challenging the terms of the ‘nation’ and the ‘national culture’ which, in the country of origin,

---

<sup>42</sup> ‘To speak of cosmopolitanism as real – what Beck and Sznaider (2006, 153–62) call “cosmopolitan realism” – is thus to refer to these situations, which we may term the cosmopolitan imagination, where the constitution of the social world is articulated through cultural models in which codifications of both Self and Other undergo transformation’ (Delanty 2006, 37).

was rejecting them. It was also in this context that Barea claimed to have – and always to have had – more open affiliations than just the national.

Another reason why a ‘critical cosmopolitanism’ framework might be useful to approach Barea’s work is because these cosmopolitan processes are seen not just in terms of translation between cultures, but as any dynamic between inside and outside, ‘the local and global, self and other, particular and universal, past and present, core and periphery’ (Delanty 2006, 43) in various gradations. This thesis will therefore explore the different ways in which Barea negotiated through his work cultural, national, political, class and professional identities and solidarities. The cosmopolitan space which critical cosmopolitanism is concerned with is, again, the ‘discursive space of translations’ (Delanty 2006, 43). If nothing else, Barea had to negotiate his position as a writer within cosmopolitan spaces of translation – ‘translations zones’ or ‘spaces in translation’, where translation becomes ‘a significant medium of subject re-formation and political change’ (Apter 2011, 6). From his role as a censor during the Spanish Civil War to the BBC World Service, Barea’s work developed within transnational and translational intellectual networks and institutions.<sup>43</sup>

Contrary to liberal cosmopolitanism with its emphasis on ‘unrootedness’, critical cosmopolitanism allows for different forms of solidarity. For Barea, the notion of ‘home’ is challenged by the experience of exile, but not negated as such. Barea’s weekly broadcasts produced in Spanish in particular are explorations of the foreign other in Britain, who, as time goes by and Barea feels increasingly at home, becomes less and less foreign. Thinking in terms of a ‘socially situated’, ‘historical’, ‘real’ and ‘rooted’ cosmopolitanism also helps avoid an essentialist understanding of Barea’s exile, as it downplays the ideas of nomadism and rootlessness often associated with transnationalism and cosmopolitanism. Cosmopolitan experiences are ultimately the result of the ways in which people navigate their encounters with the other and the world, opening up to them under particular historical conditions (Kresse 2012, 33).<sup>44</sup> One way forward may be to think of Barea’s exile as happening in what Mary

---

<sup>43</sup> For an exploration of PEN International as a cosmopolitan space, see Doherty (2011).

<sup>44</sup> These sub-aspects of cosmopolitan experience can be gleaned from how people perceive, experience and navigate the world: ‘*Weltoffenheit*, openness to the world; *Welterfahrung*, significant experience of the world; and finally, *Weltgewandtheit*, the skill of dealing flexibly with the world’ (Kresse 2012, 33).

Louise Pratt termed (for colonial contexts) a ‘contact zone’.<sup>45</sup> Pratt defines such zones as ‘social spaces where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other’ (1991, 34). Barea’s work in particular develops within a space that Mercer defines as a ‘cosmopolitan contact zone’ (2010). This is not an abstract, but a historically contingent zone where the translations between self and other unfold under the sign of deeply un-equal power-relations.

In her study of Afro-Modernism in the 1940s, Kobena Mercer (2010, 2-3) argues that among visual artists working in the contact zone of the modern art world, ‘a cosmopolitan model of cross-cultural translation’ can be seen in the ways in which they negotiate the conflicting demands of ‘anti-colonial nationalism’ and the ‘formalist narrative of metropolitan institutions of modern art’. Similarly, Barea’s work responded to the demands of working in a wartime context of both highly nationalist sentiments and strong internationalist class solidarity as expressed in the notion of a transnational ‘people’s war’ – a scenario that echoed and followed from the Spanish Civil War as well as preludeing the Cold War discourses to come. To be precise, Barea’s work developed in several overlapping cosmopolitan contact zones, from the pages of the magazine *Horizon* (Gillespie and Nieto McAvoy 2017) to the airwaves of the BBC (Gillespie and Webb 2013) and the meetings of International PEN (Doherty 2010). In regard to the cosmopolitan imagination, Mercer argues that

in the act of purposively choosing a self-questioning relationship to strangeness or foreignness [within the contact zone], such a critically cosmopolitan outlook is one in which identity is always creatively put at risk in the uncertainties and potentialities of the cultural encounter with difference and multiplicity. (2010, 7)

We need to remind ourselves that contact zones and cosmopolitanism are not devoid of locally shaped inequalities in power relations – institutional and discursive –, which cultural translators need to negotiate. As Grillo notes, ‘[t]hinking and acting beyond the local may make ‘us’ all cosmopolitans, but this does not mean ‘we’ do so in similar circumstances and under conditions of our own choosing’ (Grillo 2007). Naturally, as Clifford (1997, 198) has also argued, ‘a wholly appropriate emphasis

---

<sup>45</sup> In this sense, as Gillespie and Webb argue, the concept of ‘contact zone’ should be taken as grounded and not just in abstract terms, for example in Clifford’s (1997) configuration which emphasizes nomadic and transient experiences (Gillespie and Webb 2013, 9).

on coercion, exploitation, and miscomprehension does not, however, exhaust the complexities of travel and encounter'. In order to explore the complexities of Barea's experiences of travel and cultural encounter, this thesis aims to inscribe his exilic experience – including its transnational and cosmopolitan dimensions – in a specific time and place, whilst also acknowledging its various supra-local ramifications. I follow thus Fredric Jameson's call to 'historicize' (Jameson 2014, 9), specifically with regard to the cosmopolitan in Barea's experience of exile.

### **Historicizing Barea's exile**

Beck and Sznaider argue that a cosmopolitan methodology is the consequence of a particularly intense moment of contemporary cosmopolitanism in the twenty-first century, which they differentiate from other historical times for its self-awareness, a sort of post-modern cosmopolitan moment. However, this does not preclude the use of cosmopolitanism as a concept to interrogate historical configurations (Gillespie and Webb 2013, Gusejnova 2017, Biedermann and Strathern 2017). If there is something that exiles during the war and post-war years did not lack, it was a strong self-awareness of their complicated relations with the nation-state, along with a longing for something larger. Cosmopolitanism can be understood as an undercurrent of many of these writers in exile, as an intellectual enquiry into the limits of the nation. But to flourish, it also needed a particularly fertile, open ground – in this case London.

As a result of mass displacement, but also of an interwar tradition of transnational intellectual encounters and cultural exchanges, London in the 1940s hosted a vast network of international exiles – along with a number of European exiled governments – that intersected and were increasingly intertwined with the networks of British leftist intellectuals. The city was already a literary capital in its own right before these developments (Casanova 2004, 117), and a 'mediating area' of what Casanova has described as the 'world literary space' (2005, 108). For the period here under consideration, it can perfectly be characterized as a contact zone, and more

specifically as a diasporic and cosmopolitan contact zone (Mercer 2010; Gillespie and Webb 2013).<sup>46</sup>

It can also be argued that Barea's exile took place under a transnational and cosmopolitan *Zeitgeist*. As Eric Hobsbawm noted, 'the thirties were exceptional because 'the lines of loyalty' tended to run 'not between but across countries'' (Faber 2008b, 11–12). The internationalist tradition of Marxist thought has been, despite its often oppositional language, one of the most important lineages of European cosmopolitanism (Balibar 2012).

The international context of intellectual cooperation of the interwar years had had the Spanish Civil War as one of its 'stages' (Reijnen and Rensen 2014, 28). Foreign journalists in Spain had interacted, conflated, translated, created and contested each other and the prevailing discourses in yet another cosmopolitan contact zone – the Telefónica building in the centre of Madrid and the nearby Hotel Florida being two of the main stages – also at the intersection of highly national/nationalists and internationalists/transnational discourses.

For Barea the main site of cosmopolitan encounters was the Spanish Civil War's aftermath as he experienced it in exile, enriched by the thousands of Spanish Republican exiles and other militants and observers who fled the country in 1938-39. Many foreign intellectuals on the Left who fought in Spain – from Orwell to Koestler – continued their work in the wider cosmopolitan contact zone that Britain – namely London – became in the post-war/pre-war months of 1939. Loyalty to Spain and the Spanish Civil War was continued, in a way, not only as the results of a 'national(ist)' claim, but as an ideological allegiance to a cause that was understood from the beginning as transcending the Spanish borders. Through their participation in magazines, publishing houses and institutions with global reach, these intellectuals fed into and from a public sphere at the intersections of the national and the transnational. Cyril Connolly's magazine *Horizon* read as a 'Who's Who' of international intellectuals and writers. T.S. Eliot became a key figure in facilitating encounters through his work as an editor at Faber and Faber, a leading publisher of

---

<sup>46</sup> The concept of diasporic and cosmopolitan contact zones and the ways in which the former can be transformed into the latter through the practices of translation has been researched extensively by Marie Gillespie who has advanced the concept of corporate cosmopolitanism as a particular brand of critical cosmopolitanism (Gillespie and Webb 2013; M. Gillespie 2010a). This will be further explored in chapter 6.

its time, as did Orwell at the BBC and as a literary editor of *The Tribune*. These were some of the best known cosmopolitan literary brokers in London, fostering cultural encounters on and off air. Barea collaborated with all three of them.

One should of course stress that these cosmopolitan encounters took place as a result of mass displacement, and often started under terrible conditions. An approach that views these interactions and its effects as cosmopolitan cannot gloss over the violence that generated the encounters in the first place. However, it can open up spaces in which to think about the agency of actors in appropriating, assimilating, rejecting or reconstructing identities and labels, as well as to the ways in which this is mediated through different kinds of cultural manifestations (for a recent transnational diasporic history of Spanish Civil War refugees, see Rickett 2014). I have thus attempted, in a cultural materialist vein, to ‘investigate the historical conditions in which [Barea’s] textual representations are produced, circulated and received’ (Sinfield 2004, xxxiv). I am interested in understanding Barea’s work within its first context of production and reception, attempting to read it as feeding from and into contemporary discourses, embedded in specific institutional and publishing practices. If ‘writing is constructed socially but, also, writing is one of the constructing agencies: it influences discursive processes as well as being influenced by them’, the quest here is, as Alan Sinfield has it, ‘for the effects of the text in the world’ (1989, 36), but also the effects of the world on the text.

Because of my extensive work on the archive left behind by the Bareas, this thesis can probably also be described, as Jo Labanyi would argue (2005, 182), as an effort of cultural history, particularly because of my diachronic approach. Alongside the archival research, the thesis relies on a close reading of Barea’s literary and non-literary texts in their intellectual context, against contemporary cultural and political discourses. As Labanyi suggests, this contextual reading allows us to ‘spot the significance of apparently insignificant textual details’, elements that may not strike us otherwise as particularly meaningful, but would have immediately struck a chord among contemporary readers as members of the same ‘imagined community’ (2005, 182).<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> At the same time, I am aware that my own interpretation, as a member of yet another ‘interpretative community’, carries the marks of my position as a Spaniard writing in a British academic setting, influenced by contemporary debates on the meaning of exile literature for Spanish culture.

My investigation has taken me to work in different institutional archives, such as the BBC Written Archive at Reading and the PEN International Archive at the Harry Ransom Centre, University of Texas at Austin. I have researched the links between individual and cultural-political organisations and the debates of the thirties and forties in which intellectuals had to negotiate their relationship with state-funded enterprises and hegemonic discourses of war, hot and cold. Barea's archive and library has provided not only previously unexplored material that complements Barea's published work (namely correspondence, which has been ordered and catalogued chronologically along the way), but has also helped to place it in a wider political, cultural, social and institutional context. The holdings include most of Barea's original typescripts – except for the trilogy –, correspondence, including fan-mail, reviews of his work, clippings from newspapers and magazines and other background material, as well as many of the books in the Bareas' original library – and even the bookshelves themselves, built by Barea following his own plans.

Related to this I would like to note that my interest in historicizing takes my thesis at times into the field of Book History – understood as sociology of texts that argues that among the many ways in which a text is influenced by material conditions, publishing is one of them. My thesis ventures at times into the circumstances of publishing, particularly the negotiations with editors, agents and at times censors. Furthermore, in trying to gauge the impact of his text in the world and in order to move beyond the construct of the 'author' and the 'intended' reader, I have attempted to incorporate the voices of Barea's readers into the analysis– although I do not underestimate the methodological difficulties of a reader-reception approach. I take Barea readers – and listeners – to constitute what Stanley Fish (1976, 485) has termed 'interpretative communities' and seek to understand Barea's work also through the successive reception it encounters both in space and time – so the readings in Britain during World War Two will contrast with those in Spain but also with the reception Barea had in Latin America in the late 1950s, not only as the writer of *La forja de un rebelde*, but as the anglophile broadcaster 'Juan de Castilla'. I will approach these different contexts mainly through the proxy of reader reviews – normally considered a slanted and partial approximation to overall reception due to the particular characteristics of critics – but also, by using letters of 'common'

readers and listeners of his radio broadcasts, a rare and insightful window into the relationship of the public with Barea and his work.

A brief additional reflection on two elements that are important in my thesis. One, the fact that I work with Barea's 'first editions' of the trilogy and other texts, which means that I essentially close read his texts in English – except for his radio scripts which were written and broadcast in Spanish. This is partly to maintain historical coherence: I am mostly concerned with the period from 1939 to 1945, during which these texts were not available in Spanish. While his literature is often analysed within the category of Spanish literature, it was mostly placed at the time – by readers, reviewers and marketing strategists – within the framework of British and world literature. This makes sense if we bear in mind that his work was mainly seen through the lens of international(ist) and transnational Spanish Civil War literature. Barea wrote his texts in Spanish and Ilsa translated them into English, as well as into German when necessary – although as explored in chapter 1 the first volume of *The Forge* was first translated by British socialist Peter Chalmers Mitchell, and only later translated anew by Ilsa for the 1943 second edition. The story goes – and the archive corroborates this – that the Spanish manuscript of the trilogy was destroyed after being translated into English, so that the entire book had to be later re-translated from the English.<sup>48</sup> All foreign translations with the exception of the early French stem from the English edition. Naturally, it is also in the English versions of Barea's texts that his role as a cultural translator for the British public is most obvious. It is here that we can see most evidently the translatory decisions made to exoticize (reinforcing the otherness of the source text) and naturalize (making the otherness disappear, and render the source texts invisible and inaudible; cf. Holmes 2004, 81).<sup>49</sup>

In relation with this, it is important not to underestimate the role of Ilsa in Barea's work. As critics have noted and Barea often acknowledged, Ilsa's role went well

---

<sup>48</sup> This fact has led to both a possible explanation of the influence of English in the Spanish version (Echevarría 2004), and a doubting of the real provenance of Barea's trilogy. Rafael Nadal (1998) goes as far as suggesting that it was Ilsa who wrote the manuscript based on Barea's oral account of events. Nadal's account dates Ilsa's confession about her intention to write the autobiography in late 1939 at the earliest, when the manuscript of *The Forge* had already been written. Not only Nadal, but Soldevila (2001 [1980]) and even Hugh Thomas (1975) (in descending order of intensity) hint at the fact that Ilsa could have had more of a role in the composition of the trilogy than was credited. For a dismissal, see Eade (2009) and Echevarría (2004).

<sup>49</sup> I must however note that my work is not informed by translation theory, although it is an avenue of future research.

beyond that of translator. She was his intellectual partner and moral supporter, and many of Barea's texts – particularly the political – resulted from the couple's discussions and shared readings of the British press and other materials. Ilsa's translations surely contributed to Barea's 'literary capital' through the stylistic elegance of his fiction so often noted by reviewers. This was at times acknowledged, for example in *Unamuno* (1952) and *Spain in the Post-War World* (1945), two texts co-signed by Arturo and Ilsa. Given the abundant archival evidence of this close collaboration, I see Ilsa's role not only as one of facilitating Barea's writing, but of finding a place for his work in Britain. For this, she made use of her own social capital as a member of the Central European intellectual exile community, not to mention her socialist political and personal links in Spain, Britain and abroad.<sup>50</sup> For such reasons, Ilsa features prominently in chapter 1, and throughout the thesis I often quote from her correspondence and articles, when pertaining directly to Arturo's work or to Spain.

This brings me to the final methodological choice in this thesis, to include and discuss an interpretation of Barea's work as an autobiographical project. As I have noted before and will further explore in chapter 2, the fact that Barea's main trilogy functions as an autobiography has been the centre of much debate. I am not so interested in the referential content of the novel as such, but in other possibilities that thinking about Barea's body of work as autobiographical can bring about. Following Ángel Loureiro's *The Ethics of Autobiography* (2000), I want to highlight two elements that I believe are relevant and that tie into my efforts to historicize Barea's cultural production. Firstly, autobiographical writing is performative and as such it is as much about the present of writing as it is an interpretation of the past. Secondly, 'no other genre's thematic and strategies are so dependent on, and determined by, its addressees' (xiii) and so, following Levinas, the construction of the self is a response to the interpellation of an other that demands that one explains oneself (xii). Related to this point, Loureiro argues that aside from the second person, the interlocutor that prompts the autobiographer to 'speak', we can always find a third one, another interlocutor to whom the work is also addressed. This triangle, I argue, helps address the interaction between the foreign (British) and the Spanish as the two others with

---

<sup>50</sup> For example, it is through Ilsa's sister in Denmark that Barea's trilogy was translated there and that they visited the country on a literary tour in 1947, which had a direct impact in the consideration of his work for the Nobel Prize.

whom Barea dialogues in his work and goes a long way to explaining the complexities of his work as national and transnational.

Barea is fashioning his identity in response to his immediate circumstances, the interpellation of a British other to whom he explains himself through his work. As Loureiro argues for his authors (José Blanco White, María Teresa León, Juan Goytisolo and Jorge Semprún), we can state that for Barea exile was a precondition of autobiography. In exile he found receptive addressees for his ‘autobiographical ‘saying’’ (2000, xv). As Rosy Rickett has pointed out in her important contribution to the field, ‘exiles were constantly self-fashioning their identity in response to the circumstances, rather than (wholly) defined by them’ (2014, 15). Understanding the context of Barea’s writing becomes the more relevant because of the autobiographical nature of his work. Identity is created in the moment of writing ‘resorting to a number of collective shared discourses’ (Loureiro 2000, 16) which mediate it, ‘as well as in the context and practices and institutions that allow them to speak’ (13). This thesis thus explores the context, practices and institutions in which Barea wrote and constructed himself as a Spanish Republican Exile (as a Spaniard, as a Republican and as an exile), and more importantly as a member and representative of ‘the people’, and a (non-intellectual) writer. The autobiographical, transnational and cosmopolitan character of Barea’s work – all brought about by exile – do thus not diminish, but rather reinforce its political nature.

### **Chapter distribution**

In chapter 1 I will explore Barea’s social capital and how it was essential in allowing him to become a writer in exile. Being in Britain placed Barea at the centre of the intellectual network of the non-communist Left with its numerous magazines, institutions and personal networks of editors, publishers and other intellectuals. I also argue that Barea’s success as a writer was highly dependent on his symbolic capital as a Spanish Republican exile. Barea’s negotiations within the British public sphere were dependent on these interactions, and this chapter offers an analysis of the people who made Barea’s literary career possible. Chapter 2 explores Barea’s early publications in exile in light of the autobiographical and testimonial nature of his work in which tensions between the subjective and the objective nature of

testimonies and reportages are explored. I also argue that Barea adapts and responds to the context of production and reception of his work, by emphasizing both the Spanish national traits of his authorial voice, *and* by presenting himself as a cosmopolitan in line with the internationalist anti-fascist discourses. Barea-narrator's selves alternate between the war veteran, the most Spanish of Spaniards, an in-between, an exile before exile, and a member and representative of the people. Relating to the latter, I will explore Barea's contentious relationship with intellectuals and his own role as one.

Chapters 3 and 4 address Barea's writings on the Spanish Civil War and Spain in an attempt to deconstruct the different ways in which the texts articulate the national and the transnational. Chapter 3 focuses on the strategies Barea used to attempt to inscribe the Spanish conflict within Second World War British and international(ist) discourses. Chapter 4 focuses on his discursive strategies to both naturalize and exoticize Spain for the British reader. It explores Barea's interpretation of the Spanish Civil War as a struggle between the caste (and its foreign allies) and the Spanish people. I argue that while Barea offers a historical analysis of the Spanish conflict, he also relies on essentialist notions of the national character as informed by the Black Legend and the romantic myth.

Chapter 5 explores Barea's work for the BBC. It focuses on Barea's work as a cultural translator in reverse; that is, his descriptions of Britain and the British for a Latin American audience. A catch-phrase of the time, the 'people's war', was used profusely by Barea to describe both the Spanish Civil War and the British war against fascism. This is most evident in Barea's work for the BBC during the Second World War, but also in the post-war period, which will also be explored in chapter 5. Finally, the conclusion comments briefly upon the movements of transnationalization and (re)nationalization in Barea's work after 1945; the progressive abandonment of Spain coinciding with Barea's literary opening to the world, suggesting a future line of investigation.

This introduction has given an overview of the reception and interpretation of Barea's work in Spain through the lens of Spanish literary criticism and historiography as produced during Francoism, Transition and democracy. If brief, it also suggests another area of exploration, which has indirectly been a motivator of this thesis: a study of how *La forja de un rebelde* has been re-politicized as an exile

product, but also de-transnationalized (or nationalized) as something belonging intrinsically not to the World or to Britain or the International Left, but for the first time and somewhat worryingly perhaps, only to ‘Spain’.

## **Chapter 1. The Making of the Bareas' Transnational Network, 1937-41**

This chapter will establish the historical and social foundations upon which exile in Britain could catalyse Barea's cultural production. Whilst social capital and symbolic capital are two aspects that cannot always be strictly separated in the historical experience of Arturo Barea, they do constitute analytical categories that can help us put some order in our perception of the events. As Rosy Rickett notes, in his articulation of the 'social space', Bourdieu is specifically concerned with describing 'the processes by which people gain power over particular forms of knowledge, rather than the basic right to be recognized as a citizen, the right not to be incarcerated in a concentration camp or to be allowed to enter a particular country' (2014, 123). Rickett still applies it successfully to the case of Spanish Republican exiles in order to describe their struggle to be perceived after their dislocation from their former 'social space' (2014, 77). While Barea engages in these negotiations in order to seek recognition as an exile with a right to remain in Britain, he also draws on his social and symbolic capital in order to legitimize his view of the social world and his own place in it. To be sure, Barea's struggle is also to be perceived as a writer and an authoritative voice on the Spanish Civil War in the political, intellectual and cultural field. This chapter will explore how this happened, highlighting the tensions between Barea and Ilsa's agency and the people, institutions and discourses in which these negotiations took place. It is in this sense that we can think of Arturo and Ilsa struggling to write about Spain in a cosmopolitan contact zone in which the interactions took place in a context of asymmetric power relations, not least of all because they were refugees. Arturo and Ilsa's negotiations to redefine themselves in this context also substantiate the notion that '[i]ntellectuals do in part choose their loyalties, as do other historical actors, but their choices are enabled and constrained by their historical situations' (Rodden 1990, 268).

It is worth pointing out that few Spanish Republican exiles came to England, and most of those who did, such as the exiled president Juan Negrín, left as soon as the Second World War finished to countries where large groups of Republicans had settled already, including Mexico (for an overview of Spanish Republican exile in Britain see Monferrer Catalán 2007). I would argue that far from being a problem for

Barea, his relative isolation from the more established and structured parts of the Spanish exile community benefited him, both because it gave him additional legitimacy as one of the few representatives in Britain of the victims of Spanish fascism, and due to the broader intellectual discourses in which his work could grow. Britain was host to many members of the European Left and soon after his arrival, Barea became part of this group of intellectuals seeking recognition whilst struggling for survival in a wartime Europe.

When the Bareas crossed the channel and entered Britain, their first challenge was to simply stay and survive. Barea's main symbolic asset, his knowledge of the Spanish Civil War, was closely linked with the cause and agenda of the Left as it eventually came to be known as the 'The Last Great Cause' (Weintraub 1968). The international context of intellectual cooperation of the interwar years had the Spanish Civil War as one of its scenarios. Many British writers and intellectuals, with whom Barea associated from 1939 onwards, such as Kingsley Martin, Cyril Connolly, Stephen Spender, Gerald Brenan or George Orwell were Republican supporters. However, to make use of his symbolic capital and find a voice, he first needed to find a place, physically and socially. As this chapter will illustrate, 'European or international intellectual exchange was sought after to strengthen ideas or movements, but often depended heavily on personal connections, preferences and loyalties' (Reijnen and Rensen 2014, 28).

This chapter looks into connections that have been frequently noted in studies on Barea, but seldom explored.<sup>51</sup> I will begin by approaching the network of Anglo-American and exiled Central European intellectuals the way Arturo and Ilsa came into touch with them: first in Madrid, later in France and finally as part of their new life in England, when they found a place in an intensely cosmopolitan network of authors, editors, literary agents, translators, reviewers and broadcasters. The process is most richly documented for the time after 1938 by hundreds of letters preserved in the Bareas' archive. This, against the backdrop of Madrid's and London's cosmopolitan cultural milieus at the time, allows us to trace not only the encounters, their actors and outcomes, but also the 'stages' of such exchanges (Kershen and Migration 1997; Conway and Gotovitch 2001; Behr and Malet 2005; Baker 2009;

---

<sup>51</sup> Altisent, for example, pointed out in 1999 that the specific connection between Orwell and Barea was not documented (Altisent 2003, 154).

Reijnen and Rensen 2014, 22). The material and political conditions of cultural production in exile are also necessarily part of this picture. Barea's writing was dependent on editors who in turn were constrained by wartime censorship, foreign policy, paper shortage, and a quickly changing public opinion (see chapter 3). A mixture of political and economic factors initially limited Barea's production, but once overcome, also proved decisive for his success.

As Barea explained in 1941, he had by then managed to succeed, if not in overturning the fate of Spain, at least in forging a literary and broadcasting career against the odds:

Hoy puedo tener el orgullo modesto de artículos y short stories en bastantes revistas y diarios de Inglaterra. De tener dos libros en prensa aquí, y en América en tratos. De dar charlas para América del Sur desde el micrófono de la BBC y de hacer otras cosas aún para esta lucha en la que Inglaterra tiene que vencer o todos vamos a reventar.<sup>52</sup> (Barea 1941a)

These lines were written in response to Charles Duff, then editor of the Spanish Republican officious propaganda journal *The Voice of Spain*, who had wrongly predicted that it would be almost impossible for Barea to write for British newspapers. Barea succeeded because he was able to forge political and aesthetic connections between the Spanish struggle and the new European war; but the ways in which his work relied on the Spanish Civil War to progressively respond to other British, and ultimately international, preoccupations must be seen in connection with the author's intellectual network. It is important to note here already how, with the exception of only two moments in 1940-1941 (when Britain was forced into major doubts about Spain's neutrality in the war), Spanish contemporary affairs were of relatively little interest *per se* to the general public in Britain. As a lone Spaniard carrying 'only' a set of Civil War memories, Barea may indeed not have stood a chance in Britain. How then was he able to join the battle of words against fascism as a Spaniard on Britain's side?

As we shall see time and again, Barea's positioning in Britain as a writer – the social and material 'infrastructure', so to say, of his becoming a transnational intellectual figure – was very much dependent on his social capital as a well-connected Leftist,

---

<sup>52</sup> Barea often wrote without accents. I have added them to all quotations.

and more particularly as a member of the European non-communist Left. For the latter, the Spanish Civil War had been both the epitome of the great antifascist struggle and the site of dramatic conflicts within the Left, and Barea's symbolic capital as accumulated in both these struggles was central to accumulating social and later cultural capital. Michael Eaude has pointed out that neither Ilsa nor Arturo were particularly critical of the Spanish Communist Party or the Comintern in their writings (2011, 86). Ilsa herself once wrote that they were never 'professional anti-communists' (I. Barea 1953). But a closer reading of the published texts in connection with the personal correspondence preserved in the archive clearly shows how the couple's anti-communism evolved over the course of the Second World War and the Cold War. Hannah Arendt's term 'ex-communist' (1953) – those who dedicated their intellectual lives to communism by first defending it and later criticising it – could easily be applied to many of the intellectuals the Bareas collaborated with, such as Koestler.<sup>53</sup> The Bareas had contacts with communists – alongside anarchists, socialists, and POUMists – and closely worked with some of them, not least of all with their literary agent in the US, Max Lieber.<sup>54</sup> But their connections with ex-communists like Koestler, critics of Stalinism such as Orwell and organizations such as the anti-communist Congress for Cultural Freedom or the liberal PEN International clearly became their main alliances. As Tom Buchanan has argued, the Spanish Civil War needed to be linked up with the Second World War in a number of different ways (Buchanan 2007), and this task was left in significant part to non-communists during the early years of the Second World War. The unclear position of the Soviet Union vis-à-vis Hitler during 1939-41 came to mean that 'while Communists painted themselves into a corner during the first two years of the war, it was left to maverick socialists such as George Orwell [...] to attempt to

---

<sup>53</sup> Arendt uses the term as opposed to 'former communists' who were able to overcome their rejection of communism and explore other intellectual ventures (Arendt 1953).

<sup>54</sup> Maxim Lieber was known for representing 'proletarian voices' such as Langston Hughes, Otto Katz [André Simon] and Josephine Herbst, all of whom Barea met during the Spanish Civil War (Miles 2011, 223–24, 236; Butts 2011). Lieber would later be at the heart of a polemic in American anti-communism, the case of Whittaker Chambers against Alger Hiss, in which the former accused the latter of being a communist spy and as collateral information also accused Maxim Lieber as an accomplice of both – thus ruining his literary agency. After declaring in front of the Grand Jury in New York in 1948 and the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1950, Lieber escaped to Mexico faking a heart condition in 1951 and later lived in Poland from 1954 (Weinstein 1997, 466). The last letter Lieber sent to Ilsa is indeed from Mexico and states that he had to retire due to doctor's orders, hence not being able to meet Arturo when he would arrive in the US for his teaching position at Pennsylvania University (Lieber 1953). Presumably, Ilsa and Arturo did not know of his communist links.

articulate lessons from the Spanish Civil War that were relevant to the Britain's war with Nazi Germany' (Buchanan 2007, 181). It is in this context of a prevalence of non-communist leftist discourses of The Spanish Civil War that Barea's work became relevant. It is thus important that we understand how Barea's connections with these networks came about. For a moment at least, the focus here has to be on Madrid.

### **A literary passport: Madrid, the Foreign Press Office, and the making of *Valor y miedo***

Wondering about the fate of the Bareas after the end of the Spanish conflict, the Australian communist journalist Rupert Lockwood wrote in April 1939 to Ilsa stating that 'I should think that some of the British and American journalists to whom you were so good in Madrid would have been able to help you fix up a journalistic job' (Lockwood 1939).<sup>55</sup> Indeed, to understand how Barea mastered the task that Duff predicted would be a Herculean one, we need to go back to the Civil War itself. This is not just because it was amidst the siege of Madrid that Arturo met Ilsa, through whom his political and literary work became interweaved at different levels with that of significant figures of the Central European non-communist Left. It is also because during those months Arturo Barea met a whole range of foreign journalists, writers and intellectuals as well as other supporters of Spain, many of whom were part of the wider cosmopolitan intellectual scene of Madrid during the Civil War (Preston 2009).<sup>56</sup> All fought for the Republican side and, as Orwell exposed in *Homage to Catalonia*, many of them returned home disappointed with the role of the Spanish Communist Party. Barea himself insisted in *The Clash* that he and Ilsa left Spain fleeing from the Francoists but also from the communists who were then gaining influence in the Republican government. Both were dismissed from their roles as censors and persecuted for Ilsa's alleged relations with Trotskyism (Barea 1946b). This would, as we shall see, later enable Barea to connect with the London Left intelligentsia in his quality as a victim of not only fascism but also of communism. In his role as a censor and eventually head of the Foreign Press

---

<sup>55</sup> Ilsa helped Lockwood to broadcast for the EQA radio station and they would later exchange correspondence (Cahill 2013, 118).

<sup>56</sup> It is the site, for example, of Amanda Vaill's recent fictional treatment of Arturo and Ilsa's experiences in connection with those of Hemingway and Capa (Vaill 2014).

Office in Madrid, Barea met, for example, the journalists Herbert Matthews (*New York Times*), Sefton Delmer (*Daily Express*) and Geoffrey Cox (*News Chronicle*) (Preston 2009). Barea also came close to some writers, above all Ernest Hemingway and John Dos Passos (Barea 1946b; Preston 2009). There is much symbolism in the fact that it was Sefton Delmer, the British foreign correspondent in Madrid, who sometime in 1937 gave Arturo his first typewriter, and thus enabled him to start writing during the Spanish Civil War. Many of these relationships, to which hundreds of letters preserved in the couple's archive give testimony, continued after Arturo and Ilsa's escape from Spain.

Barea himself, in writing about these early contacts in his literary texts, made clear that the connections were not straightforward. This is to be understood, as we shall see in more detail below, as a part of his positioning in the British publishing landscape. Barea described himself as someone who had worked with and facilitated the work of international journalists, but who also maintained his position as an independent critical observer that had his roots locally. His memories often fluctuate between passing judgement on the foreigners' behaviour and acknowledging their important role in explaining the war to foreign audiences. Barea dedicated several chapters of *The Clash* to his work as a censor among foreign correspondents, his office experiences at the Telefónica building on Gran Vía featuring prominently. In this novel, written in 1944 and printed in 1946, Barea settles scores with a number of individuals, revealing his contempt for the self-serving reasons that brought people like Hemingway to Spain: 'Drinks at the Gran Via bar, drinks at the Miami bar' (Ahmad 1994, 234).<sup>57</sup> On the other hand, Barea praised some of the more hard working 'veterans' of Madrid, such as the American writer and journalist Josephine Herbst, with whom the couple would remain friends.<sup>58</sup> Not surprisingly, given the Bareas' anti-Stalinist stance and their animosity towards Hemingway, one finds particular praise for John Dos Passos, whom Arturo 'liked and respected' because 'he spoke about our land workers and peasants with gentle understanding' (1946b, 244).<sup>59</sup> With a touch of intertextuality in *The Clash*, Barea introduces a quote from

---

<sup>57</sup> Barea also praised Hemingway's attitude towards himself and Ilsa, which remained unchanged after they became suspicious for the PCE (Barea 1946b, 277).

<sup>58</sup> Much of their friendship develops in correspondence (ABP box 6). It might have been Josephine who put them in contact with Maxim Lieber, their shared literary agent in the US

<sup>59</sup> John Dos Passos had had a fall-out with the communists during the Spanish Civil War over the assassination of his friend and translator José Robles (Preston 2009, 62–92).

*Journey between Wars* (1938) in which Dos Passos had described Ilsa and Barea (1946b, 244). The detail may sound critical: during the Civil War, Dos Passos could walk ‘into the sunny streets again’ after the air raids and forget about everything; Barea, in contrast, was at the time ‘chained to the galley benches of war’ (244). But this difference – again, one that establishes community and at the same time keeps Barea’s local status apart – resolves itself through hindsight, since the passage was written after the couple escaped.

Another key element of these years is Barea’s involvement in censorship and propaganda strategies for the Republican Government, because it enabled him in exile to adapt to the necessities of another war against fascism, particularly in his journalistic writing and his work for the BBC. But aside from his role as a censor, Barea engaged in more active propaganda strategies. Barea acted as a guide for the ‘war tourism’ of prominent European leaders. He particularly recalled how he had to escort – unwillingly – the British MPs the Duchess of Atholl, Ellen Wilkinson, Eleanor Rathbone and welfare worker Dame Rachel Crowdy (1946b, 235–40). Despite Barea’s antagonism – he would state in *The Clash* that he wanted to ‘ask them rudely whether they couldn’t do anything about non-intervention without a sight-seeing trip’ – Ellen Wilkinson and the Duchess of Atholl were among those who offered the couple moral and material support upon their arrival in Britain in 1939.<sup>60</sup>

That propaganda activities and censorship could lead to writing activities is not surprising. Starting in April 1937, Barea acted as a correspondent for *Agencia España*, the Spanish foreign Propaganda Press Agency based in France. For *AE*, he sent daily reports from the *Comisariado General de Guerra* about the war situation in Madrid. In order to obtain permission for Barea to act in this capacity, the Republican leader Julio Álvarez de Vayo wrote in March 1937:

Simples comunicados militares y partes ‘sin novedad’ no alcanzan a la larga a mantener el interés periodístico sobre la lucha heroica de Madrid, que tanto nos interesa mantener vivo y constante especialmente en Francia. [...] Las condiciones que concurren en el camarada Barea permiten tener la garantía de una actuación totalmente leal y discreta en el cometido que le ha sido asignado. (Vayo 1937)

---

<sup>60</sup> Barea broadcast a laudatory obituary on Ellen Wilkinson in 1947.

It was, according to Barea's account, German exile Gustaaf Regler's and Ilsa's idea to take foreign correspondents to the front to report on the work of the International Brigades, another of the initiatives of the 'charm offensive' of the Republic (García 2010, 69).<sup>61</sup> But Barea also placed himself at the heart of one of the biggest atrocity propaganda campaigns of the Republican government in Britain. According to Barea, it was he who saved – against his superior Luis Rubio Hidalgo's instructions – a set of photographs of the children murdered by German bombs in Carabanchel. The materials were destined to be burned after the Government left Madrid for Valencia. Barea decided to take the pictures to the communists, in order to have posters made so they could show to the world the atrocities of German air raids.<sup>62</sup> Incidentally, or perhaps not, the bulk of the photographs ended up in Britain, forming the base of the campaign 'If you tolerate this, your children will be next', and were famously referenced by Virginia Woolf in *Three Guineas* (1938) (S. Cole 2009, 29–30; Cunningham 2009, 190).<sup>63</sup>

As will be discussed in chapter 4, Republican propaganda revolved around certain themes and, despite Barea's uneasy relationship with his past as a propaganda officer during his early exile, many of his British texts can be read as participating in the Spanish Republican wartime discourse which had been aimed at countering non-intervention during the Spanish conflict – and which provided fertile ground for interactions in the British Left. International propaganda produced both by Republicans and the Francoists was, already in 1936-39, primarily aimed at Britain, 'partially because it largely dictated the policy of the two main European democracies and partly because it was home to the Non-Intervention committee' (Townson 2010, vii). The 'battle of ink' took place through periodicals, books and pamphlets, public talks and organised visits to the Spanish front by journalists and politicians. The Republican Government financed a publishing house in Britain, United Editorial, and a number of periodicals that put forward their version of the

---

<sup>61</sup> It is interesting to note that most of the propaganda techniques and topics used during the Spanish Civil War had already been established by the British during World War One: visits and tours, publication of pamphlets, creation of solidarity organizations, and atrocity propaganda or accusation of infiltration perpetrating massacres within their ranks (García 2010, 12).

<sup>62</sup> Barea's role in the campaign remains controversial (Stradling 2008, 277–78; García 2010, 138)

<sup>63</sup> This incident is also an example of the impact images had for the battle for foreign opinion (Brothers 1997) and the strong visual iconography of the Spanish Civil War, which was labelled a 'photogenic war' (Cunningham 2009, 190).

war to the British public, such as *Spain at War* and *The Voice of Spain*, both edited by Irish journalist Charles Duff, whom Barea later met in exile (Nieto McAvoy 2010).<sup>64</sup>

It can thus be argued that Barea's work, including his early Civil War writing, had an international, and more specifically a British outlook almost from the very beginning and, as such, Barea's role as a cultural translator had already begun in Spain. In addition to all this, Barea started in April 1937 to publish articles and short stories in Spanish periodicals, about who, he believed, were the true protagonists of the civil war, 'the Spanish people'.<sup>65</sup> This was a key experience not only in itself, but also because not much later he started to broadcast his short stories for the Republican short-wave radio station EAQ, his first experience of cultural mediation on the waves. The broadcasts were about the 'common people' of Madrid and their fight against fascism (1946b, 274). As Barea recalls, he 'had to do something more in this war than merely supervise the censorship of increasingly indifferent newspaper dispatches' (251). The multilingual EAQ was 'one of Europe's major short wave broadcasters of the period' with a global audience of short wave listeners' to whom it spoke in Castilian, Catalan, French and English (Davies 1999, 473). One is tempted to speak of a 'radiophonic contact zone' here, and by 7 June 1937, Barea was the head of the station.<sup>66</sup> He became one of its most popular broadcasters for Latin America, widely known and loved as 'La voz incógnita de Madrid'. The popularity of these programmes at the time seems to have been considerable. A distant listener urged the 'voice' to continue broadcasting 'calmando mi dolor y mi ansia de saber, escuchándolo todos los días. Mil gracias anticipadas y Salud para todos!' (Tarrago 1937).<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup> Charles Duff had worked for the Foreign Office until he resigned in 1936 due to his disagreement on British policy on Spain. He was hired by the Spanish Republican government as it was thought that a non-Spanish editor and non-Spanish contributors would probably serve the cause best. Duff had suggested both the idea of the publishing house and the periodicals to the Spanish Propaganda Services and ran activities basically as a one-man show, which he carried on doing well into World War Two, still funded by Negrín (C. Duff 1947; García 2010).

<sup>65</sup> 'Sangre' (April 1937); 'Madre', *El Sol* (23 May 1937); 'La caída de Bilbao', *Hoja del Lunes* (21 June 1937).

<sup>66</sup> In May 1937 already, General Miaja had named Barea censor of the radio stations Unión Radio, Radio España and Transradio.

<sup>67</sup> In several autobiographical notes, Barea writes 'A voice of Madrid', as opposed to 'The Voice of Madrid', but in a letter from a listener the programme is referred as 'La voz incógnita de Madrid' (Tarrago 1937).

To further convince an international audience of the need to support the Republicans, Barea started to send short stories abroad – not surprisingly, with approval stamps from the Foreign Press Office – which were placed, at least on one occasion, by foreign correspondents in their own newspapers. Barea was therefore able to publish his first short story in Britain well before leaving Spain. In August 1937, an English translation of ‘La mosca’ appeared in the *Daily Express* with the help of the paper’s correspondent in Spain, Sefton Delmer, who added as a headline caption: ‘This story was written under shellfire by the Madrid Censor – who lost his inhibitions about writing by censoring our dispatches’ (1946b, 281–82). This was more than a year before the Spanish version saw the light in the short story collection *Valor y miedo*.<sup>68</sup> Other stories were sent abroad, and on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of February of 1938 Barea signed a contract with Henry Brinton, an Anglican and Labour Party member of the executive committee of the association ‘Friends of Spain’, giving him rights to act as Barea’s agent in the United Kingdom.<sup>69</sup> At the same time, Barea also started to publish more journalistic texts in Madrid, for example ‘La caída de Bilbao’ in *Hoja del lunes* (Madrid, 21 June 1937), which was how the people of Madrid read about the event for the first time (1946b, 256). This, incidentally, was the printed version of a broadcast Barea had read the previous night as ‘La voz de Madrid’, authorised by Miaja against orders from Valencia (256). The Spanish Civil War did not only prompt Barea to broadcast and write, it also trained him in combining different methods and styles and addressing both local and international audiences. He learned his trade at the same time as he learned to produce himself across a complex institutional landscape of intellectual and cultural production, both nationally and transnationally.

One day before the Bareas left Spain through Barcelona on 22 February 1938, Barea signed a contract with Publicaciones Antifascistas de Cataluña for the publication of the Spanish manuscript of *Valor y miedo*. This book, containing ‘estampas de la

---

<sup>68</sup> Evidence suggests that other articles and short stories may have been sent abroad to be published. In Barea’s private archive there is a translation in English of the short story ‘Brandy’ with a censorship stamp of 1937 from the Spanish Foreign Press Office. As far as I have been able to find out, the story was first printed in 1940 in the wartime short story collection *Penguin Parade*.

<sup>69</sup> Brinton had written a book for the Republican Government’s publishing house in Britain, United Editorial, on the tolerance of the Republic towards Christianity (Brinton 1937). It seems plausible that it was through him that the short story ‘Heroine of the *Telefónica*’, appeared in the monthly magazine *Spain at War*, also published by United Editorial, in February 1939. Ilsa had acted as Brinton’s translator when the latter interviewed President of Basque Regional Government Aguirre, in Barcelona (Barea 1946b, 304–5).

guerra civil española’, was a compilation of short stories on the bravery (and fear) of the people in Madrid under the siege (‘Valor y miedo’ 1938). It was again local and international at once: the contract with the publishing house established that Publicaciones Antifascistas had the right to sell copies of the books to the Spanish state if it was deemed appropriate for propaganda purposes, in particular when sold on to Latin America (Contract 1938).<sup>70</sup> The Spanish ‘original’ version was only published in Spain in autumn 1938, when Arturo and Ilsa were already living in the Hotel Delambre in Paris. An advertisement that publicised the collection stated: ‘Así es la vida en las trincheras [...] Veinte capítulos de escenas vividas pintorescas y animadas de nuestra guerra por la independencia’ (‘Valor y miedo’ 1938). It would be the only time that the stories appeared in book form. If their use as propaganda had been hinted at in the contract already, the edition was published as a photobook, with each story accompanied by a photograph from the background material of the Republican propaganda services, some of which had been already used by the Foreign Press Office where Barea had worked and hence circulated internationally. For example, the cover photograph of the 1938 *Valor y miedo* edition also appeared on a cover of *Spain at War*, the Republican-supported magazine published in Britain.<sup>71</sup> The fact that at least on one occasion a short story in the collection – “La plaza de España” – seems to be responding to the photograph that accompanies the text rather than the other way around suggests that the photographs were widely circulated and reused for several purposes in accordance with propaganda objectives (Robles 2014, 113).

The stories have often been referred to as mere propaganda material written in the service of the Republic (Eaude 2009; Altisent 2003; Echevarría 2004). Yet Barea published and re-published many of them individually in newspapers and magazines over the years, and he would continue to do so well into the fifties, the last one appearing as late as 1955 in *El Territorio*, a regional publication in Rosario, Argentina. There is thus scope to contradict partially at least Michael Eaude’s idea

---

<sup>70</sup> Echevarría argues that the term ‘propaganda’ should not be used when referring to the short stories in *Valor y miedo*. She notes that Altisent, Eaude and Fernández-Gutiérrez all use the term pejoratively, and argues that the term ‘social’ should be used instead to refer to literature in service of a cause (2004, 41-42). My point is not to negatively qualify the stories as propaganda, but to note that a) they were used as such and b) Barea thought about his work partly as such. The relationship between the photographs and the texts indicate, however, a close relationship of *Valor y miedo* and official propaganda services (Robles 2014, 113)

<sup>71</sup> Copies of the photographs at the Biblioteca Nacional de España have stamps indicating their origin (Robles 2014, 113).

that Barea later rejected the short stories as propaganda without literary value (2011, 35). Certainly *Valor y miedo* can be considered a literary passport that would give Barea the opportunity to eventually publish *The Forge*. Whilst its market was still a niche in 1938, the subsequent developments of the war would make the stories appear increasingly relevant. If for nothing else, the book strengthened Barea's confidence as an author and helped him through the first months of exile. But as we have seen, the book is really only one part of a wide range of journalistic, literary and broadcasting activities that Barea engaged with through his work as a censor. Clearly, even the most difficult of situations, such as the Siege of Madrid, could provide a whole range of opportunities to connect with intellectuals and audiences in Spain and far beyond.

### **The French interlude: remembering Paris in Britain**

Relatively little is known about the Bareas' time in France. When the couple first arrived in Paris in February 1938, they seem to have had hopes of continuing with their propaganda work with the help of the Spanish Republican Embassy (1946b, 313),<sup>72</sup> but soon discovered that the Spaniards they met in 'official and semi-official departments were profoundly afraid of anything outside the sheltered official party line' (318). The Bareas' plan of doing freelance work was further complicated by what Barea later recalled as his lack of connections in Paris. Despite being given introductions to some leftist papers, Barea realized that it would be 'extremely difficult to break into the charmed circle of French literary sets without strong backing either by a party or else by one of the acknowledged writers. I knew that I would have neither' (318).

It is not clear how desperate the Bareas' situation in Paris really was, but certainly Arturo insisted later on painting the French interlude as a time of suffering to his British readership. Naturally, as John Neubauer (2014) has argued, not all situations of mass displacement, emigration and exile can be labelled as constructive encounters or were conducive to cultural exchange. Barea's criticism of the unwelcoming atmosphere in Paris is one of several critical voices of refugees who were there in 1938 and 1939, most notably Arthur Koestler, who left his own

---

<sup>72</sup> Mention is here made of e.g. Jaime Carner, the Counsellor at the Spanish Embassy (Barea 1946b, 313).

shocking account in *Scum of the Earth* (1941). During this period Paris became ‘overcrowded by foreigners, many of whom desperately tried to get residency permits or visas to go elsewhere’ (Neubauer 2014, 46). As the months went by, the Bareas faced ‘[d]egrading encounters with hatred of foreigners, with French bureaucracy and the equanimity of foreign embassies [which] yielded sagas of exiled life’ (46) such as the German writer Anna Seghers’ *Transit* (1944). With hindsight, Barea described the suspicion with which the French authorities, but also most of the average Frenchmen with whom he spoke, regarded foreigners and their plight, particularly Republican ‘red’ Spaniards.<sup>73</sup>

How isolated the Bareas really were during his time in Paris is still uncertain. Their correspondence certainly speaks to the contrary. It was in Paris that Arturo and Ilsa became good friends of the Polish writer Jean Malaquais – who had joined the POUM while in Spain and was secretary to André Gide, and who would at one point translate a few chapters of *The Forge* into French – and Etta Federn, the German anarchist writer. Arturo and Ilsa did manage to translate and have some work published. Ilsa wrote for *Le Populaire*, the organ of the socialist *Section Française de l'Internationale Ouvrière*, whose political editor was Léon Blum. In the meantime, some of Arturo’s short stories appeared in French, Swedish and Swiss papers, continuing his opening into the transnational public sphere. This small success led the couple to believe that ‘they had made people abroad read about the Spanish war just when they were getting tired of it’ (1946b, 313). One of the stories, ‘Argüelles’, was selected by *The Nouvelle Revue Française*, founded by the anti-communist French writer André Gide. For reasons that are unclear, however, it was never published.

Even within the circles close to the Bareas, there were tensions – It seemingly irritated Barea how other Austrian exiles, with whom Ilsa established contact effortlessly, seemed not to realize (except for the social democrat Karl Czernetz, who later came to lead the ‘London Bureau’ of the Austrian Socialists) that ‘international Socialism had lessons to learn from the case history offered by Spain’s bleeding body’ (318). The French ‘workers [...] were confused and uncertain’ and anything that Barea said ‘about the need to fight for one’s chances and for a better social order

---

<sup>73</sup> Barea recalls how after the French authorities had incarcerated the poet and Minister of the Generalitat Ventura i Gassols (1946b, 330). Barea’s testimony is used in *Outcast Europe: Refugees and Relief Workers in an Era of Total War 1936-48* (Gemie, Humbert, and Reid 2012, 43).

rang hollow' (321–22). As Barea insisted later, his relative isolation reduced his 'radius of action', but he felt that the alternative would be worse as it would compromise his 'independence of thought and expression in exchange for conditional support and help, and for a party label which would have been a lie' (318). Barea considered that his main purpose in writing was to 'make people abroad see and understand enough of the human and social substance of our war to realize how it linked up with their own latent but relentlessly approaching fight' (318). The best way to do this, Barea came to believe according to his own memoir, was not to continue to write short pieces, but to start work on a novel through which he could 'better understand what was happening to my people and to our world, if I uncovered the forces which made me, the single man, feel, act, blunder, and fight as I did' (318). Thus Barea, still in France, temporarily severed from the Spanish public but keen to reconnect with a wider audience that he had started to open up to, started writing *The Forge*.

This was not, it must be added, a moment of pure literary retreat. Barea was still trying to place his short stories of *Valor y miedo*, which effectively functioned as his first introduction to many international periodicals. For example, while in Paris, he gave copies of several stories to the journalist Geoffrey Cox, who managed to place one of them, 'Boots' (1939d), in Britain. On 7 November 1938, Barea received a letter from DC Benson and Campbell Literary Agents in London. Franz Borkenau had suggested that they get in touch with Barea to ask if he had any short stories suitable for the English market. Borkenau was an Austrian Jewish sociologist who had been an agent of the Comintern, the Communist International, and later became 'a 'Cold War Liberal' of Anglo-Saxon kind' (Fair-Schulz and Kessler 2011, 94) and instrumental in the formation of the anti-communist organization the Congress for Cultural Freedom. His book *The Spanish Cockpit*, published in London by Faber in 1937, had been highly praised by Orwell. Borkenau's recommendation proved a life-changer, inaugurating Barea's long relationship with his British literary agents, again illustrating the importance of personal links in Arturo's negotiations within the literary industry and the intellectual public sphere.

Eventually, fighting for Spain proved impossible from France. Barea would later construct in *The Clash* a narrative that inevitably took the couple towards a better exile in England. He recalled, for example, how as soon as he started writing *The*

*Forge* in Paris their fate seemed to change as they ‘had a windfall’ of great symbolic value: with a piece of hers, ‘Ilsa earned an English pound, worth 180 francs at the exchange rate of the week’ (1946b, 319). The Bareas were already at that moment thinking of accepting an invitation to go to England, probably made by their friend Kenneth Fairfax. Ilsa ‘talked of going there almost as if it were her home’ (322). By early 1939, Arturo and Ilsa felt that their time in France was over. As Arturo recalled, ‘if we wanted to live and fight, and not to rot and be hunted, we had to leave France. Get out of the trap. Go to England [...] to stay there, free. Not to Latin-America, for our war was fought in Europe. But away from this stench of decay’ (330). Despite this statement, also repeated by Ilsa some years later, there is evidence that the couple were actually planning on eventually going to Mexico, as so many other Spanish Republicans did. Barea was listed at the London Mexican Embassy’s ‘Lista de españoles que desean emigrar a México sin recursos’ as ‘Intelectuales. Escritor. UGT’ (País 2014).<sup>74</sup> This final trip to Mexico never happened, however. Arturo and Ilsa stayed in Britain for the rest of their lives, and Paris and Mexico plausibly became impossible places setting the stage for an inevitable exile in Britain.

The following section traces the difficulties the Bareas faced upon their arrival in Britain, not only in order to settle with their new status of refugees, but to find their place in the intellectual network of European exiles and British writers, all struggling to fit in the war of ink against fascism, and in the literary sphere.

### **Reaching a safe haven? The Bareas’ arrival in Britain**

When Arturo and Ilsa arrived in England on 13 February 1939, shortly before the recognition *de jure* of Franco’s Government by Britain on 27 February 1939, they did so as tourists with their Republican Spanish passports still valid.<sup>75</sup> The official invitation had come from their friend and Republican supporter Kenneth Fairfax (Fairfax 1939), but the move clearly involved others, namely Ilsa’s own brother Willy. They received 10 pounds from Willy and 10 pounds from ‘a friend’ and, as

---

<sup>74</sup> As the address given is ‘Brookholds Farms. Great Minder near Ware. Inglaterra’, the date must be 1939, within a few months of arriving.

<sup>75</sup> Ilsa had become Spanish by marriage with Arturo in 1938.

Arturo later wrote, ‘no nos detuvimos a pensarlo’ (1947c). Barea remembered this difficult period with gratitude towards the people that helped them:

Hasta que estalló la guerra la vida nos fue muy difícil aquí. Nuestra primera casa fue un cottage a medias con una mesa vieja, dos sillas viejas y un colchón y un somier nuevos y una colección de preciosos trabajos de carpintería elemental hechos por mí, desde una mesilla de noche elemental que aún conservo hasta una mesa de trabajo contra la ventana que aún conserva el inquilino que nos sustituyó. El dinero – en peniques – de vez en cuando; pero los ingleses se portaron magníficamente con nosotros, dándonos crédito para comer y para vivir. De vez en cuando publicábamos un artículo sobre España y tapábamos un agujero. (1947c)

During these months in the first half of 1939, the Bareas managed to establish themselves in England, but had to face the challenges that all refugees do: from finding housing to officially justifying their need to remain in the host country, to negotiating their place within the complex political and literary landscape of Britain in the months leading up to the Second World War. Despite all this the British context would indeed prove much more receptive to these two Spanish Republican exiles, their work and their conflictive relationship with communism, than France ever had. On the one hand, their connections to international supporters of the Republicans were stronger in Britain than in Paris. Clearly, the Austrian socialist network to which Ilsa was close was also important.<sup>76</sup> On the other, Franco’s victory, but also the fact that Britain received fewer Republican exiles than France, meant that the Bareas’ estrangement from Spanish officialdom would not present such an impediment to their work as had apparently happened in France. This being said, the beginnings were far from easy. Barea recalled in a letter to Charles Duff, how when they first arrived in Britain they went to see him to offer their collaboration:

Estábamos interesados en todos los que trabajaban a favor de España y queríamos hacer contactos. Desgraciadamente, parece que no somos bastante ortodoxos en ninguna iglesia o capilla española y la visita a usted fue tan inútil como muchas otras que por aquel tiempo hicimos. [...] Y lo sentimos

---

<sup>76</sup> These documents (mostly in German), as well as the translation of Barea’s texts into other languages and Ilsa’s work and personal relations with her family, are outside the scope of this thesis – mainly due to the linguistic challenge for me, but surely merit more attention and study to underscore the international dimension of their work and relationships in exile.

mucho realmente; porque estimábamos mucho el trabajo que usted venía realizando, casi como una voz en el desierto en defensa de la España democrática.<sup>77</sup> (1941a)

At their arrival, Ilsa contacted many of the British intellectuals the couple had met in Madrid during the Spanish Civil War. As not only refugees, but political exiles, they felt the need to explain to their former comrades their conflict with the Republican government. This posed fewer problems in England than they initially thought, with reactions generally revealing considerable pragmatism. Labour MP Ellen Wilkinson wrote to them that she ‘had seen too much behind the scenes? among émigrés to take the slightest notice of all these accusations of deep dark treacheries’ (Wilkinson 1939a). Sefton Delmer seems to not have taken the internal Republican struggles all too seriously either when he wrote that ‘I gather you are both unpopular with the comrades which is too bad!’.<sup>78</sup> If Ilsa was worried that their situation might have lost them friends, Labour MP Ernest Marklew assured her that ‘[n]othing makes any difference to our comradeship and friendship. Nothing can lessen our admiration and gratitude for all you have done and suffered for your class and ours’ (Marklew 1938). Some others took a harder stance against the Bareas’ foes, but tellingly the most explicit voice was that of John Dos Passos from the United States. Barea had written to him, sending him a copy of *Valor y miedo* and asking him for help with publishing in the US.<sup>79</sup> In May 1939, Dos Passos wrote back:

les felicito a los dos por haber escapado del naufragio y seguir trabajando – eso es lo importante. Tenemos que escapar de todos los naufragios y seguir trabajando. Eso es la decadencia – es mejor decir la putrefacción del Partido Comunista abajo (sic) el influjo de la mentalidad policial rusa, es la mayor tragedia de nuestros días. Ha paralizado la resistencia de todo [lo] que hay renovador de libertad y de independencia personal en las clases obreras e intelectuales. (1939)

Many in Britain simply expressed their happiness at learning that the couple were alive. The Labour MP and Soviet sympathiser Denis Pritt wrote to Ilsa: ‘I heard of

---

<sup>77</sup> It is interesting to note that Barea’s short story ‘La Telefónica’ appeared in the last issue of *Spain at War* in March 1939. Barea never spoke about this with Duff and did not keep a copy of it in his papers, so it is possible that he may not have known about it.

<sup>78</sup> Letter from Sefton Delmer to Ilsa, 8 May 1939. Barea Archive.

<sup>79</sup> Dos Passos visited Arturo and Ilsa in September 1941.

you from time to time when you were in Madrid, as I was of course in close contact with many friends (Fischer, José Pérez, and others higher up) and have often thought of you' (Pritt 1939a). Many of these contacts would prove essential for the Bareas. It would be Pritt, for example, who would help them extend their initial three-month residency permit in May 1939 (Pritt 1939).

The Bareas' network of former comrades and friends helped them settle in the UK at many levels, from supporting them formally and financially and finding them accommodation, to introducing them to editors and finding them jobs. An example of the range of help they would get from the (otherwise somewhat resented) Ellen Wilkinson can be found in one of her many letters from that period:

Anne Gimminham [editor of *Time and Tide*, for whom Ilsa started writing notes on Spain shortly after, ENM] has been away this weekend, but I will get in touch with her during the week. With regard to the BBC, I rang up the man concerned. The pressure on that job is terrific. I don't think I would build on it if I were you as it is much more likely to go to a Right-wing Spaniard, called in this country 'non-political'. I have a Persian rug that you can have for the cottage if you like until you get something better [...] How are you off for pots? I seem to have so many more than I need and could send some along with the carpet. And don't talk nonsense about starving. I think you are a plucky woman. I am not a millionaire and I have lots of people I am helping at the moment, but I don't let my friends starve. (Wilkinson 1939b)

Among the help they received, that given by readers and scouts of publishing houses, not necessarily just writers, was essential for their promotions as writers. At times, though, their situation seemed desperate, even to their friends. Eric Monschaber, a translator and the husband of Viking Press reader Gwenda Davies, who was trying to place *The Forge* in the US, wrote in June 1939 that he had been thinking about what they could do 'to alleviate [their] present crisis'. It would seem like Arturo's situation during these months was worse than Ilsa's, or as Monschaber would put it 'you [Arturo], of course, are at any rate for the time being a bigger problem than Ilse [sic]' (1939). Arturo's ill-health – involving shellshock derived from his lengthy exposure to the bombings in Madrid and Barcelona – along with his very poor English did little to help.

Staying in Britain did not only depend on the help of left-wing supporters of the Republic, but formally on the British government.<sup>80</sup> The Bareas had not entered the country as refugees but as tourists, and changing their status proved yet another struggle for which help from their acquaintances in official posts would be of paramount importance. On several occasions, the Bareas had to explain and justify their need to remain in Britain. Arturo wrote to the Home Office in May 1939 to renew their residency permits, invoking several reasons for needing to stay in England, the most important being the couple's literary careers, now in relation to British public interest. Barea explained how both he and Ilsa were in negotiations to publish important novels, *The Forge* and *Ordeal by Bombs*, respectively:

Both these negotiations in England and the preparation for English translations for those books require the presence of the undersigned and his wife in England for an indefinite time, but not less than till the end of this year. (1939c)

The Bareas were invoking their symbolic capital as writers as a form of recognition to be granted refugee status to stay in Britain. Barea also invoked his ill-health, in fact spelling out that he was 'recovering from the consequences of shell shock suffered in the early stages of the Spanish War' and in 'need to recuperate fully' (1939c). The residency was granted in August 1939 under the condition of not entering 'any employment, either paid or unpaid, while in the United Kingdom' (Home Office 1939). Luckily for them, this particular clause did not apply to certain jobs, particularly if felt to be in the national interest. The restriction did not 'debar them from broadcasting for the BBC, writing books or articles, or doing technical or other translations' (Pritt 1939b). Here was the perfect niche for them, in continuity with what they had been doing in Madrid and Paris, and in connection with the needs of the British publishing and broadcasting trade. In a matter of very little time, they would be doing all three.

As shown by the hundreds of letters exchanged with editors and literary agents during this early period, Arturo and Ilsa were both actively trying to publish short

---

<sup>80</sup> On the difficult situation refugees faced in proving their value to the host society see Rickett 2014, 49-86.

stories and articles on Spain.<sup>81</sup> And yet there was a major obstacle precisely at that moment in terms of the publishing landscape: from the end of the Spanish conflict on 1 April to the beginning of the Second World War on 1 September 1939, the European public seems to have been saturated with wartime stories in general and the Spanish Civil War in particular – despite or perhaps precisely because the Munich Pact of 1938 had ‘created an intense war-consciousness’ (Ellis 2014, 12). This general mood has been termed the ‘1939 state’, described as a ‘war on nerves’ and a ‘climate of anxiety, suspense and speculation’ (Ellis 2014, 1).<sup>82</sup> Barea’s recollection in *The Clash* (324) of how the French wanted to believe that another war might be avoided mirrors the tension that writers (and the general population) in Britain felt between the immediate relief, following the Munich agreement, of avoiding war on the one hand and the belief that Chamberlain’s appeasement was merely a deferral and ‘morally and politically wrong’ on the other (Leonard Woolf cited in Ellis 2014, 4).

The conjuncture was not favourable, but the fundamental conditions for a continuation of Barea’s work did exist: there may have been opposition and a certain momentary apathy, but even then there was the potential for receptivity. The main objectives of Spanish Republican propaganda efforts in Britain during the Civil War had been to counter the British government’s option for a non-interventionist stance that, all too often, would prove to be favourable to the Francoists rebels. Non-intervention was a natural consequence of the political, commercial, social and often personal connections between the latter and parts of the British conservative elites, who had been concerned particularly about the fall of the Spanish monarchy in 1931 (Buchanan 1993, 19). It has also been argued that, despite or perhaps even because of being exposed to images of Spanish war atrocities, a majority of British newspaper readers opted for neutrality and even indifference (García 2007, 672–73). British public opinion often thought that ‘the bloody conflict was the result of a peculiar historical development and national character, quite distinct from the British ones if not totally opposite to them’ (Moradiellos 2002, 12). And even when the public was not indifferent, when it was moved by the wartime sufferings, the

---

<sup>81</sup> Evidence of their work keeping up-to-date with events in Spain can be found in the archive in the form of correspondence, but also in clips from Spanish and British Newspapers such as *El Heraldo de Aragón*, *Ya*, *Arriba España*, *The Times* and the *Daily Herald*, among others.

<sup>82</sup> Coined by E.M. Foster in his essay ‘The state of 1939’, the term encapsulates a turning point and a period in itself within the literary landscape in Britain (Ellis 2014, 1–2).

tendency towards neutrality would prompt them not much further than to donate for medical aid, which ‘suited the non-committed majority’ (Shelmerdine 2006, 153).

On the other hand, urban working classes, left-wing parties and engaged intellectuals had supported the Republic actively throughout, either by participating in the International Brigades (2,762 British volunteers), by aiding and supporting the cause of the Republicans in Britain, or by using the printed word, photography and art as weapons in what they believed to be an international cultural war (V. Cunningham 1980, 33). Polls by the British Institute of Public Opinion suggest that the support in Britain for the Spanish Republicans had indeed increased from 57% in March 1938 to 72% in January 1939 (Shelmerdine 2006, 173–74). It was just specifically during the first half of 1939 that editors in both France and Britain felt the general public did not want to read about war, despite the fact that it was probably all that anyone thought about. Barea later recalled how Munich had ‘destroyed Spain’s last hope’ and ‘nobody wanted to hear about anything Spanish’ (1946b, 324, 328). Barea was worried that even after finishing his first draft of *The Forge* his ‘contribution to the battle would be futile’ (328). He thought that the novel might never ‘reach and touch people who wanted to hide from their fears and from their awareness of the social rift within their own world’ (328). The disappointments about the defeat of the Spanish Republic and the French Popular Front were fading into the prospects of a wider conflict with Germany. In January 1940 Orwell wrote that ‘it is very nearly the close-season for this class of Spanish war-book’ (Orwell 2001, 335). Whilst the Bareas were receiving help from supporters of the Republican cause, editors and publishers – even the pro-Republican ones – were still constrained in their decisions by readers and public opinion.

Indeed, during their early exile in France and Britain, literary agents had advised that it was ‘better not to use a war background entirely as you limit your market’ (DC Benson and Campbell 1938), and magazines such as *The Spectator* and *Lilliput* rejected several of Barea’s wartime stories on the grounds of them being ‘too sombre for a time like this’ (Harris 1939) or too serious for a publication that used materials ‘either humorous or on some very general controversial matter’ (Jackson 1939). In the US, Dos Passos also believed that it would be hard to find a publisher for *Valor y miedo*, though he felt that he could perhaps persuade his publishing house, Harcourt, Brace & Company, to take on *The Forge*. This difference was most probably due to

the fact that the latter was a novel about Spain in a more general way, and not specifically about the Civil War ('mais non de la guerre d'Espagne dont tout le monde est saturé'), as Barea's French agent Denyse Clairouin pointed out in May 1939 (Clairouin 1939).

The Bareas were nonetheless set on writing about the Spanish conflict for an international audience. Ilsa succeeded in publishing articles and Arturo a pair of short stories on the Spanish war before the onset of World War Two. Ilsa's reports – often under the penname Isabel Martínez or signed as a 'correspondent recently in Spain' – and some unsigned notes on the situation in Spain appeared in liberal and left-wing papers such as the *Daily Herald*, *Time and Tide* and the *New Statesman and Nation*.<sup>83</sup> But despite the support of these magazines for the Republican cause, it often happened that only a few details of Ilsa's materials were used. Sometimes Spain was left out altogether. The archival correspondence shows that editors' priorities, even when they supported the Spanish cause, were not always coincidental with Spanish Republican exiles' anti-Francoist struggle. In August 1939, the editor of the *New Statesman* wrote to Ilsa that '[t]he Spanish situation is of course urgent and I should like to have an article on it, but there are so many urgent situations and too much as it is in the paper about foreign affairs' (Martin 1939).

Such rejections – the archive documents many of them – should not obscure the point though that Ilsa and Arturo were in fact slowly feeling the pulse of the British publishing trade and gaining a profile as writers and journalists. Even minor successes could lead to other publications. In the letter just quoted, the editor of the *New Statesman* Kingsley Martin also told Ilsa that the Yale Review in the US was looking for the author of one of her anonymous pieces printed in the *New Statesman*. Even more significantly, the rejections seem to have led to the writing of one of Arturo's most frequently referenced articles: 'A Spaniard in Hertfordshire'. Published in *The Spectator* in the midst of the 'state of 1939', 'A Spaniard in Hertfordshire' describes a rural town in England as seen by a Spanish refugee. As we will see in chapter 5, it is a clear sign that Barea was in the process of successfully

---

<sup>83</sup> She wrote for the *Daily Herald*, in which she had published articles such as 'Generals at Bay' (10 August 1939) and 'Bull Fight but no Bread' (16 August 1939). The *New Statesman and Nation* will appear from now on as the *New Statesman*.

adapting to the context and demands of writing in Britain already in August 1939.<sup>84</sup> The main point at present is that it is set not in Spain, but in ‘England at its quietest’ (Forster 1969, 199): a rural England serving as a refuge not only for the foreigner who has seen war, but also for the English who were still hoping to escape it.

Soon after their arrival in England, Ilsa also started campaigning to bring her parents over to Britain, quite possibly yet another reason for the couple to stay in Europe instead of fleeing to Mexico. A socialist of Jewish descent, Ilsa’s father Victor Pollak and his wife urgently needed to escape Austria after the German annexation in March 1938. Because refugees to Britain had to be supported by a benefactor, Henry Brinton, the Anglican and Republican supporter who had acted temporarily as their agent was asked to undertake ‘full financial responsibility’ for Ilsa’s parents (I. Barea 1939a). The Pollaks eventually made it to England just days before the beginning of the war.

### **Finding a place for the Spanish Civil War in Britain during the Second World War**

Given how difficult things were in 1939, how could the Second World War become an opportunity and a new beginning for the Bareas once it broke out? Barea recalled in a letter to Jean Malaquais in 1947 how

[a]l estallar la Guerra, las cosas cambiaron. Ilsa, una semana antes de la declaración obtuvo una plaza en el Monitoring Service de la BBC y diez meses después yo conseguí que me dieran un cuarto de hora en el programa para Latino-America [sic] cada quince días. Esto nos solucionó totalmente el problema económico de los cuatro. [...] Y como cuando las cosas comienzan a enderezarse, se enderezan tan rápidamente como se tuercen, fui publicando más artículos y al fin encontré editor para mis libros y me he ido convirtiendo en una figura literaria. (1947c)

Indeed, Ilsa started working for the Monitoring Service at the BBC as many other European exiles, as a polyglot contributing to the war effort by listening to, transcribing and translating foreign broadcasts – first in Spanish, and eventually also

---

<sup>84</sup> The piece was praised as ‘charming’ by the magazine which re-published an abridged version of it in the last issue of *Synopsis* (1939), a publication interrupted by the war.

in other languages including German – for the Overseas Intelligence Department until the end of the Second World War. It was here that she met fellow exiled ‘monitors’ such as the art historian Ernst Gombrich, the publisher George Weidenfeld, and the dramaturg Martin Esslin, all Austrians (Esslin with a Hungarian background) who became part of the couple’s circle of friends (Gillespie and Nieto McAvoy 2017).

During those early days of the war, Barea wrote that ‘la noticia de la Guerra, aunque esperada me ha producido un choque intenso de disgusto y un poco de nerviosismo, pero no demasiado’ (2000, 687). He felt restless in Pukerdige and wanted to work at the BBC, too, to be close to Ilsa and because ‘realmente creo que podría ser útil y aquí no hago nada’ (2000, 687). As pointed out by Buchanan (Buchanan 2007, 179), September 1939 ‘came as a release for many antifascists’ who during the previous months had had to come to terms with the defeat of Republican Spain but also the refusal of the British and French governments to offer help.<sup>85</sup> Now at last Britain was at war against the principal fascist power, and the Spanish Civil War could be brought up again with the objective of teaching the British public some ‘Practical Lessons’. An article with that precise title was suggested by Barea to *Time and Tide* in October 1939 (Ann Gimmingham 1939). Although it was not accepted, Barea soon had the opportunity to give some ‘practical lessons’ in first aid to his own neighbours in Pukeridge: ‘Ayer y anteayer tuve que hacer de profesor y aquí me tienes dando explicaciones ¡¡en inglés!! sobre la manera de hacer vendajes y transportar heridos, porque hasta ahora no tenemos ningún técnico fuera del vicario y de mí’ (2000, 686).

With the beginning of the Second World War Barea also thought that his short stories from *Valor y miedo* could be revived. Having ‘feared there would be little chance for a collection of short stories on the English-American market’ he now thought that ‘perhaps the war might make sketches of ordinary’s people’s behaviour under bombs and shells of topical interest’ (1939f). Whilst publishing *Valor y miedo* in England as a book remained a chimera, as the war advanced short stories did

---

<sup>85</sup> According to Buchanan, many on the Left felt the memory of the Spanish conflict return, and Labour members such as Jeannie Lee and Aneurin Bevan, ‘pillars of the non-Communist left, celebrated the news by listening to Spanish Republican records that they had, until that point, been too ashamed to play’ (Buchanan 2007, 179). One of the more tangible consequences was the creation of the Local Defence Volunteers, later the Home Guard, by Wintringham in the summer and autumn of 1940, when Britain was most vulnerable to German invasion. For this he put into practice what he had learnt during the Spanish Civil War (182).

indeed become the privileged wartime literary format (Mengham 2009, 26). But how would he publish it in such well-established literary magazines as *Horizon*, *Penguin Parade* and even *Lilliput*, the latter of which had previously rejected his stories on the Spanish Civil War?<sup>86</sup> Genre seems to have been one key aspect. These magazines became literary references during the war, and short stories published therein deemed to be the best ways to reflect the ‘disruptions of the rhythm of everyday life and a profound sense of historical discontinuity’ and to convey the ‘shared experience of fragmentation, unpredictability and the psychological stress of having to live from moment to moment’ (Mengham 2009, 26). Fussell has argued that anthologies – including many of these magazines – responded to the need to survey the cultural heritage of the nation in order to answer the question ‘What are we fighting for?’ (Fussell 1990, 245). He has further argued that ‘the variety honoured by the anthologies was a way of taking an anti-totalitarian, anti-uniformitarian stance, a way of honouring the pluralism and exuberance of the ‘democratic’ Allied cause’ (245). Here was, then, finally a space in the British literary field for Barea’s work – a field commensurate in some ways with the literary logics of the Spanish Civil War.

Writing as a form of political action became for Barea, as for many Spanish Republican exiles, a prolongation of the Spanish chapter in the battle against fascism. Still in 1939, Barea had felt that ‘de la guerra y contra la guerra sí puedo escribir en este momento, pero cosas exclusivamente literarias me son casi imposibles’ (2000, 688). But as the war in Europe unfolded, he increasingly saw his work on his first novel as a direct response to it. By the time he reminisced in *The Clash* (written in 1944) about how he had finished the first draft of *The Forge* in Paris, he already claimed that ‘writing was to me part of action, part of our war against death and for life, and not just self-expression’ (1946b, 328).

Importantly, publishing explicit political articles about Spain depended on more than the general public’s interests. It was a sensitive issue in Britain because the government was keen to maintain Franco’s neutrality. Editors thus often engaged in a form of self-censorship, complying with official propaganda guidelines in order to

---

<sup>86</sup> ‘Brandy’ (from *Valor y miedo*), appeared in the middle-brow and pocket book little magazine *Penguin Parade* 7, the first to be published after the beginning of the war. Barea’s first piece of fiction written in Britain, ‘Kleptomania’, was published in *John O’ London’s Weekly*, a publication ‘for readers not ‘high-brow’, but eager to know their way amongst the masterpieces’, also described as ‘the leading literary magazine in the British empire’ (Waller 2006, 93) and ‘one of two British weeklies devoted to books’ (Holman 2008, note 189, 61). Both stories are short sketches about Madrid, giving accounts of how life was before and during the Spanish Civil War.

contribute to the war effort. The most basic issue at stake was that in a time of paper rationing controlled by the Government, publishers wished to make sure they could keep printing.<sup>87</sup> Ilsa thus kept writing notes on Spain for *Time and Tide*, but no signed political article of the Bareas appeared during the first months of the war.

Again, we can observe a remarkable confluence. As it remained difficult to publish in an openly polemic tone against Franco, but at the same time the new conflict increasingly provided a forum again for connections with the Spanish struggle, the Bareas understood that the best way forward would be to combine Arturo's experience in international propaganda and broadcasting with his talent for short literary pieces engaging with the issues of war in an apparently unpolitical tone preoccupied mainly with practicalities. The Bareas' proposal was to write a series of propaganda short stories – *charlas* – for the BBC Spanish Department: 'una crónica de guerra como esta, a través de la vida inglesa', in the style of his successful article 'A Spaniard in Hertfordshire'. Ilsa thus wrote on behalf of both to an editorial officer of the Overseas News Department, presenting the couple as 'writers and now refugees' and adding that they were experienced broadcasters in wartime Madrid. According to Ilsa, their work for *La voz de Madrid* had given them 'experiences on the requirements and tastes of the Spanish and South-American listeners' (I. Barea 1939b). It is worth quoting the full passage of the initial project here:

Our concrete proposal would be to give a series in Castilian, apart from the news bulletins, under the heading 'A Spaniard discovers England'. The reason is that there is in Spain an old popular conception of England, the English and the English methods which is very unfortunate, especially as it makes more easy the type of anti-British propaganda one finds nowadays in Spanish newspapers and even more so in the oral propaganda centring round the question of Gibraltar. *Now we do not suggest a series of political talks, but of features*, taking into account the popular prejudice and simply describing in a vivid, anecdotal and personal manner the impression of a Spaniard of England, especially its rural life, landscape, then of the liberal traditions, democratic traditions, and so on (non-political of course). [...] Equally, causeries of this type would be, in our opinion, effective for the

---

<sup>87</sup> In order for Barea's writings to reach the public, censorship had to be passed (for an overview, see (Holman 2008).

Hispanic-American public which is mostly fed on similar sketches from Germany and Italy. (I. Barea 1939b)

Ilsa's letter was left with no response. In August 1940 Barea was rejected again by the Spanish Service, even though by that time the service acknowledged that he seemed 'to be something of an artist', and Faber was going to publish a novel of his, *The Forge* ('Internal Memo of the BBC' 1940). Apparently, Barea was now proposing to write a story with 'a Spanish Civil War background', but this was considered 'too ticklish a subject at present, despite its topical value' (1940). The BBC was indeed in a difficult position when hiring Spanish Republican exiles, as while acting in the national interest, it was also preoccupied with not losing its credibility (Monferrer Catalán 2007, 397–342). The Foreign Office – on which the BBC depended – had a policy of maintaining diplomatic relations with Franco to ensure the neutrality of Spain. The broadcasters at the Spanish service were constantly performing a balancing act as they had to criticize Germany and Italy while not mentioning the situation in Spain. And even so, complaints by the Duke of Alba, the new Spanish ambassador in London, were so frequent that increasingly the most politically active Spanish Republicans went to work for the Latin American Service (398–99). Most of them used pennames to prevent retaliation against their families in Spain, and to avoid diplomatic conflict. It was precisely here that Barea was to start broadcasting in October 1940.

Under such circumstances it is not surprising that Ilsa's letter to the BBC spelled out the idea of 'non-political writing' twice in the same paragraph – in fact Ilsa was probably following Ellen Wilkinson's note quoted above on how jobs at the BBC were usually given to 'non-political' Spaniards (Wilkinson 1939b). Equally important in late 1939 and 1940 was for the couple to clarify their background regarding communism. In December 1939, Ilsa and Arturo wrote to the Home Office to request a permanent permit to reside in Britain on the grounds of the importance of Ilsa's employment at the Monitoring Service and their literary work, explaining how they would not, by any means, 'become a burden to the community' (1939g). Barea had to explain that his positions had changed since entering the country, especially since the change of government in Spain, which had rendered his return impossible because of his work for the Republican Government.

In addition, I had written and published a book in Spain, of no uncertain anti-Fascist tendency [...] Both my civil servant and literary activities in Spain and outside the country make it clear that I must be considered hostile to the present regime in Spain, and an active adherent to the Allied Cause. This is emphasized by the fact that my wife is not Spanish by birth, and is well-known for her anti-Fascist Social-Democratic activities before her coming to England. (1939g)

But perhaps most importantly, he inserted the following statement into the former passage:

You will realise from this that my return to Spain would be out of the question, in spite of the fact which must be known to the Spanish Authorities that both I and my wife were threatened by the Communist faction of the Republican Government. (1939g)

Arturo and Ilsa officially positioned themselves to the British government as enemies of both fascism and communism. At one point, Arturo called Germany and the Soviet Union ‘fascistas los dos’ (2000, 682). They did, however, generally refrain during this time from voicing their anti-communism too loudly. On the one hand, there seems to have been an official position that meant that ‘writing about Russia is more or less taboo,’ as the ex-communist writer Freda Uitley told Ilsa (Uitley 1939). ‘Evidently’, as she further explained, ‘the idea is that Stalin can be separated from Hitler if we are very polite to him. What a hope!’ (1939). On the other, despite their differences with the communists, Ilsa and Arturo still believed in a Popular Front policy and in the fight against fascism taking precedence over internal conflicts.<sup>88</sup> Arturo’s parallel engagement in yet another battle, the one to publish *The Forge*, would go hand-in-hand with the couple’s progressive integration into the transnational London intelligentsia, and accompany their finding of a place of their own in the new landscape.

---

<sup>88</sup> When advised to leave Spain, Ilsa answered that ‘The only thing I can do for Spain now is not let people outside turn my case into a weapon against the Communists – not because I love the Communist Party, for I don’t, even when I work with Communists, but because it would at the same time be a weapon against our Spain and against Madrid’ (cited in Barea 1946b, 287).

### **How to publish in a foreign tongue: The battle for *The Forge***

As with the Parisian interlude, the story of Barea's fight to publish his first novel involves significant contradictions. Despite later claims to the contrary, the archival materials show that Arturo was trying to place *The Forge* in the international, not necessarily the British market in the beginning. The Bareas were, as mentioned, in the hands of UK literary agents DC Benson and Campbell even before they arrived in Britain, but the latter had sent a copy of the Spanish manuscript of *The Forge* to Putnam Publishers in New York, with whom Franz Borkenau had also spoken. The ties between American and British agencies, writers and publishing houses were tight, and publishing in America was held by British writers to be more profitable than in Britain. Putnam's reader was V.S. Pritchett, a British writer known for his work on Spanish themes (DC Benson and Campbell 1939). Barea had also contacted John Dos Passos, who was dealing with Harcourt, Brace & Company at the time, the American publishers of Sinclair Lewis, Virginia Woolf, T.S. Eliot, James Thurber and George Orwell. Gwenda David, the editorial representative and scout of The Viking Press of New York, became interested in publishing Barea's novel during a stay in London. She became a personal friend and, in her turn, recommended that the Bareas contact the French agent and translator, Denyse Clairouin, who soon agreed to try to place a French translation of *The Forge*. In October 1939, Arturo received yet another letter from Simon and Schuster in New York, saying that that they would love to publish *The Forge* and promising to write to 'Mr. [Maxim] Lieber telling him of our interest, in case John Dos Passos' publisher [i.e. Harcourt, Brace & Company] has decided against the book'.<sup>89</sup> Whilst this is the first time Lieber appears to be mentioned in the correspondence, later letters exchanged with Campbell and Benson suggest that this influential individual had actually become Ilsa and Arturo's agent before October 1938.

These intense early negotiations are evidently at odds with Arturo's explanatory introduction in the second volume of the trilogy, *The Track*, where he noted that he had written *The Forge* with the British public in mind (1943a, 1–3). How then did the book end up being published in Britain? Apparently, Maxim Lieber arranged publication of *The Forge* with Harcourt, Brace & Company, who were willing to

---

<sup>89</sup> They were also interested in a proposal made by Arturo of writing a book called *From War to War* (of which I have found no other reference), and in Ilsa's novel *La Telefónica* (Leiper 1939).

make a deal with Faber to share the expenses of the translation. In London, George Faber contacted Sir Peter Chalmers Mitchell, a socialist (and well-known Zoologist) who had lived in Spain and published with Faber an account of his own experiences during the Spanish Civil War, *My House in Malaga* (1938). Chalmers Mitchell was to translate the novel, as he had already done with Sender's *Counterattack*, published by Faber in 1937.<sup>90</sup> In fact, he even gave Barea the address of Sender in Mexico, whom he described as a 'great friend' of his (Chalmers Mitchell 1940), introducing the two Spanish writers to each other and triggering a long epistolary relationship between the two.<sup>91</sup> The book was finally edited by T.S. Eliot, who was a key figure in facilitating international cultural encounters through his role at Faber. *The Forge* was published for the first time in July 1941, within weeks of *Struggle* and soon after his review of Hemingway's novel in *Horizon* (May 1941). Clearly, Arturo was beginning to find his place and entering into an increasing number of dialogues with members of the cosmopolitan London intelligentsia.<sup>92</sup>

In 1944, Barea's *The Forge* was re-published by the book-club Reader's Union, which made already published books available to the public at a more affordable price. As explained in *The Spectator*, the objective was 'to give a second lease of life to books of merit which have not in the opinion of the promoters of Readers' Union, found the public which they deserve' (*The Spectator* 1937). Although *The Forge* had been translated anew by Ilsa, it was the first translation by Chalmers Mitchell that was sold by Faber to the Reader's Union. Barea's novel became immediately more widely circulated, consolidating his place in the literary sphere of Britain and among British readers. His relationship with British and other supporters of the Republic surely had helped him find a place among Left-wing intellectuals, but his work was now beginning to have an impact beyond this milieu and contributing to keep the Spanish question alive among a more general public. However, it was not only *The Forge* that contributed to this process, but his journalistic articles, his essay *Struggle for the Spanish Soul* and his literary criticism in *Horizon*. We need to go back to 1940 again to learn how this happened.

---

<sup>90</sup> Chalmers Mitchell also translated Sender's *Mr Witt Among the Rebels* (1937) and *Seven Red Sundays* (1938)

<sup>91</sup> Barea and Sender had never met while in Spain.

<sup>92</sup> As for T.S. Eliot's editorial impressions on these matters, little is known since all the extant proofs were sent and corrected by Chalmers Mitchell.

## **Becoming intellectuals of the British Left**

It seems that by 1940 the Bareas had started to balance their position within the British political arena. On the one hand, conservative officialdom, on which the couple depended for their protection as war exiles in a wartime Europe, would become their main source of income as they both aimed to and ended up working for the BBC. On the other hand, the political opposition and their network of British ex-fighters, newspaper correspondents, Labour MP's, editors, writers, all supporters of the Republicans during the Spanish Civil War, started providing the Bareas with their own platform to openly continue their battle against European fascism. This included invaluable financial and legal aid. As we will see in the following pages, these two apparently extreme ends of the spectrum were not as contradictory as one might expect. During the Second World War, explains John Rodden, the process by which the left-wing intellectuals de-radicalized was catalysed as they were given 'something productive to do *as intellectuals* – in the BBC the Ministry of Information, The War Office selection boards, military intelligence – and thereby *reintegrated* them into society and deepened their disenchantment with Left ideology' (Rodden 1990, 265). As Tosco Fyvel, Barea's editor and Orwell's friend, noted: 'Probably in no belligerent country had the intelligentsia volunteered so wholeheartedly as in England to serve the State at war' (1968, 49).

For Ilsa and Arturo, this situation of wartime cooperation with a state against a greater evil was not new. Nor did it unsettle their efforts to become more active in the publishing sphere. If Arthur Bryant had stated in 1934 that '[n]o one but a man of Left-wing views can hope for an opening in papers like the *New Statesman*, *Time and Tide*, *The Spectator*, *Manchester Guardian* and *News Chronicle*' (Stapleton 2001, 139), by the end of 1940, Barea had managed to publish in the three weekly journals of the list. It was in fact a combination of Barea's efforts and a change in the status of Spain in British foreign policy that put him at the right place at the right time. When Franco invaded Tangier in June 1940 (as the Germans entered Paris), for the first time in the war Spanish foreign policy became a matter of major concern to the British government. Suddenly, Barea was able to start publishing on the situation in Spain in connection with the war as a whole, particularly in *Time and Tide* and the *New Statesman*, two very highly regarded publications. Ilsa had stopped collaborating around the same time with those magazines due to her new work for

the Monitoring Service, and it was Arturo who took over, quickly becoming a regular contributor. The symbiosis in the couple's work is particularly evident in this shift – not to mention that Ilsa would still translate into English the articles written by Arturo in Spanish. These political articles are perhaps the best example of how, but also under what specific circumstances, a Spanish Republican Exile could begin to participate in a Second World War antifascist discourse in favour of the Allies while criticising not only Franco's Spain, but also British policies of appeasement towards it (see chapters 3 and 4).

*Time and Tide* was a female-run political periodical funded in 1920 by the Welsh suffragette Margaret Mackworth, 2<sup>nd</sup> Viscountess Rhondda, who was still the editor in 1940. Its feminist views, which had been progressively leaning towards the right in the interwar years, gave way during the war to a clear Antifascist stance, hitting a circulation of around 30,000 copies a week (Beddoe 2004). During the Spanish Civil War already, *Time and Tide* had been openly pro-Republican, albeit like most British media advocating a non-intervention policy. Towards the end of the Spanish conflict, the weekly had shifted slightly its editorial line towards supporting intervention in Spain. Ilsa had started writing notes on Spain upon their arrival, though the editors' support for the Spanish cause had often suffered external pressures, as happened earlier in 1939 when *Time and Tide* was reluctant to use an article Ilsa had sent on 'Spanish-Morocco' because they did not 'know what the Editor will feel about it now. Censorship, etc. is going to make things rather difficult' (Time and Tide 1939). A year later, Franco's invasion of Tangier served as the trigger and catalyst for Arturo's most prolific period of political writings on Spain. In the autumn of 1940, an article by Arturo titled 'Spaniards and Morocco' (12 October 1940)<sup>93</sup> was finally published, followed on a monthly basis by titles such as 'West of Gibraltar' (16 November 1940), 'Spaniards at Home' (London: 28 December 1940), 'Hispanity' (London: 1 February 1941) and 'Tangier' (London: 29 March 1941). These pieces summarize Barea's ideas on Franco's imperial ambitions in the Strait of Gibraltar, in the North of Africa and in Latin America, and thus prepared the ground for the longer development of such themes in his political essay, *Struggle for the Spanish Soul*, as well as the second volume of the trilogy, *The Track* (see chapter 3). These articles also became popular among Spanish Republican exiles in Britain. Catalan

---

<sup>93</sup> The invoice for the article erroneously says 'Spaniards in Menorca'.

Republican editor and owner of The Dolphin Bookshop in London, Joan Gili – who became Barea’s friend and lifetime provider of Spanish books –, mentioned in a letter that he had been reading and enjoying for some time his articles in *Time and Tide* (Gili 1941). The ex-ambassador of the Republic in Britain Pablo Azcárate wrote to Barea in 1940 that ‘[t]odo cuanto Ud. dice sobre lo que es y significa Marruecos para los españoles me parece justo y acertado. Y muy oportuno llamar sobre ello la atención de la opinión pública inglesa’ (Azcárate 1940).

Also in 1940-41, Barea contributed a number of articles to the *New Statesman*. This publication – ‘the weekly journal of the intellectual left in England’ (Deli 1985, 262) – had been founded in 1913 by Beatrice and Sidney Webb, who ‘hoped to influence the [Labour] movement from within’ with projects like this magazine or the London School of Economics, which they also instituted (Smith 1996, 4). The weekly’s editor during the 30s and 40s, Kingsley Martin, was particularly controversial because of his relatively uncritical position towards Stalinism. During the late thirties, as the purges in Russia were taking place, Martin started to distance himself from Stalinism in his articles while still supporting a Popular Front policy for Britain (Deli 1985, 262). Nonetheless, the periodical did incorporate dissident voices as its collaborators, such as George Orwell, who felt an open antagonism towards Kingsley Martin, particularly as the latter refused to publish an article by the former on his experience in Barcelona during May 1937. During the Spanish Civil War, the *New Statesman* and its editor had been clearly pro-Republican, but supported a weak non-intervention policy and refrained from openly criticising British policies for fear of a greater European war (Deacon 2008, 165). Since their arrival in England, Ilsa and Barea had been welcomed and supported by Martin, as one can read from their correspondence, and the situation in Franco’s Spain was denounced in the weekly’s pages on a regular basis. Ilsa started contributing to the magazine in May 1939. She wrote some feature articles and sent notes on Spain for the editors to use in their editorials and comments. Barea’s first article for the *New Statesman* was ‘The Men Who Walk in the Streets’ (1940g), followed by two articles on ‘Spanish Catholicism’ (1941).

**A true member of the non-communist Left: writing *Struggle for the Spanish Soul***

One of the most important consequences of Barea's early journalistic work was his collaboration with George Orwell and Tosco Fyvel, the editors of the *Searchlight Books* series where he would publish *Struggle for the Spanish Soul*.<sup>94</sup> The publisher Fredric Warburg had contacted Barea in November 1940 after reading 'Men who walk in the Streets' in the *New Statesman* and remembering 'the excellence' of *The Forge* (which, in fact, he had wanted to publish before losing his bet against Faber). With that article Barea had struck at the heart of many intellectuals' position in a time of uncertainty in which the chances of Britain winning the war were not clear. As Costello put it,

many intellectuals on the anti-Stalinist Left, in the months between Dunkirk and Pearl Harbor, including the publisher and editors of *Searchlight Books*, were convinced that Britain faced certain defeat at the hands of the Germans unless it could renew itself through a radical transformation of its political and social structure. (1989, 258)

'The Men who Walk in the Streets' (1940g) encapsulated what leftist intellectuals thought Britain needed at this time: a motive for joining in the 'people's war' for democracy and against fascism. The *Searchlight* editors themselves defended a 'collective effort to help save Britain from both the Germans and the country's own plutocratic, class-ridden, obsolete institutions' (Costello 1989, 258). Drawing on the Spanish Civil War for examples – both to criticise British appeasement and non-intervention policies and to praise the fight of the popular masses – was something a number of writers on the Left, not least of all Orwell, continued to do during the forties. It was only logical that Warburg, Orwell and Fyvel wished to discuss with Barea the possibility of writing a long political essay on 'Spain, North Africa and Spanish America and their role in the world to-day' (Warburg 1940a). Barea was told that the editors 'shall be very glad to have the subject of Spain so expertly represented in our series, since we believe that very little objective and original writing on Spain has seen the light, despite the flood of books on the subject during the last few years' (Warburg 1941).

---

<sup>94</sup> From here on, the essay *Struggle for the Spanish Soul* will be referred mostly as *Struggle*.

Barea wrote *Struggle* during the late months of 1940 and early 1941 (it appeared in July 1941) in a very clear effort to adapt to his British readership. If Spain's gradual but steady shift from a government 'between a conservative dictatorship and a Catholic Fascism' (1940i), which seemed to appease the British government, to a full-blown fascist regime was not enough to convince the British public of the need to act against Franco, Spain's imperial ambitions, starting with Gibraltar and Morocco, were now beginning to support Barea's stance. Barea did not hesitate to accept the proposal, whilst also expressing concern about how exactly to develop his arguments. He asked, for example, 'whether you want it in the form of an analytical study of the situation, or whether you want a popular account of this problem which is so little known in England for the man in the street' (1941m). Warburg advised Barea to write a 'popular account of the problem... [which] should be written as simply and attractively as possible with as much personal touch and characterization as you are able to give it' (1940b). Barea later sent a synopsis of the essay, which was going to be entitled *Falangist Spain*, and which he would 'of course, put in a narrative and often personal form, with as many anecdotes to illustrate it as possible in a relatively short book' (1940h).

The text was conceived as a 'sociological and political essay' in the form of a short book (Barea, n.d.). It partakes of what Sebastiaan Faber (2002, 96) has identified as the *perlocutionary* and Manichean discursive tendencies of the discourses of the Spanish Civil War and exile, i.e. their persuasive nature and their propensity to present the conflict between Republicans and Francoists as 'a battleground between Democracy and Fascism, Communism and Catholicism, Innovation and Tradition, Civilization and Chaos' (Kenwood 1993, 30–31). But it was also constrained by its immediacy and topicality, with the text fluctuating between political analysis and pamphlet literature. It was written in a very particular context – begun under or just after the Battle of Britain that raged from June to the end of October 1940 –, with a particular purpose – to increase the public's wartime morale whilst linking the British and Spanish Antifascist struggles – and aimed at a very specific audience – a middle-brow Leftist British reader.

Again, Barea was working with the right genre. Orwell explained in 1941 that '[o]ne development of the last ten years has been the appearance of the 'political book', a sort of enlarged pamphlet combining history with political criticism, as an important

literary form' (1970, 101), particularly relevant in a time of war and 'political passions' in which the pamphlet became an ideal form for 'plugging the holes in history' (198). In this sense, Barea's text, as well as the other books in the *Searchlight* book series, could be regarded as sharing the same benefits and constraints of other wartime pamphlet-books. One of the main characteristics of the pamphlet is its immediacy: 'the essence of pamphleteering', Orwell argued, 'is to have something you want to say *now*, to as many people as possible' (198). The *circa* 40,000 words of Barea's essay were indeed originally written in just a month, but delays in the printing due to, among other things, the destruction of the typescript and first proof by enemy action prompted Barea to keep re-writing different chapters in order to keep it 'topical and fool-proof against further developments' (1941m). In May 1941, Barea wrote to Warburg to express his hope that he would 'be able to get it printed very quickly now, as the book is of the kind that would not bear much further delay without losing much of its strength, although I believe that its analytical parts will continue to be both relevant and interesting even when political events have caught up with its prognosis' (1941k). Indeed, by the time the book was under discussion for an American reprint in the following winter, it was already perceived as being past its best moment: in the US they could not 'see their way to publishing it at present', though it was also felt that 'Spain is likely to loom big again in the public mind and that when that moment comes your book should meet a real need' (Warburg 1942).

But perhaps most importantly for Barea, working on a *Searchlight* volume brought him close to three key figures of the non-communist Left intelligentsia, George Orwell, Tosco Fyvel and Fredric Warburg. Warburg owned the publishing house Secker and Warburg which, since its foundation in 1935, had published works by Thomas Mann, H. G. Wells, André Gide and George Orwell. The firm was known to be radical, but also as anti-communist as it was anti-fascist, and hence in opposition to people like Victor Gollancz (Fyvel 1982, 95–96). It was with Warburg that Orwell published *Homage to Catalonia* after Gollancz, his previous publisher, refused to publish the book on ideological grounds, believing that Orwell's attack on communism did not benefit the Popular Front in which Gollancz firmly believed. Orwell's *The Lion and the Unicorn: Socialism and the English Genius* was the first book in the *Searchlight* series, published in February 1941, and sold more than

10,000 hardbacks. Warburg estimated the readership at about 50,000 and claimed that ‘it contributed significantly to the change of public mind in Britain which [eventually] brought the Labour Party to power in 1945’ (Rodden 2002, 44). According to Fyvel, in this strangely optimistic book Orwell captured a historical moment, ‘a patriotic English socialist moment – a moment in that dramatic year when England gathered herself from what seemed imminent defeat by Hitler’ (1982, 111).

The other editor of *Searchlight* books was Tosco R. Fyvel (or Raphael Joseph Feiweil). Born in Cologne to Jewish parents from Belarus and Moravia, he was a journalist and writer who had published with Warburg a book on Palestine in 1938. Together the editors believed that the communists had too much influence on the public opinion through Gollanzc’s Left Book Club and thought that they should warn readers of ‘Stalin’s own despotic gigantic rule’ and, crucially, the negative influence of the communists during the Spanish Civil War (97). All three were well-known anti-communists, Warburg and Fyvel later becoming members of the Congress for Cultural Freedom during the Cold War. The series was advertised as ‘the most important [new series] for 1941’, and said to ‘serve as an arsenal for the manufacture of mental and spiritual weapons needed for the crusade against Nazism’ (Costello 1989, 257). The objective of the essays was to

criticize and kill what is rotten in Western civilization and supply constructive ideas for the difficult time ahead of us. The series [...] will stress Britain's international and imperial responsibilities and the aim of a planned Britain at the head of a great and freer British Commonwealth and linked with the United States of America as a framework of world order. The books will be written in simple language without the rubber-stamp political jargon of the past. They will seek to appeal to the new generation which is fighting this war whether on the battlefields or in the factories and to all those who can recognize the spirit of the new world prospects which are opening before us. (257)

This editorial venture can thus be seen as a precursor of a ‘third-force’ politics to which we shall come back at the end of this thesis (chapter 5). This said, the statement above can also be read with hindsight as foreshadowing the pro-democracy discourse of the Cold War period. A new imperialism, for example, does

not seem to be in contradiction here with socialist humanism according to the logic of the narrative, despite the editors' criticism of British colonialism. The Atlantic alliance is clearly stated as essential to the new world order, and not only as a response to wartime necessities. As we shall see, this too was to become a place where Barea would feel at home years later.

One of the repeated themes of the essays in the *Searchlight* series was the importance of the active role of the 'common people' in the war effort and the transformation of society.<sup>95</sup> The most popular book of the series was *The English at War*, which the author Casandra (William Connors) dedicated to 'the Common People who fight, who slave, who drown, who are burnt, who are mutilated, who are entombed and who bear the fierce unremitting yoke of pain and tears' while 'the Generals die in their beds [and] the politicians catch the last aeroplane away from the fatherland' (Connors 1941, 34 cited in Costello 1989, 265). Clearly the idea of the 'people's war' was becoming a popular topic during 1941. To Barea, the Spanish 'people's war' could and should be linked to the one emerging at the heart of the British Left on grounds of a fundamentally shared, not nation-specific, larger struggle of the people against fascism and the upper classes.

In the concrete moment of 1940-41, *Struggle* was thus the Spain-related response to Warburg's, Orwell's and Fyvel's wartime project. Barea, in line with many of Orwell's beliefs, argued that the Spanish people had been crushed by the forces of fascism – national and international – but were ready to align themselves with Britain in its fight against the Axis. An obvious call for intervention in Spain, the essay focuses primarily on describing Francoist Spain, its so-called 'caste' and its 'Hispanic myth' of colonial expansion now supported by the Nazis (see chapter 4). The objective was to convince not only the reader on the Left, but conservative Britain that a moderate democratic solution for Spain was not possible with Franco. In fact, Barea argued that the people of Spain, while instinctively adverse to fascism, were also not full-blown communists. They rather partook of the qualities of an 'emotional' socialism that might fully emerge if only Britain – with its own propensity to such a democratic form – helped. Other non-communist Leftists such

---

<sup>95</sup> Ritchie Calder *The Lesson of London* (London 1941); Cassandra (William Connors), *The English at War* (London 1941); T. C. Worsley, *The End of 'The Old School Tie'* (London 1941); Joyce Cary, *The Case for African Freedom* (London 1941); Bernard Causton, *The Moral Blitz: War Propaganda and Christianity* (London 1941); Olaf Stapledon, *Beyond the 'Isms'* (London 1942); and Stephen Spender, *Life and the Poet* (London 1942).

as Cyril Connolly and Arthur Koestler were also commissioned to contribute to the series, but never did as it was discontinued in 1942. According to Warburg, the project stopped due to a lack of paper after the bombing of the firm's warehouse in May 1941, in which the typescript and final proofs of Barea's books were also destroyed. But Costello has argued that as the war progressed and a victory over Germany became a real option with the participation of the USA and of the Soviet Union, the essays became less relevant. Britain clearly needed to concentrate on fighting the war with American and Soviet support.

Regarding Barea's volume, the Spanish question receded again into the background as Franco's neutrality was consolidated under Allied pressure in 1942. *Struggle* was not as popular as the editors had predicted. Complimentary copies were sent to Edgar Allison Peers (aka Bruce Truscot, the relatively conservative Professor of Hispanic Studies at the University of Liverpool and founder of the *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*), Katherine Stewar-Murray, Duchess of Atholl (the author of a 1931 book against Stalinism), Charles Duff, John Marks (of the BBC Spanish Service), the Spanish ambassador in London Pablo Azcárate, the pedagogue Margarita Camps, and even *The Catholic Herald* – most likely to challenge the British Catholics as Barea had previously done with some articles in the *New Statesman*. Across the Atlantic, copies went to the Mexican publishing house Séneca and various editors in America – all without success of reprinting (Warburg 1942). In Britain, by early 1942 Warburg had still 'not yet sold quite half the first edition of 5,000 copies and sales are slow', though he still stated:

I do feel that when the revolution reaches Spain we shall sell out your book pretty quickly and should then be ready with a new enlarged revised and up-to-date edition to fill a very brittle need for I truly believe there is no other book on the market which gives so clear and plausible an analysis of the Spanish situation as yours. (1942)

Barea scholars and critics have paid little attention to *Struggle*. I would argue that its editorial history is key to understanding Barea's career in Britain. It also embodies a remarkable literary strategy, as the text does not only voice the preoccupations of a Spanish exile during World War Two, but, as we shall see in chapters 3 and 4, it systematically draws on cross-cultural perceptions to insert its own very specific discourse of defence of the Republican programme into the discourse of a part of the

British Left and a broader transnational discourse of anti-fascism and anti-Stalinism. Read along with the other books in the series and in relation to Barea's other articles and work for the BBC, a picture of a transnational intellectual emerges, albeit still very committed to an exile perspective with specifically Spanish traits, primarily based on the author's symbolic capital as a witness of the Civil War, to which we shall turn in more detail in chapter 2. Barea's literary career was taking off as, despite all difficulties, the Second World War brought with it a renovated – albeit often secondary and ambivalent – interest for the Spanish Civil War among the British Left. As Orwell continued, 'the [Spanish] civil war made a deep and painful impression on the English intelligentsia, deeper, I should say, than has yet been made by the war now raging' (2001, 338). As the new conflict unfolded, Barea's role as an interpreter of the Spanish Civil War and of Spain in the context of a Britain engaged in World War Two was bound to expand increasingly into the realm of literature, and it is in this field where he would gain, not only a reputation as a writer, but also a reputation as an intellectual, interpreting key figures of Spanish literature to the British, not least of all Federico García Lorca.

### **The literary critic: Lorca for the Left**

During this same period, Barea also started to contribute short stories and articles to the highbrow literary journal *Horizon: a Review of Literature and Art*. His first contribution was the somewhat disturbing story 'The Scissors', in which a small girl ends up cutting her little brother with a pair of scissors, believing him to be like her toy doll (1940e). After this, one of Barea's most important pieces of writing – the one that would definitively help establish his cultural capital as a writer and an expert on Spain and Spanish literature – was a review of Ernest Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, tellingly entitled 'Not Spain, but Hemingway'. However, it was as a result of his work on Lorca that Barea converted his symbolic into cultural capital most obviously. As discussed below in this section, Barea contributed to forging the Republican literary counter-canon in English. Barea's writings on Lorca became very popular in Britain and beyond, and as such helped cement Barea's position as an intellectual, a writer and expert on Spanish literature, defending his views, as we will see, in the contact zone in which these literary debates were intertwined with political meaning at different levels.

*Horizon* was a London ‘little magazine’, founded by Cyril Connolly and Peter Watson, who served as its art editor. Connolly was the main editor, helped in the beginning by Stephen Spender. Connolly himself had had an uneven literary career and, as happened to Barea, war ‘conferred upon him the identity he had been seeking’, becoming ‘one of the most popular and sought-after heavyweights in England’ (Fussell 1990, 210). The magazine, though, had from its inception an ambiguous take on war, particularly until May 1940. This might explain why Barea’s first short story in *Horizon* does not deal with a wartime issue at all. Furthermore, as Connolly explained (1941b) *Horizon* was not a ‘responsible’ nor a ‘political’ magazine, also quite at odds with Barea’s self-proclaimed political commitment through writing. Considered a repository of western culture at its best, *Horizon* conveyed ‘the impression that the European war was being fought about literature and history [...] rather than for Poland’s territorial sovereignty or the right of the European Jews to survive’ (Fussell 1990, 212). Barea’s essay on Hemingway came out just after one of the worst air raids on London (Fussell 1990, 215–16), as the magazine stuck to its self-proclaimed aims, which were to ‘provide readers with enjoyment and writers with opportunity, and to maintain a high literary standard during the war’ (advertisement for *Horizon*, 1939, cited in Shelden 1989, 2).

It can be argued then that the magazine was at odds with Barea’s views and objectives as a writer in war, and a challenge to his perception of his own role as an intellectual of and for the people. With a print run of 9,500 copies a month – fairly large for a small review (Shelden 1989, 1) –, *Horizon* targeted an audience of “‘general readers’” of a humanistically educated kind, presumed to be equally interested in sensitive fiction and poetry; painting, architecture, and the history of styles; sophisticated travel; music; philosophy; and European political history’ (Fussell 1990, 212). The magazine became a landmark of British high culture during the war, publishing ‘some of the finest writing during the early years when Britain was widely assumed to be losing the war’, including texts by W. H. Auden, T. S. Eliot, Christopher Isherwood, Arthur Koestler, Henry Miller, George Orwell, Bertrand Russell and Virginia Woolf, among many others (211). As critical as Barea may have been of highbrow intellectuals and detached ‘ivory tower’ attitudes, he was nonetheless – like Orwell – quite happy to contribute to a magazine that by the end of the war was ‘generally regarded as the best and most influential literary

review of its time' (Shelden 1989, 2). It gave him access to a new readership and kept him moving in very dynamic intellectual circles, even if these were not quite as 'popular' as he would have wished.

Notwithstanding all his polemical remarks, Connolly came to claim by mid-1941 that

[n]aturally, there is a tendency to associate with the groups of progressive writers in their thirties to which the editors by age and temperament belong, and when good writing becomes militant and political so will a magazine which mirrors it. Meanwhile we feel that while political truths are not ascertainable, the values of art are, and to that extent *Horizon* has no convictions, only standards. (1941b, 376)

Interestingly and somewhat intriguingly, Connolly always argued that *Horizon* did 'not exist to give young writers their first chance' (376), and that he only wished to

represent the best writing available; the deepest imagination, the clearest thought of the English, American, French, Spanish, German and Hungarian writers on which it can draw to the exclusion, alas, of much promising writing, until it has matured a little. (376)

Despite Barea having published hardly anything before his first short story for *Horizon*, he seems to have been considered by Connolly as a mature enough writer. Although Barea and Cyril Connolly did not meet personally until August 1941, correspondence shows that they shared many of the same views, and often spoke about Spain and Spanish politics, Barea writing in Spanish and Connolly responding in English. It seems quite clear that symbolic capital as a Spanish Republican exile played a role in this working relationship, catalysed by Connolly's own inclination and knowledge of Spain. One thing Cyril Connolly had had in his mind when advising writers to keep off the war was that in his own view, at least until early 1941, the ongoing conflict could not compare with the former Spanish struggle because it lacked 'the two great emotions which made the Spanish conflict real to so many of us [...] Pity [and] Hope' (1941a, 5).

The Spanish Civil War remained for many on the Left, at least during the early period of the Second World War, a conflict charged with more ideological and

emotional elements than the new war. It was in this context that it came to be known as ‘the Last Great Cause’. Barea himself later reflected:

For the last six years, I have felt frankly gratified as well as intrigued by the strength of the impression my country makes on the foreigners who come to know, or at least to meet her. This impression shows up on odd occasions which appear to have no connection with Spain, in the books of Dos Passos and Hemingway, in the editorial comments of Cyril Connolly, in the critical studies of V. S. Pritchett, in military articles by Tom Wintringham and in the poetry of that English generation whose members joined the International Brigades, or went out to report the Spanish War, or felt guilty because they had done neither. In particular, that war, small-scale dress-rehearsal though it now seems, has left a trace in the minds of non-Spaniards, which the greater material impact of this present war has never erased. (1943b, 203)

Indeed, even Cyril Connolly’s views, which initially saw only the Spanish Civil War as a proper conflict, gradually shifted as the Second World War unfolded. The number of contributions dealing with war increased in the journal. Barea’s successive texts on the Spanish Civil War can thus be seen as both responding to Connolly’s feelings about the importance of the Spanish struggle and Barea’s ambition to participate through Spanish themes in the increasing British response to contemporary wartime events.

Publishing in *Horizon* definitively contributed to Barea’s legitimacy as a writer in Britain, but also as an intellectual. *Horizon* was also to become one of the publications that most persistently gave visibility to Barea’s books through reviews. Despite a constant lack of space, all books by Barea were reviewed in *Horizon* by contributors such as Orwell and Koestler. Between 1940 and 1943, Barea also published in *Horizon* a chapter of *The Track* (1941n), several articles on Federico García Lorca (1942a; 1942b), and a review of Gerald Brenan’s *The Spanish Labyrinth* (1943b), inaugurating his role as a literary critic specializing in Spain.

Barea’s essays on Lorca – later republished in book form in 1944 by Faber – were initially aimed at an intellectual readership interested in Spanish poetry, despite its title *Lorca: the poet and his people* (1944b).<sup>96</sup> But as one reviewer of Barea’s *Lorca*

---

<sup>96</sup> I will also refer to *Lorca: the Poet and his People* as *Lorca*.

observed, '[p]erhaps [...] the right time for this [a fully literary study on Lorca] has not yet arrived, and it should be deferred until Lorca's name has been elevated above the field of political controversy' (Gallop 1944, 176). In fact, it was precisely because of Lorca's political significance for the Spanish Republicans and the British (and international) Left that Barea chose to write on him. Lorca's assassination had prompted Neruda to join the war effort, and Lorca's poems featured in every collection of poetry on the Spanish Civil War (Cunningham 2009, 189). As Barea himself explained, Lorca's poetry had had a 'strong repercussion [...] on the British intellectuals who came under the sway of the Spanish War', noting that he 'was made a hero of anti-fascist propaganda' (1944b, 75). At the same time, as explained by Barea, Lorca could be considered the poet of the Spanish people, speaking to and for them in his work. It seems like quite an obvious choice of author for Barea to inaugurate his writing on Spanish literature in Britain. It was also very much in line with what other Republican exiles were doing on the other side of the Atlantic. As Sebastiaan Faber explains, Lorca, like Machado, had been already glorified in Bergamín's *España Peregrina*:

Both [Machado and Lorca] had died during the war, and both were represented as embodying the essence of Spanish popular culture. Not surprisingly, two of the first books published by the Spanish exiles in Mexico were the complete works of Machado and García Lorca's *Poeta en Nueva York* [1940]. Both of these volumes were printed by Séneca, Bergamín's publishing house, which, as we will see, helped lay the foundation for what would become the alternative canon to the censor-stricken index in Francoist Spain. (2002, 138)

Barea – who had in fact read Bergamín's edition – was laying the foundation of the Republican alternative canon for the English-speaking world. Barea's essays on Lorca, also gave him the opportunity to assert his voice as an authoritative one on the poet in London's literary contact zone. Barea's essays stirred a debate with Stephen Spender over the possibilities of Lorca representing either a Spanish spirit or a European one (1944a). A selection of Lorca's poetry had been recently translated by Joan Gili and Stephen Spender (1939), and published in *Penguin*, and Arturo and Ilsa acknowledged the importance of this translation and of R.M. Nadal's introductory study in their essay in book form in 1944 – which by 1945 was already

in its fourth edition. John Leeman's magazine *Penguin's New Writing* – the direct competitor of, and a more committed publication than, *Horizon* – had published an article by Spender in which he criticized some of Barea's interpretations of Lorca's poetry, particularly the fact that Barea had highlighted the fact that the poet belonged to the Spanish people (1944). Barea argued that this interpretation did not entail that Lorca could not also belong to a European literary tradition. Barea offered to write an essay for *New Writing* answering Spender's views on Lorca (1944a). As with many of Barea's projects, this never happened, and we do not have Barea's full argument. This comment however shows that Barea (as we will see in chapter 2) felt a need to assert his position as a Spanish intellectual within a literary field in which other – mostly non-Spanish – voices dominated. His reviews of Hemingway and Brennan can be read as Barea's negotiations within the same literary and political struggle to establish his authoritative voice on Spain.

Barea's work helped popularize Lorca's poetry in Britain. In 1942, he received a letter from the editor of *Time and Tide* Ann Gimingham whose husband in the Armoured Corps, after reading Barea's essay in *Horizon*, wanted to find a copy of Lorca's poetry in Spanish and could not (1942). Reading had increased during the war, particularly among the troops, and both *Horizon* and *Penguin* pocket editions were ubiquitous (Fussell 1990, 242–43). According to Paul Fussell, books were key to the political education of readers during the war particularly with regard to the later victory of Labour in 1945 (1990, 242). The Spanish Civil War was increasingly considered as the 'moral touchstone of Europe' by many (Duff 1944), and the death of Lorca figured among one of the most powerful myths of the British Left. Barea was benefitting from this leftist cultural context in wartime Britain, but at the same time he was contributing to it with his work.

In 1942, Barea wrote a first literary review for *Tribune*, starting a frequent collaboration with this journal. In 1937, *Tribune* 'was founded as a voice for unity against fascism in Spain and Nazi Germany' (*Tribune* 2016). Not being an organ of any political party, it became the periodical of the Labour party's left wing. Its founder and editor through World War Two, Aneurin (better known as Nye) Bevan, was joined by editors such as Ellen Wilkinson, Harold Laski, H. N. Brailsford and Victor Gollancz. Barea knew several of those involved: Ellen Wilkinson and H. N. Brailsford were friends of the Bareas and had a history of helping Spanish refugees.

Gollancz – who published works of other Spanish Republicans – may have been more difficult to live with, but his position vis-à-vis Orwell and Stalinism was now undergoing changes. It was therefore not surprising that Barea would start contributing literary reviews of books on Spain to the magazine. George Orwell became the literary editor in 1943, and was replaced in 1945 by Tosco Fyvel, under whom Barea would contribute most of his literary reviews to the periodical. After the war, Barea also wrote for *The Times Literary Supplement* in Britain, but his work also started being published in international journals.

Cyril Connolly became important to Barea's establishment not only as an exile writer, but also as an international author in yet another way. In September 1941 Connolly told Barea that he had written

to the Pen club about you and spoke to Storm Jameson [its president] who is most anxious that you should join. I have now joined myself and with Calder Marshall, Tom Harrison, Spender, Koestler, am trying to form a group of younger writers within it, who will modernize a little its atmosphere of elderly ladies worrying about Spanish donkeys and how they are treated.

(1941c)

The Bareas would become members of English PEN in 1941. And while there is not much evidence of the Bareas' active involvement until later in their exile, Connolly's offer is significant in several ways. On the one hand, it is an example of how Barea's work was received within a contact zone in which Spain, and exiles from Spain, had to negotiate their place vis-à-vis common, exoticized visions of Spain and, as Connolly put it, its time-worn donkeys. Barea's work thus emerges as an example of the important ways in which the international Left, despite sometimes contributing to such stereotypes as we shall see, were articulating new versions of Spain and the modernizing Republican project and, for this, willing to incorporate a writer exiled from Spain like Barea. On the other hand, it also places the Spanish Civil War and the debates over Spain at the intersection of the political and the literary and, through the context of a self-proclaimed 'non-political' organization, shows the ways in which these two could be intertwined, with writers understanding their role as public intellectuals and their art as committed to a cause. It further reveals how cosmopolitan encounters often took place in semi-institutional and institutional settings of various sizes, from *Horizon* to PEN, and is proof of the early efforts of

the non-communist Left – Connolly, Spender, Orwell, Warburg, Fyvel and Koestler among them – to find a space for political action through culture, which would later materialize in the Congress for Cultural Freedom (Wilford 2003). Barea had been accepted as a writer at the very heart of the non-communist Left network.

Indeed, by the end of 1941, Barea's position among British writers and the place of his work in the perception of the British readership was solid. His was certainly the role of 'the Spaniard' among the cosmopolitan, multilingual community of London writers and publishers. But he was a 'Spaniard' of a very special sort, indeed quite unique: an exile detached from other Spanish exiles, a writer who had managed to link up with the British Leftist intelligentsia and the many Central European refugees, and to address the British people. In other words, he was a very Spanish British writer, but also a very British Spanish exile. If this chapter has shown how his deployment of social and symbolic capital contributed to Barea's success as a voice on Spain, the following chapter will focus on how he contributed to reinforce it through his autobiographical writing.

## Chapter 2. The Forging of a Writer: Barea's Autobiographical Writing in Exile

Barea's success in Britain as a writer was directly linked to his status as a protagonist of the Spanish struggle. In 1941, Allison Peers reviewed *The Forge* and *Struggle* for the *Bulletin of Spanish Studies* and wrote:

Whether by accident or by design, the publishers of Don Arturo Barea's first two books in English have given the reader full-length presentations of his personality and his political views respectively almost at the same moment. Strong attention is thus focused on an interesting figure, known previously to the reading public only by occasional articles and sketches – that of a Republican who, like so many others, left Spain during the course of the Civil War, and, after making a short stay in France, established himself in this country. (220)

As the quote suggests, 'Don Arturo Barea's' symbolic capital as a Spanish Republican exile – that is as a Spaniard, an antifascist and a war veteran – provided him with legitimacy and credibility to intervene in the British public sphere, and eventually succeed as an authoritative voice on Spain. Peers' comment highlights how it is not only through Barea's autobiographical novel *The Forge* that the reader gets to know the author, but also through his non-fictional work such as his political essay *Struggle*. Most importantly, it signals how Barea is not only writing about Spain, but assembling a complex transnational self in exile through his writing for a non-Spanish public. Barea's access to the British cosmopolitan contact zone, and increasingly a global literary and public sphere, is due to a combination of social, cultural and symbolic capital. As seen in chapter 1, this involved often difficult negotiations with fellow exiles, publishers, government officials and editors. In this chapter, I will focus on Barea's agency in contributing to generate the recognition of his symbolic capital through textual strategies. I wish to trace the ways in which Barea's self as an autobiographical construction emerged in writing in relation to the British public.

Autobiographical texts are as much about the present of writing as they are about the past they narrate; the context of production described in the previous chapter is as responsible in shaping Barea's work as the past that informs them. Indeed, for exiles,

social and intellectual relationships in the host society shape how they ‘structure their accounts of past political activity’ (Herrmann 2003 as cited in Rickett 2014, 36). Understanding Barea’s writing in the context of his new readership becomes the more relevant because of the autobiographical nature of his work, as ‘no other genre’s thematic and strategies are so dependent on, and determined by, its addressees’ (Loureiro 2000, xiii). This is not a simple, linear process. As Rickett has pointed out, ‘exiles were constantly self-fashioning their identity in response to the circumstances, rather than (wholly) defined by them’ (Rickett 2014, 15). It is here key to understand Barea’s writings not simply as representational, but as performative in that they are (among other things) acts of self-creation (Loureiro 2000, 1). Barea’s autobiography, in conjunction with his other texts, can be read as a document of ‘self-exploration, a performance in self-defence, an act of [political] propaganda, and a program for [political] action’, to quote the words used by Loureiro (43) in his analysis of the autobiographical writing of José Blanco White, another (albeit earlier) Spanish exile in Britain.<sup>97</sup> If identity is created by ‘resorting to a number of collective shared discourses’ which mediate it (13), this section will explore precisely how and in relation to what discourses Barea wrote and constructed his authorial voice as a Spanish Republican Exile and a member and representative of the people.

### **On the question of autobiography in Barea**

Most of Barea’s texts are permeated by the autobiographical: not only his trilogy, which does this most explicitly, but also his other texts. Even his non-fiction and journalistic articles often include first-person anecdotes. I will argue that this is down to Barea’s need to establish his legitimacy and credibility as a narrator of the Spanish tragedy to the British public. The struggle to find a place within the public and literary spheres was intertwined with endeavours to maintain international recognition for the Republican cause. Success in exile is at times related to the ‘ability to generate and maintain loyalty and recognition at the expense of the home regime’ (Shain 2005, 167). Spanish Republican exiles in particular were forced to compete against different – and often hegemonic – projects for the nation that

---

<sup>97</sup> The original reads ‘an act of religious propaganda, and a program for religious and moral action’ (Loureiro 2000, 43).

expelled them in the first place. Barea's work stood at the intersection of political activism and personal project, the boundaries between both blurred through discursive and rhetoric strategies, as were the boundaries of the Republican cause and of the Spanish nation itself.

Testimony and I-witness narratives of the Spanish Civil War were already a genre in its own right, and had involved large amounts of border-crossing and border-blurring for some time, if one considers the body of Spanish, British, American and other literary works produced during the Spanish Civil War about the conflict, from Sender's *The War in Spain: A Personal Narrative/Counterattack* (1937) to Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (1940). Barea was not to go against this entire body but produce something commensurate and connected to it, taking issue with particular aspects, drawing on the added legitimacy of having lived through and taken part in the conflict as a Spaniard.

In the competing narratives that existed about the Spanish Civil War during the conflict and in its aftermath, the 'key assets' to win discursive hegemony were, as Sebastiaan Faber has pointed out, legitimacy and credibility (2008b, 4-5). This was not only something authors needed to produce, it was also something that editors and publishers hoped to find. Fredric Warburg, for example, considered that the editors of the *Searchlight* series to which Barea contributed *Struggle* 'shall be very glad to have the subject of Spain so expertly represented in our series, since we believe that very little objective and original writing on Spain has seen the light, despite the flood of books on the subject during the last few years' (1941).

The genre of Barea's trilogy has been a source of substantial controversy (see Echevarría 2004 and Eade 2011, 38-43 for good overviews). A number of authors have dealt with the relationship between fact and fiction and therefore questioned whether the trilogy should be considered as an autobiography, a novel or both (Bertrand 2001, Eade 2009, Altisent 2003). Other critics have debated whether his trilogy falls into the category of social realism (Altisent 2003), social-historical realism (Echevarría 2004, 2031), neo-realism (Percival 1999), neo-romanticism (Echevarría 2004, Campoy-Cubillo 2012), existentialism (Ynduráin 1953, Torres Nebrera 2002), *costumbrismo* (Marra-López 1963, 311; Fernández and Herrera 1988, 100; Torres Nebrera, 112-114), even partaking of qualities of the picaresque (Allison Peers 1941; Marra-López 1963, 311; Lundsford 1990, 81), or an example of

*tremendismo* (Ribeiro de Menezes 2013).<sup>98</sup> What most critics agree on is the fact that Barea's work has an autobiographical character in the widest sense (Echevarría 2004, Zapatero 2015). This goes beyond the scope of identifying author, narrator and character, weighing up notions of veracity, and valuing the intention of the writer above the result (Zapatero 2009a, 25), there being reasonable consensus that the trilogy transcends the individual in order to offer a valuable testimony of the Spanish Civil War and the events leading up to it as collective events.<sup>99</sup> In fact, all of these studies mirror the original, contemporary reviews which had emphasized how Barea managed to balance the two poles of fact and fiction – see e.g. 'Where Truth and Fiction Meet' (George 1941).

Barea's own description of *The Forge* clarifies the matter to some extent only. He wrote in personal correspondence that *The Forge* was 'plus ou moins une autobiographie' (1939b) or 'a semi-fiction novel [...] describing in autobiographical form and mainly historically true the Madrid of my childhood', though also including 'psychological and sociological aspects' (1939f). As Zapatero (2009a, 124) remarks, Barea shows in his own description of his work as 'libros de memoria, por retratar más lo colectivo que lo individual' (de Villena 2001, 2) an insight into the theory of autobiography. Yet the trilogy was marketed and received at the time mostly as a non-fictional text, a biography. Reviewers consistently valued its testimonial and representative nature over its fictional achievement (cf. Sánchez Zapatero 2009a, 124; 2015).<sup>100</sup>

We can already see in the preface to *The Track* (1943) what Barea thinks of his project of writing between objectivity and subjectivity, about the self and the collective in what is an insightful description of his work as responding to the testimonial, memorialist and autobiographical impulse (Herzberger 1991, 1995; Bou 2005; Sánchez Zapatero 2009b). Tensions between the individual and the collective are common in the literary production of exiles (Bou 2005, 18) and Barea would

---

<sup>98</sup> Ortega offers a good overview of the different literary influences in Barea's work (1971, 377-378). The most comprehensive study of Barea's work as social realism comes from Mercedes Echevarría's PhD thesis. Echevarría has approached Barea's work from the perspective of the social and the historical novel.

<sup>99</sup> All studies on Barea mention this point, as do all of the reviews at the time, from the very first one by Orwell.

<sup>100</sup> Benedetti wrote that 'su fuerza mayor, su dramática intensidad, proviene del carácter testimonial de esos recuerdos, tan cercanos aún, tan metidos en nuestro presente, que hoy día continúan vigentes la mayor parte de sus tácitas censuras' (1951, 381).

confess to this in his foreword. It is worth quoting from this key text at length because it brings to the fore some of the elements that I wish to discuss in this chapter, mainly how Barea interprets his own work and, by extension, his own role as a Spanish writer in exile:

In taking and exploring my past self as a member of the Spanish generation which was the core of the Civil War, I hoped to expose some of the roots of that war. I wanted to describe the shocks which had scarred my mind, because I'm convinced that these shocks, in different individual forms but from the same collective causes, scarred and shaped the minds of others Spaniards too. [...] A very distinguished critic of *The Forge* [Allison Peers 1941, ENM] pointed out that 'the experiences chronicled by the author' are not 'at all singular', and that 'the conversations..., the discoveries... and the disillusionments of experience are such that could be described by millions...' This is perfectly true of the present book too, and it is as I think it should be. (It is, incidentally, also the reason why I cannot consider these books of mine as straight autobiographies.) The millions who shared the same experiences and disappointments do not usually write, but it is they who are the rank and file in wars, revolutions, and 'New Orders', they who carry on in the Old Order, helpless, restless, and disillusioned. Some of them defended Madrid, some evacuated Dunkirk; others died for General Franco; some of them in this country wonder just what the war is about. They are usually called the common people or the 'little men' or the 'lower orders'. As I was one of them, I have attempted to be vocal on their behalf, not in the form of propaganda, but simply by giving my own truth. [...] But I want to say frankly that I already mean the present book, *The Track*, just like *The Forge*, to illuminate to the public of this country the dark psychological and social under-currents of the Spanish War and its aftermath, which are so palpably still an integral part of this greater war. And after all, the Spain which I would like to show to the British public needs to be a part of the greater peace.<sup>101</sup> (1943a, 1–3)

---

<sup>101</sup> Although Barea insisted that *The Forge* had been aimed originally at a British public, archival evidence shows that it was written with a wider international readership in mind. Also, direct references to contemporary events and signposts to the British reader are absent from *The Forge*, but are more evident in *The Track*. However, the foreword disappeared from foreign translations of *The*

What this introduction highlights is the fact that Barea is writing at the intersection of Spanish, British and international discourses; that he is claiming to represent not only himself, not even only the Spanish people, but the people everywhere; that in doing so, his narrative aims to transcend dichotomies: he is even concerned with speaking on behalf of those who died for Franco (albeit separated by a semicolon from the heroes of Dunkirk and Madrid); that there are complex, non-linear links between past and present; and that his novel is aimed at a British and international public as a window into Spain, its people and their war because all these things cross borders and are directly relevant to all nations – Barea’s cosmopolitan commitment to speak on behalf of the foreign – and national – other is already stated in this introduction.

The *Searchlight* essay *Struggle* is another example of the importance the personal had in writing about war in general, and the Spanish in particular. The editors themselves had suggested that it should present the problem to the public ‘with as much personal touch and characterization’ as possible. This was in line with both the Spanish tradition of the personal essay and a wider aesthetic of the reportage that blurs the line between the more ‘objective’ historical or sociological essay and the more ‘subjective’ elements of personal involvement. This was to be a partisan wartime pamphlet conveyed as a personal account in which legitimacy is based on experience.

Through his writings, Barea re-creates several identities that coalesce in his literary persona. However, as we already hinted at in the previous chapter, Barea’s first step was to claim legitimacy in the cosmopolitan contact zone as an authoritative voice on Spain as the ‘most Spanish Spaniard’ (Barea 1941b).

### **Not Spain, but Barea**

If Barea could not on his arrival in Britain claim any authority based on him being a well-known writer or public intellectual, a politician or an expert in any scholarly discipline, his initial legitimacy was based on his personal experience and intimate knowledge of the Spanish Civil War, on his symbolic capital as a Spanish

---

*Track*, including the American abridged version, suggesting that it might have been written *ad hoc* for the British edition.

Republican exile, and even simply a Spaniard. For example, in his 1940 article ‘The Spanish Mind and Gibraltar’, Barea claims this legitimacy to speak as ‘I believe that nobody but a Spaniard can answer this question, and I shall therefore try to do so’ (1940b, 704). Indeed, the editors of *Time and Tide*, where this article was published, wrote to Ilsa that ‘[i]t is not easy nowadays to find anyone who can write intimately and authoritatively on Spanish affairs and we reckon ourselves lucky in having such a contributor as your husband’ (*Time and Tide* 1941a).

Partly, the legitimacy of Barea’s texts about the war in Spain is built on the premise of him having ‘been there’, which is the logic of the testimony as well as of the wartime reportage and documentary (McLoughlin 2007, 98; Labanyi 2011).<sup>102</sup> The importance of having been in a war was reinforced by the context in which Barea was writing, as in 1941 he was also again at war, suffering alongside his readers. The fact that Barea ‘saw no combat’ (i.e. fired no bullets) during the Spanish Civil War (McLoughlin 2007, 98) barely emerges. He has suffered profoundly the direct effects of battle as a soldier in the Spanish-Moroccan war, of which he writes in several pieces, most notably in *The Track*. He has direct knowledge and expertise of war as a civilian trapped in Madrid, but also of the events leading up to it, and the politics surrounding it. He knows the Republic from within; he has knowledge of German dealings in Spain as he worked for a German company in the twenties; he has suffered, as the British reader on the home front was suffering at the time, incessant German bombings in Madrid, a proper rehearsal of the Blitz.

However, ‘being there’ was not always enough, Barea soon argued. One needed to have the cultural tools to interpret what one witnessed. Two arguments were at stake here. First, to be able to interpret the war, one should be an actor and not just a witness. Peter Monteath notes that the literature of the Spanish war allows and even recommends that the figure of the ‘passionate, biased reporter’ be inserted into the account to the point that ‘the observer of action is also a participant in the action’ (1990, 75). Barea’s claim to be a participant – and actor – and not just an observer reinforces the emotional appeals to the reader of subjectivity over objectivity (77).

Second, to be able to interpret Spain, one should preferably be a Spaniard – or, if anything else, one should definitely not be Hemingway. In 1941, Barea published in

---

<sup>102</sup> For a debate of the importance (or not) of being there in war writing, see McLoughlin (2007, 100-102).

*Horizon* a hugely influential review of Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (1940). He was taking on a heavyweight, a book that during the spring of 1942 featured as the second 'favourite reading since the start of the war' for the British public, just after *Gone with the Wind* (Holman 2008, 52–53).<sup>103</sup> Barea, against the general positive reviews of Hemingway's novel, wrote 'Not Spain but Hemingway' (1941c). As Gareth Thomas has noted, Barea's criticism was not aimed at doubting Hemingway's loyalty to the Spanish cause, but to highlight the lack of authenticity of the novel as a portrait of the Spanish people and their war written by someone who simply could not understand these (Thomas 1990, 102). Barea recognized that he had been 'fascinated by the book', and thought that it was 'honest in so far as it renders Hemingway's real vision' (1941c, 351). But, Barea pointed out, in order to apprehend reality one needed to experience and not just witness it. Just 'being there' was not enough. Barea ultimately felt that

the inner failure of Hemingway's novel – its failure to render the reality of the Spanish War in imaginative writing – seems to me due to the fact that he was always a spectator who wanted to be an actor, and who wanted to write as if he had been an actor. Yet it is not enough to look on: to write truthfully you must live, and you must feel what you are living. (1941j, 361)

Barea refers to acting on several occasions in his work, and I will come back to this below. For now it suffices to note that Barea's legitimacy as an expert on Spanish affairs is reinforced in his texts by his emphasis on the importance of being an actor – as he had been – and not just a witness, for example as a journalist, of the Spanish conflict. In the review Barea therefore wanted to correct some of, what he considered, were Hemingway's mistakes. To Barea, one of the consequences of Hemingway being a spectator, as opposed to an actor, was the lack of a cultural framework to interpret correctly the Spanish mind and soul and to accurately represent Spain. It was not so much that Hemingway was not a Spaniard – Barea praised Dos Passos for describing the Spanish people truthfully – it was probably because of the fact that Hemingway had been a fellow traveller of the communists that Barea was highly critical of his views. Nonetheless, Barea emphasized in his review that '[f]or purely Spanish reasons I want to fight against this danger of a spurious understanding of *my people* [my emphasis]' (1941j, 352). Barea gave two

---

<sup>103</sup> The first film adaptation by Sam Wood was released in 1943.

examples of what he argued were blunders in Hemingway's book: firstly, the nickname 'rabbit' that Jordan, the protagonist, gives to his lover María, made no sense to Barea because, with its sexual implications ignored by Hemingway, it was contrary to Castilian male psychology; secondly, the scene of the gang rape of María is also out of character because even Falangists would never commit such an act, again because this went against Spanish culture.<sup>104</sup> Barea's accusations have been contested by a number of critics who have argued that Hemingway was aware of these cultural nuances and played with them in the novel (e.g. LaPrade 2007, 15-24). However, my main point here is that this review article must be read primarily as Barea's proclamation, in a particular moment of the early 1940s, that he himself was the true authoritative voice that could best interpret such cultural nuances to foreign readers. Hemingway's novel may be popular, but it was not a true representation of Spain. For the latter, the public needed Barea.

With this, Barea hit a nerve. The reaction of the left-wing press to his words is a good example of the growing recognition of his symbolic capital as a Spaniard. Shortly after Barea published his review in *Horizon*, Charles Duff, the editor of the organ of the Republican government, *The Voice of Spain*, published a rectification of a previous review by an American literary critic that had praised Hemingway's novel. Duff's article fully agreed with 'such a reputable Spaniard as Mr. Barea', whose expertise on the Spanish war could not be questioned (1941). Stephen Spender noted in the first review published of *The Forge* that

readers of Hemingway's book now have an opportunity of reading of Barea's own Spain; and I do not think that they will be able to doubt that, as a Spaniard, Barea was justified in attacking Hemingway [...] for *The Forge* is the autobiography of a man whose whole experience and feelings are soaked in Spanish life. (1941)

Indeed, the review was entitled 'The Real Spain'. Barea's review became 'an enormous success' far beyond the Spanish community (Connolly 1941). The Minister of Information Duff Cooper 'liked it very much', and 'Vernon Bartlett, M. [who had been in Spain as correspondent for the *News Chronicle*, ENM] sent around especially for a copy' (Connolly 1941). The literary editor of the *New Statesman* Raymond Mortimer 'was particularly impressed with the Spanish courtesy with

---

<sup>104</sup> LaPrade (2007, 17–20) argues that Barea's criticism was unfounded.

which you put him [Hemingway] right', and Cyril Connolly felt that 'it is clear that you crystalized what many readers of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (once for us but three times for a gipsy) have been unconsciously and uneasily feeling' (1941). That was why the magazine had been 'snowed under with compliments' for Barea's article (Connolly 1941). In a postscript to this letter, Connolly quoted surrealist painter Ithell Colquhoun who wanted to thank Barea for 'debunking Hemingway': 'I wish I could afford to send him a tip', the artist had added (Connolly 1941).

The reception of Barea's work in exile can clearly be understood against the backdrop of existing and abundant foreign interpretations of Spain. Barea himself set the bar when he wrote of Hemingway's novel:

It describes the violence and horror of the Spanish War so that the reader who had been in love with a strange Spain of his own nostalgia sees all his vague imaginings assuming shape and life, and feels himself to be penetrating into the innermost recesses of the Spanish soul. (1941c, 351)

As Orwell wrote about *The Forge*, 'one thing that this book brings home is how little we have heard about the Spanish civil war by Spaniards' (2001, 373). It is ironic that Barea's work was still to be read by many in a similar way as Hemingway's was, the two often linked within the same category of international narratives about the Spanish Civil War,<sup>105</sup> as a nostalgic window into Spain's past. Writing in 1975, Hugh Thomas noted that 'from the standpoint of the much more conventional, clean, characterless Madrid of today, one cannot help a certain nostalgia for the fascinating slum life of Barea's childhood: poor, often wretched, but what vigor, what eccentricity!' (536).

Within the cosmopolitan contact zone, Barea's identity as a Spaniard was the first thing that gave him legitimacy to be read and believed. It was this identity, this knowing and feeling of Spain, that allowed him to be a privileged translator of Spain for an international public. To be sure, even if he invoked his Spanishness to discredit Hemingway's novel, this national attachment acquired its full meaning within the cosmopolitan context in which Barea was inscribing his work.<sup>106</sup> This

---

<sup>105</sup> This point has mostly been made by Francoist critics who categorized Barea's novel as foreign, 'anti-Spanish' being one of the key words to refute exiles' claims to represent the culture of the Spanish nation (Ynduráin 1953).

<sup>106</sup> In correspondence with Ramón J. Sender, Ilsa wrote that 'Arturo es más él, y más el hombre de Castilla la Nueva, más el español tout simple con sus malas y buenas cualidades unidas por una fé

continued during the first years in exile and beyond. Even when he referred to such relatively accessible sources as Spanish radio broadcasts and newspapers, Barea implied that it was only he, a Spaniard, who could properly read and interpret what a British reader could not. His piece ‘Spaniards at Home’ from 1940 opens thus: ‘[t]he other day, I listened to Spanish music from Radio Madrid, somewhat nostalgically. Suddenly, the station assaulted me with several announcements’ (1940i, 1268).

Everyone could find Radio Madrid on the waves, but not everyone could feel what Barea felt. Reviewers were very receptive to this. More often than not, Barea, as Galdós before him, was ‘identified as a spokesman for his country’ offering to Britain a ‘window onto contemporary Spain’ (Hooper 2014, 5). Despite the fact that, in the half a century since Galdós’ novels were first translated into English, a number of books about Spain and the Spanish Civil War had been published, it was still a tiny minority who ‘had direct access to Spain, its language and culture’ (5). Orwell, who was careful to note in 1941 that *The Forge* was ‘not primarily a political book’ but an autobiography (2001, 341), also emphasized that

one seems to hear the thunder of future battles somewhere behind Señor Barea’s pages, and it is as a sort of prologue to the civil war, a picture of the society that made it possible, that his book is most likely to be valued.’ (339)

Barea’s great advantage over Galdós was that he was (as Blanco White had been) a Spanish writer living in Britain, writing intentionally for a British public that he knew and engaged with directly. Take for example his own stereotypical figure as a solitary Castilian with a *boina* who exaggerated his accent to impress his neighbours – and at the same time played with such ideas to deconstruct them and thus prove to the British readership that the people from this ‘far away country’, now living in an English village, were not indeed so far away.

In the opening anecdote of his first article written in Britain, ‘A Spaniard in Hertfordshire’ (1939), Barea enters a pub for the first time to find his fellow villagers playing darts. He is invited to join, and so he attempts to hit the bull’s eye by throwing the dart ‘exactly as when throwing the knife’ (1939e, 213). He explains to the readers of *The Spectator* that ‘[k]nife-throwing is a sport we had learnt in the

---

(sic) desesperada y creyente, aquí en el exilio donde cada día el choque con un mundo humano no hostil, pero sí extraño le obliga a profundizarse’ (1947). I want to thank William Chislett for donating copies of this and other letters from Arturo and Ilsa Barea to Sender to the Bareas personal archive (Barea 1947i, 1947j).

physical-culture centre when I was a boy in Madrid' (213) – a move of balancing the picturesque with a rational explanation without unhinging the former (because the rational explanation is in itself picturesque, only faintly superimposing the Britain of the present on the working-class Madrid of the past). As one would expect, 'gaping and embarrassed faces' surrounded him, to which the inn-keeper had to respond: 'He is Spanish see? [...] He's been all through the war' (213). The text then moves to add yet another layer of cross-cultural dialogue and interpretation: Barea explains how, guessing that the men in the pub were probably wondering if he often threw knives at people, he wanted to look as if he was 'able to do it but at the same time quite a harmless animal in the zoo. I had to give them the thrill they expected of me, you see' (213). And with this self-reflective acknowledgement of how Spaniards are perceived by the English common people and his willingness to play the part, to a certain extent at least, Barea seems to be telling the reader that they will understand his playful and harmless condescension. In turn, the reader is allowed his amount of 'thrill' and stereotype from the account of a knife-throwing Spaniard while maintaining a distance that, I would suggest, plays down the delicate fact that Barea could also seem to the reader as 'a harmless animal in the zoo' (213).

This was the Spanishness that gave Barea an edge in the cosmopolitan contact zone over other interpreters of Spain and its war. But even so, Barea would perform his narratives and criticism in dialogue with the work of Anglo-American writers and Hispanists. After all, most international bestsellers about the Spanish Civil War had not been written by Spaniards, and Barea's work was more often linked by reviewers with Hemingway's or Koestler's than with that of other Spanish writers. His response to Hemingway, his reviews of Brennan or his collaboration with Orwell placed his writings at the heart of the international narratives on Spain after the Spanish Civil War.

As Galdós, Barea went from chronicler of Spain to a 'fixture of the Anglo-European literary canon' in a matter of a few years (Hooper 2014, 4). From here, his work could move on to become part of the world republic of letters, in which, within a cosmopolitan cultural space, the more a piece of work showed its nationality (in a very specific, translatable and trans-culturally comprehensible way) the more interesting it became. By 1946, Barea's autobiography was regarded not only as an exploration of his personal crisis, or of the defeat of Spain, but of the disaster 'in the

whole of our Western society' in the aftermath of the Second World War (Mattingly 1946). His Spanishness now allowed him to fully dive into the transnational. A reviewer wrote that

[t]o understand himself Barea was obliged to understand Spain. If a foreigner can judge, he has done so. There is more light on the Spanish conflict in his pages, more truth about Spanish history in the twentieth century, than you could have found hitherto in a large library. And through understanding Spain, Barea has come to understand the crisis of our time better than most of us yet do. (Mattingly 1946)

Barea was probably quite satisfied when reading this review, as in 1941 he had confessed in personal correspondence that by writing about the most important stages in his life, he wanted to not only understand Spain, but to

llegar a los fundamentos de esta situación absurda que está sacudiendo el mundo entero, destruyendo viejas civilizaciones y tal vez abriendo camino hacia una nueva civilización más humana, es decir, con más humanismo, con una aproximación más íntima entre el pensamiento de los humanos y por tanto una comprensión mejor. (1941o)

This cosmopolitan commitment to mutual understanding that became more prevalent in Barea's work as the years went by – particularly after the onset of the Cold War – was already a self-proclaimed motivator of his early work, as was his role as a cultural translator.

### **A mediator and 'An honest man'<sup>107</sup>**

As the couple's friend Margaret Weeden put it in her obituary of Barea, broadcast by the Australian Broadcasting Commission (ABC) in 1958,

[a]ssuredly Arturo Barea's real value was as a kind of interpreter between two different civilisations and ways of life. His books have been translated into a number of languages, and the fan-mail he got from all over the world showed on the one hand how fascinating non-Spanish-speaking people found his picture of the Spanish mentality and patterns of behaviour; and on the

---

<sup>107</sup> Title taken from Gerald Brenan's review (Brenan 1975).

other hand, what a big impact his stories about England made in Latin America. And it is this contribution to international understanding which will live and spread like the ripples in a pool. And that is really what Arturo Barea would have wished for. (Weeden 1958, n.p.)

Barea himself often commented on his role as a cultural mediator through both his novels and his work for the BBC. Partly, it is his exilic consciousness that he constructs in his work that made him able to appreciate not only different classes within Spanish society, but also different cultures. Before we observe how through his broadcasts to Latin America he emphasized the interplay between the outsider/insider views of ‘little England’, I would like to stay with his trilogy to further highlight the construction of Barea’s function as a cultural mediator. The essay *Struggle* can be read, broadly understood, as an ethnographic narrative – not least of all because Barea mentions the influence of anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski quite specifically in his analysis of the Hispanic Myth (see chapter 4). In this section, I wish to focus on the ways in which Barea construed his work as ‘true’ or at least ‘honest’, offering both a ‘transparent window’ into Spain and a complex, critical and nuanced picture of himself and the war.

As with other first person narratives of the Spanish Civil War, Barea’s trilogy followed in the wake of earlier texts that had met the ‘immediate 1930s market for travel writing, reportage, document’ (Cunningham 2009, 191). For example, Ramón J. Sender’s *Viaje a la aldea del crimen: documental de Casas Viejas* (1934) is a text that merges the journalistic genre of the chronicle with that of the travel account.<sup>108</sup> In these genres, the value of the narrative is placed on its referential nature as much as on its autobiographical character, always presuming a pact of ‘realism’ between the writer and the reader.<sup>109</sup> In this section, then, I suggest looking at Barea’s work through the genres of ethnography and travel literature – both articulated into Barea’s novel as result of a literary tradition but also as a result of the contact zone (Pratt 1991; Clifford 1997). In this sense I will refer back to Barea’s Spanish literary roots, but also follow its exilic routes.

---

<sup>108</sup> Sender published his account of the events in Casas Viejas in three different versions: in the newspaper *La Libertad* in January 1933 (starting three days after the events took place on 10-11 January 1933), in book form under the title *Casas Viejas* (Feb 1933), and finally in a second revised version, titled *Viaje a la aldea del crimen* (February 1934).

<sup>109</sup> For an overview in Spanish on the autobiographical pact, see Sánchez Zapatero (2010).

The writer Antonia White pointed out that because Barea ‘writes with such an air of conviction’ the readers have to consciously remind themselves that *The Forge* is a novel and not a ‘sociological manual’ (1941, 218). Barea’s autobiography offers a view proximate to what in anthropology is called an ‘emic’ approach or insider view (Headland, Pike, and Harris 1990); that is, here, a bottom-up view that provides the reader with detailed information about the local and national costumes of the Spanish people, landscape and history.<sup>110</sup> Again, this was something Barea had to construe for his readers in various ways. The main mission of the trilogy was to offer an improved understanding of Spain and its war, but some of the most important passages that suggest that Barea was to be trusted as an ethnographer-like cultural translator, capable of correcting less competent commentators’ mistakes, appear in his writing on Morocco. In *The Track* (1943), we read of the young Barea writing back to his mother in Spain to explain how things in Morocco ‘really’ were – in order to counter her own ‘hotchpotch of memories and traditions’ (1943a, 43). Barea thus appears as interpreting Morocco to his mother in 1921 in the very passages where he is also interpreting Morocco (and Spain through its colonial project) to the British reader in the 1940s. Through this mechanism, Barea adds valuable historical depth to his credibility: he is an experienced ethnographer and interpreter of cultures with a long history of undertaking such tasks.

In fact, this construction goes even further. Barea presents himself as an interpreter and mediator between the Moroccan population and the Spaniards living there, a two-way translator (who at times needs to communicate in French, displaying his linguistic competence). This is then also a position from which to observe and reflect critically upon the Spaniards in Morocco, noting, for example, that the soldiers in their blockhouse ‘live worse than the Moors in their straw huts’ (1943a, 58). These descriptions of Morocco and Spain were politically significant. Barea’s comparison between the Moroccans and Spanish soldiers is one of many examples of Barea’s

---

<sup>110</sup> Although Barea’s work was often referred to as sociological, I will be using in this section the term ethnographic. On the one hand, the word highlights the methodology in social sciences that observes and studies the people and their culture. On the other, it emphasizes the fact that Barea is playing with the insider/outsider view (emic/etic) by describing his own culture (Spain) to a public from a different cultural (Britain), from the perspective of someone who is now an in-between. It points to his role as a cultural translator in the contact zone (Pratt 1991, 36–38).

criticism of the army – also found in other narratives of the Moroccan wars such as Ramón J. Sender’s *Imán* (1930) and José Díaz Fernández’s *El Blocao* (1928).<sup>111</sup>

Barea, in fact, recognized the significance of *Imán* as a narrative that explored the experiences of the average soldier, and may have found inspiration in the story of a blacksmith who in Morocco ‘blunders through dirt, danger and pain, through fighting and rout [...] battered and bruised in the most obscure depth of his mind’ (Barea 1946a, 71).

*The Track* – as well as *The Forge* and *The Clash* – offers examples of what Campoy-Cubillo has called ‘a reverse use of ethnographic narratives’ (2012, 30). Campoy-Cubillo (2012), as well as Echevarría (2004), places Barea’s work in the context of the new romantics, including Sender and Díaz-Fernández, who used defamiliarizing reverse descriptions as a strategy to subvert and challenge the colonial discourse (Campoy-Cubillo 2012, 30). When Barea is talking to a group of soldiers and they start telling him about their former lives, Campoy-Cubillo argues,

what is being defamiliarized here is the position of the epistemic subject; in Barea’s novel, the epistemic subject is both subject and object of the ethnographical interview (Barea, a Spaniard, is interviewing Spanish troops), thus subverting the traditional colonial discourse that narrates itself in opposition to a colonial object (30).

Whilst I agree that Barea’s *The Track* is clearly an anticolonial novel and that with this and other defamiliarizing techniques it subverts colonial – and wartime – discourses, I think that these instances of what we could also term ‘autoethnography’ are particularly relevant in the way they play with the tropes of travel literature. According to Pratt, autoethnographies – ‘text[s] in which people undertake to describe themselves in ways that engage with representations others have made of them’ – are also a result of, and hence indicative of, the contact zone (1991, 35). The following (admittedly long) quote from *The Track* offers one such example of autoethnography that mobilizes elements typical of the existing travel literature, such as stereotypical and essentialist descriptions of physiognomy and clothing, to captivate his non-Spanish public:

---

<sup>111</sup> The three novels are often studied together as examples of the novels of the Moroccan wars (Miller 1978, Bender 2015), but also of examples of neo-romantic novels (M. Echevarría 2004; Sánchez Zapatero 2009; Campoy-Cubillo 2012). Barea wrote several articles on Sender’s work (1946b, 1948). “Realism in the Modern Spanish Novel” (1946a) addressed *Imán* specifically.

I learnt about the races of Spain by dealing with the shipments of recruits. [...] There were the Andalusians in their short, light jackets, white or khaki, often in shirt sleeves, their trousers held in place by string or a sash. Most of them were slim and straight, dark, sallow, gipsy-like, with black eyes opening in mingled apprehension and curiosity, talking quickly in a torrent of obscene swear-words. [...] There were the men from the Castilian plains and sierras, taciturn, small, bony, tanned by sun, wind, frost and snow, the legs of their corduroy trousers fastened with twine over their bulging pants which in their turn were tied with tape over thick, blue or red, home-knitted sock. Every now and again the whole formation would be upset because a man's tape-ends had come untied. [...] Basque, Gallegos and Asturians usually came in a mixed lot on the same ship, and their discrepancies were astounding. The huge Basques, in blue blouses, with the inevitable beret on the crown of their small heads, were serious and silent, and if they spoke in that incomprehensible language of theirs, they measured their words. You felt the strength of their individual being and of their self-contained culture. The Gallegos came mostly from poor, forlorn villages; they used to be incredibly dirty, often barefoot, and they faced this new affliction, worse than the familiar penury at home, with a bovine resignation. The Asturians from the mountains were strong and agile, great gluttons and bawdy merry-makers, and they mocked the wretchedness of the people from Galicia, as well as at the gravity of the Basques. [...] Then there arrived pot-bellied, black, old transatlantic steamers with a load of recruits from the Mediterranean provinces, from Catalonia, parts of Aragon, Valencia and Alicante. The mountain people from Aragon and northern Catalonia differed in language, but they were very much alike, primitive, harsh, and almost savage. The Catalans from the ports, in contact with all the Mediterranean civilization, were a world apart from their own country men from the mountains. The people from Levante, in black blouses and laced *alpargatas*, rather handsome, but lymphatic and flabby with promise of an early paunch, were a group by themselves. And it seemed to me that a Madrileño is less of a stranger to a New Yorker than a Basque is to a Gallego, with their villages a bare hundred miles apart. (1943a, 152)

The essentialism and *tipismo* of this description betray, I suggest, the foreign nature of Barea's intended reader and the influence of travel literature discourse, but also Barea's political position. On the one hand, it follows the wartime 'tipismo de raigambre más tradicional y castiza' in the service of the revolution (Núñez Seixas 2006, 91-92). In much of the writing of the Spanish Civil War, each Spanish region was represented, literary and ichnographically, as fighting for their own independence as well as for the national integrity and the freedom of the whole of the Spanish people (Núñez Seixas 2006, 91-92). The differences of the regional types described in poems such as Miguel Hernández's 'Viento del pueblo' (1936) come together under the banner of the 'pueblo de España', which was united in its fight against fascism in defence of the Spanish nation. Barea's races of Spain though (as opposed to Hernández's *raza*) remain separate and foreign to each other. Against the heroic traits of Hernández's *pueblo*, Barea's soldiers appear to the reader as hungry, miserable and even 'lymphatic and flabby' (1943, 152). On the other hand, Barea's *tipismo* is also highly political in its criticism of the conditions of poverty of the Spanish peoples. The fragment is thus also an example of an anti-heroic rhetoric which, as we will see in the next section, mirrors the anti-war literature of the First World War – a rhetoric that places Barea's account much closer to Sender's *Imán* – published thirteen years before Barea's – than to Hernández's wartime poetry, despite the fact that both Hernández's collection of poetry *Viento del pueblo* (1937) and Barea's *Valor y miedo* (1938) were published as photobooks, examples of the Republican government's propaganda efforts (Fernández 2014, 106-115).

Barea's work presents further similarities with travel books, both in style and in content. Travel accounts offered a mixture of journal, anecdotal and socio-cultural descriptions with the objective of giving the reader insights and an understanding of a foreign country. Often *The Track* can be read as travel literature precisely in this sense. As Khemais Jouini notes:

el personaje-narrador está actuando como un auténtico viajero del siglo XVII o XVIII, dándonos precisiones temporales e informaciones topográficas sobre ciudades y poblados del norte de Marruecos en que se sitúa la acción de los distintos episodios narrados: habla de Xauen, Tetuán, Larache, Alcazarquivir, Ceuta y Melilla, con los rasgos arquitectónicos peculiares y propios de esta parte de Marruecos. (2005, 22)

In fact, *The Clash* is introduced by a quote from one of the most famous travel guides to Spain, Richard Ford's *Handbook to Travellers* from 1845 (see chapter 4). Travel books on Spain were indeed a very popular genre in Britain long before Spain became a topic of academic studies. Travellers had for centuries helped shape British perceptions of Spain, and they were still around in the 1940s. George Borrow's *The Bible in Spain* (1842) and Richard Ford's *Handbook* (1845), but also his *Gatherings from Spain* (1846), were popular enough to be referred to by Hemingway in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. When talking about writing about Spain, Robert Jordan – Hemingway's protagonist – reflects that '[t]here had been such good books written by Borrow and Ford and the rest that he had been able to add very little (2004, 257). In his study on Hemingway, LaPrade argues that part of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is inspired by Borrow and Ford – Hemingway owned copies of the books by both writers (2007, 16). LaPrade uses what he believes are clear references in the novel to Ford's travel account to defend Hemingway's knowledge of Spain against Barea's accusations (2007, 15-32). Brennan, in turn, wrote of the 1967 edition of Ford's *Handbook* that "[o]f the many excellent books written on Spain since the eighteenth century Richard Ford's *Handbook* is by general consent far the best" (1967, n.p.). As Faber points out, Anglo-American Hispanists have often referred to nineteenth-century travel books as the first studies in the field of Hispanism, despite the many errors, misunderstandings and prejudiced stereotypes present in them (Faber 2008b, 20–22).

At the outbreak of the war in Spain, the Spanish travel book had indeed been transformed in a matter of days into the Spanish war book: as Paul Fussell has noted, accounts which a few months earlier had started with chapters such as 'A Journey to Seville' were now introduced by epigraphs such as 'A Journey to Rebel Headquarters', the title of Koestler's first chapter in *Spanish Testament* (1982, 216). While there is some truth in Fussell's comment, the 'political' travel book had already been a feature of pre-war time though. Ramón J. Sender is, for example, an obvious point of reference for Barea's work, not least of all because Barea wrote several articles on Sender, even acknowledging him as a precursor (1946). As mentioned above, Sender's *Viaje a la aldea del crimen* (1934) is a pre-war example of a narrative at the intersection of travel account and reportage, in which Sender describes the events that took place in Casas Viejas in 1933. Initially printed as

independent chronicles in the newspaper *La Libertad*, Sender published them in book form soon after. The text explores the historical and political dimensions of the possibilities of revolution in Spain, denouncing the poverty of the labourers in Andalucía as well as expressing his disenchantment with the Republic. Sender held the Republican government responsible for the massacre of workers in Casas Viejas both because he thought that it had given direct orders to do so, but also for failing to implement an agricultural reform. The influence of travel writing is made specific by Sender himself in the first pages of the book – Sender later used another trope of travel book-cum-political and social commentary in letter form in *Cartas de Moscú sobre el amor (a una muchacha española)* (1934). As later Barea, Sender acknowledges the influence of British travellers to Spain in shaping perceptions of the Spanish character. In his second chronicle, ‘El Manué de Jorge Borrow es hoy limpia botas – fantasía de la calle de la Sierpe’ (2016, 12-15), Sender uses the British traveller’s idealized views of the Spanish people as the de-politicized Manué who was ‘noble, honrado, de corazón puro, humilde, pero digno’ (Borrow cited in Sender, 12) in order to criticize the Republic and its president Manuel Azaña. This use of British perceptions of the Spanish national character would be later re-cycled with a less critical reading of the government’s role during the Spanish Civil War.

Barea’s re-interpretation of the travel book responded to the genre through which British readers often approached the country, and through his work we find nods to such a pervasive tradition even whilst discrediting some of its properties. Like Sender, and unlike Borrow’s mystical and sage peasants or Miguel Hernández’s heroic people of Spain, Barea’s description of the Spanish – and the Moroccan – peoples is a political act of denouncement as much as an ethnographical exercise. As I argue in chapter 5, Barea’s take on the Spanish national character challenges as much as it feeds into a tradition of British and Spanish writings on Spain.

Travel literature and autobiography share the common trait of an implicit agreement between writer and reader that a) ‘that author, narrator and principal character are but one or identical’ and b) that there is a ‘non-fiction dominant’ by which the reader presupposes that the events have taken place in reality (Borm 2004, 17). Sánchez Zapatero has argued that because Barea’s trilogy was often categorized as a novel – e.g. it was labelled as such in the subtitle of the first edition in Spanish (1951) –, readers did not delegitimize the experience of reading if they came across an

inaccurate detail (2009a, 124–25). It is what Manuel Alberca has termed the *pacto ambiguo* of *las novelas del yo* – half way between the ‘acto autobiográfico y el novelesco’ (2007, 64) – and what Ignacio Soldevila Durante calls narratives that recreate a ‘mundo ficcional verosímil’ (2001, 87-88). However, during the 1940s in Britain, the trilogy was marketed precisely as non-fiction and the readers expected to find – and were mostly satisfied with – credible information in Barea’s texts.

While Barea himself often called his novels semi-fictional (1939f), he was capable of using precisely this to his own credit and credibility as an informer and mediator. José Blanco White had written in the prologue of his *Letters from Spain* that ‘the slight mixture of fiction which these letters contain might raise a doubt whether the sketches of Spanish manners, customs, and opinions [...] may not be exaggerated by fancy, and coloured with a view to mere effect’ (White 1822, vi). Barea felt the same need to point out in the introduction of *The Track* that his account of events is ‘historically and strictly true’, as far as ‘any individual experience can be’ (1943a, 2). Barea even states that he has tried to verify what he has recounted, ‘as a counter-check of my memory’ (2). Even in his more assumedly fictional novel *The Broken Root* (1951, 6), he noted that whilst ‘the characters in this book are my invention [...] the details of the Spanish background and the episodes outside the plot of the books are true to fact and open to proof’. Barea’s ‘honesty’ as a narrator is established partly by his confession of a limited point of view and the acknowledgment of narrating a subjective experience. The ‘honesty’ of Barea’s trilogy is best interpreted, I shall argue, not through the descriptive realism of the narrative, or Barea’s discursive strategies to reinforce its objectivity, but through the subjectivity it uses in a – potentially – modernist vein.

### **Arturo Barea, a modernist ethnographer?**

Patricia Rae has argued that Orwell’s *Homage to Catalonia* was influenced by the novels of the Great War, not only thematically but in its modernist literary technique, particularly in the limited point of view of the narrator and the great shift inwards to subjective experience (Rae 2009). I suggest following Rae to analyse Barea’s trilogy in order to highlight the coincidences and differences between Orwell’s account of the war and that of Bareas, who shared with Orwell the values of ‘third-force’ anti-

communism and the need to place himself in opposition to certain fellow travellers. If Barea construed his role as a cultural translator as a central one of his work, he also reinforced certain subjective and modernist aspects of his narrative voice. Similarly to Rae's contention on Orwell, Barea's turn inwards can be seen as an aesthetic choice that further increased his credibility as a reliable voice on Spain and its war, arguing that his role as a participant in the narrated events gave his account a subjective and partial character that was nonetheless closer to the truth of the experience of war. What we can term the modernist traits of his otherwise 'realist' autobiography were later expanded on theoretically through his literary criticism as Barea placed his authorial voice at the heart of contemporary transnational aesthetic debates on the limits of realism and the role of the author (Bloch et al. 1980).

That Barea's trilogy may have been partly influenced by earlier 'war books' has already been noted (Sánchez Zapatero 2009a, 179; Eade 2011, 64).<sup>112</sup> The novel of the Great War highlighted 'the degradation, deception and betrayal of the common soldier' and made use of certain modernist techniques such as the 'limited, prejudiced and confused narrator' (Rae 2009, 245). The clash between the epic account of the official history of the wars in Morocco and the conditions of misery, animalization, and descent into chaos and despair of the soldiers, the ultimate meditation about the meaning of human life imbues the novels on the Moroccan wars (Sánchez Zapatero 2009a, 179–90). This is the case of Barea's *The Track*, but also Sender's *Imán* and Díaz-Fernández's *El bloqueo*. Sánchez Zapatero has pointed to the existential character in such texts (2009a, 181–87), and Campoy-Cubillo has brought them under the sign of the new romantic aesthetics (2012, 27–31). As Sánchez Zapatero (2009a, 181–87) argues, many of the techniques of the anti-war books were present in the war literature of the Moroccan war. Barea's narrative – as previously the travel books – was probably influenced by British literature not only as a result of exile, but as the result of an intellectual tradition of intercultural dialogue, already present in Spanish literature. What exile did was to place Barea in direct contact with that foreign other, who soon became his main interlocutor.

---

<sup>112</sup> Indeed, both Zapatero and Eade argue that the pacifist war novel of the First World War was popular in Spain in the twenties (Sánchez Zapatero 2009, 179), and Barea does make specific reference to having read the pacifist novel of Bertha von Suttner, *Lay Down Arms!* (1905) (Barea 1943a, 110). One of Barea's short stories, 'Mr One' (19) has the World War I as its background.

Barea's trilogy as a whole offers a complex picture of war by presenting it through subjective experience and a limited narrator's point of view – notwithstanding all the recurrent claims to be representing the collective feelings of the Spanish people. Barea also claimed that his autobiography was not a reflection of his present but of his past self, characterizing them as 'novels written in the first person' as the narrator and characters 'no longer exist [...] they are no longer 'I', not myself of to-day' (1943a, 1). Barea himself wished to underline that 'neither of these two autobiographical books of mine embodies my present state of mind, imagination, and opinion otherwise than indirectly, through the pattern of what my memory has selected or rejected' (1). There is some plausibility in this as, by sitting closer to the narrated events and inside the narrated space, the narrator can describe them with more 'sincerity [...] and ruthlessness' (1). Crucially, this character has only a partial point of view and more often than not is limited to what he experiences first hand or hears from others – something that Rae has called 'epistemological modesty' (2009, 251). Taken to its extreme, this modesty results in an inability to tell, where the horror of reality is told through the absolute inability of a single individual to properly see and put things into words. We are here in the realm of European Great War modernism:

I cannot tell the story of Melilla in July 1921. I was there, but I do not know where: somewhere in the midst of shots, shells, and machine-gun rattle, sweating, shouting, running, and sleeping on stone and on sand, but above all ceaselessly vomiting, smelling of corpses, finding at every step another dead body, more horrible than any I had known a moment before. (1943a, 85)

While Barea often claims to abhor the violence of war, he also acknowledges that once in it, one is simply compelled to fight. In conversation with father Lobo, a Catholic Republican in *The Clash*, Barea explains how in this 'war of two Cains', when he

heard the battle noise I saw only dead Spaniards on both sides. Who should I hate? Oh yes, Franco and Juan March and their generals and puppets and wirepullers, the privileged people over there. But then I would rather hate that God who gave them the callousness which made them kill, and who punished me with the torture of hating any killing and who let women and children first suffer from rickets and starvation wages, and then from bombs

and shells. We were caught in a monstrous mechanism, crushed under wheels. And if we rebelled, all the ugliness was turned against us, driving us to violence. (1946b, 284–85)

Father Lobo answers – and Barea tells us explicitly that it was as if his past self ‘made him into the other ‘I’ of that endless inner dialogue’:

And this war, you say it’s loathsome and useless. I don’t. It is a terrible, barbarous war with countless innocent victims. But you haven’t lived in the trenches like me. This war is a lesson. It has torn Spain out of her paralysis, it has torn the people out of their houses where they were being turned into mummies. In our trenches illiterates are learning to read and even to speak, and they learn what brotherhood among men means. They see that there exists a better world and life, which they must conquer, and they learn too, that they must conquer it not with the rifle but with their will. They kill Fascists, but they learn the lesson that you win wars not by killing, but by convincing people. We may lose this war – but we shall have won it. They, too, will learn that they may rule us, but not convince us. Even if we are defeated, we will be stronger at the end of this than ever we were because the will has come alive. (1946b, 284–85)

The two voices are taken apart for a moment, as if analytically, only to then collapse again into the figure of Barea who, in that precise moment, decides he will become a writer to tell his truth as he had seen it and felt it. The resulting writing, however, will still remain entangled to a certain extent in the dialogic experience and the polyphony of voices recurs. When the young Barea shows Lobo one of his stories, the father exclaims: ‘What a barbarian you are. But go on, it’s good for you and us’ (286).

Rae also points to Orwell’s emphasis on ‘private’ experience and the ways in which war books represent the war as a ‘nightmare’, with a focus on the ‘physical details’ of degradation (2009, 249).<sup>113</sup> Barea’s narrative partakes of the same qualities, while also engaging in a narrative of ‘the pity of war’. Many Republican accounts of the Spanish Civil War do in fact focus on the horrors of war as a potentially universal theme and draw inspiration from the pacifist novels by means of emphasizing the

---

<sup>113</sup> In detailing his final days in Spain, Barea’s narrative also has a nightmare quality that mirrors the ‘modernist angst’ of Orwell’s narrator in building his case against the communist (Rae 2009, 252).

physical description of bloodshed and suffering, not only in the battlefield (as Barea did in *The Track*), but in urban spaces (as in *The Clash*) (Thomas 1990, 139–40).

After the battle of Annual, the burnt bodies

stank of roasted flesh, and we vomited. That day we began to vomit and we went on vomiting for days on end. [...] We did not sleep; we died each day, only to wake the following morning, and in the interval we lived through horrible nightmares. And always felt the smell. We smelt each other. We smelled of death, of rotting corpses. (1943a, 85)

As many other characters in Republican novels, Barea vomits in moments of extreme violence (Thomas 1990, 153). But the horrors of war and the reliance on the physical is not only a result of an anti-war sentiment. It is again the embodiment of ‘being there’, particularly as it was believed that ‘the battle is ‘learned’ through physical immersion: knowledge of war is, like sexual knowledge (or more mundanely, the ability to ride a bicycle) “acquired in the body”’ (McLoughlin 2007, 98).

If Orwell’s narrative avoids the atrocity elements and ‘pity of war’ discourse characteristic of the literature of the Great War, Barea’s novel endorses these in an attempt to emotionally appeal to the readers. Ribeiro de Menezes sees in Barea’s description of the suffering of victims, regardless of whether they belong to one side or another, an example of multidirectional memory which aims at overcoming the competitive memory that, she argues, the Historical Memory Law encourages (Ribeiro de Menezes 2013, 46). Sánchez Zapatero (2009a) goes one step further arguing that Barea’s references to the suffering of the Spanish and other soldiers feeds the transnational dimension of *The Track* by recounting the experience of any soldier in any war. I would add that it is crucial to consider how Barea is writing about those wars during yet another war, and that his accounts of the ‘pity of war’ could relate closely to what the soldiers of the Second World War were experiencing at the time – particularly since, as we will see in chapter 3, large parts of *The Track* regarding the Moroccan wars were written as the new war unfolded precisely in North Africa.

The fact that this suffering of victims on both sides is more heavily emphasised in the context of the Moroccan war (*The Track*) and not the Spanish Civil War (*The*

*Clash*) is, I believe, indicative of yet another way in which Barea's novels are moving between several discourses. For Barea, it seemed easier to displace these views of war to the Moroccan conflict, while adhering in his writing on the Spanish Civil War in the context of the Second World War to the 'versus habit' of anti-fascist language and themes. In *The Track*, Barea is able to explore the transversal horrors of war without compromising his support for the Allies and Republicans. Here the most important enemy is the common enemy throughout: all are victims of the Army, the Church and other members of the elite.

Rae also understands *Homage to Catalonia* as partaking of the ethnographical qualities of some of Orwell's other work (2009, 250). In confessing to his often 'ignoble responses of a fieldworker' Orwell's narrating voice 'is consistent with the values of modernist ethnography' (250). Bronislaw Malinowski was the father of an ethnography that aimed at reporting on the "'customs, beliefs and prejudices' of the fieldworker' as it delved into the culture of the observed (Malinowski 1922, 4 as cited in Rae 2009, 250). Through his detachment from the other soldiers, Orwell's narrative can be seen as foregrounding, rather than hiding, his cultural limitations (250-251). I believe that this quality of Orwell's exploration of the war in Spain, while not identical with Barea's, can help explain some of Barea's contradictions in describing the peoples of Morocco and Spain, his relationship with his wife and family, his detachment from other soldiers, his reactions to war, to the terror in Madrid and his time in France. Barea's link to 'modernist ethnography' is hinted at, but not followed up on, in one of Eade's (2011, 68) epigraphs for his discussion of Barea's *The Track*. By referring to *Heart of Darkness* – a reference that he does not go on to explain – Eade draws an important parallel between Joseph Conrad's and Barea's work. Malinowski's admiration of Conrad has been noted, and comparisons between Conrad and Malinowski (Clifford 1988, 92-114) and Conrad and Orwell (Rae 2009) reveal what Clifford calls a shared 'ethnographic subjectivity' in the efforts of all these authors to self-fashion. Barea, too, can be seen as embracing some of these traits in his novel, not least of all the open confession of one's own ideological bias and prejudices as an observer. In highlighting his in-between character, Barea often reflects on his own limitations to understand events, and his inability to overcome at times his own rebellious nature. In his final hours in Spain, Barea reasons that

I knew that I was not willing to kill. But I was an organizer and a propagandist, and I did no work as either. I might have been less self-righteous, more elastic in my dealings with the bureaucracy; after all, I had worked with it successfully in the service of patents whose benefits went to the heavy industry I hated. Now, in the great clash, I had put my qualms and aversions above the work. I had driven myself out of my chosen post in the war, out of Madrid. But for my intransigence and cherished individualism, Ilsa and I might still be doing work which, to the best of my belief, we did better and more unselfishly than most of the others. [...] Did I escape to an illness of the mind because I could not bear to be face to face with the things my eyes saw, and the others seem able to overlook? (1946b, 301–02)

Even when admitting to his ‘escape’ (into shell-shock, a condition every British reader knew was beyond individual agency), Barea maintains that he is, in a terrible way, more aware of the horrors he has seen than others who decide to look away, precisely because of his failure to fully commit. The legitimacy that he thus claims through confessing to his own limitations as an observer and narrator are in line with Barea’s construction as an honest writer. As Thomas has put it, Barea ‘lays himself open to criticism for the way in which he treated his wife precisely because of his honesty’ (Thomas 1990, 122).

### **An exile before exile**

The exilic consciousness has been often noted in Barea’s work in terms of his in-between status within Spanish society, mostly in terms of class. Critics have often emphasized Barea’s identity as a ‘desacomodado’ (Benedetti 1951, 376), ‘dividido’ and ‘solo’ (Pérez Minik, 308), ‘desclasado’ (Tawnson 2000, xiv), ‘entre clases’ (Eaude 2001, 75), en ‘terreno de nadie’ (Torres Nebrera 2009, 55).<sup>114</sup> More often than not, scholars read into Barea’s autobiography the biographical events that might explain his political commitment – and later his independence from party politics that ultimately forced him into exile – as a result of that life-long displacement (Ortega 1971, Lunsford 1999, 83; Eaude 2009). If Gareth Thomas sees the ‘exilic view’ in Republican literature of the Spanish Civil War as displayed through the

---

<sup>114</sup> For a complete overview, see Echevarría (2004) and Serrano Asenjo (2015, 339).

main characters of these novels as feeling cut off from others, being unable to communicate or not knowing where to go and what to do (Thomas 1990, 156), he adds about Barea's diasporic consciousness that '[i]t is not necessary to be an exile to display exilic symptoms. Barea would have probably been alienated even without living in England. These symptoms, however, are exacerbated by the prospect of an extended exile' (Thomas 1990, 156).

Indeed, such was the case of many Republicans who stayed in Spain after the war in what has become known as 'inner exile' (Ilie 1981).<sup>115</sup> In the case of Barea, it has been argued that he was an exile of this sort even before the war. I am interested, however, in reversing this analysis and arguing that as much as Barea might have indeed been an in-between and displayed 'exilic symptoms' while still in Spain, the fact that he emphatically highlights all this in his work written in Britain could also be a result of exile, more than its precondition. By highlighting in his novel how he already felt displaced in Spain, Barea constructs an exile before exile that does two things: it puts him in a position to better observe while in Spain; and it prepares him, in the text, to become the exile who will write it.

Enrique Serrano Asenjo has offered an analysis of Barea's self-construction of his childhood and adolescence as an in-between through a reading of his more intimate geography, which he argues is a 'space between spaces' (2015, 338). Barea's liminal position in his early years between the world of his wealthy relatives and his mother's poverty or in between his childhood and adolescence are exemplified in the ways in which he describes (or not) the access to his mother's *buhardilla*, the balcony in his uncle's house, his neighbourhood Lavapiés, or the pine woods in the outskirts of Madrid, all border spaces. What I find most relevant in Serrano Asenjo's analysis is that it highlights more than others the ways in which this liminal self is being created at the moment of writing far from Spain, through different discursive and rhetoric strategies, as a subject that is a 'cabal antecedente del adulto dividido entre clases y tiempos, e incluso entre dos países y dos lenguas, como certifica la suerte editorial del libro' (353).

Barea's intimate cartography can also be understood as defining an in-between space 'providing the terrain for elaborating strategies of selfhood – singular or communal –

---

<sup>115</sup> Aznar Soler argues against the term 'inner exile' (2002, 21).

that initiate new signs of identity' (Bhabha 1994, 2). As Homi Bhabha argues in the introduction to *The Location of Culture* (1994, 2),

[t]erms of cultural engagement, whether antagonistic or affiliative, are produced performatively. The representation of difference must not be hastily read as the reflection of pre-given ethnic or cultural traits set in the fixed tablet of tradition. The social articulation of difference, from the minority perspective, is a complex, on-going negotiation that seeks to authorize cultural hybridities that emerge in moments of historical transformation.

If we understand Barea's autobiography as a performative act of self-creation, the key announcement of all in-between spaces in Barea's novel is exile, and exile itself as the space of enunciation. Omar García-Obregón has indeed argued that '[y]o situaría el exilio en el área que reserva Homi Bhabha para el 'in-between', el intersticio cultural, esos espacios con los cuales se negocian los significados de la autoridad cultural y política' (2009, 6). Contributing to highlight Barea's 'transnational consciousness', the trilogy as a whole can be explained as Barea's search for an identity 'a caballo entre dos extremos' (Marra-López). We can thus go back to the view that José Ortega took in his article 'Arturo Barea, novelista español en busca de su identidad' (1971), in which he saw Barea's autobiography as the efforts of a writer to assemble an identity through the act of writing. The 'interesting figure' (Allison Peers) thus forged is that of the exile who cannot be anything else but an exile.

This figure could and probably had to hold several complementary and mutually reinforcing identities. The biography on the jacket of *Struggle* states that he is a member of the Spanish people – 'Son of a widow, educated in a school of a religious order, dependent on relative's charity, working at age 13' – who escapes poverty to a 'comparative affluence' (1941b). Barea's experience in the Moroccan war is mentioned to highlight his first-hand knowledge of Franco and to explain why he 'came to hate the corrupt militarism of Spain' (1941b). During the Spanish Civil War, Barea became 'head of the Foreign Press and Censorship Office in Madrid' and was later made 'Commissioner for Foreign Broadcasts by General Miaja', accounting for his knowledge of Republican Spain in an official capacity (1941b). His literary career is dated as beginning in 1937 (1941b). His first volume of short stories is mentioned, as well as his time in Paris 'as a free-lance writer under very

bad conditions' before coming to England. Finally, his credentials as a writer in Britain are listed as 'a number of articles, sketches and short stories in the English press, and a full-length autobiographical novel is appearing this spring' (1941b). Barea's foreignness was construed as his capital within the new contact zone, but also downplayed in order to present the Spanish cause and himself as its representative, not in opposition to the British, but fighting in the same camp, particularly as *Struggle* was published within the wartime literary efforts to support the 'people's war'. The biography thus notes that since arriving in England in 1939, 'Barea has always lived in the country because of poet's fondness for the quiet English countryside' – a blatant nod to a key trope of British patriotism. In reference to his assimilated 'Englishness', the account finishes by remarking 'that his spoken English is still atrocious, but he is beginning to appreciate Jane Austen' (1941b). Barea was a Spaniard who was not only fond of the English, but partook enough of Englishness as to become 'one of ours', and not only the primitive other (1941b).

The process of the forging of a 'rebel' was happening as Barea writes his trilogy, but also many other texts, during the first half of the 1940s. Across these texts, Arturo Barea never fits comfortably in one class (he is a working class clerk made into bourgeois), one religion (an anticlerical spiritual soul), one place (he moves between city and country, is an experienced traveller of Spain and Europe and has already been exposed to other cultures in Morocco), one culture (not formally educated but with literary ambitions), one political creed (he is a trade union member above all and a humanist socialist, but supporter of the Popular Front, with a soft spot for the anarchists and capable of uniting with the communist when needed), one woman (Ilsa is not his first wife, albeit she does become his first true partner) or one Republican Spain (as he is critical of many Republican errors).

If the latter point became the most widely underscored reason among critics to highlight his objectivity and the honesty of his testimony, all the other aspects played their part in the picture. In a review of *The Forge* in 1941, Antonia White noted that Barea the protagonist, narrator and author, 'knows from the inside the lives of beggars, bank-clerks, shop assistants, bourgeois and peasants. He has been rich and poor, employer and employed, submissive and rebellious, believer and sceptic' (1941, 218). 'Knowing', whilst depending on some kind of belonging to some degree, does not mean a definitive and unambiguous belonging to a single group or

place or home. Barea's contrapuntal awareness is presented as being there from the beginning, his capacity of knowing is in relation to a belonging that involves constant movement in and out, as in the new ethnographic method.

The only stable and unquestionable alignment of Barea in all this is with the 'common people', as he sides with the victims of injustice throughout his work (Echevarría 2004, 55-56). To be sure, despite – or precisely because of – the different roles he played in life and the different social classes he came to know intimately (whilst always feeling like an outsider), Barea's class consciousness was heightened and put to the test during the war. Barea's trilogy has been read as a pessimistic narrative of 'deseducación política' (Altisent 2003, 157), in line with the disenchantment of many anti and ex-communists for the failures of the Left, including other Republican exiles (Thomas 1990, 149–55). Furthermore, Ortega has noted how in *The Clash*, Barea's identity disintegrates during the war; he feels detached from his body which starts to dissolve and believes to be also losing his mind (1971, 384). Ortega therefore sees the novel as precisely Barea's cathartic attempt to reconcile his Unamunian 'yo agónico' with the world through a dialectic based on hope, on a communion with a humanity beyond the confinements of (Spanish) society and history (1971). But if Ortega sees this struggle as an ongoing process in the novel which fails to materialize, I suggest that it can also be seen as reconstructed from the vantage point of exile, precisely because it is in this new space of the in-between where this *desarraigo* conveys an ethical awareness, often claimed by writers in exile (Faber 2006). To be sure, while his identity dissolves and his life as his former self is essentially destroyed, it can be argued that Barea resurrects himself in exile through his writing and for his writing. Ugarte (1999, 51) in fact notes that exiles tend to separate their lives in two, their previous life in the homeland and the new life in exile – the need to record one's life seen as the need to understand the person who one was before the metaphoric death of exile. In this sense the autobiographical act of self-creation goes hand-in-hand with the chrono-spatial crisis, which is experienced by the exile as also an identity crisis. Barea's trilogy ends in the moment his exile starts (cf. Zapatero 2009a, 261, n. 146), or more precisely, it ends as his exile in Britain starts, as he reaches the place and present of writing (at least of the second and third volumes).

But whilst all this is true, Barea's resurrection is still primarily the opportunity to reconstruct a self that is not only a psyche recovering from past wounds, but a figure who can claim legitimacy and credibility as an exile to speak about Spain and intervene in the world. There is a personal quest here to keep traces of the past self,<sup>116</sup> but it is also a legitimizing and political rhetoric. Barea's claims to his working-class origins are to be seen in this instance in the overall context of constructing an authorial voice.

### **A writer for (and of) the people**

Parallel to his building on his Spanishness as a representative of Spain, Barea's writings constantly reinforce his working-class credentials as a representative of the Spain of the Spanish people. Through his work, Barea articulates his role as a working class intellectual, writing on behalf of and for the people: 'creo que soy el primer escritor que proviene de las clases bajas de una gran ciudad, y el primero con experiencia de la industria y el comercio modernos' (2000, 124).

The first volume of the trilogy, *The Forge*, surely helped establish these credentials in its portrayal of childhood in the working-class quarters of Lavapiés and his early experiences of injustice and class antagonism.<sup>117</sup> But Barea's take on his role as a 'people's intellectual' is also articulated in his work, not least of all through specific criticisms towards other Spanish intellectuals.

Throughout his work, Barea posits himself in a very different category from that of the traditional Spanish 'intellectual', which he often defined as 'an aristocracy of the Left' (Barea 1943a, 138). Not only did he write several literary essays in which he gave an overview of the Spanish literary and intellectual movements of the twentieth century, including several essays describing Unamuno (1951), Ortega and Madariaga as elitist intellectuals out of touch with the Spanish people (1947), he also dedicated a whole passage of his autobiography to a negative description of the literary and

---

<sup>116</sup> What is left from his previous life is his origin, his mother, his belonging to the Spanish people (Ortega 1971, 383–84). As Ortega (1971) and EAUDE (2011) noted, the importance of the 'roots' in Barea's novels can be seen in the many images of rooted trees.

<sup>117</sup> This alignment is at times betrayed by Barea's own writing. Both Ortega and Serrano Asenjo have argued that Barea's account of his early years is in fact ambiguous in that he claims pride in his working class origins that he often fails to materialize. While Ortega (1971) provides a Freudian explanation of Barea's relationship with his mother, Serrano Asenjo (2015) notes that in his detailed descriptions of his intimate geography, Barea fails to ever describe the *buhardilla* where he lives with his mother, therefore refusing to fully engage with her poverty.

intellectual field of the 1920s (1943, 32-138), into which he had tried to tap at the time. According to his account, after having been told by Valle Inclán to ‘stay home and study’ if he wanted to learn how to write instead of going to the *tertulias* of the Ateneo and the cafés of Madrid, he unsuccessfully tried to access *La Residencia de Estudiantes* concluding that

the marvellous achievement of Giner de los Ríos had a very serious defect, the basic defect of all Spanish education: the doors were closed to working people. Intellectuals of the highest standard might issue from there, as in fact they did, but all of them came from well-to-do families which could afford not only to give their sons a professional career, but also to let them study for this career in open challenge to the formidable organization of religious schooling. There was no road for me there.<sup>118</sup> (1943, 138)

Barea’s claim is that he had to educate himself: he did not wish to go through the system of the conservative Right with its traditional values cultivated in Catholic schools. But neither did he, nor could he, wish to be part of an intellectual, often leftist elite that had not been able to connect their cultural projects with the demands of the Spanish working classes (Holguín 2002, 144). Barea’s claims to be a ‘people’s intellectual’ resonated well in the historical context of writing about Spain in Britain during the Second World War as a ‘people’s war’.

Barea was here carving a space for himself not only against the big names of the generation of 1898, but against his contemporaries who had participated in the Spanish Civil War. Barea purported to resent the Spanish Left-wing intelligentsia and their ‘exaggerated and often undeserved publicity in this country [England]’. They had been unable, both in Spain and in ‘emigration’, to make ‘themselves core of the Spanish democratic and socialist mass movement’ (1941b, 112). In *Struggle* (1941) he called these people ‘self-centred’ and ‘self-conscious’ and added that they joined communism to gain ‘an intellectual framework’, while despising the trade unionists (1941b, 113). He felt that

[t]he fantastic educational surge among the Republican masses was, I think, better understood and shaped by Anarchists in Catalonia and the functionaries of the socialists youth groups and the trade unions than by the

---

<sup>118</sup> These claims were doubted by Guillermo de Torre who asked Barea to cut them out of the novel because they rung untrue. Barea did not.

‘Alliance of anti-Fascist Intellectuals’ with its spectacular pseudo-Marxists activities. (113)

Barea was particularly critical of the International Anti-Fascists Writer’s Congress, ‘with its exhibition of intellectuals posturing on the background of fighting Madrid and discussing the political behaviour of [anti-communist writer] André Gide’ (Barea 1946b, 263). In *The Clash*, Barea blames his and Ilsa’s dismissal from the censorship office in Madrid on Constanca de la Mora’s and María Teresa León’s decision in their capacity as members of the Spanish Communist Party (1946b, 265). All this mirrors remarkably, and hence should be read along with, the feelings vented by Orwell towards certain sectors of the British intelligentsia:

[t]here is little in them except the irresponsible carping of people who have never been and never expect to be in a position of power. Another marked characteristic is the shallowness of people who live in a world of ideas and have little contact with physical reality. [...] It is broadly though not precisely true that the people who were the most ‘anti-Fascist’ during the Spanish civil war are most defeatist now. And underlying this is the most important fact about so many of English intelligentsia – their severance from the common culture of the country. (1941, 38)

Orwell, in his review of Barea’s novel, had echoed Barea’s sentiments when saying that ‘[t]o the Spaniards the war was not a game, as it was to the ‘Anti-fascists’ writers who held their congress in Madrid and ate banquets against a background of starvation’ (2001, 373). Orwell emphasized that Barea’s legitimacy as an author was based fundamentally in his class as he argued that ‘it is most of all his peasant origin that fits him to describe the war from a specifically Spanish point of view’ (372).

This said, Barea allowed for some exceptions in the Spanish intellectual landscape, namely Ramón J. Sender and, as we have seen, Federico García Lorca, both recognized by Barea as representatives of a literature of the working classes, albeit in different ways. In his essay ‘Realism in the Modern Spanish Novel’ (1946a), Barea identified Sender as the first writer to capture in his literature the social movements in Spain.<sup>119</sup> Like Barea claimed for himself, Sender had already been labelled as

---

<sup>119</sup> Barea wrote to Sender for the first time in 1947 to thank him for his review of the US edition of *The Forging of a Rebel* in the *New Leader* (1947). In his letter, he recounts their first encounter and his admiration for the writer of *Imán*. Barea wrote, ‘Nos hemos cruzado una vez en la vida hace unos

‘anti-intellectual and anti-literary’ and therefore had ‘made his way outside the cliques and sets which dominated the intellectual life in Spain’ (1946a, 68).<sup>120</sup> Barea credited *Imán* – the story of a blacksmith given the nickname of Magnet because he attracts not only the pieces of red hot iron that could harm him but, as a conscript in Morocco, he ‘seems to attract trouble, misfortune and hurts’ (71) – as having

the strength to move its Spanish readers and to make their resentment and rebellion more articulate, because it showed, through the mental life of that simple brute of a soldier, the senseless suffering of a whole conscript army led to the slaughterhouse by greedy, ambitious and often inept generals. (71)

Sender’s style was so close to the average Spaniard’s experience, Barea explained, that it soon became ‘a symbol for the anguished, numb struggle of the men at the bottom of the social pit’ (72). Barea also credited Sender as being the inaugurator of an ‘imaginative realism’, particularly in *Seven Red Sundays* (73-75). This path opened by Sender, Barea argued, paved the way for the novel that the post-war Spanish people needed to ‘clarify their minds and illuminate their actions’ (75) – novels which fused the ‘reality of social life and the inner mind’, combining ‘emotions and the surface of things’, and engaging with ‘the struggle to shape ... [the] present and future’ (75).<sup>121</sup> If, for Barea, Sender was the novelist of the Spanish people, Lorca was their poet.

In his essay entitled *Lorca, the Poet and his People* (1944) he defended the view that though Lorca ‘grew up to fame within and through the progressive intelligentsia of his country [...] he became not the poet of a high brow set, but the poet of the Spanish people’ (1944b, 11). Barea argued that the *Romancero* became ‘a banner of the Spanish masses’ because it enabled the ‘ordinary men and women who fought in

---

veinte años. Esta entrevista fugaz que para usted no puede haber tenido huella alguna, la tuvo para mí intensa. Alguien nos presentó en una barraca de libros viejos que hubo en la calle de Carretas donde en tiempos existió una fábrica de peinetas para nuestras abuelas. Ramón Sender era entonces para mí una figura a imitar aunque de él no conocía mas que *Imán*, pero me parecía encarnar toda la rebeldía y toda la honestidad que yo sentía dentro de mí’ (1947i).

<sup>120</sup> Ironically, it is precisely on grounds of this essay that Francoist critic Ynduráin accuses Barea of being an intellectual (see page 132). As Francis Lough notes, it was a common stance among Spanish revolutionaries to claim to be anti-intellectual. This attitude is exemplified, for example, in Antonio Espina’s article ‘¿Incompatibles?: la cultura y el espíritu proletario’ (1930) (2011, XXXIII).

<sup>121</sup> Blending political commitment with subjectivity was central to the literary projects of many on the European Left. This was exactly what the new romantics in Spain had advocated in the 1930s, particularly Díaz Fernández’s *El nuevo romanticismo* (1930), Max Aub attributed to socialist humanism in *Discurso de la novela española* (1945), Orwell expressed in ‘Why I Write?’ (1946) and Sartre wrote with regard to existentialism and socialism in ‘What is Literature?’ (1948).

Madrid' to 'discover themselves and explore their feelings' through Lorca's verses (11). In fact, while Barea affirmed having met many of those detached intellectuals before and during the war, he also claimed to have come to know Lorca from the vantage point of the 'common reader' (18). Barea might not have belonged 'to [Lorca's] set, but I belonged to his public, the people, and it is the people's Lorca whom I know' (12).

In his literary criticism in general, Barea distanced himself from 'professional' intellectuals. He wrote in a letter:

Yo no soy un crítico literario en el real sentido de la palabra. Lo único que ha pasado es que, posiblemente, me he metido donde no me llamaban por razones puramente españolísimas... yo no entiendo de gerundios bastante para ponerme barba de profesor o de crítico; lo único que pasó es que me enfadé seriamente primero con las distorsiones de Hemingway en su famosa novela *For Whom the Bell Tolls* y después con algún poeta inglés que no quiero comentar.<sup>122</sup> (1954b)

In his writings about Spanish literature, as in the rest of his work, Barea often drew on personal experiences that could explain his literary knowledge. In *The Forge* he explains how as a member of the growing working class reading public – a reality that would have resonated strongly in the British Left – he had accessed the great literature of the times through the cheap editions that flourished during the first decades of the twentieth century thanks to 'revolutionaries' such as Blasco Ibáñez and his 'Illustrated Novels', proscribed by the priests at school (Barea 1941c, 121–22). According to his autobiography, Barea's informal education results from his literary ambitions and love for reading. Novels – from *Uncle Tom's Cabin* in relation to the colonial Spanish-Moroccan wars and the independence of Cuba to pacifist books such as *Lay Down Arms!* (1943a, 43,110) – are frequently mentioned in his autobiography, particularly in *The Track*.

It was in this capacity that he could claim a specific, 'popular' cosmopolitanism for his work. It is his belonging to the working class that, Barea argues, makes him capable of understanding the struggle of the people everywhere. As quoted above, Barea explicitly stated in the introduction of his autobiographical trilogy that he attempted

---

<sup>122</sup> In reference to Stephen Spender and a disagreement they had over Lorca.

‘to be vocal on [...] behalf’ of the ‘common people or ‘the little men’ or ‘the lower orders’’, who ‘do not usually write’, because he ‘was one of them’ (1943a, 2). It is precisely through this articulation of and insistence on the people that Barea claims to be fighting with his literature for ‘the common people’ in both Spain and Britain, and eventually elsewhere (1–3). Roland Gant wrote in his study of the trilogy, ‘Arturo Barea: a Writer of the people’:

One hears of the various leaders, of popular figures in this or that party, but what is known of Juan Pérez, the Bill Smith or John Doe of Spain? What was the life of the working-class Spaniards during the years which led the plotting of a revolution, the war itself and the taking of Spain as a symbol? Out of that final conflict emerged a writer who speaks for the common Spaniard. Although the epithet ‘a working-class writer’ has been abused in its use I do not hesitate to apply it to Arturo Barea. In addition to speaking for the Spaniard, Barea speaks for the international working class.<sup>123</sup> (1949, 29-30)

Naturally, Barea’s claims to anti-intellectualism were not bought by all. In his review of Barea’s work, the Francoist critic Ynduráin pointed out how a few chapters of Barea’s trilogy had been printed in Sartre’s journal *Les Temps modernes* (1946) as proof of the writer’s intellectual credentials. The accusation that followed was, and still is, the standard charge against anyone writing for those who cannot write. Ynduráin argued that ‘[a]unque Barea ha hecho alarde de no ser escritor intelectual y no se paga de refinamientos, en 1946 colabora con una publicación inglesa de minorías, en *Focus Two*, editado por Rajan y Pearse’ (1953, 76).

Although such accusations of leftist intellectualism were a particularly sordid product of Francoist Spain, Ynduráin’s review – which is important to understand Barea’s exclusion from the Spanish literary canon (Larraz 2009, 138-140) – makes some valid points about Barea’s work that go beyond the author’s social status into matters of literary style:

Su artículo ‘Realism in the Spanish Novel’ [*sic*] forma parte de un Symposium dedicado a la novela de la tercera década. [...] Y piensa que el único viable es aquel que junte la realidad social de la vida con la

---

<sup>123</sup> This endorsement of international working class struggle eventually turned into a declaration of universal, ‘human’ values. In the introductory note for the *The Broken Root* (1951), Barea explained that ‘[i]n telling a story about the Spaniards living in Madrid in 1949, I have tried to give shape to human problems which are universal and by no means confined to a particular country’ (1951, 6).

interioridad, lo emotivo y la apariencia de realidad. El lector advertirá al momento cómo las ideas de Barea coinciden con el concepto literario más difundido en los últimos años, con el de Sartre, por ejemplo. (Ynduráin 1953, 76)

For Ynduráin, the whole argument made in this thesis that Barea wrote as a transnational author would be reduced to a simple dismissal of him as an author whose only luck was that he rode of an international wave.<sup>124</sup> Simultaneously, Barea was also accused of writing bad Spanish, of being too popular and uncultured.<sup>125</sup> But others, who Barea must have felt mattered more to him by then, wrote of Barea's anti-intellectualism like Mario Benedetti: '[p]ese al mismo Barea, la depuración intelectual que la realidad experimenta en su obra, resulta tan evidente como su antiintelectualismo [...] Nada de esto supone *intelectualizar* la realidad [...] sino disponer de ella inteligentemente' (1951, 378-79). Barea must have been happy with this description, which echoed so well the appreciation by Tosco Fyvel who in 1941 wrote that as soon as he spoke to him he realized that this 'Republican Spanish refugee writer' who 'seemed tired, and spoke in halting French [...] must be a writer of rare perception' (1941b, 5).

This chapter has explored Barea's autobiographical project as a performative act of self-creation in which Barea's collapsed several identities into his literary persona and authorial voice. To find a voice within the cosmopolitan contact zone, he emphasized his 'Spanishness' as instrumental in his role as a cultural mediator. In this sense, Barea's work can be studied in the in-between place of ethnography and travel literature, particularly in its dynamic handling of insider/outsider views. Barea's credibility was based on his role as an actor, not only an observer, which gave his account of Spain and its wars a subjective perspective. Barea's modernist techniques, particularly in relation to his war writing, have been analysed in this chapter through the lens of the literature of the Great War as antiheroic accounts of

---

<sup>124</sup> Although an evident condescending and negative criticism of Barea's work, I partly have argued similarly to Ynduráin in that Barea 'iba a favor de la poderosa corriente antifascista y su obra corría la suerte de un alegato contra los enemigos de las grandes potencias democráticas; solo así se explica la fortuna de esta novela, traducida a nueve idiomas en poco tiempo' (1952). Although I would not say 'solo', I do agree in that Barea's anti-fascism 'partly' explains his international success.

<sup>125</sup> The trilogy in its re-translation into Spanish had some grammatical inconsistencies that have been often noted. The translation in English, in contrast, while mimicking a popular Spanish speech, was often praised for its literary qualities. This may have contributed to the imbalance between Barea's international and Spanish literary reception.

the individual and degrading experience of soldiers. Barea's limited, partial and confused narrating voice can be seen as that of Patricia Rae's 'modernist ethnographer'. Barea's self-construction as an exile before exile further construes his in-between position by which he claims the legitimacy to act as a cultural translator. Finally, despite his several shifting identities, Barea's allegiance to the people is central to his identity as a working-class and an anti-intellectual writer. As we will see in the following chapter, in order to keep the anti-fascist struggle of the Spanish Civil War alive, Barea had to adapt his writings on the Spanish conflict to make it a part of the larger battle.

If we have started this chapter by noting how Barea's autobiography was written as an ethical response to an other (Loureiro 2000), I would like to finish by pointing to the fact that literature also allows for the reverse encounter. Ribeiro de Menezes' interpretation of Barea's trilogy as 'multidirectional memory', or what I have argued is Barea's voice as a 'modernist ethnographer', suggests that Barea's work, while highly political and politicized, can and should also be read for its literary qualities. As Francis Lough (2012, 237) has argued for the literature of the Spanish Civil War,

the more a text is valued for the experience described, as raw testimony or propaganda for example, than for any qualities it may have as a literary text, the more transparent and utilitarian, and potentially time-and context-bound, it becomes; if, on the other hand, a text is viewed primarily as a literary text, this very categorization will bring with it a different approach to reading.

While most of my analysis in this thesis is perhaps more preoccupied with the former analysis than with the latter, Lough's quote points at the importance of understanding Barea's trilogy in literary terms, which this chapter has also explored. Lough suggests that certain contemporary novels of the Spanish Civil War can be seen as staging not only the events that took place during the conflict, but 'Attridge's notion of an encounter with "the other" in which the self becomes transformed' (252) – an experience that echoes a cosmopolitan encounter. Lough (2012, 238) concurs with Attridge (2004, 27–28) in that when confronted with a literary text, the reader also encounters an other, and does so through time, so as to trigger a process of change in the reader that allows for different encounters and indeed different readings. Similarly to how the encounter with alterity in cosmopolitan thought demands an ethical response, Attridge (2004, 130) argues that '[a]ll creative shaping

of language' also makes ethical demands on the reader, understood as a 'disposition, a habit, a way of being in the world of words'. Literature then encourages a process of 'questioning, and self-questioning' (Attridge 2004, 208) on the reader, but also on the writer. Barea's questioning of the other and of the self, along with the openness of his literary work to a readership intent on listening to the exiled translator – as seen in the different interpretations it triggers – does deserve a cosmopolitan literary reading.

### Chapter 3. The Key to Victory is Spain

As we saw in chapter 1, writing about the Spanish Civil War in Britain was a socially and intellectually complex task. It depended on editorial choices that took into consideration the public's mood, wartime discourses, but also censorship and British foreign policies. Barea's place as explored in chapter 2 enabled him to write from the interstice between Spain and Britain and intertwine the two nations. In his role as a cultural translator, Barea interpreted Spain and its war for a British public. To do this for a British – and increasingly international – audience, Barea both situated himself in a unique position and tapped into wider wartime discourses about the anti-fascist fight for democracy. Rearticulating various versions of the war in Spain in order to offer a usable past to better fight the present of the Second World War was at the heart of the work of many Republicans in exile, who hoped that the triumph over Germany might bring about the fall of Francoism. In these connections between the local, the European and the global, between Spain, Britain and the wider world, and between the past and the present, we can consider Barea's work as transnational and partaking of a complex triadic relationship between the homeland, the host state and the Republican exile.

This chapter will explore how Barea translated his experiences of the build-up to the Spanish Civil War, especially during the Moroccan War, into lessons to be learned by the British, both in essays and in *The Track*. Three quotes – by Charles Duff, Arthur Koestler, and Barea himself – sum up the mood that allowed for the maintaining of Spain on the agenda of the British Left as the Second World War unfolded:

If the ordinary newspaper-reader can be brought to understand that Franco's Spain is not neutral, is venomously hostile towards England and directly under the control of Germany, then it is at any rate conceivable that our policy may be changed by force of public opinion. (Orwell 2001, 337)

Spain is Europe's Original Sin; that is why the memories of that ridiculously small-scale war remain unblurred in our minds even now, and bear such a strong emotional charge. (Koestler 1941, 219)

It is easy for any Englishman to see that Spain is strategically important in a European war. The very existence of Gibraltar shows that generations of English statesmen and military men were aware of it. (Barea 1941b, 108)

But the position of Orwell, Koestler and Barea was in no way dominant. As Orwell noted in 1940, 'if one remembers how during the past three years we have been deluged with books on the Spanish war, mainly from a pro-Government angle, it might seem that the familiar Popular Front viewpoint is hardly worth re-stating. Unfortunately, this is not the case' (2001, 336). Barea, in his turn, complained in *Struggle* that 'strategic considerations, coupled with a blissful ignorance of Spanish conditions and psychology' led to 'the deliberate and resolute blindness of the British press and officialdom to every turn and twist of Franco Spain's international policy' (1941b, 108).

In fact, the official position of Britain towards Spain, its propaganda strategies and foreign policies were ambiguous at best and generally avoided overt criticism in order to not provoke Spanish anti-British sentiments and to push Franco into the arms of the Axis (Cole 1990, 72–75). Above all, the challenge for the transnational intelligentsia in London was that, despite the Second World War being understood as an international conflict, its early years were a 'time of particularly profound national self-absorption' in Britain (Baxendale 1999, 301). Despite Britain hosting a cosmopolitan contact zone where British writers and European exiles engaged in transnational discourses about war as a defence of democracy, British wartime narratives were often highly nationalistic. To appeal to a British reader who may have been more concerned with the daily challenges of war than with what had happened and was happening in Spain, Barea had to frame his topics as primarily British wartime concerns – particularly in his earliest articles written in Britain.

Barea needed to bring up examples from the war in Spain and connect them with current British interests and anxieties. To do this, one common strategy was to work on the Spanish conflict's international dimension as a prelude to Britain's current war. 'Europe's original sin', in Koestler's words, served as a cautionary tale of the failures of appeasement and non-intervention, and of the dangers of the fifth column controlled by Germany. As Tom Buchanan has argued, left-wing supporters felt that two lessons could be learned from their experience in Spain and the fate of the Spaniards: the need to fight fascism and the ability to resist foreign aggression

(2007, 178). The symbolic function of the Spanish Civil War in Britain often appeared as a continuation of its ideological rather than its (reduced) geopolitical importance (Ucelay da Cal 1990, 24). But during the Second World War supporters of the Republic also felt the need to prove that Spain was more than just the ‘moral’ cornerstone of Europe. Support for the Spanish Republicans had to be framed as ‘as a part of the general defence of democracy’ but it was also important to highlight ‘the strategic importance of the Spanish peninsula’ (Orwell 2001, 336). When Franco’s invasion of Tangier in the autumn of 1940 brought Spain into the eye of the British public again, it was crucial to point out Franco’s plans for reviving a Hispanic Empire starting in Gibraltar – and thus affirming that controlling Spain could be the key to victory over Germany (Duff 1940).

To understand how Barea connected the two conflicts, this chapter offers a thematic close reading of *Struggle for the Spanish Soul* (1941), a selection of key journalistic articles (1940-1941), *The Track* (published in 1943, but written in 1941), and some correspondence and personal notes.<sup>126</sup> Barea’s texts will be seen as both responding to British wartime discourse and as continuing the earlier Spanish Republican propaganda efforts to challenge non-interventionism. But it is important to note from the beginning that this was a complex undertaking particularly with regard to Barea’s positioning during these years as an expert on Spain.

### **The transnational Spanish Civil War**

As Paul Preston has argued, one of the fundamental questions in the interpretation of the Spanish Civil War was whether the war was fundamentally a Spanish issue or could be seen as part of a larger struggle (1984, 5-6). The most progressive positions were not necessarily those maintaining the internationalist theory. In Preston’s view, the importance of the work of Gerald Brenan, author of *The Spanish Labyrinth*

---

<sup>126</sup> The articles are: ‘The Spanish Mind and Gibraltar’, *Time and Tide* (6 July 1940); ‘Fifth Column’, *Reynold’s News* (19 August 1940); ‘Spaniards and Morocco’, *Time and Tide* (12 October 1940); ‘West of Gibraltar’, *Time and Tide* (16 November 1940); ‘The Men who walk in the Streets’, *New Statesman and Nation* (23 November 1940); ‘Spaniards at Home’, *Time and Tide* (28 December 1940); ‘What Morocco Means to Spain (condensed from Time and Tide), *World Digest* (21 January 1941); ‘Spanish Catholicism I’, *New Statesman and Nation* (25 January 1941); ‘Hispanity’, *Time and Tide* (1 February 1941); ‘Spanish Catholicism’, *New Statesman and Nation* (25 March 1941); ‘Tangier’, *Time and Tide* (29 March 1941). Most of these texts are closer in time than they may appear. Barea was already writing *The Track* in 1941, and he started *The Clash* in 1943. Part of the delay in publishing was due to the need for Ilsa to translate and edit the volumes, for which she had little time because of her job in the Monitoring Service.

(1943), was precisely that he gave an interpretation of the war as a specifically Spanish affair:

While most contemporary writers were still playing with the simplistic notion that the Spanish war was a battle between fascism and communism, Brenan perceived that it was a fundamentally Spanish affair, rooted in the agrarian question and comprehensible only in terms of the previous hundred years of Spanish development. (Preston 1984, 5–6)

Other Hispanists such as Hugh Thomas, in contrast, gave a ‘highly colourful narrative account’ which ‘emphasized the role of British intellectuals, the wider diplomatic dimension and the activities of the International Brigades, to the detriment of the ‘Spanishness’ of the Civil War’ (6). Similarly, Jorge de Hoyos has argued that the different political families of the Republicans in their early exile in Mexico offered different interpretations of the conflict, not only based on the war/revolution distinction, but also stressing the international/national dimension of the war. For example, the more democratic-liberal sections of the Republic emphasized the international nature of the war as a first step in the fight for democracy against international fascism, relegating the role of the Spanish people to the background and presenting Franco as a traitor who sold himself to Hitler and Mussolini (de Hoyos 2011, 5). As such, the version of the Spanish Civil War as a war against foreign invaders gained prominence in its aftermath for the international public sphere. This interpretation of the war as a foreign invasion coexisted with interpretations of the war as a class struggle (8). Exile thus appeared as the only free Spain in which the moral duty of intellectuals would be to write about the Spanish war and the situation of imprisonment of the Spanish people under Franco’s rule (6). Barea’s work seems to move between these poles – the national and the transnational – with some ease. If in his journalistic articles and in the foreword of *Struggle* the narrative of the war in Spain is described as merely the first stage of the larger war, most of Barea’s other work, including much of the main text of *Struggle*, is about highlighting the role of the Spanish people in fighting against the Spanish ruling class. For example, Barea both praises and downplays the role of the International Brigades not so much on account of many being communists, but transnational. The tensions between different versions of events were an inheritance of the several propaganda strategies of the Republican government during the Spanish Civil War.

If for the Francoists the war had been shaped as a national movement, a religious crusade, and a war against communism, for the Republicans the war had been and still often was described alternatively as the defence of a legally elected government against a military rebellion, a struggle between progress and feudalism, and a national fight of the Spanish people against a foreign invader (García 2010, 114; Núñez Seixas 2005). The main propaganda themes around these narratives included presenting the Republic as the embodiment of a modern and democratic country, pointing at German and Italian intervention and countering accusations of religious persecution by stressing the oppressive and corrupt nature of the Spanish Catholic Church (Moradiellos 1989, 299).

In Barea's work we can see a continuation of these themes, not necessarily excluding each other but often coexisting within the same texts. Aside from the themes mentioned above, Barea's writings on the situation in Spain revolved around other main topics that were later expanded in his political essay for George Orwell's *Searchlight* series, *Struggle*: the expansionist strategy of Franco in Morocco and the Francoist idea of a Spanish Empire regarding Latin America; all of which were possible threats for British interests. In the following sections, I will focus on how Barea made the links between the Spanish Civil War and the Second World War explicit and explored them as parts of the same struggle for democracy against fascism. As Tosco Fyvel wrote in the foreword to *Struggle*, 'the tragic struggle of the Spanish people against all odds is shown not as the last failure of the past, but a continuing part of our own present history' (Fyvel 1941, 2). There were lessons that could be learned from the Spanish conflict, and Barea was happy to teach them.

### ***The rear of a Fifth Column***

Britain suffered the German Blitz (the Battle of Britain extended from September 1940 to May 1941) along with a growing fear of Fifth Column activities. In June of 1940, Barea suggested to the weekly *Reynold's News*, the organ of the Co-operative Party, writing an article on his experience of the bombardments in Madrid. The editor suggested instead that Barea write an article on 'the practical procedure of the Fifth Column as you saw it at work in Spain' (Elliott 1940). It was Barea's role as a witness of a previous conflict, but not necessarily as an expert on military tactics,

that made his testimony valuable to *Reynold's News*. The piece 'Fifth Column' became one of Barea's first articles in the British press. It could not have been timelier, as it was published in September 1940 at a moment when talk about fifth columnism had just started to emerge in the American and British press as a possible explanation for German quick victories in Europe, especially in France.

Fifth Columnism was one of the most popular wartime myths of both the Spanish Civil War and the Second World War (Jong 1952). The term had been coined in 1936 by Franco's general Emilio Mola to explain that, while he had four columns to attack Madrid, a fifth was undermining Republican authority inside the besieged city (Ruiz 2014). A play by Hemingway published in 1938 carried as its title 'The Fifth Column'. In 1940, the theme received wide coverage in the American and British press. It was thus a perfect connector that could be used to remind readers of how understanding the Spanish struggle could be useful in order to better fight Germany. To make the connection more vivid, it was only logical to emphasise how the enemy now was the same as the enemy then. In Spain, German 'technicians and industrialists were busy creating a network of key positions with a view to the future "non-belligerency" of Spain' and paved the way for a close relationship between Hitler and Franco against Britain (Barea 1940c). Most dramatically, of course, the Fifth Column had helped defeat the Republic from within. As John Langdon-Davies had done in *Fifth Column* (1940), the book that helped popularize the term in Britain (Buchanan 2007, 154), Barea argued that such activities in Spain had been aided by the situation of 'hunger and lack of arms' on the Republican side, which had subsequently 'demoralized the defenders' and made Valencia a 'hotbed of defeatist rumours' (1940c). The people of Spain would not have surrendered if they had not been sabotaged from within by the fascists and the Germans.

The real danger for the British, Barea argued, was that '[t]he raw material for the fifth column was – and is everywhere – to be found among men who declare, firmly convinced of their own patriotism: 'Rather Fascism than Socialism'' (1940c). This argument was similar to that made in *The Lion and the Unicorn* by Orwell, who argued that sections of British society were secretly supporting Germany (1941a). Orwell contended that a victory by Hitler would appeal 'to the very rich, to the Communist, to Mosley's followers, to the pacifists, and to certain sections among the Catholics' (1941a, 62). Even more worryingly, as had happened in Spain, the

working classes might also surrender if they came to think that defeat was near (62). Both Orwell and Barea were writing this in 1940 when, as mentioned already, the chances of a British victory over Germany were felt to be less than good. The message in Barea's article was clear: in the midst of the Battle of Britain, Britons should not give up. They should think of what happened in Spain – and of course ideally, once victorious, think of liberating Spain as well.

The message that the people must not surrender is a frequent motive in Barea's writings. It had been there in *Valor y miedo*, and clearly deserved further cultivation in Britain as a means to participate in a British inspirational discourse to sustain the public's morale on the Home Front. Here the discourse of the Left resonated with official declarations. On the eve of the Battle of Britain, in June 1940, Churchill had encouraged Britons to endure German bombings just as the Spaniards had done.

I do not at all underrate the severity of the ordeal which lies before us; but I believe our countrymen will show themselves capable of standing up to it, like the brave men of Barcelona, and will be able to stand up to it, and carry on in spite of it, at least as well as any other people in the world. (1940)

### *Spanish bombs*

It is remarkable how the most modern warfare – Hitler's *Luftkrieg* – was coming upon Britain amidst invocations of a Civil War fought in a marginal corner of Europe. But of course the machinations, many argued, were the same, always coming from Germany. The most obvious way in which Germany was responsible for the defeat of the Spanish Republic was through its military support to the rebels; the most shocking and relevant means was the involvement of the *Luftwaffe* in bombing civilian populations. As Hugo García has noted, the Republic drew great propaganda benefits from the rebels' air attacks on civilians in their territory (2010, 137). If countering non-intervention was one of the Republic's main propaganda objectives, then insisting on the fact that many of the attacks were done by German bombers was an argument that could not be stressed enough.

In light of this, it is interesting that Barea's proposed piece on bombs for *Reynold's News* was rejected. Ilsa wished to publish a novel titled 'Ordeal by Bombs' about her experiences in the Telefónica building, insisting on the fact that it could be marketed

as relating to the new air bombardments. But this proposal was rejected, too. Only two short stories from *Valor y miedo*, a collection largely concerned with the experience of bombardment, were re-published on the topic until 1945.<sup>127</sup> This may suggest that, despite all that could be learned from the Spanish Civil War, the British public was still not quite ready to hear that particular line of the lesson.

But the archive shows clearly that air bombardment was a constant preoccupation of the Bareas during their early exile and until the end of the Second World War. Already in *Valor y miedo*, bombed sites appear as the stages and at times the protagonists of the destruction of war. The early short story ‘Argüelles’ – a text that later found its way into *The Clash* – describes a ghostly and deserted neighbourhood on the Madrid front, a ruin of its former self, devastated by the incessant and unforgiving enemy shelling.<sup>128</sup> The sites of air attacks in Barea’s work are often filled with victims who have suffered terrible wounds. In spite of not being able to fully bring to the fore the example of the Spanish Civil War in the printed press during the early 1940s, many of Barea’s broadcasts for the BBC during this period did refer to his own experiences – albeit focusing on the Blitz. Finally though, one major literary contribution about the bombings in Spain did come out: in *The Clash* (1946), Barea was able to both describe his experiences in Spain at great length and reflect on the fact that the British had not wanted to hear about them. It came across as a belated lesson, an exploration of Spain that, having been suppressed earlier, came back with a vengeance. Robert Stradling notes that ‘[t]he overarching narrative of *The Clash* reveals its author’s personal obsession with bombing, to the point of paranoia’ (Stradling 2008, 275).

If there was any ‘paranoia’, it was justified in the first place, and of course a feeling increasingly shared across Europe. Air raids and the bombed city were, as Stephen Spender and the feminist and pacifist writer Vera Brittain argued, the ‘background’ of the Second World War. Popular novels such as James Hanley’s *No Directions* (1943) were set in London during the Blitz (Rawlinson 2009, 197). And it did not take a radical stance to see how the immediate antecedent had been the experience of ‘total war’ in Spain, with Guernica becoming rightly its ‘signal visual monument’ (Cole 2012, 198). Narratives of the Spanish Civil War were full of scenes of aerial

---

<sup>127</sup> ‘Heroine of the Telefónica’ (Barea 1939a) and ‘Brandy’ (Barea 1940a).

<sup>128</sup> For more on the relationship between *Valor y miedo* and *The Clash*, see Rodríguez Richart (1992, 223-229)

bombardment, including Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. Portraits of civilians craning their heads and staring into the sky became an iconic image through the photographs of Robert Capa, David Seymour 'Chim' and others (198, 213), often reproduced in publications such as *The Voice of Spain* and *Spain at War*.

Barea's own shell-shock is a major theme in *The Clash*, but also a reality which haunted him for many years. Barea's fictionalized description of a twitching piece of brain after an air raid (1946, 238) mirrors his documented fear of taking trains and going into London to record his programme for the BBC during the Blitz, expressed in numerous letters to friends. Thinking of his work as a means to exorcise personal traumas is surely one way of reading Barea's trilogy and its vivid descriptions of the effects of war and bombardment (Ribeiro de Menezes 2013, 56). Of course, 'the affective description to convey the horrors of war' (Ribeiro de Menezes 2013, 50), the focus on the bodily experience and the 'pity of war' that permeated the anti-war books of the Great War are all there in Barea's novel.

Yet it is important not to lose sight of the politics of writing accounts of bombardments in Spain in the midst of another war. The air raid scenes in Barea's fiction follow quite closely the conventions of Republican atrocity propaganda, appealing very directly to basic emotions of fear and anger through affect. This was naturally the case in the short stories of *Valor y miedo*, written during the siege and contracted for propaganda purposes, but then many of the same descriptions reappear in *The Clash* to make very similar points. In fact, if the former stories dealt primarily with the 'ordinary people's behaviour under bombs and shells' (Barea 1939f), the latter focuses quite gruesomely on the aftermath, on the death tolls and the dismembered bodies of the victims. Following the conventions of atrocity propaganda writing, Barea's victims were, for the most part, children, women and working class families but never, for example, middle class business men.<sup>129</sup> The scenes of a pregnant woman 'propped up on her bleeding arm-stumps' or 'a bundle of petticoats with a leg sticking out, bent at an impossible angle over a swollen belly' surely resonated with a readership which had just suffered the same fate. Whether they did so by arousing sympathy or repulsion, and whether they were ultimately

---

<sup>129</sup> An exception might be the short story 'Brandy', but then it is a rather unflattering portrait of the protagonist, a middle-aged bourgeois that in order to overcome his fear had to drink cognac every night while lying terrified in bed, with his rather unpleasant wife. This man later imagined that he had acted with courage during the air raids alongside the rest of the *madrileños* by helping those in need.

effective in gaining support for the cause of Spain was never clear though. As one untouched reviewer noted, Barea's 'unreasonable frame of mind' might not have been due to shell-shock at all. In his opinion, 'those who saw how little shell shock bombing produced in a united London may wonder whether the anxiety created by suspicion, intrigue and denunciation was not its root cause' (Gallop 1946, 136).

This comment shows just one of the possible ways in which the use of atrocity propaganda could be counterproductive. The critic believed that the situation in Spain was radically different from that in Britain – not least of all because of the internal strife among the Republicans as opposed to the unity of the British people, a view that Barea was keen to contest. Charles Duff had already advised the Republican government in 1937 that atrocity propaganda was not particularly popular with the British readership, partly because it gave the impression that the war in Spain was the result of the savagery of Spaniards as a radically different people (García 2010). Barea remembered vividly, when writing *The Clash* in 1944, the resistance of foreign correspondents to repeatedly reporting on the consequences of German air raids, as the effect of such news seemed to tire rather than to interest the public.

Barea's description of Vallecas after a raid is a good example of atrocity propaganda weaved into a novel, with the emotional emphasis placed on the tragedy of a particular working class family hit by German shells:

I went to investigate the damage done by a single three-engined Junkers which had circled low and slow over the jerry-built cottages of Vallecas, on the evening of January the 20<sup>th</sup> [1937], dropping a stick of bombs on the little square where women were sewing and children playing. I had met the father of three of the murdered children, and I thought that I would do what the professional journalists did not do because minor raids were no longer a story for them. [...] His wife had been killed on the doorstep, with a baby in her arms. Two older girls had been killed. A six year old boy had lost one of his legs. The smallest girl, aged four, had over a hundred scratches and wounds from shrapnel dust in her little body. The eldest boy, bleeding from his torn eardrums, had carried her to the First Aid Post in his arms. I visited the one-legged boy in the Provincial Hospital and heard the father, Raimundo Malanda Ruiz, tell the story [...] I imagined that this was a good case history

to illustrate non-intervention, but presumably I did not understand the market of foreign public opinion well enough.<sup>130</sup> (1946b, 229-30)

Written in 1944 and published in 1946, this passage is a remarkable balancing act. It brings to the fore Barea's awareness of the importance of international propaganda – including atrocity propaganda – and of his own confessed role as a propagandist during and after the conflict. It leaves out the crudest details without allowing the reader to rest for a second, as the text goes from the bombs straight to the mourning family. It also accuses any reader who may have tired or not wished to read about such events, virtually forcing them to now imagine what has been left out. One of the possible problems here, Barea added, was the English resistance to thinking, let alone talking about, death.<sup>131</sup> 'War means death', wrote Barea in his essay on Lorca essay in 1942, but while the Spaniards were fighting their war,

it was still possible for an English war correspondent to avoid gruesome stories about mangled bodies, 'because people don't want to read about such things at their breakfast table'. But then the haze of blood drifted over the Continent, and those who could not help sensing it, the poets and the genuine intellectuals, had to prepare for the inevitable test. How could they learn to face those hideous visions without becoming 'morbid'? (1944b, 76).

Barea's criticism does not quite do justice to the way foreign correspondents reported the bombing of Guernica and elevated it to the highly symbolic status it has retained to this day (Cole 2012, 213). Barea's ambiguous evaluation of the role of the foreign press and overall intervention was a recurrent theme in his work. It can be read in light of his attempts at legitimizing his role as interpreter of the war as well as a criticism in hindsight of non-intervention and what he felt was the disengagement of the general public opinion, in obvious need of enlightenment on the matter. There was, Barea argues, a need for him to act in place of the 'professional journalists' who were not doing their job.

---

<sup>130</sup> Whilst Stradling (2008, 277) doubts that this bombardment ever took place, the memories of Vallecas victims such as the Malanda family are widely available to the public (Fernández 2010). Whether they took place exactly as Barea describes or not is difficult to say, but the details (whether fictitious or not) certainly do not suffice to discredit the account as a whole, as Stradling implies.

<sup>131</sup> Barea's words contrasts with what American writer Gamel Woolsey identified as an interest in atrocity propaganda stories – she coined for it the term 'the pornography of violence' in her book *Malaga Burning* (1939) (cited in Valis 2010, 214).

*The Clash* also pointed to air bombardment in other ways to highlight that the Spanish Civil War was an antecedent of the Second World War. In relation to the experience of bombardment in Britain, Barea recalls the bombings in Barcelona as a series of images flashing by as in a nightmare – another modernist technique found in narratives of war. However, he also remembers meeting John Strachey – who joined the Air Force in 1940 and later the directorate of bomber operations, while broadcasting for the BBC (1946b, 305) – and Nordahl Grieg, ‘the Norwegian writer who was shot down in a British aircraft during a raid on Germany six years later’ (305). The mention of these well-known Second World War heroes ties the destiny of the Vallecás families directly to that of the British people.

More importantly, as much as the previous quote on the victims of air bombardment can be seen as yet another description of the horrors of war, it is also a clear denunciation that, in this instance, the Germans were the clear guilty party; the anonymous and powerful enemy against the common people and their children. Mentions of the relationship between the Spanish upper classes and Germany are frequent in the trilogy. Barea recalls, for example, how, while working for the patent office in the twenties, a German engineer came to demonstrate to the Spanish authorities how the Junkers could be used as bombers (1946b, 79–80). This also served to drive home the argument that the Spanish Civil War, which Britain had allowed to continue by not intervening, had been the chief rehearsal for the wider conflict, not just in ideological terms, but because the German air force had had its training ground there. Even if this had been repeated an infinite number of times during the Spanish war, Barea could not resist reminding his British readers that the German “‘tankists” and pilots in Franco’s army tested the arms which they later applied against France and England’ (1940c). The two wars were materially connected.

### ***A fight between World Democracy and World Fascism***

The main reason though to connect the two wars was that they could be read as two stages in the same global conflict, argued Barea in many of his writings in the same period. The ‘average Spaniard’ had defended not just the Spanish Republic, but ‘World Democracy’ against ‘World Fascism’ (1941b, 70). The Second World War

was, as the Spanish Civil War had already been, ‘a war of freedom against despotism, of democracy against totalitarianism, of future socialism against present fascism’ (Barea 1941b, 115). In *The Clash*, we find the narrator suddenly analysing the war in Spain from the vantage point of knowing how it ended. In thinking about the meaning of the Republican fight, Barea noted:

Even in my own ears, my purpose sounded crazily audacious: to make people abroad see and understand enough of the human and social substance of our war to realize how it linked up with their own latent, but relentlessly approaching fight. (1946b, 318)

This message had been best encapsulated in Barea’s first article for the *New Statesman* in November 1940, ‘The Men Who Walk in the Streets’ (Barea 1940g), which we have seen left a lasting impression on the editors of the *Searchlight Books* series. Barea opened the article by presenting the main contenders, careful to ally Franco with the Axis powers and the Republic with Britain and international anti-fascism. On the one hand, he argued, the *Duce*, the *Führer* and ‘their unfortunate Spanish imitator have irrevocably lost their birth right of simple and fearless life among their fellow men, for they have lost their personal cleanness and dignity in their quest for power’ (511). That is why, according to Barea, they need to go around in bullet-proof cars and with a theatrical display of guards. ‘On the other hand’, Barea argued, ‘we know Mr Chamberlain and Winston Churchill and the King and Queen walking on foot through the streets of British towns’ (511). Furthermore, Barea reminded the reader that not only dictators had lost their right to walk the streets, but ‘Hitler and Mussolini have killed very many men who thus walked the streets, in confidence and dignity’ such as Etkar André, Hans Litten or Giacomo Matteotti, heroes of the European Left in its fight against fascism (512).<sup>132</sup> Barea recognises that he can speak of these men only from ‘second-hand information’, and therefore focuses for the rest of the article on examples of men ‘of whom I can speak out of direct knowledge’ (512); that is of Spanish Republicans who he thought could

---

<sup>132</sup> Etkar André was a member of the German Communist Party who was hanged in 1936. The first battalion of the International Brigades was named after him. Hans Litten was a German Jewish lawyer known for having antagonised Hitler in cross-examination in 1931. He committed suicide while imprisoned in Dachau in 1938. Giacomo Matteotti was murdered by fascists in 1924 after publicly denouncing them in, among other places, his book *The Fascists Exposed: A Year of Fascist Domination*. Hugo García identifies him as one of the anti-fascist heroes commemorated in the magazine *Octubre* in 1933 (2015, 9) and in *Almanaque antifascista* edited by the CNT-FAI in 1937 (29).

be regarded as new additions to the international anti-fascist pantheon. In Spain, Barea reported, Franco had recently killed Esquerra Republicana de Catalunya leader Lluís Companys and one of the Republic's leaders who had shown willingness to negotiate with Franco, the socialist Don Julián Besteiro. Both of them

had remained upright, firm in their convictions, right or wrong, during the violent tempests which in the end swept our country into chaos and ruin and put it into the hands of the brutal adventurers of the twentieth century. Up to the very end, Julián Besteiro and Lluís Companys freely walked through the streets of Madrid and Barcelona. Like Churchill or Bevin or the King of England in London or Glasgow, now. (512)

As Churchill and Ernest Bevin represented different political projects in the wartime all-party coalition government, Companys and Besteiro personified a Republic in which different ideological positions were possible and desirable in contrast with the monolithic and fear-based totalitarian regimes.<sup>133</sup> Both Besteiro and Companys had been able to walk freely in the streets of Republican Spain, despite their politics being in conflict with the Government. Barea is careful to point out that he 'never agreed with their political ideas', but chose to talk about these men because of their 'qualities of honest men with clean hands', describing them as 'Spanish democrats' and 'humanists' who above all 'hated bloodshed' (512). Companys and Besteiro gave credibility to the version of the Republic as a democracy, and diminished the Francoist version of the war as a fight against communism, particularly as both Company's and Besteiro had challenged Negrín's Government, the latter to the point of organizing the Coup against the Prime Minister of the Republic. But more importantly, both were dead today because of '[f]ascist brutality, thinly disguised by military glamour and a varnish of Christian-sounding phrases' (512). The implication in Barea's argument was that not all Republicans were communists, but Franco's murderous regime was beyond any doubt fascist.

With this, Barea seems to have felt that he may have pushed his British readers to their limit. He hurried to add:

Yet, I have no intention of speaking of my country's tragedy. What I want to stress to you, the British, is the significance of men who can walk in the

---

<sup>133</sup> Ernest Bevin was a Labour politician, Minister of Labour from 1940 to 1945 (for more information, see 233-4).

streets, freely – the physical and the moral valour of a cigar hanging in the corner of a mouth, or a casual bowler hat. Don't let it get lost. Defend it, as we Spaniards perhaps did not know how to defend it, although we stoically supported bombs and shells of the same trade mark as the shells and bombs that now fall on you. (512)

With this backhanded motivational compliment Barea encapsulated the central message of the 'people's war' as a war for democracy against fascism going far beyond the boundaries of the nation. If 'freedom' was one of the Churchill's key wartime concepts (Baxendale 1999, 308, 303), Barea translated it from an abstract idea into the everyday personal experience of walking down the street. At the same time, the figure of a man walking down the street with a bowler hat surely reminded the British readership of the national symbol that was Strube's cartoon 'Little Man', the epitome of the ordinary man in the street of interwar Britain ('British Cartoon Archive' 2016). However, in this article, Barea's admiration of the British people and the system that safeguards their dignity and individual freedom extends beyond the praise of the common man to the representatives of the State. Barea's article partly partakes of Churchill's Whig (liberal) narrative, in which Britain's historical mission was to fight for freedom which was best represented in its Parliamentary Institutions (308). If the Francoist state did not represent the Spanish people, in Britain both the British people and British institutions embodied the will of the nation, and were worth fighting for. Even the institution of the Monarchy – against which the Spanish Republic had stood – was praised in this motivational piece by Barea for its democratic nature. In fact, the Crown was generally praised in wartime discourses not for 'its heroic leadership' but for contributing to the war effort 'like everybody else' (308).

The same motive would appear again in Barea's writing as he dedicated his broadcast 'Holiday' in February 1941. Even Orwell had claimed in *The Lion and the Unicorn* that a socialist revolution in Britain would surely 'abolish the House of Lords, but quite probably will not abolish the Monarchy' (Orwell 1941a, 85). This adequacy of the British state to its people was the perfect reverse of Barea's analysis of contemporary Spain. And Barea's 'people's war' echoed to perfection the war of Churchill's speeches: as the prime minister put it on 14 July 1940, although 'we are ranged beneath the crown of our ancient monarchy [...] this is no war of chieftains

or of princes [...] it is a war of people's and of causes' (cited in Baxendale 1999, 308). If Parliament was 'the expression of an unconquerable national will', the people became agents of their destiny, the motor behind their leaders, reminding them of their wartime mission to resist the enemy until the end (308). Barea could only add:

If one day you should see those men, your leaders, in their humanism afraid of more sacrifice of lives, then urge them on. Give them new spirit. Acclaim them in the streets of your towns whenever they walk there. Tell them that life is not only valueless but will be lost in the end by the hands of butchers, in shameful darkness, if there is too much fear that others – you – might die. (1940g, 512)

Considering the overall message of the article – to resist defeat, even in the face of their leader's fear and death – the mention of Besteiro could also serve as a warning of the dangers of surrendering: dying in shameful darkness instead of in the midst of the fight for freedom. But more importantly, while praising the values of the British democratic system and encouraging its people to fight, Barea reminded his readers that the right to walk the streets should also be shared by Spaniards and by the people everywhere. One victory could lead to the next. The worst mistake Britain could make was to keep supporting Franco out of the fear of him joining an Axis, of which he was already part.

### ***The Track from the Spanish Moroccan War to the Second World War***

'So Spain pocketed Tangier!' wrote a somewhat ironically triumphal Barea in November of 1940. If Spain might hold the key to victory, it was also because of its geopolitical role in the Mediterranean, particularly though its intentions towards Gibraltar and Morocco:

True to the example set by Germany and Italy on other occasions, Franco Spain tore up an international treaty, brushed aside promises and declared that an international fiction was now removed at long last, English influence driven out of yet another spot, and that Tangier was Spanish. (Barea 1940f, 1115)

Franco invaded the Tangier International Zone in June 1940. He suppressed its international institutions in November 1940, annexing it to Spanish Morocco for the remainder of the Second World War. This event would be one of the two times in which Francoist Spain put Britain's diplomatic efforts to the test, gaining an unusual prominence in the course of the war. The other moment of Spanish involvement in the war was the participation of the Blue Division in the Eastern Front against Russia, announced in July 1941. After the Spanish Civil War, a devastated Spain was dependent on Anglo-American economic aid, which was administered within a strategy oscillating between coercive and co-optative. Despite the fact that this dependency would effectively prevent Franco from entering the war on the side of the Axis, Franco was not absolutely constrained by it, as proven by his constant violation of agreements with the Allies. During the critical years of 1940-1942, Franco's decision on whether to enter the war or not became a matter of serious preoccupation for Britain (Smyth 1999, 188). As Denis Smyth explains, 'Spain's geopolitical location astride maritime, imperial and intercontinental lines of communication made her choice for peace or war a matter for considerable –and, at times, critical – importance for both belligerent camps during the Second World War' (189).

As a consequence, if not Spain's collaboration, at least Spain's neutrality was regarded as essential for Britain to win the war. As Charles Duff put it in *The Voice of Spain*, 'a friendly Spain is desirable, a neutral Spain is vital' (1939, 66).<sup>134</sup> The primary goal was to prevent a German attack on Gibraltar at all cost, which would have meant a catastrophe both on the Mediterranean and the Atlantic fronts at various levels, including the loss of import channels from overseas on which Britain was dependent to sustain the war effort.<sup>135</sup> After the war, Churchill could not help but recognize that Franco's neutrality during the conflict had been essential to an Allied victory. But as Smyth points out, 'Churchill's gratitude was misplaced', as Franco's non-intervention was anything but the result of strategic goodwill (1999, 189). Churchill would perhaps have been more aware of this if he had read any of Barea's writings on the matter.

---

<sup>134</sup> Charles Duff had written an essay highlighting Spain's strategical importance in the Mediterranean, *The key to Victory: Spain* (Charles Duff 1940).

<sup>135</sup> Franco's neutrality would also prove essential during the Anglo-American operation 'Torch' in North West Africa in November 1942, for which Gibraltar would be the key strategic point (Smyth 1999, 189).

The bulk of Barea's explicitly political writing on Spain took place during 1940 and 1941, when Franco's colonial claims to North Africa and Gibraltar made Spain the protagonist of British foreign policy. Barea published several articles as well as *Struggle*, in which he assessed the significance of Franco's incorporation of Tangier into Spanish Morocco in November 1940 for both Spanish and international actors.<sup>136</sup> In 1941, Barea also wrote *The Track*, his autobiographical account of the Riff War in 1920-1926 – one of several stages of the Spanish colonial wars in Morocco. Finally published in 1943 by Faber, *The Track* can be read as the literary expression of his political writing of this period.

I will focus here on reading passages of *The Track* within the context of the Second World War and Britain, by comparing some recurrent themes in the novel with Barea's contemporary texts on Spain and Morocco. Read against each other, these texts give a picture of Barea's efforts to change public opinion towards Spain's perceived neutrality during the Second World War. Franco's annexation of Tangier should, Barea argued, be read as the first step of his colonial expansion. Ironically, the end of the status quo was probably the best solution for Britain and the Spanish Republicans. If Spain entered the war in Morocco, the Spanish masses would revolt against the dictator and join the British struggle against fascism. The Spanish people, Barea explained, were particularly scarred by the experience of Spanish colonialism in Morocco during the 1920s, which was 'the living space of the ruling Caste of Spain', and 'the dying space for the common people of Spain' (Barea 1941b, 91). The indispensable element for the Spanish people to rise though was international support, particularly from Britain. In contrast with Franco's imperialist ambitions, Barea held the view that a future 'democratic Spain would have to renounce its protectorate over Morocco, but claim its sovereign right to Gibraltar, and to lease it to England as a base' (126). Barea's argument is constructed to appeal to a British reader, and to convince her of the common destiny holding Republican Spain and the Allies together.

This novel was only published in 1943, when the Franco regime had already decided to follow an inconvenient but essentially harmless policy of neutrality. However, it was written in the heat of the events of 1941. 'The Legion', a chapter of *The Track*

---

<sup>136</sup> The articles analysed will be the following: 'The Spanish Mind and Gibraltar' (6 July 1940) (1940b); 'Spaniards and Morocco' (12 October 1940) (1940d); 'West of Gibraltar' (16 November 1940) (1940f); 'Tangier' (29 March 1941) (1941h).

on the Spanish fascist leader Millán Astray, had already appeared in *Horizon* in December 1941, at the height of the Tangier crisis. It is a chapter in which Barea gives a vivid account of one of the battles in which he participated in Morocco in the 1920s. He is witness to the atrocities of the Spanish colonial army and the irrationality of war. This chapter was published in the midst of Operation ‘Crusader’ in North Africa, in which the British fought the Axis forces commanded by Rommel, and it was probably also attempting to remind readers of the links between Francoist Spain and the Germans in North Africa.

As Eade (2011, 63, 113) has already suggested and I explored in chapter 2, the trilogy can be read together with the more explicit ideological programme of *Struggle*. For the purpose of this chapter, what I would add is how skilfully Barea analyses Spain’s imperial ambitions in the 1920s as relevant to the outcome of the Second World War. *The Track* focuses on the Moroccan war as a pivotal moment in forming both Barea’s personality as a young adult and in underpinning Spain’s internal conflicts that lead up to the Spanish Civil War. It is in the foreword of this volume that Barea reflects on the fact that his autobiography was losing some of its therapeutic value in favour of a more political reading of his past. It is also here that he addressed the British public to explain that he believed *The Track* to illuminate ‘the dark psychological and social under-currents of the Spanish War and its aftermath, which are so palpably still an integral part of this greater war’ (Barea 1943a, 3).

Accordingly, in *The Track* Barea often interprets events from a contemporary perspective despite his claim that he ‘constantly endeavoured not to let my present knowledge and convictions impinge upon the picture I formed at the time, because only this picture is historically relevant’ (2). In fact, critics of Barea have noted a change in style in this volume, highlighting the more explicitly political content, particularly the explanation of ‘the embryo of fascism’ and his own anti-war and anti-imperial stance (Echevarría 2004, 167; Eade 2011, 62). I suggest that this may have been down to the immediacy of the events that Barea was responding to. While writing *The Forge* in Paris, shell-shock and personal grief had been intertwined with the collective loss of hope for Spain and fear of the unfolding events in Europe in 1938. In 1941, it is not only a generic anti-fascist sentiment that Barea is articulating, but a concrete response to wartime events.

### ***Who owns the Rock? Talking about Gibraltar and British non-intervention***

‘The Spanish Mind and Gibraltar’ (Barea 1940b) was one of Barea’s first political articles published in Britain and it already addressed the situation in Gibraltar, a contentious cornerstone of Spanish-British relations of strategic importance for the outcome of the war. It appeared as a response to correspondent Vernon Bartlett, who had wondered if the Franco-Spanish propaganda on Gibraltar would be enough to ‘rally the Spaniards against England, including those Spanish Republicans who had fought against the Fascist menace’ (704). If the Gibraltar question was not properly explained – by a Spaniard, Barea argued – it could lead the British to underestimate the importance of the matter and make further mistakes in trying to appease Francoist Spain. Keeping in line with what he had done in ‘A Spaniard in Hertfordshire’ (1939), Barea starts his analysis in ‘The Spanish Mind and Gibraltar’ with crossed national (mis)perceptions:

During my wandering in England, I have been asked dozens of times whether I had often taken part in a bullfight. [...] It is, however, compensated by a corresponding popular idea in Spain: to the average Spaniard, an Englishman is a robber, because England stole Gibraltar from us. (1940b, 704)

Barea argues that – as with many misunderstandings among the Spaniards about the British – this historical antagonism is not natural, but due to the hegemonic discourse of the Spanish ruling caste, influenced by the Germans and passed from generation to generation by the teachings of priests at school. In a rather humorous account of his schooldays, Barea remembers how the teacher explained to his eight-year-old pupils that the English not only stole Gibraltar, but that England was a country of freemasons and its king ‘the foremost Mason’, which impressed a picture in the children’s mind of ‘bearded men with a knife between their teeth, and a bomb with a smoking fuse in their hands’ (704).<sup>137</sup> The Francoist regime would refer to Spanish Republicans in similar terms, ‘freemasons’ being one of the key words. The obvious conclusion for Barea is that the Francoist regime, including the Catholic Church, was

---

<sup>137</sup> Barea’s description of the English might have reminded a British reader of the stereotypical image of an anarchist – ‘in his childish mind, freemasons, anarchists, and nihilists all meant the same’ – so often associated with the Spanish (Barea 1940b, 704).

in opposition to Republican Spain in equal measure as to the heretic Protestant England (704). In order to fight back, the latter two should share their destinies.

Naturally, there was no point in going too deep into the history of the Rock, lest some memories might surface regarding the murky appropriation of the place in the early 1700s. The solution to Barea was simple: it was ultimately the Germans who were to blame. The Gibraltar campaign had started during World War One when ‘German propaganda in Spain then launched an anti-English campaign through [the journal] *Tribuna*’ (704). The Spaniards involved were used by German agents ‘as much a plaything of German power politics as the Carlists of our day have been made the instruments and the cannon-fodder of Nazism’ (Barea 1941b, 84). At the time of writing, the Gibraltar question was being revived in Spain for the same propagandistic purposes (Barea 1940b, 704). And if the British were to hold on to Gibraltar as they certainly would, then it should be done not against the Spanish people, but against the Spanish caste and their pro-German affiliations (704).

Until it was manipulated by the Germans, Barea explains, Gibraltar was only a matter of picturesque patriotism, fed by an essentially harmless anti-French and anti-English sentiment taught in Spanish schools. Now, however, Britain needed to stop and think again about its non-interventionist stance. The Nazi campaign might work, Barea feared, because the Spanish people of Barea’s generation have been heavily exposed to this narrative and the ‘ignorance concerning England among the ordinary Spanish people is enormous’ (705). In fact – the circularity is remarkable – these very same people felt resentment against England because of the non-intervention policy (705). Britain should, as Barea kept insisting, change its policy towards Franco’s Spain.

In *Struggle*, Barea expands on this article by introducing more evidence of the ‘fascist-imperialist and German propaganda in Spain’ (Barea 1941b, 87). He also gives more examples from his school years in order to explain the pervasiveness of Gibraltar as a *leitmotif* of the historical antagonism against England. He brings to the readers’ attention that ‘Franco referred to Gibraltar as the irrevocable legacy left to Spaniards by Queen Isabella the Catholic’ (Franco’s speech from July 17 1940, cited in Barea 1941b, 88), and that ‘[f]alangist propaganda left no doubt that this would be part of Hitler’s New Order and of the disintegration of the British Empire – not the outcome of friendly negotiations’ (88). The lumping together of Isabella the

Catholic, Falangism, Hitler and a threatened British Empire carries remarkable power. It is only lightened by this slightly picaresque and at the same time most British of allusions to pragmatism as a universal value. According to one of the anecdotes, the Spanish workers and labourers had other problems to worry about, so much so that a group of gypsies had once told Barea: '[l]ook. As to its being Spanish, the Rock *is* Spanish. But God preserve us from the 'Misters' going away. What should we poor devils live on if they did?' (87).

In a more serious vein, the following personal anecdote, used both in *Struggle* and in *The Track*, takes place as Barea and his captain in the early 1920s are observing Gibraltar across the channel from Ceuta. The captain confides to him that

[o]nly 12000 metres in a straight line, and we are here so powerless. You know I'm no preacher, but I can't help saying that Gibraltar is really a disgrace. You know what guns we have here in Ceuta. They are older than you or I. England won't let us fortify the place or set up modern guns. Krupp [the German armament producers] would have installed them for us free of charge. (87)

The anonymous captain's views are given as an example of the anti-English and pro-German historical sentiments of the Spanish army – and an accusation against Britain for trying to keep Spain in a subaltern position. This is a Manichean interpretation of the conflict, and the main function of the text is unashamedly perlocutionary. In *The Track*, the same anecdote conveys a slightly different, more complex message. The captain now has a name, Captain Barberán. About Gibraltar, he remarks that '[t]he Rock is a bit of Spanish soil which we must redeem' (178). But then the conversation goes on to the war in Morocco. Tangier, to the invasion of which Barea was now reacting as a writer, was in Morocco after all. Barea – the young soldier in the novel – now blames the international powers for creating the Spanish Protectorate in Morocco as a result of the Conference of Algeiras in 1906. His Captain agrees and says: 'Do you know that England won't allow us to fortify Ceuta or the Sierra Carbonera? We still got our old batteries from the year 1868, and in a few places even bronze guns' (178). Barea is quick to also blame the French – by the time of this writing, subdued by Hitler – for selling arms to the Moroccans. He suggests that '[we Spaniards] ought to address ourselves to the Powers who gave us the task to tackle, and say to them: 'Gentlemen, here you have it back; settle it

between yourselves as you like', in reference to Germany, Britain and France (179).<sup>138</sup> The blame is not with the Germans alone this time. The pointing to the international responsibility for the situation in Spain and Morocco is evident. Europe as a whole needed to sort things.

Barea's writings on Gibraltar were an integral part of his constant criticism of British non-intervention. Certainly the character of his arguments had to do with choices related to genre. But his writing was even more constrained by the unfolding of the war and Britain's foreign policy objectives, which shifted according to the rapidly changing international events. In his first journalistic article for *Time and Tide*, Barea's take on non-intervention had been relatively mild. In the political pamphlet and then in the novel, it is more aggressive. In 'The Spanish Mind and Gibraltar' (Barea 1940b, 705), the BBC is said to have given a 'reasonable explanation for non-intervention'. In *Struggle* and *The Clash*, the criticism is fierce. Barea now recalls how foreign journalists instructed by their countries to downplay the first Italian intervention the Civil War, because 'the fiction of non-intervention had to be conserved' (Barea 1946b, 232). There was a shared desire to 'get the news of what was happening across to the people and the papers in England France, and the United States' (232).

All of this was not free of risk, but Barea and his editors seem to have calculated that he would have the support of a majority of Britain's leftist readership. In the midst of the Second World War, when it was obvious that non-intervention had not prevented a European war, Barea put his finger in the wound of Chamberlainian appeasement. Of course it was not a bad moment to do this, since Chamberlain was not in charge anymore. Now, it was the leaders of the past who could be blamed. Churchill, in contrast, could be invoked as a strong figure, capable of mobilizing Britain to defend itself. Winston Churchill, Barea explained, whilst being 'a conservative who has many ideas contrary' to his, was 'at least a man. To put it brutally — a man with guts' (Barea 1941b, 74). Here was yet another platform on which the British and the Spanish people could unite: in a gendered paroxysm that makes us uneasy today, the manliness of the British soldiers now fighting Germany was on a par with the

---

<sup>138</sup> The conference settled that Morocco was to be divided into protectorates, the French one in the South and the Spanish one in the North, which left Germany out of the equation. In order to limit Germany's power in Africa, Great Britain supported France in what was the beginning of the *entente cordiale*.

manliness of the Spaniards who had fought to defend Madrid and Barcelona. The Spaniards were ready to endorse the new war as their own alongside their natural allies in the North – even though, unfortunately, ‘English men’ had not thought ‘our fight was theirs’ (74).

At this point, not only a strong leader like Churchill was needed, but strong citizens who would participate actively in the ‘people’s war’. The book that encapsulated this discourse, Michael Foot, Frank Owen, and Peter Howard’s *Guilty Men*, had been published in July 1940 by The Left Book Club. It became an immediate best-seller and sold around 200,000 copies that year alone (Holman 2008, 29). Orwell made the same argument in several articles, including in his essay *The Lion and the Unicorn* (1940). Barea’s stance was to be part of the tide, always with the insider twist. He explained that he did not think Britain should attack Spain, but that Britain should not waste more time in securing allies within Spain. If they showed the Spanish regime that ‘Britain saw through their game’ and ‘was conscious of having friends in the working-class districts, the villages – and the prisons of Spain’, then something could be done (Barea 1941b, 123). Barea felt that this ‘change in diplomatic language’ could have countered German and Falangist propaganda, while demonstrating ‘the basic strength of England’ (122). Furthermore, ‘[i]t would have created less resentment and distrust in the minds of Republican Spaniards than the consistent flattery offered to Franco and his regime by Sir Samuel Hoare’ (122). Barea leaves a door open by saying that ‘all this is past history, just as much as is Spanish ‘neutrality’’ (122).

Barea’s criticism of non-intervention is always balanced with words of praise relating to his exile in England, particularly after his negative experience in France – a resentment with which many British readers would have sympathized. ‘How few have we reached England!’, he wrote in *Struggle*.

It is not that I want to flatter a country where a book like this one can be published. I myself have experienced emigration in France, the traditional country of refuge, where I passed through misery and tribulation. Having travelled through all the stages of bitterness of the average Spaniard, when I reached England I was apprehensive and disillusioned. Only here have I begun to breathe. Here at least a man can feel free. (73–74)

Despite all of the misunderstandings, difficulties, censorship and overall pernicious non-intervention strategies towards Franco's Spain, Britain was nonetheless a place from which Barea could still intervene in the public debate on the Spanish question, even criticizing – as much as possible – his host countries policies. This became all the more important as Franco threatened to intervene in the Second World War.

### ***'What Morocco Means to Spain'<sup>139</sup> and Britain***

Parallel to the Gibraltar question, in 1940-1941 Barea wrote extensively about Morocco in several journals as well as in *Struggle* and *The Track*. In one of his first articles on the matter, Barea already identified that Spanish-Tangier posed a fundamental challenge to Britain, being 'out of reach of the guns of the Rock itself' (Barea 1940f). Spain now controlled the Straits of Gibraltar on both sides (Smyth 1999, 188–89), but Tangier was also the key to Morocco (Barea 1940f). Franco intended to conquer the entire region as part of his Hispanic imperial revival (1940f; 1941b): 'By the rights of history, Africa is the natural prolongation of our country. Our mission in the world begins in these neighbouring lands', the Foreign Minister Serrano Suñer proclaimed in December 1941 – and Barea immediately quoted in *Struggle* (1941b, 189).

Barea explained to the British readership not only the political and strategic wartime relevance of Spain's invasion of Tangier, but its ideological and historical dimension for the Spanish people, which he took back to the 'Tragic Week' of 1909 (1940d; 1941b; 1943a). Ironically, in 'Spaniards and Morocco', published in October 1940, Barea argued that 'England has every reason to rejoice over the fact that Spain's complicity with the Axis powers is taking this turn' (1940d). If Franco was to enter a war with French Morocco he would 'kindle the flame of a rebellion which is at present secretly smouldering' among the Spaniards because 'the association that Morocco carries for the mass of Spaniards is that soldiers have to go and die there in order to enrich a small clique' (1940d). As he added, Morocco had been for nearly a century, and particularly over the past forty years, 'a cemetery for Spanish men, and a business proposition for a few privileged ones' (1940d). Barea knew out of his experience that

---

<sup>139</sup> This is taken from the title of Barea's article in *World Digest* (21 January 1941). The complete title reads 'Death, suffering, graft, woes without end: that is – What Morocco Means to Spain'.

to serve as a soldier in Morocco was worse than to be in prison for a crime. It meant being condemned to three years of hunger and misery, condemned to be devoured by lice, scab, bugs and flies, to die of fever in a dirty hospital, in barracks where the rain came in, where the patients were lying on slimy clay, as for instance in the hospital of Tetuan in 1921. (1940d)

The examples given in the article were again expanded in the novel. Anonymous characters were given names and personal histories made to accentuate their suffering.<sup>140</sup> Reviewers of *The Track* were struck by Barea's descriptions of the Spanish army and its illiterate soldiers who were recruited from the people in extreme poverty of Spain's villages. Alexander Gallop wrote for *TLS*:

Himself he has the gravest doubts whether the Spanish soldiers sent to civilize the Moors were not blind men leading the blind. Again and again he reverts to the wretchedness of the Spanish recruits. 'The hunger of so many of the recruits was what impressed me most deeply, but next to it their illiteracy' (page 155), 'and that mass of illiterate peasants commanded by irresponsible officers as the backbone of Spain's Moroccan field armies' (page 159). (Barea cited in Gallop 1943, 392)

These portraits of Spanish soldiers in Morocco were not new to the English writer. Sender's *Imán* had been translated into English in 1934 for the first time, selling 15,000 copies in that same year (Estebán y Santonja 1988, 13).<sup>141</sup> These illiterate peasants, so impressive to the British reader, were among the people who, Barea argued in the article, would revolt against Franco if his claims to Morocco went any further. They and their abundant utterances clearly functioned very effectively, particularly in the novel, where their plight was described at length. Thus Gallop noted how Barea 'shared, one feels, the view of Don Paci [*sic*] at Serafin's Bar in Madrid [in reference to one of the characters in *The Track*]: 'Morocco hasn't been settled and will never be. It's Spain's evil spirit, and all our misfortune will always come from there', in this reviewer's view' (392). As in other critical accounts of European colonialism, Morocco's 'evilness' was not down to the Moroccan people,

---

<sup>140</sup> Eade notes how Barea believes that concept of 'hunger' is a key feature of the Spanish novel (2011, 72). Barea's descriptions of 'hunger' in *The Track*, argues Eade, echo Sender's descriptions in *Imán* and Cela's in *La familia de Pascual Duarte* (1942) (72).

<sup>141</sup> Eade (2011, 69) compares fragments of *The Track* and *Imán* to highlight the differences in between Barea's and Sender's narrative techniques.

but to the exploitation of troops by Spanish Army officers and the caste. Corruption in the 1920-24 period, another striking *topos* for the British reader, is given special attention in Barea's writings. In 'Spaniards and Morocco' he writes that:

Personally, I know the other side of the life in Africa too, the side of officers who came from Spain without a penny, often up to the neck in debt. A few months afterwards, they could lose a thousand pesetas in the casinos of Tangier. [...] The stories of graft in Morocco are endless and true. (Barea 1940d)

Also (near) endless was Barea's backlist of anecdotes. We read again and again about the corruption of the Chief Commissariat of Larache who 'distributed a million pesetas among his officers', or of racketeering with blankets, which meant that the soldiers were left to sleep in the cold while the officers profited. Spanish speculators, such as Count Romanones or Juan March – a supporter of the rebellion of 1939 – and even King Alfonso XIII were also involved in Morocco's 'business' opportunities. The morals of the racketeers made Spanish Morocco into 'a battlefield, a brothel, and an immense tavern' (Barea 1943a, 29). All this is set in the 1920s and never explicitly linked to the current situation of Spain in North Africa in 1941 – but the echoes were evident. In *The Track*, Barea carefully construed a teleological narrative by which the Spanish-Moroccan war could only be seen as an antecedent of the contemporary war in Europe. On the one hand, the war in Morocco was presented as the birthplace of Spanish fascism and one of the main causes of the Spanish Civil War (Eaude 2011, 62). The title of *The Track* referred both to the road between Tetuan and Xauen which Barea helped to build at the beginning of the novel, and to the road linking the Riff War with the rebellion of the *Africanista* generals against the Republic.<sup>142</sup> The novel finishes with a visionary blind Moor who refuses to walk on the road because he does not want his sandals 'to slip in blood' (237). The road, he says, 'is full of blood, all of it. I see it. And it will fill with blood again and yet again and a hundred times again!' The novel closes with the premonitory words: 'twice already that road had been soaked with Spanish blood.'

---

<sup>142</sup> According to the correspondence, T.S. Eliot is responsible for the English title of *The Track*, which Barea had intended to call *The Road*. Eliot considered that the proposed title 'The Road' was not very original as it had already 'been used twice, once by Warwick Deeping' (1931) (DC Benson and Campbell 1941).

Yet in those days many thousands of men were building the tracks of new roads through all Spain' (237).

On the other hand, Barea expounds in the novel the international dimensions of the Spanish war in Morocco, making obvious and perhaps not so obvious references to the Great Powers, as we have seen and will further argue. Whilst in *Struggle* Barea wrote that '[t]here is no need to go into the question of the raw deal over Africa handed out to both Monarquists and Republican Spain by the Great Powers' (Barea 1941b, 89), in *The Track* he gives a full account of the involvement of England and Germany. Prompted by the aforementioned Captain Barberán during their conversation about Gibraltar, the young Barea gives his views on the international panorama:

Firstly, the fault of those who made the Treaty of Algeciras. On one side the Spanish leaders wanted something which would permit the army to wipe out its defeats in Cuba and the Philippines, and give our generals a living. On the other side there was England, interested in having no other power facing Gibraltar, not even France. And Germany, too, not wanting France either. Between them they've brought it on us. While we were wrestling with this damnable problem in Morocco, we had no chance to become [*sic*] a power in Europe. Perhaps it saved us from the Great War, but certainly it has ruined us as a nation. (Barea 1943a, 178)

Barea's interpretation of the war as influenced by foreign interests and in turn having a consequence in international geopolitics is most prevalent towards the end of *The Track*. Barea here shifts from his personal experience towards giving to the reader information that he has read in 1920s newspapers or gathered through conversations with Army friends in higher ranks. As Barea the author explains, he was trying to make sense of what was happening in Morocco by turning to the 'scanty information in the press, as though by realizing what was happening outside my own country I would discover the right angle, the right perspective to gauge what was happening to us' (234).

From here, it is but one step beyond the realm of the geopolitical into the ideological. The end of the Spanish and French conflict in Morocco was best understood as a consequence of the international struggle between socialism and fascism, Barea

argues. He remembers how in 1925 already he was trying ‘to understand the development of the two great opposing ideas [...] outside Spain (234). The support of the French Communist Party to Abd el-Krim, the leader of the Riff revolt, had as an immediate effect the crushing of the latter by the joint forces of Spain and England (234). The contemporary situation in Morocco – particularly Spanish colonialism – could partly be blamed on the strategies of the French communists, and particularly of Jacques Doriot’s decision to issue a manifesto backing Abd el-Krim. Doriot was inevitably a striking figure to 1940s readers: a communist expelled from the French PC in 1934, founder of the fascist *Parti Populaire Français*, collaborationist, propagandist, and creator and fighter of the *Légion des Volontaires Français*. What might have seemed a veiled criticism of Soviet intervention is immediately turned into an accusation against Germany. To Barea,

Doriot’s tactics were so blatantly stupid as to equal those of an *agent provocateur*. His later career makes it possible to question whether he was not less of a clumsy demagogue than an efficient servant of his masters. (234)

Criticizing collaborationist France in 1941 was as relevant to Second World War discourses as proving that Germany was behind many of Spain’s conflicts, past and present, its colonial rule in Morocco included. It would have led readers fearful of Fifth Columnism, the great topic of the moment, to go over and over these lines again, feeling the pulse of potential collaborationism and hence the long arm of Germany, or so Barea hoped.

### ***The limits of criticism: facing censorship in Britain***

That Spain was a key player that now Britain had to oppose was further proven in the summer of 1941, as Franco sent the Blue Division to fight alongside Hitler’s troops against the Soviet Union. Immediately Barea reacted and wrote to Warburg that this new situation provided ‘Falange with easy slogans and the semblance of action’, but did not fundamentally alter his analysis of Spain in *Struggle* (1941u). As he had been revising *Struggle* in April 1941, he had believed that Franco would embark on his ‘African adventure’ very soon, during the late spring or summer. Now German attention shifted to the Eastern front, potentially lowering the pressure around Spain. However, on 17 July 1941, the Spanish leader delivered a speech (originally written

by Luis Carrero Blanco) embracing the Axis powers, forecasting the Allies' defeat and warning the US not to intervene. This was a major escalation. It first prompted a public statement by Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden, warning Franco that if he did not 'desire further economic arrangement for his country', then the British government would 'be unable to proceed with their plans, and their future policy will depend on the actions and attitude of the Spanish government' (*The Times* 1941). But military action against Spain was also on the table now. On 23 July it was decided to seize the Canary Islands under operation 'Pilgrim', to be carried out in September.

Barea's reaction to this second crisis in Anglo-Spanish relations during the war developed in his correspondence with the editors of *Time and Tide* and the *New Statesman*. Here is a crisis during which a gulf opened between Barea and one of his editors precisely because he, as a Spanish Republican, was deemed overly emotional and unable to stick to the rules of British journalism. In July 1941, Barea was asked by *Time and Tide* to write a note commenting on Eden's 'reasonably strong statement' (*Time and Tide* 1941b). Barea's note was never published and a copy has not been found, but the letter sent with it reveals his exasperation with the policy of appeasement towards Franco's Spain and the past hesitation of the journal to publish anything overtly critical towards Spain. 'I cannot help pointing out', Barea stated in his letter,

that the policy which I have consistently criticised, not only from the point of view of a Republican Spaniard, but also from the point of view of the British war effort, has now led to an impasse – hence Eden's statement, – and it might have been more interesting for your paper to publish constructive criticism and analysis at a time when it was less obvious than it is now.

(Barea 1941p)

Barea was referring to the journal's refusal to publish various articles that had become 'rather critical and explicit' (Barea 1941p). In his response to Barea, the editor explained that they would not publish his note because they felt that his commentary was not constructive enough: 'As a Spanish Republican you have a perfect right, and one with which we personally sympathize, to say "I told you so", – but to moralize after the event is not the function of the weekly review' (Ann Gimingham 1941). That Barea was going a little too far seems to be the tone of the

friendly and elegantly formulated reminder of the editor of *Time and Tide*, Ann Gimingham, who now took it upon herself to interpret British politics to her Spanish acquaintance:

British diplomatic language always is couched in curiously restrained language. Even a complete rupture in diplomatic relations is normally expressed quite mildly. And short of breaking off diplomatic relations Mr Eden's pronouncements could not by British standards have been much stronger [*sic*]. One cannot therefore interpret it by a strictly verbal comparison with the more forthright not to say abusive statements that Franco and Suñer now habitually utter. (1941)

Barea needed to tone down his criticism and bring it into line with the official guidelines: 'once our own country was in the toils of war, bereft of all Allies, and with the odds against us, we could not consistently advocate a strong policy towards Falangist Spain when we knew that we had no strength to implement it' (1941). She even added that she had

been engaged in constant wrangles with this censorship as to what we may or may not say about Spain [...] Believe me or not we were even required to withdraw a short time ago a reference to the executions that were going on in Madrid [...] We cannot say what we would like to say about Spain – viz. – that we should like to see in our country a movement to support the overthrow of the complete Falange outfit. (1941)

Criticizing Franco in a pamphlet such as *Struggle* had different implications from openly criticizing Foreign Secretary Eden in *Time and Tide* – or the *New Statesman*, for that matter. No-one less than Kingsley Martin, the editor of the *New Statesman*, wrote to Barea in 1941 in response to a drafted article in which the latter criticized Eden:

The official view about Spanish propaganda, as I have ascertained from conversation with some of the people concerned, is that we must go on being polite to Franco as long as possible, though there is no doubt in anybody's mind that the time will come, probably soon, when such politeness will be impossible. When that time does come the M.O.I. [Ministry of Information] and B.B.C. will, I expect, be looking round for Republican broadcasters and

trying to use all the people whom they now cold-shoulder. I hear stories that shock me about the treatment of Republicans who have been used by our publicity services during the present period of appeasement propaganda, and it occurs to me that this article may damage your wife's position on the B.B.C., and possible prejudice your own future usefulness. (1941)

Martin even added this powerful reminder – albeit still sweetened with the prospect of upcoming change – of the need for self-censorship in such difficult times:

I think it altogether shocking that this letter is no one's idea except my own. I don't suggest that you should be at all blackmailed by this consideration – I merely think that you should be aware of the point and that a change of B.B.C. policy is probable before very long. (1941)

Barea had to de-escalate. He answered that both he and Ilsa were aware that the article could cause them problems, 'but at the time of the Eden statement we thought it worthwhile to take the risk' (1941q). He even added that he had anticipated a negative response as he thought 'it probable that there were censorship problems, as there are so often in matters concerning Spain' (1941q). Barea agreed with Martin's suggestion that the article 'might impair my potential future work while its present usefulness (the usefulness of the article I mean) is not overwhelmingly great' (1941q). This reaction shows not only Barea's ability to adapt, but to understand the imperatives of writing during wartime and the workings of censorship, having been a censor himself in Spain during the war. He also decided to write another article, which was to explore 'the psychological basis for British propaganda to Spain, or rather [...] the psychological conditions for the reception of British propaganda in Spain' (1941q).<sup>143</sup> In a separate letter probably dating from this period, he commented on how he could only give his 'opinión honrada con las limitaciones que me impone la Guerra y mi carácter de extranjero en este país' (Barea, n.d.).

Barea's de-escalation was in line with Churchill's, who reportedly only read Franco's speech in August 1941 and considered the whole event unfortunate, but harmless overall. Operation 'Pilgrim' was cancelled and Franco escaped war with Britain. After this and as the war progressed, Franco realized that a reorientation towards the Allies would be necessary in order to survive the defeat of the other

---

<sup>143</sup> This article has not been found, either in the archive or in the *New Statesman*.

European fascist powers. Whether by coincidence or not, after these events in 1941, Barea did not write any more political articles in either *Time and Tide*, the *New Statesman* or any other periodical. It was in *The Track* and *The Clash*, more sheltered from the daily pressures of (self-)censorship, that Barea's political writing continued after 1941.

This chapter has looked at the different ways in which Barea's early work as an exile in Britain aimed at proving the links between the Spanish Civil War and the Second World War. Lessons from the Spanish conflict could be learned and Barea (re)used his experiences to illuminate the British public regarding the importance of fighting for democracy and against fascism, including the Spanish version of it. Barea made sure that he drew the parallels in particularly poignant themes such as the dangers of a German 'Fifth Column' or the shared experience of air bombardment. The international interpretation of the Spanish war is therefore favoured in some of these early writings – as it will be towards the end of the war in his last political pamphlets, *Spain in the postwar World* (1945) and *Freedom for Spain!* (1945) – in as much as this maintained Spain relevant for the international anti-fascist struggle. The second section of this chapter then explored Barea's political writing on Spain's strategic position during the Second World War, focusing around three main events: Gibraltar, the annexation of Tangier and the participation of the Blue Division in the Eastern Front. I have argued that Barea's main objective was to prove that the Francoist regime was far from neutral and to sway public opinion into regarding Spain as part of the Axis powers and therefore a menace to Britain. The extent to which Barea could openly criticize British foreign policy was dependent on the international context and diplomatic strategies as much as on the genre, medium and readership of his work. However, the political nature of his work extends to all of his writing, including *The Track*. While set in the past, a close reading of certain passages in the novel and a comparison with his journalistic work for *Time and Tide* and his essay *Struggle for the Spanish Soul* highlights that the teleological narrative of events during the Rif War extends not only to the Spanish Civil War, but to the Second World War.

But while the Spanish Civil War served as a historical background for the contemporary situation in Europe and could provide motivation to a population in the British home front, it was also obvious in the minds of most people that Spain

and Britain were, despite the coincidence of the anti-fascist struggle, in fact very different nations. Even worse, the two countries had throughout history developed an antagonism that was fed by a particular conception of Spain referred to by the generic term of Black Legend. Instead of attempting to break down such barriers systematically, Barea understood the need to build on perceived cultural differences. His work thus also interprets Spain and its war in its exceptionalism as a 'far away country'. Precisely to reinforce the argument that the two nations were fighting the same war, Barea decided, at times, to highlight the specific 'Spanishness' of the Civil War as we will see in the next chapter.

## Chapter 4. Spain is (not) Different

‘... honour eternal is due to the brave and noble people of Spain, worthy of better rulers and a better fortune! And now that the jobs and intrigues of their juntas, the misconduct and incapacity of the generals, are sinking into the deserved obscurity of oblivion, the national resistance was indeed wild, disorganized, undisciplined and Algerine, but it held out to Europe an example which was not shown by the civilized Italian or Intellectual German.’ – Richard Ford, *Handbook for Travellers in Spain and Readers at Home*, London, 1845. (Barea 1946b)

As we have seen in chapter 3, Barea attempted to present the Spanish conflict in connection with the wider conflict that tore Europe apart in the 1930s and 40s and the concrete challenges that Britain faced from 1940. However, Barea did not ignore the Spanish specificities of the Civil War. On the one hand, it was his main symbolic asset as a cultural translator to have experienced it first-hand and to know Spain from the inside. On the other, Barea’s narrative of the Spanish Civil War and the years leading up to it could not be explained only in relation to its international dimension. Spanish ‘exceptionalism’ (Jover Zamora, Fusi Aizpurúa, and Gómez-Ferrer Morant 2001; Loureiro 2003) was the main reason why interpreters of Spain were needed in the first place.<sup>144</sup> This tension was part of a broader tradition of both British and Spanish explorations into the *problema de España*, with a bearing on the understanding of the Spanish Civil War.<sup>145</sup> Franz Borkenau wrote in 1937:

I began my studies under the common delusion that the Spanish revolution was simply an incident in the fight between Left and Right, Socialism and Fascism in the European sense of the word; I have been convinced by observation on the spot that this is not so, and have since tried to discover, under the external appearances which present the common form of political struggle throughout Europe, these actual driving forces which really differ widely from the conventional European patterns that are being generally used to describe them. (Borkenau 1937, x)

---

<sup>144</sup> In correspondence with Sender, Barea described their work as ‘este intento nuestro – suyo y mío, – de interpretar España y defenderla con la cara alta, ante los propios y los extraños’ (1947i).

<sup>145</sup> Comparative studies have questioned whether Spain was really ‘different’ from the rest of Europe. See, for example, Townson (2015); Shubert and Álvarez Junco (2000). For a collection of articles reflecting on how cultural difference is in fact constructed, see Delgado, Mendelson, and Vázquez (2007).

In this chapter I will focus on how, whilst attempting to link the Spanish problem to a transnational ‘people’s war’, Barea also presented Spain as the site of a ‘very Spanish’ struggle on the fringes of Europe and modernity. For this, he drew on a well-established tradition of writing on national characters, including the Spanish generations of 98 and 1914, but also much Anglophone and international writing produced on Spain during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries – such as Richard Ford’s *Handbook for Travellers in Spain and Readers at Home* (1845), a classic quoted at the beginning of *The Clash*. In doing so, Barea drew on existing British perceptions of ‘that far away country’ (Buchanan 1993), Spain, as they had developed over many decades. The ‘cultural difference’ that Barea explored can be traced to, among several traditions, ‘a very recognizable Anglo-Saxon intellectual genealogy’ of writings on Spain, to quote from a study on another author, José Ortega y Gasset, by Fernández Cifuentes (Delgado, Mendelson, and Vázquez 2007, 111). As explored in chapter 2, with a mixture of travel books, wartime reportage, testimonies and memories, Barea could translate difference ‘into something familiar’, referring to ‘familiar conceptual frameworks’ (111).

The most established frameworks were, for the British public, those of the Black Legend and the romantic myth.<sup>146</sup> Both orientalised Spain.<sup>147</sup> As Sebastiaan Faber argues, Spain

functioned for both England and America at crucial historical moments as a ‘constitutive other’ to help define themselves as nations. An exoticized, demonized representation of Spain as an empire in decline (the ‘Black Legend’) served to bolster both countries’ self-image as the only legitimate source of enlightened modernity. A similar process of ‘othering’ Spain

---

<sup>146</sup> The term ‘Black Legend’ was coined by Spanish journalist Julian Juderías in 1912 when protesting about the characterization of Spain by other European countries as ‘a backward country of ignorance, superstition, and religious fanaticism that was unable to become a modern nation’ (Greer, Mignolo, Quilligan 2008, 1). For more on both re-interpretations and questioning of the concept of Black Legend see for example Aram 2008; Cárcel 1998; Moradiellos 2011; García 2010; Pérez 2009; Edelmayer 2011. I use the term as a short-hand that encapsulates a range of anti-Spanish sentiments found frequently among the British public opinion, particularly during the Spanish Civil War.

<sup>147</sup> Faber (2008b, 9) argues that the concept of Hispanism can be used similarly to Said’s Orientalism (1978). Spain is constructed as a discourse by the great powers (United States, the Netherlands, England, Germany, and France), which ‘deploys a ‘soft’ kind of imperialism vis-à-vis a politically marginalized Spain that, like the Orient, is constructed as exotic, backward, passionate, violent, and so on’ (9). A similar argument – with slightly different implications – is also made by Shubert and Álvarez Junco (2000).

allowed for idealizing (but no less distorted) representations of Spain by oppositional movements, most notably, romanticism. (Faber 2008b, 7-8)

In fact, as Álvarez Junco (1996, 93) has argued, the romantic myth was a re-evaluation of many of the elements of the Black Legend as the result of the change in sensibilities of the Europeans during the nineteenth century. After that, these two visions of Spain coexisted in the European imaginary, feeding into the Spanish debates on the national character of the early twentieth century.

British attitudes towards Spain did not undergo a radical change after 1936. The Black Legend of the sixteenth century and the romantic myth of the nineteenth century were still the frameworks by which foreign observers could judge the situation in Spain. The polarization of the public opinion in Britain mirrored the discourses of the Francoists and Republicans. Supporters of the Republic, not least of all the Spaniards involved in international propaganda, reinforced these myths in order to contextualize and mediate the Spanish struggle with the ultimate goal of awakening an effective, and not just affective, solidarity in the foreign public (Ucelay da Cal 1990).

As many have argued, the British narratives of the Spanish Civil War were therefore profoundly influenced by such stereotypical preconceptions of Spain and its political history (Shelmerdine 2006; Buchanan 1993; Walton 1994; Faber 2002; Ucelay da Cal 1990; García 2010; Moradiellos 2002; 1999). British travellers to Spain had for centuries contributed to a view of a wild and often inhospitable country, full of extremes and highly individualistic characters, capable of enduring suffering and inflicting cruelty like no British ever could (Balfour 1998). Spain was often perceived as a semi-oriental country on the fringes of Europe, on the margins of, if not radically opposed to, western modernity (Faber 2008b; Shubert and Álvarez Junco 2000). These visions of Spain as constructed by foreigners can be seen as dialoguing with the images that Spaniards chose to represent themselves (Delgado, Mendelson, and Vázquez 2007, 111; Cifuentes 2007). As Álvarez Junco (1996, 95) notes, if one thing was clear to both Spaniards and non-Spaniards was that ‘there was such a thing as a Spanish identity, a Spanish character, a Spanish “soul” or “essence”, with very definite traits’.

In adhering to these already established frameworks, Barea had a ready-made list of stereotypical characters and themes that he could draw on to better describe Spain and the Spaniards. According to the Black Legend, the Spanish national character was defined by its cruelty (as when conquering America), bigotry (as proved by the Inquisition) and vanity (as represented by the Spanish *hidalgo*), accompanied by the idea of Spain being a backward and barbaric country. The romantic myth attributed Spaniards with an equally essentialist and exoticized character that included bravery (when fighting against Napoleon), pride (as displayed during the French siege of Saragossa in 1809), individuality (as represented by Don Quixote) or heroism, chivalry and honourability (Moradiellos 2002: 6; Faber 2008b: 161).

However, Barea's work went one step further. He established a connection between Spain and Britain that acknowledged the differences in national characters while highlighting the similarities between the people of England as a whole, on one side, and the Republicans as a synecdoche of the Spanish nation, on the other (cf. Bowman in Faber 2002, 39, 141). As suggested in chapter 2, in his role of cultural mediator, Barea translated Spain both by exoticizing it – to reinforce the otherness – and naturalizing it – to make the otherness disappear (Holmes 1988, 47-48). As we will see in the first section of this chapter, he highlighted Spain's otherness through the Black Legend especially with regard to the Francoists. And while he drew on the romantic myth to talk about the Republic, he also naturalized the Spanish people's plight against oppression by relating it to the British fight against fascism, uniting the two under the common banner of the 'people's war', which will be explored in the second section of this chapter.

Barea described the 'old' feudal Francoist Spain as other to modern democratic Britain and 'foreign' to the true Spanish nation – to demonstrate how the true Spanish nation was in fact close to the British in its fight for democracy. For this, he had not only a negative, but also a positive mythology at hand: that of what was known in Britain as the Peninsular Wars and in Spain the War of Independence (1808-1814). Whilst the Francoists argued that the war against Napoleon had been, like the Civil War, a struggle against foreign ideas and in favour of a traditional Catholic Spain, the Republicans presented it as the fight of 'the Spanish people' for democracy against a foreign (and repressive) oppressor. This later version inevitably resonated strongly with a British tradition that saw the Peninsular Wars as a struggle

in which Britain had intervened against Napoleon and consolidated the foundations of its influence in the Atlantic. British intellectuals in the nineteenth century had based their romantic myth of Spain on the fact that it had ‘ceased being the redoubt par excellence of reaction and clerical obscurantism and, in the aroused minds of certain opinion makers like Shelley, turned into a shining tower that spread the fire of liberty’ (Burns cited in Faber 2008b, 24). Republicans reinforced this version of the Peninsular Wars by emphasizing how the two nations had been united in defeating a common enemy in 1808 as much as they were in 1936 – Duff’s *Spain against the Invaders: Napoleon 1808 – Hitler and Mussolini 1936* (1938) is an example of the rhetoric used. As Barea put it, ‘the defeat of Napoleon began in Spain’ (Barea 1940d, 1002).<sup>148</sup>

Ultimately, Barea’s work built on these ideas of the Spanish national character to shift the focus from the ‘us’ and ‘them’ in terms of nationality (e.g. Great Britain versus Spain) to a dichotomy based on ideological opposites (fascism versus democracy). In doing so, Barea’s writings mirrored not only Spanish Republican themes, but fit quite closely with wartime narratives in Britain. As the *Voice of Spain* quoted at length from a Report of Parliamentary Debates,

[w]e are now in a civil war, a civil war of ideas. The distinction is not between an Englishman and a German (Hon. Members: ‘Oh!’), or an Englishman and a Frenchman or a Dutchman or person of any other nationality, but between those who are agreed upon certain ideals and those who have very different ideals. There are those who are suspect and not suspect in every group. (*Voice of Spain* 1940)

The clash of ideas between ‘socialism’ and ‘fascims’, while oppositional, is not rooted in cultural or civilizational essentialist antagonisms – what Gilroy terms ‘civilizationism’ (2005a, 23). As the quote from *Voice of Spain* notes, it is not the categories of ethnicity, race or national culture that underscore the struggle, but class. Nonetheless, there is a wartime construction of a common identity based on the notion of ‘democracy’. As Jameson has put it, ‘the unity of the collectivity’ is usually based on the exclusion of a ‘common enemy’ which enables the idea of a ‘utopian abolition of social antagonism’ (as cited in Faber 2002, 39). If the enemy of

---

<sup>148</sup> Eade also notes that Barea references fascists and Napoleon in *Valor y miedo* (2011, 24), as does Echevarría (2004, 47).

the Spanish people were the Francoists, the ‘common enemy’ of the Spanish and the British people alike was international fascism – of which the Francoists were an integral part.

### **‘Othering’ the Spanish caste and deconstructing the ‘Hispanic myth’**

In much of his writing of the period, Barea contrasts the ideals of the Republican concept of a ‘new Spain’, based on democratic and progressive values, against the brutal backwardness of what he termed the ‘Old New order’ of Franco and the caste, which had for centuries controlled all branches of power. One of the most powerful narratives of the Spanish Civil War presented the conflict as a struggle between feudalism versus modernity. As in the work of Gerald Brenan, much of Barea’s interpretation of the Spanish conflict relied on a socio-economic explanation of the war that underscored the conflict between the *latifundistas*, the army and the Church on the one hand (what Barea put under the banner of ‘the caste’), and on the other, the Republican Government’s agrarian, military and religious reforms, supported by most of the Spanish people. Barea in fact praised Brenan’s *The Spanish Labyrinth* because it ‘comes nearest to the heart of the matter in his admirable chapter on the Spanish agrarian question. This, of course, is the central problem of Spanish social history and politics, past, present and future’ (Barea 1943b, 208).<sup>149</sup> Not only Barea’s essay, but his trilogy presents a vivid picture in which the Civil War features prominently, tinged with the elements that often presented it as a result of the feudal nature of the caste.

Barea’s accounts of the abuses of industrialists, businessmen, but above all, landowners are an essential part of his work. One of the most striking examples is in his short story ‘The Cone’ (1943), in which a child witnesses how his father dies, having been forced by the owner of the vineyard to clean a wine cone amidst toxic fumes. In *Struggle*, Barea opens his historical analysis of the ‘typical economic foundations’ of the ‘Spanish Right and the Spanish Left’ with an account of the exploitation of labourers in an agricultural estate in Castile, Dehesa Casablanca, in which he claimed to have worked as a business manager during 1928 (Barea 1941b, 34). The landowner, ‘who belonged in a general way to the extreme Catholic Right’, ‘held absolute feudal power over his vast domain’ abusing his workers to the extent

---

<sup>149</sup> The agrarian question had been a preoccupation of Spanish writers of the 1930s, from Sender’s reports on Casas Viejas, to Antonio Machado’s and Rafael Alberti’s poetry .

of choosing to let his crop rot instead of accepting the workers' demands for a slight increase in their miserable salary in order to teach them that they had 'no right to claim anything' (36).

These are the two fundamental forces at play: 'the rich land-usurer, grown capitalist but not yet a modern industrialist, who is in control of all political, religious, social and economic life in a vast stretch of land' exemplifying the Spanish Right; and 'the wretched farm-labourer, grown sullen, desperate and anarchist', who embodied the Spanish Left (36). But pointing to an unholy alliance of Army, Church, Monarchy and Capitalism was not straightforward in itself. Critical leftist readers may have agreed easily with such a sweeping panorama, but other parts of the public would inevitably need further convincing regarding the negative influence of institutions that all played an important part in British life. To explain the need for radical change in Spain, one had to explain the radical inadequacy of such key institutions in the first place. I would like to analyse Barea's writing with regard to three of them: the Church, the socio-economic elite, and Franco himself as a replacement of the monarch. In explaining them to a British audience, Barea highlighted their singularity and 'Spanishness', while making sure that they were also seen as allied with international fascism.

### ***The political Spanish Catholic Church***

Barea was highly critical of the Spanish Catholic Church, not only as an organization supporting Franco's regime, but also in general as an institution pursuing objectives that had little to do with the Christian religion – and of course nothing to do with the interests of the Spanish people.<sup>150</sup> This was the case in both his non-fiction (particularly *Struggle* and a two-part article for the *Statesman and Nation*, 'Spanish Catholicism') and his trilogy (the first and third volumes in particular; Ynduráin 1953, Alborg 1953, Ruíz 1957, Devlin 1966, Ortega 1971, Lundsford 1988, Rodríguez 1992).

The topic was a minefield because of the widely publicized outbreaks of anticlerical violence during the early days of the Republic. Campaigns against the Spanish

---

<sup>150</sup> Barea's focus on anticlericalism on the basis of the Church's political and institutional nature in Spain – as opposed to his own religious attitude in general – has been noted (Devlin 1966, Ortega 1971).

Republic for religious persecution were launched in Britain from the beginning of the Republic by the Monarchic opposition in exile, with the express goal of gaining support from British Catholics (and others) who ‘ever since the church-burnings of May 1931 had tended to regard the new Spanish regime as anti-Christian’ (García 2010, 24). The Monarchy and the Church were in fact widely appreciated institutions among the British public. With the coup of July 1936, a battle for British public opinion had started in which accusations of religious persecution were key to the interpretation of the civil war as an anti-religious (i.e. communist) crusade, or indeed a ‘war of religion’, as Allison Peers put it (Moradiellos 2002, 11). The Duke of Alba declared after the war: ‘Thanks to the Catholic press we could preserve in England a movement of sympathy towards General Franco’ (12). This was not simply a matter of British conservatives feeling close to Spanish conservatives: a substantial portion of Labour voters in Britain were working class Catholics. The Spanish Embassy in London was quick to assure the British that ‘this is not a religious war. It is a social war between the rich and the poor’ (García 2010, 117). *Voice of Spain* hurried to publish first-hand accounts by British witnesses with titles such as ‘The Bible in Spain’ or ‘I Went to Mass in Spain’, especially in 1938-39 (*Spain at War* 1938; *Voice of Spain* 1939).

Barea himself had appeared to the British public in what appears to have been a Republican propaganda event before leaving Spain. In 1937, the left-wing Anglo-Catholic Tom Driberg wrote a column for the *Daily Express* under the pseudonym William Hickey. On 7 October 1937, he reported on a meeting in Madrid between Protestant pastor Dr. Fliedner, ‘whose church in Madrid has been open throughout the war’, and the Roman Catholic Father Lobo, the ‘priest of a formerly fashionable church who has been negotiating with government for the reopening of churches’ (Driberg 1937). Having interviewed Father Lobo, Driberg explains:

Recalling that English Roman Catholic papers had always cast doubts on credentials of Roman Catholic priests who came out as Government supporters, I questioned Lobo about this. Quiet, dark, of peasant origin, a famous preacher, he – and laity I met – emphasised that he had never been suspended, was under no ecclesiastical censure. Churches could have been opened long ago, but for anarchists: Government can guarantee order during Mass, can’t guarantee that mischievous Anarchists won’t attend, take names

of worshipers, molest them later. Meanwhile, most churches I saw are used as storage-houses, are structurally undamaged (except by Franco's shells). (1937)

Driberg says of both religious men that they 'are friendly with Socialists & Communists. Both have had scraps with Anarchists' (1937). In the picture accompanying the article we find Dr. Fliedner, Father Lobo and, most notably, Arturo Barea. The caption says: 'United front? Roman Catholic Fr Lobo & Protestant Pastor Fliedner dine in Madrid with communist radiator Arturo Barea' (1937). There is a copy of the picture in Barea's archive, suggesting that Barea knew it was being taken and also knew what its purpose was.

Once in Britain, Barea held on to the key aim of Republican propaganda to convince the British public that the Republic did not only support freedom of religion, but many Republicans were indeed Catholic. Barea now reinforced, on the one hand, the 'otherness' of the Spanish Catholic Church – stating and then addressing the difficulty for the average British reader of grasping its idiosyncrasy. As Barea underlined, 'Spanish Catholicism is, and has always been, something by itself, radically different from modern English Catholicism' (1941f, 79). This criticism of Spanish Catholicism would necessarily have appealed to a British Protestant readership for which the Black Legend of Spain included the religious conflicts of the Reformation and the Counter-reformation and the darkest chapters of the Spanish inquisition. But it did require fleshing out. Barea had already hinted at the differences between religion in Britain and in Spain in his article 'A Spaniard in Hertfordshire' (1939), speaking about the different ways in which Spanish Catholics and English Protestants approached each other. In that early piece, he wrote about the generosity of his English village parson, who had offered the Bareas his help in settling into their new home when believing them to be Roman Catholics – and also after finding out about his 'complete estrangement from the church' (1939e, 214).<sup>151</sup> So, Barea asks, what is different about English church institutions? 'Everything, to me,' he answers, 'The bicycle, the informal visit, the easy acceptance of somebody

---

<sup>151</sup> The idea that Protestants are heretics in the mind of the Catholic Church is reinforced in *The Clash*. Don Lucas, the Novés priest, says: 'Now don't tell me that you're one of those Protestant heretics; it would pain me greatly, but in that case I would not be able to tolerate your presence in this Sacred House for a single moment' (Barea 1946b, 47).

not of his faith', or the fact that Catholics in England are not 'isolated and shunned' like Protestants are in Spain, where they are still believed to be 'heretics' (214).

According to Barea, the Spanishness at stake was institution-specific, not an inevitable result of Spanish culture. One of the most important messages to convey was that whilst the Spanish Catholic Church was inherently intolerant, the Spanish Republic was not. Negrín had reaffirmed the freedom of worship in his 13 points of 1938, a blueprint of objectives for the Spanish Republic. Barea too condemned the violence against the priests – but blamed it on the Catholic Church's historical role as an agent of repression.

The Don Leocadio Lobo referred above is one of the key characters in *The Clash*, and it has been remarked that he acts as the voice of conscience of Arturo (Herrera de la Muela 2012, 99–100). Barea recognizes that it was Lobo who helped him through his breakdown towards the end of 1937: 'The man who helped me then, as he had helped me through the evil weeks that went before, was a Catholic priest, and of all those I met in our war he commands my deepest respect and love' (Barea 1946b, 282). According to Barea, Lobo had the task of 'investigating cases of hardship among the clergy, and he had to face the fact that some of the priests whose killing by the 'Reds' had been heralded and duly exploited came out of their hiding, safe and sound, and demanded help' (284). In fact, Lobo was one of two main spokespersons of the Republican Government who at the Religious Affairs sub-section of the *Secretaría de Propaganda* dealt with foreign Catholic opinion (García 2010, 90). As such, he had written the pamphlet *Primate and Priest* that was published in Britain in 1937 and had accompanied British visitors in Madrid (84, 152–54).<sup>152</sup> Through Father Lobo Barea voices an explanation for the antireligious violence in Spain:

The deepest hurt to him [Lobo] was not the fury vented against churches and priests by maddened, hatefilled, brutalized people, but his knowledge of the guilt of his own caste, the clergy, in the existence of that brutality, and in the abject ignorance and misery at the root of it.' (Barea 1946b, 283)

One of Barea's main arguments remained indeed that the Spanish Catholic Church had aligned itself with the elite against the people. In his essay *Struggle for the*

---

<sup>152</sup> García, x, 84, 152, 294. *Primate and Priest*, London, Press Department of the Spanish Embassy, 1937.

*Spanish Soul*, he explains that in doing so the Spanish Catholic Church played a major role in the repression of the Spanish people: ‘In national history as they [the caste] came to see it, the Church of Spain has always been the soul and intellect of the Spanish State; the whole greatness of Spain was due to the Church’ (Barea 1941b, 56). The influence of the Spanish Church in education is told in several anecdotes both in the trilogy and in his essay. Most of Barea’s memories of his years in the Catholic school were, as he recounts, about how his teachers – most of whom were priests – tried to instil in their pupils an antagonism towards France and England to protect them from the influence of foreign liberal thinking. When Barea dared to tell one of his teachers that the king Alfonso XIII had married the English Princess María Victoria, the teacher corrected him by saying that

[b]y the grace of God, she is now no longer English, but Spanish. And what is more, she has renounced her religion and become a member of the Holy Roman Church, so that she is now doubly Spanish. (86)

The anecdote is obviously aimed at confronting the British reader with the Spanish Catholic Church, which he depicted as in clear contrast with British liberal traditions – as seen in his comments on Protestantism above. Barea also addressed the contemporary situation in Spain after the Republic’s defeat. It was argued at times in the British press that the Catholic Church could help prevent Franco from joining the Axis. Barea countered these opinions by emphasizing how the Spanish Catholic Church had only benefitted from the current regime, their economic and ideological rights, and their influence restored; it could only continue supporting Franco as it preferred him to liberalism with its take on ‘freedom of thought for the individual’ (Barea 1941b, 117); and it would certainly never support England, as it believed that this country’s liberal tradition lead to ‘collectivism and communism’ (118).

Another of Barea’s criticism of the Spanish Church concerned its involvement with political activities (cf. Ortega 1971, Lundsford 1988, Echevarría 2004). Barea explains to the British readership – here perhaps targeting Catholics on the Left – how in Spain the Church belongs mostly to the Right, operating politically through Catholic parties aligned with the monarchists, the industrialists and the Spanish SS, the *Falange* (Barea 1941b, 72). In *The Clash*, Barea appears arguing with a priest in Novés (Toledo), who is described as a member of the ‘political Church’: the priest belongs to *Acción Popular*, the political party of José María Gil-Robles. Barea

accuses the priest of using the pulpit for propaganda and of blaming the workers while forgiving the rich (1946b, 47).

However, as important as it was to explain the Spanish Catholic Church to a British audience, Barea also needed to emphasize that it was close in spirit to fascism and Nazism. In the final section of *Struggle*, Barea reinforces the link. Francoist propaganda, he argues, ‘firmly maintains that the Axis represents the spirit of the New-Order-cum-Christianity against plutocratic-liberal-heretic England’ (1941b, 118). Barea explains that the ‘other Spanish Catholics who were and are rebels against the political clergy’ – for example the Basque priests – feel that England’s victory would be their victory against ‘Fascist medievalism’ (119).<sup>153</sup>

### *Explaining the ‘caste’*

The second key institution of Spain targeted was the socio-economic elite. It was an important target in itself and also because of its proximity to the Monarchy – with which, as mentioned, many Britons sympathized. To prove how the Spanish Monarchist elite was a backwards-looking block of privileged and cruel individuals making life impossible for the people, Barea adopted a concept that would resonate strongly with his British readers: the ‘caste’. During the Second Republic, the term ‘caste’ was used pejoratively by the Left to denote the privileged class, associated with the term *cacique* (Santos 1980, 183).<sup>154</sup> For Barea it designated ‘the feudal aristocracy clustered around the Court, the high clergy, the Army, the big landowners, the scanty capitalists and the huge, swollen body of bureaucracy’ (Barea 1941b, 38). The term was necessarily familiar to Barea’s British audiences because

---

<sup>153</sup> Inevitably, Barea was making arguments that would stir the emotions of many Catholics. A letter to Kingsley Martin shows that he was interested in provoking the British Catholic lobby and its mouthpiece *The Tablet* in particular (1941e). Seeing that a piece of his in the *New Statesman* had been published without his name, he stated that he ‘would rather like to figure as the author, partly because the article is written in a definitely personal style, and above all, because I hope it will provoke a certain amount of controversy’ (1941e). Barea went as far as sending copies of *Struggle* to *The Tablet* and *The Catholic Herald*, hoping that the essay would be reviewed and further the debate. Some of Barea’s statements were questioned by Catholics in Britain. Not only *The Tablet*, but also some Catholics on the Left such as Antonia White (who otherwise praised *The Forge* in her review for *Horizon*) had doubts about whether some of Barea’s accusations were true (1941).

<sup>154</sup> The term caste was indeed used pejoratively by both the Left and the Right in Spain to denote the privileged class, associated with the term *cacique*. Balbotín – exiled in the UK – defined the concept as ‘una frase dedicada, no ya a las masas populares, sino a la “élite”, a los grandes capitalistas, a los grandes terratenientes, a toda la casta opresora...’ and stated that ‘el deber fundamental del Gobierno republicano-socialista era derribar la casta de los grandes terratenientes’ (*Diario Sesiones*, 15-6-33, 26-4-33 as cited in García Santos 2008, 183, 188).

of its Indian colonial connotations as a paradigm of radical differences and prejudices between segments of society inscribed from birth that are contrary to modern principles of social equality and justice. Orwell used the term ‘caste’ to refer to Germany in *The Lion and the Unicorn* (1940), relating it to India. He argued that Germany ‘behaves towards conquered countries as an exploiter, its aims being that of a caste system with four castes as in Hindu religion’ (50). With Barea, the Spanish *hidalgos* could now come in as a clear example of the Spanish caste’s vanity: men who felt ‘savage hatred against the rising tide of democracy’ (Barea 1941b, 59), whose cruelty was duly exemplified in the declaration of a Francoist aristocrat who had told the journalists Hubert Renfro Knickerbocker and Sefton Delmer during the war: ‘the rebels on the other side belonged to an inferior race, only fit to serve, or else, if unwilling to serve, to be exterminated’ (59). In this infamous interview, published in the *Washington Post* in 1937, Captain Gonzalo de Aguilera had made extensive declarations about how the Spanish conflict was ‘a race war, not merely a class war. You don’t understand because you don’t realize that there are two races in Spain – a slave race and a ruler race’ (Knickerbocker 1937). ‘Caste’ was the perfect term for Barea to insist that the goal of the Spanish elites was to ‘crush modern progress’ and to put them at odds with the British public as a whole. It combined the essence of the Black Legend with the British notion that modernity needed to be brought to other parts of the worlds, be it the Orient or Spain.<sup>155</sup>

One of the most important goals of Barea was to paint a picture of Franco’s Spain and the forces behind it as radically different from and opposed to Britain before, during and after the Spanish Civil War. Part of Barea’s strategy to exoticize the Spanish elite in *Struggle* was the inclusion of many terms in Spanish such as *señores* (38), *pronunciamento* (38), *cacique* (38), *latifundios* (39), *conquistadores* (100) or *Caudillo* aside from keeping the original names of *Requetés* or *Falange*, the latter of which appeared on occasion as ‘Fascist *Falange*’ (50). This was all closely associated with the Catholic Church, but also brought into geographical proximity with Africa and the Orient: Barea contended that ‘the interests of the feudal Caste of Spain and those of the feudal Caste of Morocco coincided, not only in material but also in political and social manners’ (Barea 1941b, 96). The same point was reinforced in *The Track*. These were the extreme conditions responsible for a

---

<sup>155</sup> It also allowed Barea, incidentally, to distance himself from Unamuno’s *casticismo* and its essentialist take on Spanish society, of which Barea was critical.

workers' revolt that might seem excessively violent to a British readership, but needed to be understood in its own context. It was only because of desperate situations such as those created on La Dehesa Casablanca by members of the caste that workers consequently 'turned what people termed "anarchists"' and burnt crops during the strikes of 1933 (1941b, 36).<sup>156</sup>

It is important to ask whether Barea may have addressed more than just occasionally a potential conservative audience in Britain. He invested much energy in attempting to deepen the gulf between the elites of Britain and Spain. First of all, he wished to point out that '[t]he majority of the Caste believe that the British Empire is [...] on the verge of collapse' (Barea 1941b, 121). His main line of argument, however, was to highlight the fundamental cultural differences between the British ruling 'class' and the Spanish ruling 'caste'. Whilst the former, conservatives and liberals included, could be demonstrated to be natural allies of the Spanish people and their republic, the latter were the enemies of democracy, including its capitalist foundations. The caste was a pre-modern horde that had established its hegemony by controlling the educational system (51). They kept invoking the imperial splendour and the Catholic greatness ruined by (British-supported) Liberalism in the 1800s. Science was years behind, and in literature the caste went as far as prohibiting translations of Shakespeare 'for their excessive profane language' (52).

In criticizing the Spanish caste for indulging in essentialist and spiritual arguments of Spain's lost grandeur, Barea goes slightly against fellow Republicans who saw the otherness of Spain on the margins of modernity as a source of spiritual values that could revitalise the West (cf. Faber 2002). While, as we will see in the next chapter, Barea is not totally immune from this intellectual tradition, he will nonetheless remain quite critical of the revival of Spain's pre-modern glories. Spain was 'rich in heroes', Barea noted, but 'there exists no more dangerous form of wealth for a country which does not know what to do with its heroes' (Barea 1941b, 37).

---

<sup>156</sup> These events remind us of the Casas Viejas incident that took place in the same year of 1933 and that Sender wrote about in his *Viaje a la aldea del crimen* (1934). Sender had already argued that it had been the miserable conditions of the workers that had triggered their violence against the landowners.

### *Franco, the 'Monster-Caudillo'*

If the Spanish caste was bad enough in itself, some of its worst qualities were also concentrated in a single man. Denigrating Franco was a core task of Republican propaganda in Britain. Both *Struggle for the Spanish Soul* and *The Track* include chapters with vivid portraits of Francisco Franco.<sup>157</sup> The first was singled out by Arthur Koestler in a review for *Horizon*:

I have read quite a number of voluminous books on Spain, and was surprised how many new facts I learned from Barea's 30,000 word booklet; among other things the first plausible character-analysis of that strange little monster-caudillo' (Koestler 1941, 219)

The importance of the chapter on Franco was not missed by the publishers, and the advertisement placed by Secker and Warburg already noted that *Struggle* was not only '[t]he first book in years to make clear the real nature of the Spanish problems', but contained 'an original full-length portrait of Franco' (Secker and Warburg 1941). Barea even intended to publish the chapter with the title 'The head of a State' separately, before publication of the full-length essay, particularly as the latter had been delayed by the destruction of the original typescript (Barea 1941).

The message here was that Britain should not trust Spain to remain neutral based on the character of its leader. Barea bases his description not on accounts tainted by 'political creed' (Barea 1941b, 20), he argued, but on his first-hand knowledge of Franco during his years in Morocco. Barea's 'frankness and impartiality' (20) on the matter is reinforced by an initial emphasis on the dictator's positive traits: his fearlessness and honesty 'in the sense of financial correctness and incorruptibility' (21), which in a place like Morocco where most officers were corrupt 'won for Franco the liking of those working under him, and singled him out from his superiors' (22). Once this has been said, the ground is ready for an attack on the leader. First of all, it needed to be beyond any doubt that Franco was a character fundamentally unsuitable to lead the Spanish people. Barea starts by ridiculing Franco physically, distancing his figure from the idealized stereotypes that a British reader might have had of the Spanish military hero. Barea argues that

---

<sup>157</sup> Another fascist figure that features prominently is Millán Astray. In *The Track* there is an episode of an *arenga* that was published separately alongside a description of Astray's confrontation with Unamuno in Salamanca (1941n).

[n]obody who sees him finds it easy to think of Franco as the leader of Spain. In physical appearance, he is not so much a Spanish as a Mediterranean Jewish type (not that I want to introduce any racial theory). He is fattish and rather short, even for Spain. [...] His somewhat protruding eyes are blank and wide open, the eyes of a man who has no inner problems of his own and remains untouched by outward problems. I always thought he showed signs of that lymphatic disposition which eliminates, or at least reduces, a number of the normal reactions and sensations. However that may be, there is no doubt that physically Franco in no way corresponds to the traditional Spanish idea of a hero and *Caudillo* [...]. (1941b, 26)

The somewhat ironic Jewish reference would have shocked anyone in Franco's camp sympathizing with racial theories. What is even more striking for this period is the insinuation of a physiologically determined emotional disability, a 'disposition' placing Franco apart from healthy people. Similar accounts were being given around this time of both Hitler and Mussolini. In Britain, before the full extent of the Nazi crimes was known, Hitler was portrayed as a 'comic as well as a rapacious figure in contemporary literature', the BBC giving him the title of 'Herr Hitler' while he was 'popularly portrayed as insane' (Rawlinson 2009, 205).

At the same time, Barea presented Franco as a 'product of the Spanish Foreign Legion', which was 'very different from the romantic legends woven round it by a duped section of the English press when it came to 'free Spain from the Reds' in 1936' (Barea 1941b, 28). While in the *Tercio*, Franco grew 'ruthless, self-centred, distrustful and supremely self-confident' shifting from the war against the Moors to a war on the 'inner enemy', a war against 'the people who wanted to finish forever with war and the army' (32). Ultimately, Franco was dangerous not in his quality as a statesman, but in his 'cold military intelligence' and his lack of imagination, which made him a 'destructive tool of political and social forces alien to him!' (33). Franco's intransigence is presented by Barea as contrary to democratic values as practiced by politicians in Britain. An oppositional other to the British, but also to the Spanish people, Franco – as the representative of the Spanish Right and the caste – was the 'common enemy' of both.

Economic factors were not enough to explain Francoism, so we find explorations of Franco's and the caste's motives in psychological terms. Their hunger for power was

fuelled not only by greed, but also by a historically rooted desire ‘to escape from a modern Spanish feeling of inferiority, and to demonstrate their rightful claim to social superiority’ (Barea 1941b, 51). Depressingly, as Barea argues, this feeling has been ‘even transmitted [...] to the surface of the mind of the working-class Spaniards, as the ideology of a ruling caste always does’ (58). The myths cultivated by the caste had a certain success among the people, even if it was only on the surface for the time being, the fundamental ideals of this class being in tune with those of Britain. But it was a dangerous thing nonetheless. At the centre of this worrying hegemonic process, Barea claimed, stood the Francoist ideology of *Hispanidad*: something he called the ‘Hispanic myth’, and which went far beyond a simple cultural folly. The ‘dream of a Hispanic Empire’ (67) with its expansionist claims towards Latin America and the danger it consequently posed in a context of growing German influence, needed to be understood by everyone in Britain before further endorsing non-intervention.

### ***The ‘Hispanic myth’***

The *mito de la Hispanidad* of the Franco regime had its origins in intellectuals of *Acción Española* such as Ramiro de Maeztu, Isidro Goma and Emilio Vizcarra. It made claims for a revival of a cultural empire for Spain that, based on Catholicism, would encompass Latin America. In *Struggle*, Barea quotes from the Spanish paper *Informaciones* which wrote on account of Serrano Súñer’s visit to Berlin and Rome in the autumn of 1940:

We want only a spiritual Empire in America. [...] Inevitably, our Empire has a territorial significance. We demand the lands discovered and conquered by our *conquistadores*, and christened by our missionaries with plain Spanish names which cannot be pronounced by the pirates – lands which shall shortly receive the honour of being restored to our Empire.<sup>158</sup> (1941b, 100)

The Hispanic Myth was explained by Barea as the national myth through which the ruling caste and Franco both understood and shaped Spain, its past and its future as a

---

<sup>158</sup> Hindsight confirms how closely Franco’s imperial claims were related to German and Italian imperial ambitions: references to a Spanish Empire disappeared from Franco’s official discourse after the end of the Second World War (Gibernau 1999, 80). The word ‘pirates’ probably refers to the British.

leader of the Spanish-speaking nations, potentially competing with British interests in the Atlantic. Having addressed Gibraltar and Morocco as the first geographical steps of the new Hispanic imperialism (chapter 3), Barea focuses next in *Struggle* on the third area of concern for Britain of Spanish foreign policies, Latin America. The basis of this Spanish 'spiritual Empire in America' (1941b, 100) is explained by Barea in the central chapter of the essay, 'The Hispanic Myth'. Barea starts by explaining the new meaning of Hispanity as defined by Franco: an indivisible Hispanic world, of which Spain must be the 'spiritual, cultural and economic Axis' (100). According to Barea, Spanish propagandists, in full agreement with Germany and Italy, claim that 'Latin-America was to be Spain's sphere of interest in the New Order' (100). Nonetheless, he adds, the opinion of some media such as the paper *Informaciones* is that the "Empire has a territorial significance" and thus the lands conquered by Spain should 'receive the honour of being restored' to it (100). Barea warns of the possible alliances of Latin American Countries and Spain against England (through the Falkland Islands) or the USA (through Cuba), which is encouraged by *Falange Exterior*, an unofficial diplomatic 'Fifth Column' in Latin America (100). Moreover, he presages that the 'fantastic myth of the New Spanish Empire' is now beginning to be a 'political menace to the international policy of the Anglo-Saxon democracies, precisely because it touched on the former colonies' (101).

To tackle the new imperial ideology, Barea works with a definition of 'myth' based on the ethnographic work of Bronislaw Malinowski. He quotes from 'Myth in Primitive Psychology' (1926): 'The Myth touches the deepest desires of man – his fears, his hopes, his passions, his sentiments, as it validates the social order, justifies the existing social scheme and ranges from expressions of sheer artistry to legalism' (60). Barea argues that after the Spanish Civil War – which was a rebellion against 'the people' then in power who had for centuries been the servants – the 'gentlemen of Spain' needed 'a myth, a national pattern for emotion, belief and self-justification, which would fill the void caused by the complete absence of a concrete political programme' (59). They would therefore rekindle the 'Hispanic myth', Barea noted, which would help the Francoists articulate the need to revive a past which had obviously not been 'good' for most Spaniards (60). School and Church would help maintain the myth of the glorious past of the 'Golden Age' and of the Spanish

Empire: Spain needed to restore the greatness of the reigns of the Catholic Monarchs, the emperor Charles V and Philip II; a greatness which led to the conquest of America. Barea aims to explain what constitutes the myth, which justified the violence of the Civil War as a necessary step for 'imperial greatness': the Spanish empire on which 'the sun never set', was based on a spiritual and universal mission to conquer and civilize the world (61). According to the myth, every Spaniard would be secure precisely because 'the greatness of the nation and its mission were supreme', explains Barea (62). Spain lost her power when she lost national unity and foreign ideas perverted the spirituality of the nation. The last of these foreign ideas, Barea continues ironizing about the myth, was Marxism. In turn, *Falange* had managed to save Spain from its decline and degeneration and would now go back to the tasks set for her by Queen Isabella. According to Barea, these tasks consist in regaining Gibraltar, conquering Africa and continuing 'the spiritual and cultural mission in the Americas', while fighting infidels and maintaining inner unity against peninsular nationalisms (62).

Barea goes back to Malinowski's definition to explain how the myth responds to the feelings of the caste, satisfying its inferiority complex and promising a new future. It also helps to blame the present state of the nation on foreign powers (above all, England, the 'archenemy of the Spanish Empire'), on Liberalism, on party politics and on democracy (65). Regarding how the myth operates among the common people, Barea agreed that '[i]t has the right mystical sound which defies cold reasoning because it appeals to undefined conventional emotions and permits the individual to exalt himself through the nation which carries him along, while he feels helpless as long as he is alone' (65).

As happened with Britain's enemies, Germany and Italy with their own national myths, the 'imperial myth' was grounded in a 'social myth', Barea argued. This 'social myth' emphasizes that 'inner unity' will only be achieved with an authoritarian State to which all elements of the social structure must be submitted: Spain 'One, Great and Free' (65). In order to obtain this victory, the myth supported that war was necessary – thus posing an obvious threat to Britain's Atlantic interests (65). For Barea, when the Spanish caste, full of 'resentment and humiliation', talks about Spain being the 'Mother Country', they imply 'self-assertion and a reclaiming of lost riches' (102). On the other hand, loyal to his previous defence of the masses,

Barea says that '[t]o the common people of Spain, America, both North and South, meant and means a completely different thing: freedom, and a hope of reasonable prosperity' (102). Therefore, it is the caste, the rulers of Spain today, Barea continues, that want a Hispano-America dominated by the Spanish caste, while the common people just want a free Hispano-America to which they can escape from the Spanish caste (102–3). The caste have perverted the 'noble idea of universal Hispanic culture into an imperialist slogan' and backed it up with interests such as those of the Church, which claims an united front of 'true Spanish religious spirit' to defend America against 'the materialist spirit of the North, and even to conquer the North for the true faith' (Barea 1941b, 102–3).

But if Barea admitted there was a 'noble idea of universal Hispanic culture', what was his take on it? Faber has argued that the rhetoric used by the Republicans in exile around *hispanismo* and *pan-hispanismo*, while differing in its practices, were nonetheless quite similar to Franco's rhetoric of *Hispanidad* in claiming to represent the true Spanish nation, in seeing Spanish culture as having been marginalized by Anglo-American modernity and in claiming a spiritual connection between Spain and the whole of Latin American. This position is further supported by Angel Loureiro's point on the genealogy of Franco's Hispanic myth, which he traces to earlier discourses, both liberal and conservative, around *regeneracionismo* both in Spain and America. In his essay 'Spanish nationalism and the ghost of empire', Loureiro argues that

[i]t could be rash, and perhaps even irresponsible, to thread a narrative line with the Spanish constructions of Spanish America leading from Menéndez Pelayo to Maeztu and to the Francoist regime, with precursors and variations such as Castelar, Valera, Galdós, Altamira and Unamuno, among many others. But it would be equally irresponsible not to question the preparatory role that nineteenth-century Spanish constructions of Latin American, both liberal and conservative, had in the later development of the ideological and political program in defense of the concept of *Hispanidad* used by Francoism and developed around the notion of a spiritual legacy that Spain bequeathed to its former American possessions. (2003, 73–74)

Barea's claims on the relationship between Spain and Latin America were indeed close in *Struggle* to the *hispanismo* of other Republican exiles. For Barea, a 'free

Spain would be the centre of this empire based on free and spontaneous collaboration, and a member of an international commonwealth of free nations' (Barea 1941b, 127). According to Barea, '[s]uch a Spain would find an Empire given to it' (127). That is, Arab and Hispano-American intellectuals would be free to 'interchange with the intellectual life of Spain', resuscitating the 'old Hispano-Islamic culture'. Moreover, '[t]he creative spiritual and material forces of Hispano-America would once more align themselves on what used to be called 'the Meridian of Madrid' in free interchange with the intellectual life of Spain' (127). In fact, Latin America was indeed the new intellectual home of Spanish literature as 'Spanish Fascism and religious fanaticism' cannot destroy the past works of intellectuals because they were being reprinted in presses in Latin America, while they were 'being reduced to pulp in Spanish soil' (127). In *Struggle*, his mentioning of the 'Meridian of Madrid' takes Barea back to 1927, when one of the most ardent debates on the intellectual relationships between Spain and Latin America had taken place. Spanish intellectuals such as Guillermo de Torre had claimed a spiritual and cultural connection between the countries across the Atlantic in which Madrid would feature at the centre, while Latin American writers argued that Latin American literature should not have to refer to Spain as a metropolitan centre, either in literary or in editorial terms.

In later texts on Latin America, Barea will criticise quite specifically this tendency among Europeans – particularly Spaniards – to write about the continent from a European perspective. In reviewing Madariaga's *The Fall of the Spanish American Empire* in 1947, Barea argues that '[i]t is high time for us to study the history of the peoples of Spanish America without trying to use it for our ends or theories. What are they feeling and doing has begun to affect our shrunken, divided, ex-European world' (1947f, 6). In this statement, Barea both connects and diverges from the prevalent Republican exiles' ideas on Latin America. He is claiming for Latin America its role as a guide for the broken European post-war world, but places Spain within Europe as part of the Old World almost in opposition to Latin America. As Barea put it, '[i]nvariably, any interpretation of the 'decline and fall' of the Spanish Empire will become a political assessment, both of modern Spain and of the trend in

modern Spanish America' (1), and Madariaga's could be classified, Barea argued, as a reactionary and conservative project (1).<sup>159</sup>

This review of Madariaga was however written in 1947. *Struggle* was written under the immediate necessity of countering Francoist imperial propaganda in 1941, and in laying claim to a 'noble idea of universal Hispanic culture' (102) Barea, whilst perhaps betraying a legacy from the generation of 98 and 1914, also aimed at evoking in the intended reader of the essay – a British reader – another set of ideas about the possible role of Spain in the war against Nazism, and its growing influence in Latin America. Perhaps in this instance, Barea's description of the relationship Spain would have with Latin America also mirrors discourses in Britain about the possible outcome of the British Empire during and after the war. The *Searchlight* series had as one of its aims to 'stress Britain's international and imperial responsibilities and the aim of a planned Britain at the head of a great and freer British Commonwealth and linked with the United States of America as a framework of world order' (Costello 1989, 257). Orwell's anti-imperialist stance is well known, but in the context of war he argued in *The Lion and the Unicorn* that the only logical policy for the British Empire was to create a 'federation of Socialist states, like a looser version of the Union of Soviet Republics' (1941a, 69). While Barea's claims to an intellectual relationship between Spain, Morocco and Latin America are far from Orwell's – and the reality of the British Empire –, one possible reading could be, once again, that Barea was trying to convince the British of the important role a free and democratic Spain could play not only in Europe, but among the Latin American countries, as their guide against Francoist and Nazi intervention. This latter point was in fact highlighted by Tosco Fyvel in the introduction to *Struggle* in which he claimed that if the true and democratic Spain was freed from Franco it would 'give a genuine lead to all Spanish civilisation' (Fyvel 1941, 6).

Barea's *Struggle* fits into the *Searchlight* series as an essay which analysed a national myth, like George Orwell's *The Lion and the Unicorn* and Sebastian Haffner's *Offensive against Germany*. In Tosco Fyvel's foreword to *Struggle*,

---

<sup>159</sup> Barea hardly ever wrote specifically about Latin America. Exceptions would be his five broadcasts on Latin American writers for the BBC. In his reviews of Latin American writers he interprets their work as representative of the Latin American nations. If Barea mentions the fact that these works are written in Castilian language, he does not indulge in other pan-Hispanic claims to spiritual unity or otherwise.

Orwell's and Haffner's essays are both mentioned. To Fyvel, 'nationalism and the National Myth' are as deep-rooted a force as ever in our modern age of machines and great cities' (Fyvel 1941, 6). Orwell's essay is a wartime-driven analysis of the 'English myth', which Fyvel described as 'that pattern of patriotism, slackness, kindness, and imperturbable courage which is the strength of England' (6).

Sebastian Haffner, an anti-Nazi German exile who wrote for the *Observer* and after the war became one of West Germany's best known columnists and historians, wrote an essay on, as Fyvel described it, the "'German myth' of the haunting sense of instability ever driving the German mind to extremes' (6). If Barea's essay shares with Orwell's his political solution for both England and Spain in the form of a third way down-up socialist revolution, it shares with the essay on Germany the objective of convincing the British readership not only of fighting a 'common enemy', but of the support of the people of Spain – and the people of Germany – as representatives of the true nation(s).

Barea argues that the common people of Spain do not partake of the Hispanic myth of the lost grandeur as they were never a part of it, and that free from the weight of the past, the Spanish masses embody the essence of the democratic 'New Spain' as understood by the Republic. This cohesion of the Spanish masses as described by Barea is meant to contrast strongly with his criticism of the attempt by the Spanish caste to create a false sense of unity through the idea of the 'Hispanic myth'. If Barea censures the Hispanic myth because it 'appeals to undefined conventional emotions and permits the individual to exalt himself through the nation which carries him along' (Barea 1941b, 65), it would seem as if in identifying all Spaniards with yet another vague concept such as the 'people' he was reinforcing in turn the British discourse of a 'people's war'.

### **The people's war(s)**

As we have seen in the first section of this chapter, Barea 'othered' the Spanish caste, its institutions, representatives and its myths. He did so by insisting in some of the most prevalent stereotypes offered by the Black Legend, the feudal character of Spanish élites, the bigotry of the Spanish Catholic Church and the imperial pretences of Spain's lost grandeur. In contrast, Barea articulated a version of the Spanish Civil

War as a ‘people’s war’. In doing so, he was able to connect the fight of the Spanish people against fascism with that of the British.

One of the most pervasive interpretations of the Spanish Civil War both at home and abroad presented the Spanish people as fighting a foreign invader who was ‘directed by a few traitors belonging to the upper classes, the clergy and the army, now at the service of the ‘fascist-imperialist world coalition’’ (Núñez Seixas 2005, 47). In contrast, the true Spain, ‘represented by the lower classes, those brave peasants, workers and sailors, heroic women and children who took up arms on 19 July 1936, became the upholders of national independence’ and thus ‘the people’ emerged once more as a subject of the war effort (47). Patriotic claims of the Spanish people fighting against a foreign invader were not new in Spanish historiography, which also resonated strongly with British understandings of Spanish history. As it happened, the last time that Britain was military involved with Spain it had been to fight a foreign invader in 1808, Napoleon. As María Zambrano wrote in 1937, ‘the people fought again for their independence, while the *señoritos* helped the invaders, as during the Napoleonic invasion’ (cited in Núñez Seixas 2005, 47-48).<sup>160</sup>

For supporters of the Republic though, this stance meant articulating notions of the nation that would counter the Francoists claims on the one hand, but that would also incorporate the internationalist language of the working class movements of the previous decades. The Republican Popular Front had already embraced the Gramscian understanding of the ‘national-popular’ that would unite the different political projects in a broad inter-class alliance that could counter the hegemony of the Spanish Right. The people were seen in this context ‘as a way of transcending the narrow ‘economic-corporate’ interests of class’ (Faber 2002, 29). If, as we have seen, Barea conceived of himself as a (non)intellectual speaking on behalf of the Spanish people, his own experiences as a member of the people – from his life with his rural peasant family, to his working class upbringing, to his white collar job and wartime experiences – gave him the material to draw a picture of the different incarnation of the Spanish masses; one that permeates his autobiographical novel, but that is specifically addressed in *Struggle*.

---

<sup>160</sup> One of the most striking images of the Napoleonic wars can be found in the work of Francisco the Goya, used by both the Republicans and the rebels for propaganda purposes (Basilio 2014, 149). Writers, painters and photographers – both Spanish and foreign – commented on, described and used Goya’s paintings in their work (see chapter 5).

The people were identified with the nation and were ‘represented by a multi-class alliance from the peasantry to the middle classes’ (Núñez Seixas 2005, 48). In Barea’s view,

[t]he great mass of Spanish people is still socially and politically unshaped, principally because Spain is not yet industrialised. I feel justified, therefore, in talking of the masses or ‘common people’ without always distinguishing between the hired workers, the small peasant proprietor and the middle class. (1941b, 69)

Barea used in his texts well-known antifascist symbols that were aimed at transcending the differences between the different versions of the war. Certain key words featured at the core of the shared leftist anti-fascist political culture, such as ‘el pueblo’ o ‘la revolución’, which were both a common banner as much as a site for contestation (García 2015). Other symbols placed by Barea in the hands of the people were the mottos *¡No Pasarán!* and *Unión de Hermanos Proletarios* (U.H.P) as well as the myth of the Defence of Madrid, which features as the moment of popular uprising, brotherhood and solidarity of the people in arms fighting fascism in *Valor y miedo*, *Struggle* and *The Clash*. In doing so, he was not alone. The heroism of the *madrileños* became the theme of much of the literature of the Spanish Civil War, such as Antonio Machado’s *Madrid, baluarte de nuestra Guerra de independencia* (1937) or José Herrera Petere’s *Acero de Madrid* (1938) and later Max Aub’s *Campo Abierto* (1951) or Maria Teresa León’s *Juego Limpio* (1959).

The common people fighting against fascism became the protagonist of the literature of the Spanish Civil War, from the collective hero in Miguel Hernández’s *Viento del pueblo* (1937) to the anonymous, scared and brave people of Madrid as in Barea’s *Valor y miedo* (1938). Much of the best work of Spanish writers in the early twentieth century – from the *generación del 98* to the *generación del 27* and the new romantics – was imbricated with their exploration of the people, in the sense of both ‘folclore como saber popular y la [vertiente] política revolucionaria’ (Fuentes 2006, 22). As I will argue for Barea, this understanding of the people as *ethnos* and *demos* had as a consequence the need to negotiate essentialists notions about the Spanish character – such as ‘su presencia y su sabiduría y sensibilidad artística milenaria’ (Fuentes 2006, 22) – and its revolutionary character as agents of social change.

Ultimately, as García notes, during the Spanish Civil War, ‘la España *antifascista* seguía siendo el *pueblo*’ (García 2015).

One of the advantages of focusing on the people for a British public was that the identification between ‘the people’ and ‘us’ could be interpreted from different perspectives, beyond the traditional discourse of the Left, particularly in the context of the Second World War as a battle for democracy. The polysemic nature of the word ‘people’ allowed not only for an articulation of a class alliance, but for multiple connections across borders. In Spain, as Álvarez Junco argues (2012, 91–92) the populist claims were used by all political sectors in the early twentieth century, from the liberals’ take on the *pueblo* as race (91), to the anti-liberal conservatives’ individual ‘people’ (91-92), to the radical Left that identified the collective ‘people’ with the working class and took a more internationalist approach (92). Similarly, for Britain, on the one hand, the people were perceived as the agents of democracy in the liberal Whig discourse. On the other, some writers on the Right also used the term in a way in which ‘the people’ meant something as generic as the ‘decent men and women esteeming justice, honesty and freedom’ and ‘struggling to survive in a modern age’ (Baxendale 1999).

The ambiguity of the concept might also be explained by what Giorgio Agamben reminds us is the dual meaning of the term. ‘The people’ has in Europe a double connotation in referring to both ‘the whole of the citizenry as a unitary body politic’ and at the same time ‘also the poor, the underprivileged, and the excluded’ (Agamben 2000, 29). In articulating the meaning of the people for an English readership, Barea was also building on the fact that not only the Spanish ‘el pueblo’, but the English ‘the people’ also signified ‘the ordinary people as opposed to the rich and the aristocracy’ (30). These dual movements of inclusion/exclusion in ‘the people’ are fundamental to the way in which the concept is used in western politics and go a long way to explaining the ease with which it was invoked during the Second World War as the national call of a democracy fighting for its freedom, whether it also entailed a social revolution or not (Orwell 1941a). The people was invoked by such different writers as the socialist J. B. Priestley and the conservative Arthur Bryant, as the term easily fit different agendas, weaving itself into several ideological textures. Ultimately, as Étienne Balibar (Balibar and Wallerstein 1991,

93) explains in *The Nation Form*, when the idea of the nation is to be thought of as a community it is generally defined as ‘the people’.

Invocations of the ‘people’s war’ were to unite Britain against a foreign invader – in similar fashion to Spain –, particularly during the bleak months of the Battle of Britain in 1940 and 1941. In fact, it was probably because of veterans from the Spanish Civil War such as Tom Wintringham that the phrase started to be used in reference to the Second World War (Smith 1999, 70). However, the ‘people’s war’ as well as ‘the people’ had different meanings, from the continuity it represented for conservatives such as Churchill to the leftist proposition that ‘it was about a necessary though quiet revolution’ (Smith 2014, 96). On the one hand, from the more ideological Spanish ‘people’s war’ to the British one, the political *tout court* had been diluted. The latter mostly referred to the fact that the war was being fought on the home front (70) and as such it is used in one of the most referenced books on the matter, Angus Calder’s *The People’s War* (1992). On the other, the ‘people’s war’ was a call to overcome ‘not only fascism but also the near treachery of the élite of the 1930s’ (Smith 2014, 7) and their appeasement policies, as argued by the editors of the *Searchlight Books* (see chapter 1).

One of the ways to talk about the nation that avoids thinking in metonymic terms – for example to see them through ‘their historic institutions or monocle diplomats or patrician rulers’ – is to think of nations in terms of their ‘national character’, i.e. ‘in terms of their people’s common characteristics, which was more appealing to the democratic minded’ (Mandler 2006, 153). The language of the national character has to be both ‘slippery and flexible to do the job it purports to do’; it has to be ‘loose enough to appeal to an audience actually very diverse in geography, class, lifestyle and culture, and yet specific enough to strike a chord of recognition in the individual reader’ (2). As such, it ‘is capable of being constantly contested and reinterpreted by a wide range of social actors and from a wide variety of ideological positions – liberal and even radical as much as conservative’ (1).

Debates on the Spanish national character – and its many incarnations in regional national characters but also in materialist and historicist interpretations of it – as a consequence of the *desastre* of 1898 were notoriously less optimistic, related as they were to *el problema de España*. What Julio Caro Baroja criticized as the myth of the national character in 1970 was being explored at the time by the generation of

98 and the *regeneracionistas* including Rafael Altamira's *Psicología del pueblo español* (1902) (Baroja 2004, 12,76). Discourses on the idea of 'English national character' had had their 'heyday' during the interwar years and would be particularly vindicated during the Second World War (Mandler 2006, 143, 196). Barea's interpretations – and questioning – of Spanishness might have been influenced by the latter discourses of the Second World War in Britain, but was also surely influenced by the former in Spain – even if to resist it.

There was indeed a use of the idea of the national character in the inter-war periods that belonged not only to the conservative, but also to liberals and the Left 'for whom it was one way of expressing a faith in democracy' (153). In *The Lion and the Unicorn*, Orwell acknowledged the role patriotism played during the Second World War and expressed his belief that there should be a specifically English socialism and that the war should be understood as intrinsically linked to a socialist revolution in Britain.<sup>161</sup> In this essay, Orwell argued that 'national cultures' existed and should be integrated with the internationalist efforts of socialism.<sup>162</sup> Whilst ultimately considered by Orwell as a myth, the idea of national characters and cultures became increasingly relevant in the context of war. Orwell even distanced himself from the intelligentsia that had had a more internationalist and urban outlook in the 1930s, particularly the communists, whom he criticised for separating 'patriotism and intelligence' (1941a, 39). Unorthodox socialists like Orwell and the writer J. B. Priestley reinforced in their articulation of the 'people's war' the relation between patriotism and anti-fascism.<sup>163</sup>

Barea's exploration of the Spanish people in his work are, as we have seen, also concerned with the people as *ethnos* – as representatives of a culture or ethnic group – and not just as *demos* – the common people. In describing them for the British audience, Barea often resorted to essentialist romanticized stereotypes that were part

---

<sup>161</sup> As Smith notes '[i]n George Orwell, the writer who came closer than any other to finding the left-wing shorthand of the war that Churchill invented for the right, it was this subtle blend of patriotism and millenarianism that was to prove so powerfully seductive as a credo for a British social democracy [...] By the time of *The Lion and the Unicorn*, Orwell was even less scared of revolutionism, because he believed it would be undertaken in a quiet, more "English" way' (Smith 2014, 96–97).

<sup>162</sup> Newsinger has argued though that Orwell's patriotism was a response to a critical juncture, which he later revised by questioning the real existence of national cultures in his book *The English people* (1947) (1999, 73).

<sup>163</sup> Priestley, who would also contribute articles to *The Spectator*, ran an extremely popular wartime BBC broadcast called 'Postscript'.

of the British imagination as much as they were part of the imagery of the generation of 98, such as in the work of Antonio Machado and Miguel de Unamuno, and of the generation of 27, such as in Federico García Lorca and Rafael Alberti (Fuentes 2006, 22). Indeed, references to Castile and its silent peasants, sometimes brute and sometimes sage – and key figures in the imagery of the generation of 98 as much as of the European romantic myth –, abound both in Barea's trilogy and in his political essay *Struggle* (1941). For all his analysis of the Spanish 'masses' as agents of democracy in this political wartime pamphlet, Barea's description of the Spanish people incurred in frequent stereotyping. On the one hand he writes in *Struggle* that

I personally believe that the enormous number of militant trade unionists, more or less vaguely anarchists or socialists, distrustful of politics and politicians, refractory against any kind of bureaucracy, have been –and still are – the potential élite of the Spanish Left. From their ranks came the men and women who actually organized defence, production, education and leisure with initiative and independence – the NCO's [Non-commissioned Officers] of Spanish democracy. (1941b, 111)

On the other hand, this portrait of the people as the revolutionary elements in Spain – arguably also a common Republican myth of the Spanish Civil War, as we have seen – is complemented by a description of these men and women as being 'romantic, violent, credulous and suspicious' as a result of 'the inevitable heritage of a half-feudal society', and, I suggest, as the British perceptions of the Spanish national character would also picture them (112). The key here is the emphasis on 'heritage' not so much as an eternal quality, but as the material conditions that explain the 'Spanish character in its present mould' as directly related to its economic and political circumstances (82). To be clear, Barea will explain the actions of the Spanish people as reactions against the harsh conditions imposed throughout Spanish history by hereditary privilege and the ruling caste. Although this approach is at times interwoven with certain stereotypical perceptions of the Spanish people, Barea will argue against the people being passive receptacles of intellectual products.<sup>164</sup>

---

<sup>164</sup> Barea's take on the people contrasts then with what Faber analyses for many Republican exile writing (2002). For Faber, the discourse of the exiled intellectuals in Mexico 'invoked romantic essentialist notions of nation, and paternalist notions of the people or folk as both the provider of cultural "raw material" and the receiver of intellectual product' (5).

This is so much the case that he will criticize other intellectuals and writers, from Hemingway to Unamuno for incurring in these essentialist portrayals of the Spanish people. Despite agreeing with Brennan's *The Spanish Labyrinth* on many fronts, he would also say that 'the book tends to speak of Spanish characteristics as though they were immutable, truly racial and not conditioned by historical and social factors'.<sup>165</sup> Barea gives several examples, noting how Brennan, despite trying at times to explain these conditions as a result of geography

intersperses comment and generalized judgement in his analytical account: 'Spaniards are a very envious race' . . . 'they are neither just nor fair, but honest' . . . 'abnormal sensitiveness to injustice' . . . 'by nature a suspicious and exclusive race' . . . 'patient and fatalistic' . . . 'liberty-loving and anarchic' . . . and so forth. (1943b, 205)

Notwithstanding, even when acknowledging that it is historically constructed, Barea often writes with the generic assumptions that there is a 'Spanish way of thinking' (Barea 1941b, 72), that the Spanish people are 'simple' and 'proud' (73) or that Spanish republicans and socialists are 'loyal' and 'stubborn' (75). What is held to be an essentialist trait of Spanish national character might well be explained by material conditions, but Barea seems to sometimes resort to these Spanish stereotypes, which are incidentally shared by the British public, as a device to engage the reader in a more poetic – and already familiar – reading of the Spanish 'soul'.<sup>166</sup>

Barea's take on the national character is, however, political on yet another front. It places his work in relation with but also in opposition to the Spanish tradition of writing on the *problema de España*, of liberal intellectuals such as José Ortega y Gasset and Salvador de Madariaga. Years later, Barea condemned Madariaga's lack of historical method for his tendency to 'explain political developments out of the

---

<sup>165</sup> Sebastian Balfour agrees that Brennan, as well as many intellectuals of the Left, incurred in stereotypes of the Spaniards (1998, 172). Faber gives a more positive reading arguing that Brennan's *The Spanish Labyrinth* is the first study on Spain to avoid resorting to the Spanish national character, by explaining the situation in 'as the product of complex evolutions in the country's history, economics, sociology, culture, and climate' (2008b, 159–60). In order to do so, Faber argues, 'Brenan implicitly leaves room for the possibility of positive, progressive change in Spain' (2008b, 160).

<sup>166</sup> The title of the essay seems also to respond more to the British expectations of the Spanish national character as a sort of 'premodern folk whose lifestyle and values somehow embody an essential *Volksgeist* threatened by modernity' (Faber 2002, 30). It is so at odds with the rest of Barea's essay that Koestler wrote in his review of *Struggle* that 'Arturo Barea's book is an excellent survey of the historic roots, the economic and mass-psychologic realities of Spanish fascism; the only point to criticize is the pompous title' (Koestler 1941, 219).

unchangeable elements of ‘character’, ‘spirit’ and collective ‘soul’ (1947f). In his essay in book form on Miguel de Unamuno (1952), Barea censures that in *En torno al casticismo* (1902) the philosopher not only explores the relation between humanity, the nation and the individual, but also ‘transmits an impression of certain permanent aspects of Spanish society and of that elusive quality called ‘national character’’ (1952, 15). It is interesting to note then that *The Forging of a Rebel* has been often studied under the banner of Unamuno’s *intrahistoria* (Bender 2014, Ribeiro de Menezes, Alison 2013). If Bender (2014) uses the term more to refer to the ‘interior history’ or history from below (Boyd 1997, 129–31) – which Barea’s trilogy is – Ribeiro de Menezes (2013, 52) argues that ‘Barea creates a multilateral poetics, in which a series of historical conflicts provide the backdrop for an emerging idiom of brutality that echoes Unamuno’s emphasis on history as enduring and eternal in his infamous notion of intrahistoria’.

Despite Barea’s claims to the contrary, this latter understanding of his trilogy as *intrahistoria* hints at the ways in which his descriptions of Spain and the Spaniards are also in tension with essentialists notions of Spain and its people, even if explained in materialist terms. For example, Barea explains in *Struggle* that one of the results of the inner strife of the Republic was the people’s withdrawal ‘into the disdainful and haughty silence of the old Castilian peasant’ (1941b, 73). Contingent as it may be, the silence of the peasants reminds us of Unamuno’s silences, but also brings to the fore the necessity for Barea to speak in name of the silent masses. ‘Silence’ is, as Victoria Carpenter has noted (2010, 194), the most repeated element in Unamuno’s *intrahistoria*: ‘the common people live a “vida silenciosa”, practice a “silenciosa labor cotidiana y eternal”, possess a “silencio augusto” and form part of “la inmensa humanidad silenciosa”’ (194). Similarly to Carpenter’s argument on Juan Rulfo’s work, Barea’s use of the figure of the silent Castilian peasants is not rooted in an essentialist nationalism that equates the nation with an eternal tradition (194). Rather, it highlights the importance of rebelling against the people’s historical silence. Moreover, because of its autobiographical and subjective nature, Barea’s trilogy also partakes of an ‘intrahistoric character’, in as much as ‘la intrahistoria es la que recoge las renegociaciones de la identidad personal de cara a una comunidad en concreto o a una nación en particular’ (García-Obregón 2009, 3).

The point here, I suggest, is that Barea argues rationally against any kind of essentialist national character, but nonetheless uses its languages to open a dialogue between cultures in a way in which the exoticizing can easily transfer into the naturalizing. As we will see in the next chapter, this technique was used by Barea not only in *Struggle* – or in the trilogy –but in his first article written in exile for the British public, ‘A Spaniard in Hertfordshire’ (1939) in which he describes in a *costumbrista* manner his earliest impressions of the English village in which he first settled at his arrival. The difference between the political essay and the anecdotal and ‘non-political’ sketch is that while in the former there is no room for irony, in the latter the playful inter-play of stereotypes shows the observant reader the inner workings of Barea’s very political cultural translation (see chapter 5). As we will see, traces of a diasporic imagination can surprisingly be found in many of Barea’s propagandistic broadcasts for the BBC, despite constraints of writing under wartime censorship. As such, they are key to understand the inner workings of much of Barea’s other work, not only as products of cultural mediation but as critical commentaries that are also highly political.

While different – Barea represents the traditional Spain as a romantic and a backwards country in the periphery of Europe – the Spanish people also had to be the same, or, at least recognizable, particularly because during the Spanish Civil War and beyond, the main goal of the Republican supporters was to convince the British public, and not just the ‘fellow workers’, that the Spanish Republicans were ‘people like us’, that ‘the Republic represented civilised ideas’ (Shelmerdine 2006, 131, 132). If the Left was already convinced, it made sense to articulate the argument within a wider sector of the public sphere. In the following section, we will explore how Barea’s role as translator of the British people for a Latin American audience for the BBC placed the British people at the centre of another war, the Second World war.

## Chapter 5. Juan de Castilla: Broadcasting Britain for the BBC

Barea explained in 1955, after 16 years of exile, that he enjoyed broadcasting for the BBC ‘because I continually discover new things about this country that I want to tell to the people of my own language as friends. I can only hope to have shared some of my affectionate discoveries among ‘the English’’ (1955b). After 750 talks, Barea felt like ‘a veteran of many battles – battles for a new subject through which to convey English life to Spanish-American listeners, week after week even when it seems to me that my brain has dried up’ (1955b). Barea’s work for the BBC was about more than casually sharing his everyday ‘British’ experiences with his audience. It began when the BBC Latin American Service’s main objective was to counter Nazi and Italian propaganda. In these broadcasts, Barea shifted from writing about ‘a people’s Spain’ – discussed in chapter 4 – (1943b, 209) to a full endorsement of the British ‘people’s war’. It was in this transfer that Barea became ‘Juan de Castilla’, ‘el símbolo de todo un pueblo’ (Eaude 2001, 279) as he would say in an interview at the end of his life. But ‘Juan de Castilla’s’ role was not to explain Spain to the British anymore. Barea’s remit as an ethnographer and cultural mediator began to shift at the BBC to that of observing England and translating its customs to Spanish-speaking audiences.<sup>167</sup> I will therefore continue to explore Barea’s work for the BBC within mostly British – and wartime internationalist – discourses. His propaganda effort became most visibly aligned with British military and diplomatic interests, in contrast with his other work which at times was censured for countering official positions vis-à-vis Spain as seen in previous chapters. It was thus as a Spanish exiled broadcaster on the payroll of the BBC that Barea opened up to the transatlantic space.

Barea’s work for the BBC is the best example of how Barea adapted to the British context and its wartime discourses. The BBC offered Barea a hegemonic platform from which to speak to a world at war. On the one hand, his broadcasts are another site for his ethnographic work as a cultural translator. After Arturo’s death, Ilsa had thought that ‘he really achieved what he hoped to do: to forge a link between this country, which he loved, and people of his own language overseas’ (1958). During

---

<sup>167</sup> The broader context of the reception of Barea’s work in Latin America is a future line of research, for which the correspondence in the AIBP archive is an invaluable source.

the 17 years he worked at the BBC from 1940 until his death in 1957, Barea wrote weekly broadcasts:

[a]nything considered typically English: the local Christmas Club; Faringdon's Festival of Britain celebration, or a political harangue over a pint in the local is turned into 'man in the street' commentaries for his Latin-American listeners. (1952)

Barea therefore contributed to the construction and projection of an image of Britain overseas – to broadcast Britishness with a Spanish flare. A controller at Broadcasting House would say of his stories that Barea always emphasized 'the 'human angle', e.g. Molly breaks a teacup on 'V-J' Day, and ever after 'V-J' Day will be remembered by Molly's broken teacup' (Young 1946). However, as this quote already hints at, Barea's talks were also strategically important within the British propaganda and later cultural diplomacy strategies. Barea's 'man in the street' commentaries (as explored in chapter 3) were an integral part of the anti-fascist struggle as understood within the discourse of the 'people's war'. Barea's role as press censor in Spain and radio broadcaster 'La voz incógnita de Madrid' surely helped him adapt to the BBC wartime apparatus. In fact, on the occasion of his 750<sup>th</sup> talk, Barea also said that: 'I am convinced that the power of the radio as a propaganda or cultural medium is not only limitless – it has scarcely [*sic*] been explored. It can be a very dangerous weapon – a power for good or bad' (BBC 1955b).

Around 850 scripts survive in the Bareas archive, but have rarely been studied in detail.<sup>168</sup> They are usually considered to be pieces of *costumbrista* prose with a certain sociological, but little political and no literary value at all (Eaude 2001, 157). However, once they are read together with other contemporary discourses, they regain significance, especially in the context of the BBC's strategies of 'Broadcasting Britishness' (Gillespie, Webb, and Baumann 2008) and 'selling democracy' (Taylor 1999) through the World Service during the Second World War and after it. My reading of Barea's broadcasts in this highlights the political in their

---

<sup>168</sup> Arturo and Ilsa Barea Papers (AIBP), London; British Broadcasting Corporation Written Archive Centre (WAC), Reading. A selection of these scripts was published by Nigel Townson (Barea 2000). Other works on Barea's collaboration for the BBC are Monferrer Catalán (1998, 2007); Eaude (2001, 2011); Nieto McAvoy (2011, 2015); Townson (2015); Gillespie and Nieto McAvoy (2017).

apparently ‘apolitical’ nature in relation, not only to their content, but to the institutional setting in which they were produced.

First, I want to explore the BBC as a contact zone; as a space that encouraged broadcasters to engage in cosmopolitan practices of translation, which were highly political and politicized as they were aimed at competing in the international arena for a discursive hegemony. Second, I propose a close reading of an inaugural text that was originally presented to the BBC as the model for all future broadcasts, ‘A Spaniard in Hertfordshire’ (1939). This text will allow us to explore some of Barea’s strategies as a cultural mediator and their political significance in writing on the English national character to Spanish-speaking audiences. It is in this text that the articulation of Spain and Britain, the use and deconstruction of crossed perceptions and his strategy of reflecting on the self by focusing on the other are most obvious. Thirdly, Barea’s full endorsement of the ‘people’s war’ and the British propaganda strategies are most evident in his early broadcasts. A close reading of a sample of them will prove Barea’s contribution from his ‘puesto de batalla’ (2000, 469) to forging some of the myths of the ‘people’s war’ for an international audience, as well as highlighting the political nature of his commentaries aimed at, as noted above, broadcasting Britishness and its core values of freedom and democracy. A fourth section will go beyond 1945 to explore the way in which Barea’s broadcasts of this period can help us understand how the Labour post-war settlement came to signify for Barea a partial solution to the *aporia* of exile and the failed Republican project. These years mark a shift in Barea’s intellectual geographies and temporalities, in which the transnational character of his work is both challenged and highlighted by its progressive ‘return’ to a Spanish-speaking community in Latin America in the 1950s. This final section will briefly outline these movements.

### **The ‘corporate cosmopolitanism’ of the BBC**

As explored in the Introduction, I approach Barea’s work in London in general, and for the BBC in particular, as taking place in a diasporic and cosmopolitan contact zone. I also place his radio scripts in what Marie Gillespie and Alban Webb have termed a culture of ‘corporate cosmopolitanism’ that the BBC World Service (WS) has fostered throughout the years since its inception as the Empire Service in 1932

(Gillespie and Baumann, 2006; Gillespie 2010b; Gillespie and Webb 2013; Gillespie and Nieto McAvoy 2017). Radio as a cosmopolitan practice has in fact been noted, particularly because ‘radio waves don’t respect national borders and in doing so have potential to interrogate nationalism’ (Smulyan 2007, 63; Robertson 2008, 460).

Within the contact zone at the WS, both diasporic and cosmopolitan practices are dialectical processes worked out in and through power relations and structures within and beyond the walls of the BBC WS and the Foreign Office. They are also linked to translation activities in a broad sense, which include other transactions such as transporting – the different flows of communication –; transposing – which refers to the adaptation and re-versioning of a programme or a genre for a different audience – and transmitting – i.e. the decisions about which audiences, where, receive what, when, why and how – all of which are central practices of ‘critical cosmopolitanism’ (Gillespie and Baumann 2006; Gillespie and Nieto McAvoy 2017).

However, this performative cosmopolitanism as enacted in socially situated everyday practices of translation and contestation at the BBC (Gillespie and Webb 2013, 10) is conditioned not just by cultural sensitivities, but by corporate imperatives, as well as journalistic interests (Gillespie and Nieto McAvoy 2017). These institutional practices contribute to a form of critical cosmopolitanism that can be best described as ‘corporate’ (Gillespie 2010b; Gillespie and Webb 2013; Gillespie and Nieto McAvoy 2017). The resulting ‘corporate cosmopolitanism’ places translation, transformation and transculturation at the heart of the WS’s ethos, but also under the aegis of its corporate policy. It is performative in the way it articulates a self-reflective and self-questioning relationship to foreignness (Gillespie and Webb 2013, 11) not only at the personal or group level, but also as an institutional.

The BBC World Service was set up as a contact zone for overseas Britons in 1932 as the ‘Empire Service’ with the goal to

‘project’ England overseas: to define ‘Englishness’ before other countries took the initiative. Such a projection of the nation, its politics, society, culture and belief systems, would be essential, [...] for the maintenance of ‘peace itself.’ (Robertson 2008, 459)

Its role against fascism during the Second World War and its early anti-Stalinist stance helped the WS gain its moral credentials as a global authority and as a

cosmopolitan voice for ‘democracy’ during the Cold War and beyond. The Second World War did not only bring the need to broadcast to the world in conflict, but made listening to other international broadcasters – namely, but not exclusively, to the Germans and Italians – of paramount importance to win the war. The first foreign language services to be inaugurated were the Arabic (January 1938) followed a few months later by the Spanish and Portuguese service to Latin America. The former was a direct response to Mussolini’s invasion of Abyssinia, while the later was a strategy to counter Nazi propaganda to Latin America, particularly in light of the fact that

[c]ountless Brazilians, Argentinians and Chileans, in position of influence and friendly towards our country, have told me how difficult it is to stand by and watch the effects of these activities [of German and Italian propaganda] and see Britain lift no finger to protect her name and interests. (Briggs 1985, 143)

The Munich crisis in September 1938 gave birth to further collecting and broadcasting activities. By October 1941, 250 news bulletins in 30 languages were being monitored at the BBC Monitoring Services by over 500 language specialists (Renier and Rubinstein 1986). By 1942, the BBC broadcast in over 45 languages and became known as the ‘External Services’, which comprised the ‘Overseas’ and the ‘European Services’ – the Latin American Service depending on the former. During the Second World War, the BBC followed a policy of anti-fascist campaigning ‘not by retaliation, but by the widespread dissemination of straightforward information and news’ (Briggs 1985, 142). In this effort, British journalists and intellectuals were joined by a large number of European exiles such as the Bareas: the BBC with its offices in central London became a ‘diasporic contact zone’ (Gillespie 2010b), a platform where refugees could join the British war effort by supporting their host country in the war of ideas – but also negotiating their positions with regard to the BBC’s strategic guidelines and British censorship (Briggs 1995, 18). From the Second World War on, the WS became a state broadcaster and was until 2014 funded through a parliamentary ‘grant-in-aid’ administered by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO). This meant that the FCO dictated where the WS broadcasted, but editorial control rested with broadcasters, except at times of war (Gillespie 2010b, 236). During 1941, for example, the Latin American Propaganda

Policy Committee established the guidelines that the broadcasters should follow ('Foreign Gen. Latin American Propaganda Policy Committee' 1941).

In this context, 'projecting Britain' – British values and institutions – became one of the core objectives behind the language services. Aside from the news, which was translated from the original in English, programmes about the everyday lives of the British people were often mediated by exiled broadcasters, such as Barea, which fed into and enhanced the BBC's propaganda and later cultural diplomacy strategies. In turn, successive re-interpretations of Britishness as umpired by these broadcasters to their (former) homelands – in Barea's case, to the former colonies of Spain – collided and colluded with more monolithic identities. The credibility brought about by the diasporic broadcasters at the BBC depended on their ability to act as cultural intermediaries between the corporation and the audiences, between Britain and the world (Gillespie and Webb 2013, 7-8).

As already noted, to think of the WS as an institution concerned with public and cultural diplomacy is key to understanding its importance as an asset of British soft power, despite the contentious relationship of the WS with government – particularly as its grant has been removed and it no longer depends on the FCO (Gillespie and Nieto McAvoy 2017). The WS was indeed conceived from the government's perspective in political terms as a response to Britain's geopolitical needs (Gillespie and Webb 2013, 5), even if the WS fought from its very inceptions for its editorial independence. The BBC WS wartime operation was a complex one that had to balance several wartime and national interests – including those of the several governments in exile that wanted to have a say in the home politics of their respective countries through the BBC (Footitt and Tobia 2013, 73). The BBC had to liaise with national and international governmental agencies and appeal to a heterogeneous audience with different world-views, expectations and relationships with Britain. As for its policy on Spain, it was officially stated in internal correspondence on 6 June 1941 that '[i]t is found in our liaison with the MI [Ministry of Information] and the FO that the general line of the Government is favourable to Franco', and accordingly the BBC's policy was to avoid offending 'large sections of the Spanish audience' (Monferrer Catalán 2007, 401). In July 1941 – around the time of the polemic about the mild response of the foreign minister Anthony Eden to Franco's defiance explored in chapter 4 – Ilsa complained in

correspondence that the Spanish service was ruled by ‘crypto-fascists’ (Mansell 1982, 167). However, the BBC also had evidence that large sectors of the Spanish population that did not support Franco ‘looked to the BBC to stand up for democratic values’ (167).

As already noted in chapter 1, Barea did not work for the Spanish service but for the Latin American Service, as did other Spanish Republican Exiles such as Salvador de Madariaga, Luis Araquistáin, Wenceslao Carrillo, Segismundo Casado, Luis Cernuda or Esteban Salazar Chapela among others (Monferrer Catalán 2007, 397–435). Far from this being a problem, it meant that there was a good chance of reaching listeners in Spain as ‘cross-listening was inevitable’ (Mansell 1982, 24), which is actually confirmed by a few letters from the Spanish audience.<sup>169</sup>

However, in as much as broadcasters were often regarded officially as mouthpieces for the BBC, from its very inception, the BBC’s hegemonic discourse was endorsed, adapted, appropriated and ultimately contested by precisely those who were employed to reinforce it – the conflict between the antifascist and anticolonial projects of George Orwell, Una Marson and Mulk Raj Anand has often been noted (Kerr 2002; Hill 2010; Ranasinha 2010; Gillespie 2010b; Gillespie and Nieto McAvoy 2017). Hill has argued that the Empire Service could be seen in Lacanian terms as ‘the voice of the master’ aiming at reinforcing the British Empire at a time in which the Dominions were seeking independence (Hill 2010). As such, the role of the diasporic broadcasters was, according to Hill, that of the puppet of a ventriloquist (Hill 2010, 35–36). But during the war, with the advent of the language services, the cosmopolitan contact zone that the BBC represented was also a ‘translation zone’, a site that is ‘in-translation’ (Apter 2011, 6). These diasporic voices had the agency to destabilise and therefore enrich the potentially unilineal ‘discourse of the master’ through their practices of translation, transposition and transculturation. True, the final word on the message to be delivered rested with the BBC. All scripts were supervised by a censor of each language service, and a switch censor could stop an inadequate reading at any time (Mansell 1982, 81). The fact that Barea had been a censor during the Spanish Civil War in Madrid surely explains his understanding of the need for censorship and the requirements of writing during wartime. The exilic intellectuals had therefore an ambivalent status and were closely monitored, but had

---

<sup>169</sup> Barea also got correspondence from Spaniards in Tetuán (Tetuán 1954).

also an agency in acting as cultural and linguistic interpreters, bridging the gap between producers and audiences (Gillespie and Webb 2013, 7). The diasporic ‘gifted amateurs’ (Mansell 1982, 96) that joined both the BBC Monitoring and language services were therefore first seen as ‘mere translators’ who voiced, but also creatively adapted, centrally produced news material attuned to the local sensibilities of overseas audiences. But slowly, during and after the Second World War, they gained creative and editorial autonomy becoming ‘professionals in their own right’ (96).

Barea’s radio work can therefore be analysed as both a result of the transculturation practices that took place at, and were later encouraged by, the WS; and as contributing to discourses of national projection. During the Second World War Barea regarded his work as propaganda. In personal correspondence to his censor, he wrote of his script ‘The Blitz’ (1941s) that he thought that it was ‘una buena pieza de propaganda. Sin modestia!’ (1941r). However, because of their obvious nature as products of cultural translation and the reflexivity these texts deploy, Barea’s social commentaries can also be read as partaking of a cosmopolitan imagination (Delanty 2006, 42–43). Barea’s use of exile as a literary device, a technique that plays with borders between insider and outsider, is obvious in these texts. If, as we have seen, this is present in Barea’s work as a whole, it is worth thinking of it as part of the general broadcasting work of other intellectual exiles at the BBC. Their diasporic self-distancing techniques are also fundamental to the BBC World Service styles of reporting at an empathetic distance. Enacted by its diasporic writers and broadcasters it becomes a central feature of the WS corporate cosmopolitanism (Gillespie 2010a, 5). In fact, despite Barea’s support for the ‘people’s war’, the task of ‘projecting’ Britain abroad meant constructing different, at times conflicting versions of Britishness. As was the case with other diasporic broadcasters, Barea had to negotiate British culture – understood both as civilization and as way of life (Williams 1985, 12) – for a foreign public to whom they spoke in a shared language (Gillespie and Nieto McAvoy 2017). As such, it is worth thinking of Barea’s radio scripts as a result of the contact zone.

Furthermore, despite Barea’s scripts being aimed at a Latin American listener, they were also broadcast from the start to different linguistic populations. Every talk was broadcast both in Spanish and translated into Portuguese to be read by a Portuguese

‘ventriloquist’ for Brazil. In 1940, several of Barea’s scripts were also translated for the Hindustani service, which broadcast ‘A Hero Alone’ in August 1941 (Indian Editor 1941). A Spanish interpretation of Britishness read to Brazil and India, is an example of the ‘loops and flows’ of translation among the different languages, not always under the editorial eye of staff at the centre. The source text is now a mobile text, an ‘intertext’ caught up in processes of translational and transnational movements.

### **Aren’t you glad you live in England? The politics of non-politics and the English National Character**

Before Arturo Barea started to work for the BBC Latin American Service in October 1940, already in August 1939 Ilsa had written to the BBC Spanish Service to suggest a series of talks called a ‘A Spaniard discovers England’ based on Arturo’s first article in exile, ‘A Spaniard in Hertfordshire’ (1939e), in which he wrote about his first impressions of Puckeridge where they had gone to live shortly after their arrival. Published in the midst of the ‘state of 1939’, an article about the English national character seemed like an appropriate topic for the weekly *The Spectator*. And yet, Ilsa enclosed in her letter to the BBC a copy of the proofs of the article as an example of the hypothetical radio broadcasts that could be used as anti-German and anti-Italian propaganda. The letter and the article thus seem to suggest already a distancing of Barea’s writing from Spanish politics, or at least a more nuanced approach to political commentary on Spain that could reach a wider public and better accommodate itself to the institutional discourse, represented both by the BBC and by a supporter of the conservative Government such as *The Spectator*.<sup>170</sup>

On a more personal level, the article could be interpreted, as Townson has suggested, as a sign of an understandable admiration for life in Britain after a difficult situation of war in a backwards and violent Spain – a sentimental token of gratitude towards

---

<sup>170</sup> Different sources describe the editorial line of the paper either as Liberal or Conservative, but always a highbrow weekly (Deacon 2008, 164; Mandler 2006). Regarding the Spanish Civil War, *The Spectator* had proved true to its claim of being above all pro-Britain in its foreign affairs policies. This meant that during the war in Spain, of all Labour and Liberal weeklies, *The Spectator* was the only one not to align itself with the Republic (Deacon 2008, 163). Furthermore, in articles published during 1939, *The Spectator* defended the government’s choice of recognizing what they insisted was an ‘independent’ Spain, particularly if Franco was to adhere to the Anti-Comintern pact. It was precisely against these types of views that Barea wrote *Struggle*.

the country that had taken them in. It could also be read as a more politically motivated example of what Shain calls ‘exile loyalty’ towards the host state in exchange for British protection and support. Such explanations are plausible, but it seems to me that by focusing only on the motivations (political or personal) of the author one can overlook the significance of the article itself. An analysis of the text against the background of the pre-war discourse in Britain can give us an insight into how it articulates a ‘structure of feeling’ that would become more relevant after the beginning of the Second World War. The article also underpins the apparently innocent praise of English national character as embodied in the people which would become so central during the Second World War that it is still commonly referred to as the ‘people’s war’.

‘A Spaniard Discovers England’ has been regarded as an early example of the ‘anecdotic and literary prose’ that would later become the model for most of the scripts Barea wrote for the BBC. But far from being ‘non-political’, this anecdotic and personal feature is a critical exploration of a version of the Spanish Republican project (linked to a democratic and free England), against two basic institutions of Francoist Spain: the army and the Spanish Catholic Church. Barea’s text is an example of the ways in which several discourses could overlap and be re-appropriated for different audiences; of how the in-between status of exile could articulate ideas of nationhood that would eventually be construed as transnational; and of the role that the elusive language of the populist can play in the multiplicity of interpretations.

As we saw in the previous chapter, Barea’s writing on Spain often followed the ‘versus habit’ of ‘us’ against ‘them’ that permeates much propaganda and wartime discourses. However, as ‘A Spaniard in Hertfordshire’ signals, ‘us’ for Barea was not only ‘us-Spaniards’ or ‘us-Republicans’, but became in exile ‘us-anti-fascists’ and ‘us-people’, and even ‘us in Britain’. In ‘A Spaniard in Hertfordshire’, Barea sketches an image of a ‘Little England’ which had made Arturo and Ilsa feel welcomed when arriving in Britain. With this apparently innocent topic, however, Barea is participating in a cultural and political discourse that revolves around ideas of ‘national character’ in the British public sphere, a discourse that was particularly significant as Britain was debating whether to enter the war. As Sonya Rose argues in *Which People’s War?*, ‘such representations of nationhood were understood by

the Government, the press, as well as many members of the public at large to be crucial to morale and to generating the massive public support that was needed for the war effort' (2004, 7). Writings on the national character during the war supported 'both the idea that nations did have a character and that, in the English case, it was made of the right stuff' (Mandler 2006, 143, 196).

Barea's article contributes to the idea of the nation as an 'imagined community' of which he was already becoming a member through 'this quiet little village in Hertfordshire where I am living now, trying to recover' (1939e, 213). The article describes a selection of traits, people and institutions which seem to represent an idea of what was identified at that time as the English national character: 'the quiet little village' with its 'English inn' where Barea saw for the first time 'people playing darts'; the policeman 'in his average garden of tulips and wallflowers'; the tolerant parson; the 'friendly and helpful' 'nice little people'; and, yes, the bad weather, but sustained with optimism by the villagers who always greeted him by saying 'Lovely morning, sir', whether it 'looked like rain' or not (1939e). These are a collection of apparently innocuous and random items that have the capability to 'yoke real national differences based on a wide variety of experiences to a few key psychological traits' (Mandler 2006, 2).

This said, there was no real consensus on what was exactly the 'right stuff'. Different positions were taken not only about what the idea of national character meant during Second World War, but what it had meant in the past and would mean in the future: 'past mistakes', explains Baxendale, '- whether for appeasement or for industrial capitalism itself - and the possibility of future change, both raised fundamental questions about the nature of British society, which were argued out from a range of different positions' (1999, 321). As we have seen was common regarding the Spanish Civil War, there was indeed a dispute about whether Britain was fighting 'in defence of the values of traditional England' as Churchill proclaimed at the beginning of the war, or with the objective of 'turning this war into a revolutionary war and England into a Socialist democracy' as Orwell wrote in *The Lion and the Unicorn* (1941a, 76). The terms of the debate were by no means circumscribed to the war years, having been subject to many interpretations and reinterpretations during the post-war and beyond. Were the war years socially revolutionary, culminating in the Labour government of 1945 and the welfare state? Or rather, were they a

conservative time in which myths of the British past were rediscovered only to reinforce the idea of a timeless and rooted country in no need of change? (Smith 2014, 96–97).

What the war did seem to reinforce was a discourse that implied a ‘sense of belonging’ to an England/Britain that ‘is not that image, or that national characteristic: it is simply ‘us’, and the familiar life we share’ (Baxendale 1999, 297). And that familiar life is also shared by ‘A Spaniard in Hertfordshire’, a refugee who could ‘appreciate more than others’ the ““nice”, peaceful days’ in a Britain heading towards war (Barea 1939e, 214). On the one hand, ‘the character of the people was universally acknowledged from all points of the political spectrum as the key to winning the war, and even to deciding what the war was for’ (Mandler 2006, 193). On the other, Barea’s take on the people can be seen as partaking within this ‘universalist logic’ of the several wartime discourses at play (see chapter 4). Is it supporting a nostalgic view of traditional rural England, reinforcing the liberal narrative of individual freedom and democracy, or perhaps supporting the ‘people’s war’ not only against fascism but against the upper-classes in the construction of a new socialist Britain? The next paragraphs will explore the possible interpretations of Barea’s article, which do not necessarily exclude each other, as in much of Barea’s BBC broadcasts they seem to be in complementary tension.

The article in *The Spectator* was indeed, as Ilsa (I. Barea 1939b) had explained in her letter to the BBC, written in a ‘vivid, anecdotal and personal manner’, focusing on England’s ‘rural life, landscape’ and in clear contrast with the past perceptions of a Spaniard:

Before coming to England I thought I knew quite a lot about the country from books and from people I had met [...] There [in Spain], England is pictured as a grey and very ugly country, a mixture of Whitechapel, factory chimneys and ‘Lords’, with hard and unfriendly people, without flowers to speak of (for how could flowers exist in that eternal smoke and fog?), where grass is being cultivated by the English very painstakingly and laboriously as a sort of national duty.

This silly picture must have tinged my expectations more than I care to admit. For when I came to this village the green country, its flowers – more

than in Spain – and the friendliness of the people came as a pleasant shock.  
(1939e, 213)

‘The love of flowers’, Orwell claimed in 1943 ‘is one of the first things that one notices when one reaches England from abroad, especially if one is coming from southern Europe’ (Orwell 1941a). The title of Barea’s piece is representative of his conscious use of location: the village – it could be any village – is set in Hertfordshire, which E. M. Forster had called ‘England at his quietest’ (1969, 199). The English countryside had been one of the ‘English themes’ typically identified with a traditional England (Stapleton 2001, 3). The anti-urban sentiment, argues Stapleton, ‘formed a significant political and cultural motif in the liberal-conservative resistance to totalitarianism’, but was also a ‘protest ‘against the new, urban intelligentsia’’ (124-125). Freedom was seen from this conservative perspective as essentially spiritual rather than political, and embedded in the English countryside. The article’s focus on rural England could be understood under this discourse as one must bear in mind who were the potential readers of *The Spectator*: the country gentlemen, and supporters of the conservative government’s policies, whom a Spanish Republican refugee must convince of the fact that they, Republicans and British of Right and Left, were all ‘us’ against ‘them’, against fascism and against Francoism as an integral part of it. On the other hand, the English landscape as a theme was present in most contemporary periodicals. It was not only *The Spectator*, or other liberal and conservative weeklies, which had sections such as ‘Country Life’; the left-wing *New Statesman* also included a regular section called ‘Country Notes’ in which the authors would reflect among other things on whether farmers could appreciate the beauty of the English land or not. Barea’s use of a quintessential rural scenery in both this article and the BBC broadcasts can be understood as the recognizable background (home and abroad) to his analysis of a changing, historical and popular Britain. But as we have already argued, the British countryside could also be contrasted with the Castilian landscape, as one of many material constraints that formed the British and Spanish national characters.

‘A Spaniard in Hertfordshire’ can be read precisely as a contribution to a discourse of the nation represented by the common people, the little men and women who embodied an Englishness that was worth fighting for, and who would also fight

against the enemies of democracy. When Barea encounters the British, he meets not the Lords, but the ‘nice little people’:

I had hoped to find great individual freedom. But I expected at the same time a very cold rigid, un-responsive atmosphere. [...] Our grocer said the first day, in a very self-confident understatement: ‘You’ll find us a nice little people’. An old craftsman embarrassed me by suddenly having tears in his eyes when he heard we came from Spain – and by taking some pennies from the price of his goods. (1939e, 213)

‘A Spaniard in Hertfordshire’ is an article about the people, as most of Barea’s writings were. It is not only an ethnographic description of the people in their ethnic specificity, but an exploration of them as agents of democracy. It is an article about the villagers among whom one can find the generosity, goodness, optimism and a certain naivety that made the English so welcoming to refugees. In a more subtle way there is also a positioning against the upper-classes, in this case the British upper-classes. As Smyth has argued, the Second World War as the ‘people’s war’ ‘overcame not only fascism but also the near treachery of the élite of the 1930s’ (2014, 7). When Barea explains how his perceptions of Britain and the British had been so far from the reality of the warmth he had encountered, he blamed the books he had read, but also the fact that until arriving in Britain he had only encountered a specific kind of Englishmen that could be traditionally found in Spain.

Of course, most Spaniards have met an odd collection of Englishmen if any: a few rather peculiar tourists – the kind that walk through Madrid with a tropical helmet on the head, a water filter under one arm and a grim determination not to be swindled by those natives on their faces [...] the hard-boiled civil engineer, some British sailors rolling down the road and some charming, wealthy people settling down in Andalusia. (1939e, 213)

The opposition of the people and the ‘common Englishman’ to this ‘colonel blimp’ or John Bull had been best represented in Britain in a cartoon that became popular in the 1920s, Sidney Strube’s ‘Little Man’ (Mandler 2006, 164–65). It was to retain and even increase its symbolical value as an incarnation of the English National character throughout the war years. Traditionally a representation of the everyman in the street topped with a bowler hat and always carrying an umbrella just in case, the ‘Little

Man' stereotype was 'gentle and good-natured, rooted in 'the back garden, the fireside and the 'nice cup of tea'' (Orwell cited in Mandler 2006, 189). In order to prepare the temperate 'Little Man' for war and to transform him into an agent of social revolution, writers on the Left tended to give him a more proletarian varnish, including among his many hobbies the darts, and among his favourite settings the pub (189).

So Barea's little men in the article were not only riding bicycles and working in their gardens. The text opens with Barea entering the pub – 'I had never seen people playing darts but I wanted to join in. It was my second visit to the inn; in fact, it was my second visit to any English inn' (1939e, 213). As much as Barea loved pubs – 'yes, I do like these inns', he says (213) – , the communal space of the bar could also be interpreted as the epitome of democracy: 'When you enter a pub,' wrote Thomas Burke in 1943, 'whatever you may be outside the world, you are, for the time being, a common member of a classless pub... the bar... is almost the only place where you find not only democracy in being but true Socialism in practice' (cited in Rose 2004, 4–5). A fictional village pub, 'The White Elephant' was a frequent scenario for Barea's broadcasts about British life, embodying notions of Britishness and democracy– as does the game of darts, which is not only British but, according to Orwell, was conceived as a specifically proletarian hobby (Mandler 2006, 189). At the same time, as we will see in the next section, the pub – 'La tabernita de Frank' – was a setting in which the villagers discussed their political views in many of Barea's BBC sketches, mirroring the author's use of the Spanish bar and café as the settings in which the Spanish people from different political factions could discuss their views on politics and war. The pub, as the bar, was the social space for dialogue and debate of the 'common' people of Britain, and Spain.

To better characterize the achievements of British society, Barea uses Spain – the 'Old Spain' that Republicans had been fighting against – as a contrast. And he does so by reinforcing certain elements of the Black Legend as we saw in chapter 4, not least of all by invoking Lorca's description of the *guardia civil* which, Barea later argued, for the Spaniards 'had become the symbol for the oppressive force of a hated [Spanish ] State' (1944b, 18). '[T]he two persons who astonished me the most, as the most perfect contrast to what we were used in Spain, where the village policeman and the village parson' (1939e, 213).

It took me a long time to believe that the policeman's home was that ordinary, nice little house in our road, with an average garden of tulips and wallflowers. [...] The tall young red-checked fellow in shirt-sleeves tying up sweet peas looked like something out of a story for me. Till I saw him in full uniform on his bike – on his bike!

When our foreigner's registration cards were issued, we were not ordered to fetch them at the police station in the little country town but the constable brought all papers to our house. Did he know that this little thing affected us as the best possible propaganda for the English system? Whenever I meet our village constable on his bike, giving me a perfectly friendly and normal greeting, I have a funny feeling of experiencing liberty. (213–14)

To further highlight this point, Barea brings in the *guardia civil*:

And I kept thinking of the grim Guardia Civil on their black horses, under their bicorn hats, who always have to go in pairs because they have the invertebrate hatred of the whole countryside against them. Spanish country police live in barracks, completely isolated from normal village life. Their wives come under barracks discipline, too. One can't imagine them taking off their uniforms even for going to bed. 'Their souls of lacquered leather', says the poet Federico García Lorca of them. (214)

Freedom is a key element in the article, and through the policeman and the clergyman it is linked to 'the liberal traditions, democratic traditions' of Britain (I. Barea 1939b). Freedom ('individual freedom' and 'liberty') was during the war the key concept in a 'Whig narrative of national progress through the development of free institutions' (Baxendale 1999, 308). Britain, defended Churchill in January 1942, was fighting for their own but most importantly for world freedom (308). Barea's article does fit quite nicely into this positive interpretation of the British status-quo in 1939. It is understandable that a refugee in seek of political and public recognition would not want to engage in a critical discourse of his host country's policies in his first article in a widely read liberal and pro-Government weekly, but this support for British democratic traditions will remain a constant in Barea's work for the BBC, despite his criticism of British – and American – capitalism and non-

intervention position during the Spanish Civil War and his later endorsement of a Labour third way politics in the post-war.

‘A Spaniard in Hertfordshire’ is a key text for the articulation of various discourses: it combines British perceptions of Spain with Spanish perceptions of Britain to address, ultimately, a certain British perception of Britain that Barea wished to embrace. It is aimed at countering the stereotypical image Spaniards, and for that matter most Europeans, had of Britain and the British, again, by using the power of those stereotypes. By doing this, Barea inserted himself in a tradition of non-British contributions to the idea of English national character, represented among others by Salvador de Madariaga’s *Englishmen, Frenchmen and Spaniards* (1931) or G. J. Renier’s *The English: Are They Human?* (1931) (Mandler 2006, 143–95).<sup>171</sup>

Anglophile novels and essays written by foreigners had been popular since the end of the First World War, contributing to reinforce a national self-image, to the extent that ‘conspectus of foreign views of the English, alongside domestic views, had become a journalistic commonplace’ in Britain (177). Their purpose was mainly to counter previous negative views in Europe of British policies and establish a stronger link between the continent and England, which became increasingly important during the war (180). The Second World War ‘also raised major questions about Britain’s external image, how she viewed herself and felt herself to be viewed in relation to the rest of the world’ (Smith 2014).

Barea agreed. In 1940, he wrote in ‘The Spanish Mind and Gibraltar’ that

an active British counter-propaganda, directed to the Spanish people, is urgently needed. [...] Spaniards should be told that England is not the dark, ugly and inhuman country of their imagination, they should be told how the spirit of free democratic institutions works out in war. A mutual understanding must be established among the English and the Spanish people. And in that, England can certainly count upon all the many Spaniards who consider themselves self-constituted allies of British democracy. (1940b, 705)

Barea had already told the British in ‘A Spaniard in Hertfordshire’, and now he needed to tell the Spaniards, or at the very least the Latin Americans. In ‘The

---

<sup>171</sup> Incidentally, Gustaaf and Olive Renier were good friends of the Barea’s and Olive helped Ilsa and Arturo with their translation of *The Forging of a Rebel*.

Spanish Mind and Gibraltar' Barea highlighted the role of the BBC in doing so, not knowing that in a few months' time he would himself start contributing to this cause. Despite his broadcasting to Latin America, Spaniards could tune in and finally learn that, among other things, 'there are flowers in England – more than in Spain' (1940b, 705).

It is nonetheless somewhat surprising that Barea should have chosen to publish 'A Spaniard in Hertfordshire' in *The Spectator*, a paper with established anti-Republican views. But perhaps it was precisely the sense that the pro-Francoist stance of *The Spectator* was above all pro-British and that one could build on that to counter the general editorial line. An illustrative article, 'Interlude in Navalcarnero', was published in *The Spectator* on 21 July 1939 (two weeks before Barea's). It is an account by a foreign correspondent in Spain, very much in the same anecdotic manner of what Barea writes about Hertfordshire. In it, the journalist F. J. Sutherland describes the miseries of Madrid to compare them to the wealth of the nearby town of Navalcarnero, which had been under the Francoists' control since October 1936. The story centres on a 'National' soldier Sutherland had met who 'epitomised all that was most attractive in the Spanish character' (1939). Sutherland had experienced 'a memorable Spanish vignette, – in the plaza, soaked in sunshine, the cool colonnades, the white walls, and this cheerful southerner, making us welcome...' (1939). In an attempt to help the reader identify with the 'southerner' National soldier and to convey the message that the British did have a historical relation with Spain, it turns out that the 'essentially Spanish' man was, after all, the descendent of an Englishman, as his name was quite surprisingly, but maybe not so, Francisco Drake. There is the pretence of establishing a relation between Britain and Franco's Spain, and Barea's article as we saw in the previous section attempts to counter precisely this vision. The language of national character with its stereotyping is evident in both articles. However, in Barea's, through the distancing effect of irony and reflection – as the anecdote in chapter 2 on how Barea was seen as the Spaniard who threw darts but was also 'a harmless animal in the zoo' (1939e, 213) –, in the ways that he both plays with and debunks stereotypes we can already find traces of a complex cultural mediation and cosmopolitan imagination absent from the depiction of Navalcarnero. However, in order to write about the English and their national character, Barea is building on British perceptions of Spain and of the Spanish national character. If the

Black Legend' was represented in the *guardia civil* and the Catholic Church, Barea here embodies the whole of the Spanish nation – or as it often happened in Barea's writing, at least the Castilian. In 'A Spaniard in Hertfordshire', Barea gave examples that reinforced his Spanishness. But Barea's Spanishness is of a special kind as in this account he endorses the essentialist image of the proud Spaniard so dear to the romantic myth (Moradiellos 2002, 6).

I probably represent still a minor sensation to the village, simply by being Spanish and coming here from a war. A pity I am no Cabinet Minister or General. I try to do my best and play up. Being a Castilian, I find no difficulty to conform to the popular idea of a haughty Spaniard when I walk through the high streets. (1939e, 214)

In presenting himself as an archetypal Spaniard, Barea fed from the perceptions the British had of Spain before and during the Spanish Civil War, while making a political point (see chapter 2 and 4). The article uses both stereotypes to reinforce the idea that the romantic figure of the proud and somewhat wild Spaniard was also a believer in freedom and democracy as opposed to the Black Legend of violence and bigotry of the Spanish Catholic Church. In doing so, it keeps the Spanish Civil War current, even if intertwined in the depiction of rural England (see chapter 4). If, as Shelmerdine has argued, '[t]he ubiquitous 'Little England' mood encouraged indifference', then Barea's article can be read as an attempt to use precisely the image of a 'Little England' for which the Republican struggle could now, during the war, have a meaning (2006, 174). If any anti-alien sentiment existed in this environment, it was playfully neutralized, in this case through humour. In 'A Spaniard in Hertfordshire' Barea's encounter with British nationalism becomes a charming anecdote:

The only time I came across marked nationalism was when I told another inn-keeper's wife (yes, I do like these inns) that her spaniel was a dog of an originally Spanish breed. She drew herself up and said: 'Oh no, this is an English dog.' (1939e, 214)

In this playing with stereotypes, the positive traits of both nationalities outweigh the possible clashes of the cultural encounter. Nevertheless, when writing through the gaze of the other, at the same time that there is an exercise of exoticizing, the

differences can be overlooked. To prove it, Barea finishes his article by emphasizing how he is becoming not so much the outsider, but more of an insider, and effectively one of 'us':

What I am quite proud of is the fact that I have now mastered the rules of the game played each morning when people meet in the street. 'Lovely morning, Sir' 'Very nice, isn't it?'

At the beginning I tried earnestly to say that it looked like rain when it did. But after having heard many times a reproachful: 'Oh, don't say that, Sir'. Now I answer always: 'Yes, indeed, a very nice day', even if a shower hangs already over our heads. After all, these are still 'nice', peaceful days which I, the refugee, can appreciate more than others. (214)

As we have seen, despite it being an apparently 'non-political' article about the British, 'A Spaniard in Hertfordshire' underpins the idea that the battle between the Republicans and the Francoists was not a 'struggle between Communism and Western civilization', as incidentally *The Spectator* argued in its editorials, but 'a crucial battle between Democracy and Fascism' (Moradiellos 2002, 5). It does so by presenting an ambiguous and populist depiction of a traditional, yet free and democratic England to which readers could relate from different perspectives within the political spectrum. In contrast to this England, in the spirit of what Orwell called 'my country right or left', stood Francoist Spain, and supporting the English values, the Spanish Republicans in exile and by extension, the Spanish people.

The relation between the article and the BBC scripts is a point made specifically by Ilsa in her letter (1939b), which means that both she and Arturo thought it possible to reuse the article to accommodate the needs of a Latin America that was exposed to German and Italian propaganda.<sup>172</sup> It seems that what Barea thought could contribute to a pre-war discourse in Britain could very well be translated and re-used to reinforce a political discourse which exported Britain's democratic values embedded in their national character. If one is to re-evaluate the geographies of Barea's work, it is within a transatlantic context of the Second World War and the Cold War that his 'non-political' but very political analysis of the British takes on a new meaning beyond the anecdotic commentary.

---

<sup>172</sup> Indeed, the article was re-worked to be broadcast on 15-16 August 1941. A copy of the script is yet to be found, but there are plenty of examples in the archives that can be read against this text.

### **The Battle of the potatoes or broadcasting the ‘people’s war’**

John Bexandale has argued in his study ‘You and I—All of Us Ordinary People’: Renegotiating ‘Britishness’ in Wartime’ (1999, 300) that Michael Billig’s concept of ‘banal nationalism’ is particularly important to understand much of what the BBC broadcast during the war: ‘In the destruction and disruption of war, the minutiae of ordinary life became all the more precious, a source of national pride, and just as much as democratic institutions, under Nazi threat’ (300).

If this was true of the BBC broadcasting to Britain, it was also the case of the cultural programming at the BBC World Service. The BBC reflected in 1945 its mission of projecting Britain by noting that

[h]ardly an aspect of the British way of life, or accomplishment in any realm, is left unobserved, undiscussed, unillustrated or unexplained by people with expert, and frequently first-hand, knowledge. (BBC Yearbook 1945 as cited in Robertson 2008, 467)

The exercise of ‘projecting Britain’ was far from a neutral exercise of cultural translation. If during the Second World War it was part of the British propaganda strategies, in its aftermath it still functioned – as it does today – as an agent of soft power (Gillespie and Webb 2013; Gillespie and Nieto McAvoy 2017). As Gillespie and Webb (2013, 6-7) have argued,

BBC programmes were a passport for listeners to life in Britain and to the everyday lives of its people, and became the window through which much of the rest of the world came to know Britain as a society and as a diplomatic agent in international relations. Programmes about life in Britain, from the perspective of and voiced by the diasporic BBC intermediary, performed a hugely important cultural diplomacy function.

In this section I focus on a sample of early Barea’s Second World War radio broadcasts (1940-1941), in order to explore the ways in which Barea acted as a ‘diasporic BBC intermediary’ in order to offer a version of the ‘people’s war’ discourse for a Latin American public. I suggest that Barea, in writing these ‘causeries’ on the people of his village, is indeed following some of the most pervasive themes that shaped the imaginary of the Second World War in Britain

(Noakes and Pattinson 2013). Once again, in doing so, Barea played with the perspectives of the insider/outsider, as he placed himself within the culture that he was describing while his epistemological view was that of exile. In this case, Barea was acting as a ‘propagandist ethnographer’. The explicit links with the Spanish Republican project, however, were lost in these talks, as Barea could not directly address the situation in Spain on air.

I will start with one of Barea’s most common observations in his early broadcasts which referred to the English people’s obsession with tea. In his broadcast ‘Refugio’ from 24/25 November 1940, he noted that

[c]omo todo el mundo sabe, los ingleses beben té y el té es una cosa que detesto... imaginan que el café es té. En una tetera de medio litro echan dos cucharadas pequeñas de café, las rocían de agua hirviendo y obtienen un líquido de color ámbar claro. Afirman muy serios que está riquísimo y que les quita el sueño. En los bares, lo cobran. (2000, 348)

Barea is using here the language of the national character; an example of ‘banal nationalism’ that can give an image of the British that could be embraced by most – including the Latin American listeners. As Emma Robertson has argued with reference to the BBC,

[t]he versions of Britain to be projected were rarely articulated in an explicit way, although conflict arose over whether the focus should be on London or the regions, on the political or on the ‘everyday’, and on ‘high’ intellectual culture as opposed to light entertainment. ‘Britishness’ took shape in the spaces between such dichotomies and in the ethereal borderlands traversed by the airwaves. (2008, 468)

The innocent commentary about tea brings Barea to tell the audience about one of the most difficult times for the British on the home front and one of the most pervasive narratives of the Second World War, The Blitz (Smith 2014, 70–90). His listeners learned of the solidarity of the British people under German air-raids. Barea and his neighbour of ‘media casa’ – in reference to semi-detached houses, which he finds astonishing – go down to their shared shelter almost every night and, because of the lack of tea, share more often than not Barea’s cups of coffee. Barea, proud of

his coffee, which he prepares in a clay pot brought from France in his suitcase, continues by reflecting on the fact that

[t]oda guerra es en sí una revolución. Y las revoluciones comienzan por cosas pequeñas. Ahora, muchos vecinos míos, ingleses de pura cepa, creo, vienen más al olor del café que al amparo de la cueva. A veces discutimos del café y el té frente a frente. (2000, 349)

The Blitz through a Spaniards' eyes reinforces the myth that the British endured admirably German bombardment by keeping calm (Smith 2014, 70–90). Barea's most gruesome descriptions of the consequences of air-raids were limited to his writings on Spain, particularly in the trilogy. When it comes to Britain, not only does he give no signs of atrocity propaganda, there are hardly any elements of explicit anti-war sentiment either. His casual commentaries avoided any kind of discourse on the 'pity of war', thus keeping in line with the motivational stance that British propaganda had taken both on the home front and abroad. In doing so, Barea fully endorsed the new language of 'banal nationalism' as well as of the 'keep calm' propaganda. But these broadcasts are also an example of how Barea's gaze as the other plays a key role in canalizing a shift from the national to the transnational. In highlighting his role as a cultural translator he is here using exile as a literary device. To be sure, his view as a refugee, like that of many others, is

a distancing technique that plays with borders between insider and outsider, but which is also crucial to the self-distancing techniques so fundamental to the BBC World Service styles of reporting at an empathetic distance. This is a central feature of the corporate style of cosmopolitanism practiced at the World Service. These tensions were experienced acutely, but also reconciled as complementary. (Gillespie 2010a, 5)

Barea often invokes the fact that he is one of 'us' – the British, the people, the antifascists – as when he sees an R.A.F. airplane fly by he calls them 'un avión de los nuestros' (2000, 355), but he is also often reminded that he is a foreigner. For example, when he goes to the village school to talk to the evacuated children about the war and when he asks a child for his opinions about the Germans, the answer is that 'pues los alemanes son los que vienen en los aviones y tiran las bombas. Y se

me ha quedado mirando como si dijera, ‘Este tío, como es extranjero es un idiota que todavía no sabe esto’ (1941i).

Speaking from the space of the in-between also gave Barea the option to reinforce the highly nationalistic discourses of wartime propaganda. Barea’s apparently innocent cultural commentary always referred to his own first-hand experiences. He often started the broadcasts with an anecdote that was a sideline of what he was really going to talk about. Barea was apparently well-known for his cooking skills and the couple always had visitors over for lunch on the weekends, particularly monitors who worked at the BBC with Ilsa. It is not surprising that Arturo would open a script on war-time rationing – central to the narrative of the ‘austerity Britain’ period of the war and post-war – with a culinary critique on the stereotypical lack of cooking skills of the British. In ‘Hambre’ (December 1940), Barea confesses to having adopted the tradition of the Sunday Roast, but that he generally prefers to continue cooking ‘Castilian’ food. As rationing became worse, he taught his neighbour to cook with oil instead of butter, which, after some initial hesitation from the mother and son alike, was an absolute gastronomic success. Barea’s argument here is that, in fact, British rationing was not that bad as nobody suffered real necessity. It was only the most popular products – like tea, butter or bacon – that were rationed, which meant that the British consumed them in too high a proportion:

los ingleses han perdido su posibilidad de comer rebanadas de pan untadas en mantequilla sin tasa ni medida, [...] el té está racionado, lógicamente. Se necesitaría un convoy diario de té para surtir a los ingleses en la medida necesaria para su costumbre. Té en la mañana, té a media mañana, té a mediodía, té en la tarde y, por la noche, té, pero aceite, café, carne de cerdo aunque no bacon y pescado sin límites aún no han entrado en la cocina inglesa. Y ello, simplemente, porque a despecho de todo lo que se diga, en Inglaterra no hay hambre y casi diría no hay aún escasez. Hasta los perros ingleses tienen aún su hueso con bastante carne para roer cada día. No hay hambre. Y el terrible problema que crean los bombardeos de ciudades inglesas, lo salva la solidaridad y la improvisación, esta improvisación inglesa tan maravillosa en un pueblo que en la vida ordinaria para nuestros ojos es lento, terriblemente lento. (2000, 352)

This situation in Britain contrasts quite sharply with Barea's description of rationing in Francoist Spain. Written also in December 1940 for *Time and Tide*, Barea's article 'Spaniards at Home' (1940i) gives a detailed account of the small rations, 'which bear no comparison with present rations in England at war', as well as of the number of vagrant and homeless children who end up in '[i]nstitutes as bad as any Dickens described, a savage travesty of Christian *caritas*' in post-war Spain, two issues to which the British would be particularly sensitive during these last months of 1940, as we can see from his radio broadcast. For the opening of *Struggle*, written about the same time, Barea uses a description of Goya's 'The Year of the Hunger' (c.1814) to describe how he imagines the people in post-war Spain when he listens to Spanish radio: 'scourged by the plague, gnawed by hunger, broken by the parched skin, showing through their tattered clothes and the death-skull plain in the faces under their wide-brimmed hats', as '[a]n unending procession of thousands upon thousands, the vanguard of shadowy millions of living spectres' (1941b, 9). Barea's use of Goya mirrors del Vayo's in *Freedom's Battle* and Sender's in *Contrataque* (Monteath 1990, 76–77). In fact Goya's 'Desastres de la Guerra' is a classic example used often in Republican propaganda, most notably because it also added to the narrative of the Spanish Civil War as a new war of independence of the Spanish people against foreign invaders, like the Napoleonic war had been and to which the British could relate (Basilio 2014, 106). Although pertaining to different genres, published in different media for different audiences, these comparisons highlight the different strategies Barea deployed to tap into different propaganda discourses. In contrast with the lack of agency and desperate conditions of the Spanish people, the Britons' solidarity and resilience can be seen in the following scene that Barea describes after a Blitz bombing:

Cada casa que no había sido tocada, tenía un fuego encendido y el fuego rodeado de pequeños cacharros plenos de agua. El agua hirviente se convertía en tazas de té. El té surgía de todos los rincones donde las amas de casa lo habían almacenado antes de su racionamiento. Surgían las galletas y los cakes. En la calle había camionetas con un hornillo y un caldero de agua que servía tazas y más tazas de té, entre el polvo, el barro y los ladrillos rotos. [...] Mi vecino y yo, mi mujer y mi vecina, hacíamos té y freíamos patatas que pelaban afanosas unas mujeres, no sé quiénes, alrededor nuestro y que

devoraban los chicos soplando y calentándose a la vez las manos.[...] Y os digo yo, hambre no tiene Inglaterra. Y no la tendrá. Hasta el último hombre en estas islas hará como en la noche trágica que ha padecido mi ciudad, en tanto que siga esta guerra. (2000, 353)

The solidarity of the British people – and the foreigners within – is highlighted by the centrality the ‘little men and women’ acquire as agents and not just victims or war. The war was a war sustained for and by the people:

El minero del mar, el descargador del puerto, el maquinista en su tren, el mozo de estación con sus fardos, el chófer en su camioneta, el tendero en su tienda y la mujer en casa en su compra diaria, soportarán las bombas, no pensando en ellos, sino en los que de ellos dependen, y marcharán adelante con el deber cumplido. (2000, 354)

In these final words of Barea’s broadcast we find one of the encapsulations of the ‘people’s war’: the role of the common people on the home front will contribute to the war effort as much as that of the soldiers (Calder 1992). Similarly, in ‘Caminos de hierro’ of January 1941, the importance of the trains and the role of the anonymous heroes are reflected upon on one of Barea’s train rides from rural England to London, but also the reinforcement that the war was not only being fought for individual freedom, but for and by the people as a collective:

Del coraje que tienen estos ferroviarios ingleses tendrá que escribirse en la historia de esta guerra sin igual, donde no solo habrá regimientos famosos, sino hombres de los que no llevan uniforme. Ni aún hombres, sino grupos anónimos de un pueblo entero que lucha por su vida. Y entre estos grupos anónimos figurarán sus ferroviarios. (2000, 358)

Barea’s highly nationalistic wartime discourses were often transformed into a transnational interpretation of the Second World War. In many ways this is also Barea’s take on the Spanish Civil War, as we saw in chapter 3, a struggle at the intersection of the national and the transnational. The fight of the British people as encapsulated in these key workers for the war effort soon transformed into the fight of all democratic peoples against fascism. A point that was a major issue in official wartime and later Cold War British propaganda was precisely whether the Second World War was a ‘national’ or an ‘international’ affair. There was indeed a tension

in the reconciliation of fighting for ‘English, British or even European’ values whilst fighting for ‘a powerful alternative discourse of “human” and “universal” rights and values’ (Mandler 2006, 193).<sup>173</sup> The BBC World Service was indeed a ‘mouthpiece’ for the ‘democratic’ as well as ‘universal’ values as represented by Britain. But it was often the case that Barea explicitly invoked the international(ist) efforts of those who were fighting fascism.

In his talk ‘Aliados’ (1941d), Barea tells his audience how French, Spanish, Norwegians and Czechs enlisted to fight alongside the British ‘porque son unos tíos muy flamencos’, yelled ‘soldado García’. While toasting in the pub the victory of the British,

Míster Brown, el inglés silencioso, con su traje aún sucio de ceniza por haber hecho de bombero voluntario, dice – ‘por Inglaterra solo no! [*sic*] Por Inglaterra y por sus aliados. Por vosotros y por todos los que en el mundo luchan con nosotros’. Mientras bebemos un poco religiosamente, termina, el aparato de radio nos envió las doce campanadas del Big Ben. (1941d)

While endorsing a transnational war effort, Barea also mentions iconic figures of British wartime memory. As Malcom Smith has argued, ‘many of the diaries and other contemporary accounts of the Blitz also pay tribute to the work of the Auxiliary Fire Service’ (2014, 78), including Barea’s broadcast. Big Ben – the sound of its chimes, but also continuous references to it – was used as a symbol that helped forge an aural iconography of Britain for listeners abroad (Robertson 2008, 462, 468).

As in ‘Aliados’, the pub – the fictitious Six White Elephants – is one of the most popular stages for Barea’s broadcasts. Frank, the landlord, is one of Barea’s on-going characters and features already in his first BBC script of 14 October 1940, ‘La batalla de las patatas’. Frank, like the rest of the villagers, has been planting potatoes instead of flowers as a sign of agricultural patriotism; he ultimately becomes a ‘soldado en la guerra de las patatas’ (2000, 222). Barea tells us about Frank’s battle to make his uncooperative potatoes grow until they become ‘unas regias patatas’:

---

<sup>173</sup> A tension that is still at play today between the ‘universal’ values endorsed by the BBC in fostering a ‘global conversation’ and its role as an asset of British soft power (Gillespie and Nieto McAvoy 2016).

Todos hemos brindado por esta victoria en la guerra de las patatas y Frank se ha sentido como un héroe, que ha alcanzado una victoria, como casi todos los héroes, sin saberlo. Y entre sorbo y sorbo de cerveza ha mostrado la patata más grande y ha dicho: – Si la viera Hitler, se moría de rabia, ¿Qué creía, que nos íbamos a morir de hambre? (224)

Growing potatoes was as Barea explained ‘una novedad creada por la guerra y que constituye un frente en la batalla contra Hitler’ (222), which was at the centre of the wartime campaign ‘Dig for Victory’ (Smith 2013). Among the many resources available, there were information pamphlets such as *Potato Growing*, which instructed the British population on how to ‘Eat for Victory’ and counter the constraints of rationing (Knight 2011, 103). Wartime themes such as the home guard in ‘Guardianes del hogar’ (1941g) and the arrival of evacuated children to Barea’s village in ‘Cosas de chicos’ (1941i) are covered by Barea in his broadcasts. More openly political broadcasts include ‘Democracia inglesa’ (1941t), in which Barea clearly expressed the view that the Second World War was indeed being fought in the name of democracy:

Creo que efectivamente está naciendo la verdadera democracia. Este es un parto de la humanidad, en el que todos los ricos y pobres tenemos los mismos dolores, porque las bombas no entienden de clases sociales. Estos ingleses de las clases altas que han visto destruidas sus casas y palacios, estos obreros que los descombran y que han visto también sus casas en ruinas, están unidos por los montones de escombros, sobre los que tendrán que re-edificar las nuevas casas, la nueva sociedad, donde puedan vivir juntos en el futuro. Y como ellos el mundo entero. (1941t)

Many of Barea’s scripts were indeed shaped to fit the BBC remit of broadcasting Britishness. However, as we have seen, he also spoke on air about the Second World War as a transnational phenomenon in which the fight against fascism was the main argument of the Allies. Barea often broadcast on international wartime events as they unfolded and in 1943 he prepared a comic programme called ‘Otto and Fritz’ that was aimed at making fun of the Germans (Wessel 1943). Barea’s scripts for the BBC were written in response to wartime narratives and within the constraints of official propaganda strategies. In this sense, they do not always reflect all the detail of Barea’s political ideas, although they did respond, I suggest, to a genuine belief in

the ‘people’s war’. During the Second World War, the people became ‘the whole of the citizenry as a unitary body politic’ and not only ‘the poor, the underprivileged, and the excluded’ (Agamben 2000, 29). However, during the post-war reconstruction, the Labour settlement and its welfare system would emerge as an answer to Barea’s socialist beliefs in a true ‘People’s Britain’ in response to the impossibility of a ‘People’s Spain’.

### **The Third Force and beyond: Barea’s position in the Cultural Cold War**

After the definitive failure of the republic in 1945, and as Barea wrote less and less about Spain, his radio talks focused increasingly on defending a humanist and internationalist socialism as a ‘third force’ between capitalism and communism, which he believed were realized in the politics of the postwar British Labour Government from 1945 to 1951. Although Barea’s stories focus on the construction of the British welfare state as lived by his neighbours or as discussed in the pub, defending the values of freedom and democracy both as British and as ‘universal’ placed him in the centre of the ideological struggles of the Cold War in a transnational space that is configured as – in Vertovec’s words – ‘a site of political engagement’ (2009, 4). One of these sites of the Cultural Cold War struggle was the CIA financed Congress for Cultural Freedom, which gathered together anti-communist intellectuals from Arturo and Ilsa’s network and beyond such as Franz Borkenau, Arthur Koestler, Stephen Spender, Fredrik Warburg, Tosco Fyvel, Albert Camus, Julián Gorkin and Salvador de Madariaga, among many others. Despite their different levels of commitment to the anti-communist cause – from Camus’ third way to Madariaga’s liberalism – they all nonetheless participated – knowingly or not – in this covert operation more willingly than co-opted (Saunders 2000; Scott-Smith 2002; Wilford 2003; Glondys 2012).

Eight years after the end of the Second World War, well into the Cold War, Salvador de Madariaga wrote about Arturo Barea:

Ni que decir tiene que la honorabilidad personal y profesional de Barea no están en causa ni para nada entran en las consideraciones que siguen. Considero su elección un grave error por parte de Vds. En este país [Gran Bretaña] está considerado (y poco importa que sea justa o injusta esta

consideración para los fines prácticos que se proponen Vds.) como un bevanista, y en último término, un neutralista.<sup>174</sup> (cited in Glondys 2012, 125)

These lines were addressed to the ‘Comité de Honor’ of the journal *Ibérica* in the context of an ‘anti-neutralist’ campaign led by Republican anti-communists through the *Cuadernos del Congreso por la Libertad de la Cultura*, a publication of the Congress for Cultural Freedom. The fragment is an example of ‘cómo los parámetros de la Guerra Fría dictaban los valores de la izquierda antifranquista’, as Olga Glondys has put it (125). Madariaga’s accusation is that Arturo Barea had, over the years following the end of the Second World War, failed to fully embrace the anti-communist cause. Given how Barea’s principal network in the early 1940s had been in the non-communist Left, this might seem surprising. However, I would argue that Barea’s ‘neutralismo’ is indeed an endorsement of a ‘third-force politics’ (Sinfield 2004, 101) between Soviet communism and American capitalism, as encapsulated by the Labour policies after 1945. In fact, the post-war settlement represented for some Republican humanist socialists like Arturo Barea and Max Aub a political hope (Aub 2003, 105–8). In Barea’s case, his reorientation towards British ‘third-force’ politics meant a partial solution to the lost Republican project.

During the aftermath of the Second World War, Barea continued to work for the BBC. It is important to keep in mind the great political responsibility of anyone working at the BBC under those conditions:

It is now widely recognised that the mass media played an unusually influential part in the battle between the ‘East’ and the ‘West’ between 1945 and 1991. The cold war was, after all, as much of a propaganda conflict – a battle of words, sounds and pictures – as one fought between diplomats, soldiers and politicians. The BBC, as a broadcaster of news, comment and entertainment in Britain and large parts of the world throughout the cold war, stood at the very centre of this propaganda conflict. (Shaw 2006, 1353)

Barea’s supposed ‘neutralism’ was more than just an equidistant position between the US and the USSR (which, in the understanding of Madariaga, favoured the Soviet stance by not attacking it aggressively enough). It was in reality a very clear

---

<sup>174</sup> The Bevanites were the supporters of left-wing Labour MP Aneurin Bevan. As Minister of Health from 1945 to 1951, Bevan was responsible for instituting the NHS. In 1951 he resigned from his new post as Minister of Labour and became the leader of the left wing of the Labour party, also called the Bevanites.

position linked, especially from 1945, with the politics of the left-wing Labour Party 'Third Force' movement which led up to the Bevanites. As the war ended, Labour came to power and, over the post-war years, developed a policy that has been described as economically socialist, and politically democratic. Barea's scripts of these years make constant reference to the two main pillars of Labour's welfare state programme: 'nationalization – notably of mines, railways, goods transportation and utilities – and the provision of medical services' (Judt 2006, 69). The nationalization of mines is in fact described by Barea in 1947 as an 'hecho histórico que un día tendrá su sitio en la historia de este pueblo y en la historia de todos los pueblos' (1947a). It gained particular visibility in the *charlas* along with the very hard winter of 1947, which worsened the hunger and misery across Europe (1947b; Judt 2006, 86). The enemy was nature but also private enterprise: and through Barea's broadcasts the Latin American public hears that the state has finally taken 'a su cargo los servicios de la comunidad que sería peligroso dejar en manos de los particulares' (1947d).

The educational reforms, the housing policy and social security were other key themes. As Barea explained to his Latin American audiences, the new National Health Service would mean that 'cada ciudadano tenga derecho a un médico y a cada médico le pague el Estado, que es tanto como pagarle todos los ciudadanos' (1948e). The advantages of the NHS were 'rotundos': '[e]n 1938 se morían 57 niños de cada mil que nacían antes de llegar a cumplir el año. El año pasado [1948], 31' (1948e).

This was not only about people's health. Along with post-war rationing and the educational changes, the NHS was a leveller: '[p]obres y ricos en este país tienen derecho a asistencia médica y farmacéutica, incluidas operaciones quirúrgicas, completamente gratis. Al servicio dental, ortopédico y óptico' (2000, 263). In a speech delivered in January 1948, the Prime Minister Clement Attlee summarized the objectives of such policies:

The policy of democratic socialism which the Labour government is carrying out seeks to create conditions in which a good life will be attainable by every individual in the community, free from oppression whether by Governmental or by vested interests. Already great strides have been made towards a fairer distribution of wealth. Broad measures of social security have been passed. Basic industries are being steadily brought together under public ownership

without scarifying any of the liberties which we all hold dear. (*The Times* 1948)

By April, Barea was transmitting precisely this to his Latin American listeners:

Lo primero es que hoy Inglaterra tiene menos lujos que nunca tuvo, pero al mismo tiempo menos hambre y menos miseria que tuvo jamás. Hay menos ricos y hay muchísimos menos pobres; casi me atrevería a decir que no hay pobres. Hay trabajo para todos y trabajo decentemente pagado, el que más mal pagado está. Hay comida para todos, comida decente y barata, hasta para el que tiene menos dinero. Los viejos y los inútiles están protegidos; los niños y las mujeres preñadas también. Y no protegidos con una limosna, sino con un derecho a cobrar de todos los sanos y de todos los útiles, lo que necesitan para vivir decentemente y no en la miseria ni en el asilo. No hay explotaciones ni jornales bajos, ni hay ya explotaciones de niños haciendo trabajo de hombres; hay en cambio escuelas abiertas y obligatorias hasta que los niños han cumplido quince años y hay vacaciones pagadas todos los años para todo el que trabaja en estas islas. (1948a)

To be sure, other European countries took some measure of this kind after the war but, as Tony Judt put it, ‘nowhere outside Britain was comprehensive social coverage attempted on so generous a scale all at once’ (Judt 2006, 75). The idea emerged of a British-led Europe as a ‘third force’ in the post-conflict world. Members of Labour Left published a landmark pamphlet in 1947 entitled *Keep Left*. Along with their pledge to continue to implement socialist policies, they criticized the Atlanticist tendencies of Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin in relation to the emerging international Cold War panorama (Callaghan 2004, 198; Schneer 1984).<sup>175</sup> They asked for a united and independent Europe under British stewardship, which would be capable of avoiding a split of the world into two blocks dominated by the US and the USSR (Lipgens and Loth 1988, 673). The idea of a ‘third force’ radiated well beyond the party, engulfing unions and intellectuals of the non-communist Left who, even into the 1950s, shared what Hugh Wilford has described as ‘an unusual

---

<sup>175</sup> Ernest Bevin became the Labour Foreign Secretary in 1945, after serving in Churchill’s wartime coalition government. His strong anti-communist views made him abandon the “third-force” idea in favour of an alignment with the US. Bevin’s politics often conflicted with those of Left Labour Minister of Health, Aneurin Bevan. While Bevan’s support for a “third-force” policy remained a consistent political position throughout the 1940s and 1950s, Bevin’s brief support for a “third-force” manifesto was probably only a pretext to enforce strong anti-communist policies.

sense of optimism and idealism' (Wilford 2003, 17). Regardless of the internal ideological discrepancies of Labour, the idea of presenting Britain to the world as an alternative to both Stalinism and American capitalism became so powerful that Ernest Bevin himself declared to the Cabinet in January 1948:

It is for us as Europeans and as a Social Democratic Government, and not the Americans, to give the lead in spiritual, moral and political sphere[s] to all the democratic elements in Western Europe which are anti-Communist and, at the same time, genuinely progressive and reformist, believing in freedom, planning and social justice – what one might call 'The Third Force'. (cited in Wilford 1998, 356)

The initiative became part of British foreign policy and communication with Clement Atlee's January 1948 speech, already mentioned above. The Prime Minister explained:

At one end of the scale are the Communist countries; at the other end the United States of America stands for individual liberty in the political sphere and for the maintenance of human rights, but its economy is based on capitalism, with all the problems which it presents and with the characteristic extreme inequality of wealth in its citizens. [...] Our task is to work out a system of a new and challenging kind, which combines individual freedom with a planned economy, democracy, with social justice. (*The Times* 1948)

Barea's radio broadcasts criticizing capitalism predate the official proclamation of the 'third force'. In 1947, he exposed in his piece 'Decadencia' how the American government was indifferent to the suffering of its own people, leaving them to starve while the country produced an excess of potatoes and exported them (1947e). To control the price of potatoes as Britain did would revert to a country's advantage, as its richness needed to be measured by the absence or not of 'sus mendigos y de sus hambrientos y de sus parados y estos tres grupos son tres grupos que no existen en Inglaterra' (1947e).

But the geopolitical considerations in Barea's scripts grew more elaborate in 1948. About the Soviet-American negotiations attempted in May 1948, Barea commented that the citizens of all other countries had no interest in

ver cuál de los dos [la Casa Blanca o el Kremlin] es mejor y cuál es peor. Nosotros lo que quisiéramos es algo muy diferente. Quisiéramos como ha dicho muy claramente el Ministro de Negocios extranjeros Mr Bevin: Paz. [...] No. No se resuelven así las cosas. Ni se resuelven de la manera que el Gobierno ruso ha pretendido hacer, ni se resuelven tampoco de la manera del gobierno norteamericano declarándose públicamente antiruso [*sic*] y tratando de llegar a un acuerdo con Rusia con las puertas cerradas. Las cosas se resuelven y se pueden resolver fácilmente a la clara luz del día. (1948c)

Barea also posits clearly how Britain, in contrast with the two emerging superpowers, offered its people an open and transparent public sphere:

En Londres podéis oír cada semana a un orador comunista en plena vía pública tratando de convencer a los transeúntes. [...] En Nueva York no se puede predicar hoy el comunismo, ni en Moscú se puede predicar el sistema capitalista. [...] Vosotros, la mayoría, creéis en la fuerza, yo creo en el convencimiento. [...] En este país, donde el primer ciudadano es Rey y el segundo socialista. En este país, desde el cual me dejan hablar a mí. (1948c)

Maintaining equidistance was not about neutrality, but about finding a third way clearly distinct from the two blocks. Barea even considered that there was a causal link between capitalism and communism, as the injustice of the former generated the willingness in the masses to follow totalitarian doctrines such as communism and fascism. In commenting on the Italian elections of 1948, Barea expressed his fear that, as unchecked market economies ('la libre competencia sin atenuantes') had already generated fascism and Nazism, now the Italian Communist Party might come to power (1948b). In this talk, Barea paints the US as the worst case of free competition, not only because in the American Southwest people were becoming millionaires by selling overpriced petrol, cotton, wheat and meat to a world in need, but also because those capitalists were ready to exploit the cheap labour of countries such as Italy, thinking that by this they may halt Bolshevism, when in fact this action was having the opposite effect:

Cuando los estómagos están vacíos y el pan cuesta más que se gana; cuando no hay lumbre en la cocina y los hijos lloran de frío; cuando en esta miseria se ve que hay gentes que ganan con ella millones, el convertirse en

bolchevique o en nazi es muy simple; porque lo que se busca no es una solución ideológica, ni una solución política; lo que se busca es pan, es remedio a la desesperación. Y a cambio de una garantía mínima para uno y para la mujer y los hijos de uno se está dispuesto a ceder lo que se llama libertad. (1948b)

To a Europe in crisis, Britain offered a solution both to American lack of social justice and to Soviet lack of freedom:

Sí. En Inglaterra está organizado el trabajo, están regulados los jornales, están limitadas las ganancias, el pan está racionado y la mantequilla, el azúcar o las patatas; pero hay ganancia para todos y hay pan para todos. No hay una medida ancha para unos y estrecha para otros. Las gentes no hablan de revoluciones, ni de Mesías y cuando gritan algunos diciendo que no les dejan hacerse millonarios las gentes se sonríen. Cuando gritan otros ofreciendo el paraíso que Hitler ofrecía a los alemanes hambrientos, las gentes se sonríen también; y se sonríen por último cuando otros les ofrecen el paraíso de Moscú. [...] ¿Es que Inglaterra ha encontrado la solución? No, no lo creo, pero sí está en el mejor camino y que el mundo estaría en un camino mucho mejor si se siguiera su ejemplo, tratando de que no hubiera hambrientos y evitando que los millonarios surjan a centenares cuando hay millones que no comen. (1948b)

Barea's broadcasts during this period are, as we have seen, more openly political. However, it was still the case that his role as a cultural translator was the most valued aspect of Barea's broadcasting. A listener wrote:

he escuchado la mayoría de sus interesantes charlas durante 1948 y este año, con atención y las que más me impresionaron fueron las sobre (sic) la aldea en que vive, y sobre las diferentes personas y lugares de Londres, como las sobre los choferes de taxi, las Olimpiadas, los clubs británicos, el Londres antiguo, Navidad, etc. Los episodios que relata en su carta me han interesado profundamente, más aún porque mi padre cuenta algo parecido, pues cuando el luchó en la primera guerra mundial, jamás mató un soldado enemigo. Me parece que el ideal por el que Ud. lucha será logrado, y en un futuro no muy

lejano. Por eso me permito insinuarle no cejar en su noble labor e incluirlo más aun en sus diferentes charlas.<sup>176</sup> (1948)

During the late 1940s at least, Barea's broadcasts were contributing to project abroad an image of Britain that was more in tune with his political stance off-air. In 1948 he wrote to his friend, the author and translator Jean Malaquais that

yo sigo siendo revolucionario y antisatalinista [*sic*] y también de una manera idéntica a la tuya, no de la misma forma que los 'Demócratas' de ahí y de aquí, porque también veo clara la proximidad de una guerra, en la que aparte del desastre espantoso que va a ser y que va a poner en peligro la verdadera existencia de la Humanidad, no vamos a tener más resultado que un poco más de esclavitud, en el mejor de los casos, o una esclavitud total en el peor. No me preguntes cual considero mejor, la victoria de uno o del otro porque no lo sé. (Barea 1948d)

As the 1940s drew to an end and the economic and military fault lines of the Cold War became consolidated, 'third-force' discourse was abandoned by Britain. The Marshall Plan and the Atlantic reorientation of Britain in NATO, created in 1949, are signs of how for a majority of Labour government members 'the US appeared, in contrast [to the Soviet Union], humane' (Wilford 2003, 22). It can be argued that thus the more centrist elements in the party defeated 'the positive, constructive intentions of those who retained a greater sense of leftist possibility' (18). In the 1950s, anti-communism became the central theme of British external policy even as Labour remained in office.<sup>177</sup> And despite a comeback in 1951 of the Bevanites and

---

<sup>176</sup> This letter is an example of the abundant correspondence with listeners in Latin America in Barea's personal archive. This particular listener was a Jewish exile in Uruguay with whom Barea had an epistolary relationship. He is also mentioned in Barea's broadcasts 'Mahatma Ghandi' (25 January 1948). The document suggests the possibility of future research into Barea's reception in Latin America. Topics addressed in the letters range from the Spanish Civil War (a lot of reminiscence once the listeners realize that Juan de Castilla is indeed Arturo Barea, author of the *Forging of a Rebel*), communism (accusing him of being one or of being an anti-communist), nationalism (either accusing him of being a propagandist for the British or reflecting on the listener's own national characters), Latin American and European current affairs (Suez crisis, post-war reconstruction or 'el proyecto de mercado común latinoamericano' in 1957), culture and literature (about Barea's books, but often it is letters of writers that send books to Barea in the hope of finding a translator and/or getting promoted in the UK and Europe). The tone is often quite intimate and listeners often commented on Barea's niceness and the fact that he always answered the letters, either personally or through his broadcasts.

<sup>177</sup> Anti-communism had already been part of Labour Foreign policy since in 1948 it created the Information Research Department, with the objective of briefing the media, intellectuals and politicians on the dangers of communism. Ironically, the IRD was described for the first time in Ernest Bevin's 'third-force' manifesto. In fact Bevin's support for and appropriation of the Labour

Left Labour, their third way politics were unsuccessful against the polarized logic of the Cold War. As Wilford explains:

Above all, it was the Cold War which wrecked the leftist possibilities of the period, confusing and demoralising those still trying to carve out a scene for humane socialism in between the great powers, and emboldening those whose main concern was fighting communism. (40)

The logic of the Cold War affected many ‘third way’ intellectuals, such as Stephen Spender or Sartre, who were forced to take (opposite) sides (Sinfield 1989, 86–115). Despite his defence of a humanist socialism, Barea was among those who felt increasingly confused and demoralised by the politics of the Cold War, and his broadcasts in the 1950s progressively fell into a rhetoric of liberty, an embrace of universalism, and a belief in a common humanity – albeit with an increasing fear of the atomic bomb – that embraced, more than he was willing to admit, one of the two sides of the iron curtain, and it was not the communist.<sup>178</sup> Whether by 1951 his views on who represented the worst option had changed or whether Juan de Castilla’s opinions were often at odds with Barea’s self-proclaimed radicalism, during his trip to the US in 1952 his radio broadcasts from New York focused on precisely the virtues of American democracy that he had criticized a few years earlier, albeit, not as wholeheartedly as he had defended the British.<sup>179</sup>

During the 50s, the increasing polarity of the Cold War and the participation of Barea in transnational institutions of the non-communist Left as the Congress for Cultural Freedom and International PEN had the double consequence of opening his work to a broader transnational public sphere and bringing him closer to the struggle against Franco and the Spanish Republican exile, with whom he reconnects through members of the Spanish branch of the CCF. Indeed, after Madariaga’s angry letter, Barea collaborated on occasion with the Congress for Cultural Freedom. In November 1953 he gave a conference on Spanish Literature in Paris, and he published an article on Camilo José Cela – the introduction to the translation of *The*

---

Left ‘third-force’ project – later incarnated by the Bevanites – has been often understood as a strategy to launch the IRD (Wilford 1998, 53).

<sup>178</sup> This said, these scripts from the 50s exceed the limits of this study and await further detailed analysis in order to avoid the Manichean logic of the Cold War.

<sup>179</sup> In fact there is a tension during this time between Barea’s support for an Atlanticist policy and his socialism that is present in his broadcasts and develops in personal correspondence.

*Hive* – and a short story in *Preuves y Cuadernos* (1955a; 1954a; 1957).<sup>180</sup> In 1956, when the BBC sent him on tour to Latin America, Barea coordinated with Julián Gorkin a series of talks in partner centres of the Congress for Cultural Freedom (Gorkin 1956).<sup>181</sup>

Barea's visit to Argentina, Chile and Uruguay was financed by the BBC, who, according to a radio interview for Radio Córdoba that Barea's gave on the same trip, had sent him there because:

yo iba hablando ya 16 años para los países latinoamericanos y me había hartado de hablar a alguien a quien no conocía de ninguna manera. Y la BBC de Londres al fin se decidió a gastarse unas cuantas libras en que viniera a conocer a estos pueblos. (cited in EAUDE 2001, 280)

However, in personal correspondence, Arturo commented that 'es una exigencia, – la única que hace la BBC –, que a cambio de pagar el viaje, reciba una propaganda discreta tan extensa como posible. Y así, una condición que pongo es que en los anuncios que hagan de conferencias se haga siempre figurar 'el comentarista de la BBC de Londres, Juan de Castilla', junto con mi propio nombre como escritor' (1956). In fact, it was often the case that Barea was better known to the Latin American public as Juan de Castilla. Emir Rodríguez Monegal wrote of his visit to Uruguay that

[h]abía muchos para los que el nombre de Barea era solo el nombre oficial de alguien que les era muy querido, conocido como Juan de Castilla; alguien cuya voz llegaba a través de la radio cada domingo; alguien que conversaba

---

<sup>180</sup> However, it is also possible that Arturo's collaboration with the Congress for Cultural Freedom, as well as his trip to the US, was a literary opportunity in the first instance more than an ideological choice. Ilsa wrote to her friend Margaret Weeden that Arturo 'had to dash to Paris for two or three days and give a lecture on Spanish writing now, inside the country and in emigrations, to the people who form the Spanish-French group of the Congress for Cultural Freedom; you know, the people who publish *Preuves*, *Cuadernos* and *Encounter* over here, I was very glad for him, it gave him new possible interesting contacts. The parent body is, of course, rather too professionally anticommunist (American money, partly from the TUS!) to be altogether to our taste, but they have eminent and reputable people, like Camus and the truly great Hispanist Maurice Bataillon. They got in touch with A. because of his introduction to the Cela book, which they will publish in both *Preuves* and *Cuadernos*. I had to re-translate it in a hurry. This should be quite well paid, too, while his trip to Paris was only financed as far as expenses were concerned –lavishly so' (I. Barea 1953).

<sup>181</sup> For more on Barea's trip to Latin America see Granata de Egües (1993) and EAUDE (2011) Barea's trip to the US in 1952 was also an ideologically challenging experience. This suggests further lines of investigation to fully understand Barea's ideological evolution during the 50s. Of this trip, Ilsa wrote to Margaret Weeden that: 'and finally, when he had quite digested the profoundest part of his mental crisis – i.e. got to the root of his Europe-funk—and so shed the after effects of his *americanitis*, he suddenly emerged *de profundis*' (I. Barea 1953).

con cada uno de ellos, en una voz familiar y cálida, para comunicar sus pequeñas experiencias diarias como habitante de un pueblecito en Inglaterra. (Rodríguez Monegal 1957)

The thousands of the letters in the archive corroborate this. However they are also proof that Barea's pro-British broadcasts – particularly during the 1950s – were not always well-received, particularly from other sectors the Left. The organ of the CNT in Montevideo published a rather critical review of one of Barea's conferences saying that '[n]o al charlista de la BBC, sino al escritor de los tres volúmenes de 'La Forja de un rebelde' esperábamos en esta parte sur de América. Y es el charlista de la emisora londinense el que ha venido' and accusing him of only satisfying 'las damas de la más o menos buena sociedad, con abrigo de piel y pluma en el sombrero' (Milla 1956).

Although a full study of the reception of Barea's broadcasts in Latin American exceeds the scope of this thesis, these examples shed some light into how Barea was interpreted differently in different contexts, both geographically and temporally. This process mirrors Barea's ideological transformation in contact with British affairs, leftist intellectuals and through his collaboration with the BBC's global outreach effort during the war and beyond. As we have seen in this chapter, by writing about the British people for Latin American audiences, Barea could further link the Spanish struggle with the idea of a 'people's war'. In this reverse role as cultural translator, Barea was engaging in broadcasting a version of Britishness with a Spanish flare for a Latin American audience within the institutional setting of the BBC's 'corporate cosmopolitanism'.

The final section of this chapter clearly points to the importance after 1945 of the Cold War as the background international framework against which intellectuals such as Barea had to define their politics. This becomes particularly tangible in the connections that these intellectuals established with transnational cultural enterprises – such as PEN or the Congress for Cultural Freedom – founded (and funded) with the central aim of disseminating as widely as possible the values of freedom and democracy and which can also be studied as cosmopolitan contact zones. This allows for an interpretation of Spanish Republican Exile culture which challenges the traditional readings of their work within Spanish historiography and places it within the realm of the transnational and the cosmopolitan.



## Conclusion

‘Poetry is cosmopolitan, and the more interesting the more it shows its nationality.’

(Johann Wolfgang von Goethe on *Weltliteratur*, 1827)

This thesis has explored the importance of exile in the work of Arturo Barea, focusing on a series of texts produced between 1938 and 1945. Through a combined reading of the trilogy *The Forging of a Rebel* alongside a body of work – essays, articles, radio scripts – generally overlooked by critics, the thesis offers a detailed historical analysis of the first context of production and reception of Barea’s writing in Britain. It highlights the challenges and opportunities of exile as a transnational and cosmopolitan experience, and demonstrates the different ways in which the homeland and the host state intersect in Barea’s work. This transnational reading of Barea’s writings, as outlined in the introduction, is the main contribution of this thesis.

On the one hand, Barea’s writings have been read here as exercises of crossed cultural translation in which Spain, its people and the Spanish Civil War were construed for a British – and later international – public, while Britain, its people and their role in the Second World War were interpreted for a Latin American audience. Building on established cross-perceptions and the language of national characters, these texts transcend the ‘national’ framework by occupying the space ‘in-between’ – a transnational space that Barea also claimed for himself as a writer and as a character in his novels. Through a constant critical interplay between insider and outsider perspectives, Barea shifts the logic of national dichotomies, relocating it in a transnational setting, mainly in the framework of ‘democracy’ versus ‘fascism’ during the Second World War – the Cold War will further force him to redefine his politics. By using exile – including exile before exile – as a literary device and deploying self-criticism and distancing techniques in fiction and non-fiction alike, Barea’s work systematically challenges and reinforces this oppositional language with reference to a cosmopolitan imagination. This thesis has underscored the importance of cultural translation and the different interactions of the local and the

global in Barea's work, thus providing an example of the possibilities of a 'critical cosmopolitan' reading of Spanish Republican exile culture in Britain.

For this, not only the 'roots', but also the 'routes' of Barea's exile have had to be traced, requiring a mapping of Arturo and Ilsa's connections with the wider transnational intellectual network of the non-communist Left. The importance of thinking of Barea's place of enunciation as the diasporic and cosmopolitan contact zone that London was during the 1930s and 1940s has proved to be a fertile ground on which to reconsider the 'Spanishness' of Barea's work. Existing cultural formations such as the 'Spanish national character' were already the result of the coming and goings of different national and international intellectual traditions, but Britain at the time of Barea's exile offered an intellectual and publishing environment particularly conducive to a further transnational reframing of discourses. This thesis has emphasized the historical importance of the informal intellectual networks, the publishing landscape, and the 'corporate cosmopolitanism' of the BBC as the institutional sites in which Barea developed his work. All three were conducive to supporting Barea's continuous border-crossing.

Finally, this thesis has explored the several levels of transnational discourse that were at play in Barea's work. From the narrative of the Spanish Civil War as an international phenomenon, to the interpretation of the Second World War as a fight for world democracy, to the invocation of the 'people' and the 'people's war' or the ways in which his work and his role as an intellectual intersected with the main aesthetic debates of the period, Barea's cultural production in exile transcends the limits of the Spanish nation. The increasing circulation of Barea's texts through different media within a European and a transatlantic context (radio broadcasting, but also translations of his written work and sponsored travels across the Atlantic) reinforce the configuration of a transnational framework for its analysis.

This thesis has ventured to 'dialogize' Barea's exile in space and also in time. As the territorial loss of exile also bears a temporality crisis, exiles often resort to memory in order to establish a relation with the absent nation. However, as I have suggested, there is an alternative to 'mystifying' the Republican exile as only a nostalgic exploration of the Spanish – and the exiles' – past. A transnational and cosmopolitan approach can offer an avenue to analyse Spanish Republican exile cultural products in a wider historical setting, in line with theoretical insights from diaspora and exile

studies. It allows us at the very least to understand exile as a site for political engagement not only with the homeland, but also with the host state and beyond. Through the exploration of movement and displacement as constitutive aspects of Barea's work, this research challenges static ideas of identity and meaning in exile culture.

Chapter 1 has focused on Barea's deployment of social and symbolic capital during his early time in exile in Britain. It has explored how upon the couple's arrival in England, the connections established earlier with foreign correspondents in Madrid and the network of Central European exiles to which Ilsa belonged, allowed them to become a member of the transnational non-communist Left. The formal and informal encounters took place through magazines, institutions and personal relationships with editors and other intellectuals. Barea's negotiations within the British – and later global – public sphere were dependent on these interactions. I argue that it was because Barea was exiled particularly in Britain – a country with an existing and thriving cosmopolitan contact zone very close to its centre of power – and able to find a place in such networks that his literary career took off so successfully so soon.

Barea's success as a writer was then highly dependent on his complex self-representation as a Spanish Republican exile. As we have seen in chapters 1 and 2, Barea's insider knowledge of Spain and the Spanish Civil War was often noted by reviewers of his work and in personal correspondence. Chapter 2 in particular analysed Barea's work in exile in light of the autobiographical nature of his work, here understood as performative. I have argued that in the act of writing, Barea is reconstructing an identity through his texts that will feed into and draw from his symbolic capital as a refugee from the Spanish Civil War in Britain and contribute, in turn, to further accumulation of cultural capital. The tensions between the subjective and the objective nature of testimonies and reportages can be traced throughout Barea's work, as a clear example of the literature of the Spanish Civil War, but also as an example of the contemporary aesthetic debates in which Barea is participating. Barea adapts and responds to the context of production and reception of his work, by emphasizing the Spanish national traits of his narrating voice and at the same time using them to enhance his role as a cultural mediator. In this sense, this thesis explores the possibilities of looking at Barea's role as that of an ethnographer and, on grounds of his use of certain observation and writing

techniques developed in the interwar period, as that of a modernist ethnographer. The self of Barea as a narrator also emphasizes, throughout his work, a diasporic identity through which he reconstructs his past self as an exile before exile. His authorial voice as a member and representative of the people and his contentious relationship with intellectuals can thus be explored as further reinforcing the constant movement between the inside and the outside of the nations described.

In translating the Spanish Civil War for a British readership, Barea needs both to naturalize and exoticize Spain. The Spanish struggle came to be understood in its aftermath in Britain primarily as a rehearsal of the larger battle, and Barea was ready to teach lessons on this. Chapter 3 has explored the ways in which Barea frames the Spanish Civil War and the Spanish-Moroccan colonial wars of the 1920s within the wider discourses of the Second World War, coinciding with contemporary events as they unfolded, particularly Franco's invasion of Tangier in late 1940. In contrast, chapter 4 has explored the opposite movement. Barea also emphasized the specifically 'Spanish' character of the war in Spain, which reinforced his role as a necessary cultural translator. In doing so, he drew on pre-existing stereotypes of the Spaniards as offered by the Black Legend and the romantic myth which were already common in Spanish international propaganda. This places his texts in an in-between space where the national and the transnational are articulated at different levels and by different actors. These two chapters have also brought the political nature of Barea's trilogy to the fore, in as much as it can be read alongside various different – and often conflicting – contemporary interpretations of the Spanish Civil War.

Finally, chapter 5 has explored Barea's work in the inverse direction, as a cultural translator explaining Britain and the British people to a Spanish-speaking audience in Latin America. I have argued here that through the language of national character, Barea again inscribes his apparently anecdotal commentaries on British culture in a wider narrative, that of the 'people's war'. Through translation practices fostered by the 'corporate cosmopolitanism' of the BBC World Service, Barea's work was infused with an exilic voice while being understood within the remit of 'broadcasting Britain'. The wartime propaganda effort that Barea thus contributed to led increasingly to an endorsement of Labour policies, especially during the post-war settlement. This overlooked process has allowed me to place his work for the BBC – as an example of his wider politics – within a 'third-force' political framework that

became briefly hegemonic in Britain after the Second World War. The broadcasts from the post-war period seem to partially resolve the tensions already apparent in Barea's earlier work between a humanist socialism and an open anti-communism. If for other Republican exiles like Max Aub 'el suyo fue siempre [...] un socialismo *irreal*, un socialismo democrático que quiso compatibles socialismo y libertad' (Aznar Soler 2003, 23), Barea was able to fulfil his humanist socialism specifically through the British post-war settlement. Even after the crisis of 1956, Barea continued to believe that 'el ejemplo de Inglaterra, bajo el Partido Laborista, demuestra que no es necesaria una guerra civil para imprimir un cambio social hondo a la economía de un país' (2000, 572). Barea was able to transcend the *aporia* of the Spanish Republican project and the nostalgia often associated with exiles by endorsing a British project that became through his writings increasingly more transnational in scope.

### **Future directions**

The close contextualised reading of Barea's cultural production between 1938 and 1945 has provided a detailed analysis of his most well-known production in exile, which, I argue, is fundamental to understand Barea's work and his ideological evolution in the aftermath of the Second World War. This has inevitably left out much of the post-1945 production, the study of which will probably further highlight Barea's transnational movements on an increasingly global scale. During the 1940s, Barea tapped fully into the circuit of world literature, his work appearing not only in Britain but also in international journals and collections alongside that of widely known contemporary writers, confirming him as a member of the transnational republic of letters. *The Forging of a rebel* was translated into several languages and Barea enjoyed a burst of international success that culminated with a book tour in Denmark in 1947.<sup>182</sup> He was now entirely in the field of creative tension described by Goethe in his definition of *Weltliteratur*, quoted at the beginning of this conclusion, between the cosmopolitan and the nation. A study of this period could

---

<sup>182</sup> During the 190s and 1950s, aside from the Argentinian editions, there were translations in the following countries USA (1946), Denmark (1946, 1947), Czech Republic (1947), The Netherlands (1947, 1948), France (1948), Italy (1949), Sweden (1950), and Austria (1955).

build on this thesis to follow the ‘routes’ of Barea’s work in new contexts of reception.

At the same time, the translation of *The Forging of a Rebel* into Spanish opened another chapter of Barea’s literary career by exposing him to Spanish speaking readerships, among which many were Republican exiles. The first edition was published by Losada in 1951 and edited by Guillermo de Torre, with whom Barea started an epistolary relationship. Arturo and Ilsa also started a literary relationship as translators of Spanish writers in Spain such as Camilo José Cela and Juan Goytisolo. Arturo wrote the introduction of Cela’s translation into English of *La colmena*, *The Hive* (1953). After Arturo’s death in 1957, Ilsa continued her translation activities for Spanish-speaking writers who wished to publish in English, and correspondence shows her dealings with writers in Spain such as Ricardo Fernández de la Reguera and exiles such as Francisco Ayala, Max Aub and Esteban Salazar Chapela. Studying these connections would offer a picture of the insertion of Spanish literature into world literature and highlight the importance of translators such as Ilsa Barea as instrumental in this process. Ilsa Barea’s role in this thesis has been briefly addressed in relation to Arturo’s work. A study that further traced her influence and authorial voice in Arturo’s work by problematizing the term ‘the couple’ should be complemented by research into her own work as a writer and translator.

This same movement away from and back to Spain can be seen in his trip to the USA in 1952. Barea’s appointment as Visiting Professor of Spanish Languages and Literatures at The Pennsylvania State College put him in touch with American culture while enabling him to meet other Spanish Republican exiles in the US such as Ángel del Río. A study of these years would contribute to an understanding of Barea’s ideological evolution during the 1950s, in which the transnational fight against communism would be a source of opportunities as much as of new challenges to overcome as Barea struggled to define his socialist humanism within the polarized geopolitical context of the Cold War. One of the sites of this struggle was International PEN. The archival material held at the Harry Ransom Center (University of Texas at Austin) provides a good starting point to think about the intellectual endeavours of Spanish Republican exiles in relation to other exiles at the

intersection of national and world literature.<sup>183</sup> This could be complemented with research into the reception of Barea's work – including his radio broadcasts as Juan de Castilla – in Latin America and within the diaspora of Spanish Republican exile through the numerous reviews but also the letters from listeners in the Barea archive. Another important future step would be to explore Barea's work through the lens of Spanish literary criticism and historiography during the Transition and democracy. It would need to analyse the underlying ideology of the interpretations of Barea's work and to therefore problematize the category of 'cultural products of exile' and 'political discourses of exile', insofar as they have been (or not) integrated in said historiography. In particular, it would be important to address the (re)nationalization of Barea's work after the end of Franco's dictatorship. Barea's place in literary historiography today can probably be explained by what Balibrea sees as the 'sueño de un tiempo exiliado circular', the logic of which is that

la ruptura en el continuo del tiempo que el exilio abre [...] se cierra al fin en un círculo cuando la presencia de lo que obligaron a ausentare se realiza en la nación. Como si el tiempo no hubiera pasado, como si nada se hubiera perdido y el encuentro fuera posible. (2007, 36)

This process is particularly obvious in Mario Camus' television adaptation of *La forja de un rebelde* for the Spanish national TV station, Radio Televisión Española, in 1990. This vastly expensive production can be seen as an attempt at de-politicizing the trilogy as an exile product within the cultural policy of the contemporary PSOE government, which had as its objectives to reinforce a sense of democracy through the mass media (Quaggio 2011). However, it is also ultimately a re-politicization aimed at reinforcing the foundational myth which 'conecta en un mismo discurso Segunda República, antifranquismo y democracia a través del hilo conductor del liberalismo' (Balibrea 2007, 28). The adaptation and appropriation in Spain of Republican exile culture often implies the loss of alternative political projects that vanished from the nation-state during Francoism. In Barea's case, it also implies a loss of the transitional and cosmopolitan dimensions of his work, which have been the focus of this thesis. This work would be in line with recent debates around the role of Spanish Republican exile during the transition and democracy (Balibrea 2007; Balibrea et al. 2014; Quaggio 2014a, 2014b).

---

<sup>183</sup> I was an AHRC Visiting Fellow at the HRC in August and September 2014.

Balibrea's questioning of 'the dream of circular exiled time' interrogates at the most fundamental level the possibilities and limits of return. Barea himself already explored his own 'fictional return' in his novel *The Broken Root* (1951), written around the time when he became a British citizen in 1948. The fictional character Antolín Moreno returns to Spain in 1949 only to decide to go back into exile – and fully embrace his new home. As I have argued elsewhere (Nieto McAvoy 2014), this rejection of Spain can be understood precisely as the realization that there is no possible closure of the imagined circular exiled time, but only rupture. It is in this sense that we can best understand Barea's statement made in Argentina in 1956, captured on one of the very few surviving recordings of his voice, that 'la patria se siente como un dolor agudo' – a wound that cannot and should not be closed.<sup>184</sup> Antolín's rejection of Spain is further cemented in Barea's increasing claims in the 1950s of the need to write beyond the limits of the Spanish nation. In his 1953 conference for the Congress for Cultural Freedom, Barea finally stated that

Durante la guerra hemos escrito muchos de nosotros –os voy a decir– con una pasión y una esperanza: la pasión y la esperanza de que los españoles nos iban a leer; la esperanza de que cuando Hitler se derrumbara, Franco se derrumbaría automáticamente, y España volvería a existir, y los libros podrían leerse en España; y escribíamos para España. ¿Para quién íbamos a escribir? Sí, esto para nosotros era un problema transitorio. Pero la realidad es que lo que nos parecía un problema transitorio no era un problema transitorio sino un problema definitivo, y es que ningún novelista español puede escribir para España ni debe escribir para España: tiene que escribir para el mundo y debe escribir para el mundo. Pero si tiene que escribir para el mundo y debe escribir para el mundo, entonces tiene que asimilar el mundo, tiene que sacar de dentro de sí todos los esbozos que conserva todavía de la guerra civil española, tiene que renunciar, verdaderamente renunciar a los sueños de ver sus libros en las librerías de la Puerta del Sol, y tiene que soñar con que su voz, con que la voz de todo escritor español se oiga y se vea en todas las librerías del mundo libre. (2000, 211)

---

<sup>184</sup> In correspondence with Sender, Barea explained that 'por esta España creo que he hecho y puedo hacer muchísimo más aún fuera de España que dentro de ella' (1947j)

Barea's rejection of Spain – here against a backdrop of 'writing for Spain' that brushes over Barea's much earlier embracing of non-Spanish speaking publics, more than a decade before this statement was made – can be understood as leaving behind the space of exile to relocate in the *here* and *now*. This is why it is interesting that Arturo and Ilsa Barea's private archive will be transferred in the near future not to a Spanish institution – Badajoz, where Barea was born, was considered as an option –, but to the Bodleian Library at Oxford, not very far from where the couple found a new home. This event – alongside other commemorative gestures such as naming a street in Madrid after Barea – suggests another line of exploration of the different interpretations of Barea and his work within debates over the memory and legacy of the Spanish Civil War. In re-evaluating the importance of exile as a 'life led outside habitual order' (Said 2000, 186) for an understanding of Barea's work, I am hoping to add credit to Adorno's words in *Minima Moralia*: 'for a man who no longer has a homeland, writing becomes a place to live' (Faber 2002, 6). And yet, at the same time, I believe that it is equally important to establish exile as an order, and writing in exile as a path *to* a new place and time, thus questioning Said's definition of exile as *only*, in Wallace Steven's words, 'a mind of winter' (cited in Said 2000, 186).

## References

- Agamben, Giorgio. 2000. 'What Is a People?' In *Means Without End: Notes on Politics*, 29–35. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ahmad, Aijaz. 1994. *In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures*. London: Verso.
- Alberca Serrano, Manuel. 2007. *El pacto ambiguo: de la novela autobiográfica a la autoficción*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.
- Alborg, Juan Luis. 1962. *Hora actual de la novela española*. Madrid: Taurus.
- Allen, Rupert C. 2014. *Psyche and Symbol in the Theater of Federico Garcia Lorca: Perlimplin, Yerma, Blood Wedding*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Altisent, Marta E. 1999. 'Autobiografía, testimonio y propaganda en la ficción de Arturo Barea.' In *Sesenta años después: Las literaturas del exilio republicano español de 1939*, edited by Manuel Aznar Soler, 147–59. Barcelona: GEXEL.
- Álvarez Junco, José. 1996. 'The Nation-Building Process in Nineteenth-Century Spain.' In *Nationalism and the Nation in the Iberian Peninsula: Competing and Conflicting Identities*, edited by Mar-Molinero, Clare, and Angel Smith. 89–106. Oxford and Washington, DC: Berg.
- . 2012. 'En torno al concepto de "pueblo"'. De las diversas encarnaciones de la colectividad como sujeto político en la cultura política española contemporánea.' *Historia Contemporánea* 0 (28). Accessed May 2 2016. <http://www.ehu.es/ojs/index.php/HC/article/view/5013>.
- Anderson, Benedict. 2006. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Appadurai, Arjun. 1995. 'The Production of Locality'. In *Counterworks: Managing the Diversity of Knowledge*, edited by Richard Fardon, 204–225. New York and Abingdon: Routledge.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. 1998. 'Cosmopolitan Patriots'. In *Cosmopolitanism: Thinking and Feeling beyond the Nation*, edited by Pheng Cheah and Bruce Robbins, 91–114. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- . 2007. *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers (Issues of Our Time)*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Apter, Emily. 2011. *The Translation Zone: A New Comparative Literature*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 2013. *Against World Literature: On the Politics of Untranslatability*. London: Verso.
- Aram, Bethany. 2008. *Leyenda negra y leyendas doradas en la conquista de América: Pedrarias y Balboa*. Madrid: Marcial Pons Historia.
- Arendt, Hannah. 1953. 'The Ex-Communists.' *Commonwealth* 57 (March): 595–96.
- Asselineau, Roger. 1965. *The Literary Reputation of Hemingway in Europe*. New York: New York University Press.
- Attridge, Derek. 2004. *The Singularity of Literature*. London: Routledge.
- Aub, Max. 1945. *Discurso de la novela española contemporánea*. Mexico: Colegio de México.
- . 2003. *Hablo como hombre*, edited by Manuel Aznar Soler. Seville: Renacimiento.
- Ayrton, Pete. 2016. *¡No Pasarán!: Writings from the Spanish Civil War*. London: Serpent's Tail.

- Azcárate, Pablo de. 1940. 'Letter to Arturo Barea,' October 15. Box 6. London: Arturo and Ilsa Barea Papers (AIBP).
- Aznar Soler, Manuel. 1999. 'Le retour dans la littérature de l'exil républicain espagnol de 1939.' In *L'émigration : le retour*, edited by R. Duroux and A. Montadon, 51-68. Clermont-Ferrand : Université Blaise-Pascal, Centre de Recherches sur les Littératures Modernes et Contemporaines.
- . 2002. 'La historia de las literaturas del exilio republicano español de 1939: problemas teóricos y metodológicos.' *Migraciones & Exilios: Cuadernos de la Asociación para el estudio de los exilios y migraciones ibéricos contemporáneos*, 3: 9–22.
- . 2003. *Los laberintos del exilio: diecisiete estudios sobre la obra literaria de Max Aub*. Seville: Renacimiento.
- Baker, Edward. 2009. *Madrid cosmopolita: la Gran Vía, 1910-1936*. Madrid: Marcial Pons Ediciones de Historia.
- Balfour, Sebastian. 1998. 'El hispanismo británico y la historiografía contemporánea en España.' *Ayer* 31: 163–82.
- Balibar, Étienne. 2012. 'Citizenship of the World Revisited'. In *Routledge Handbook of Cosmopolitanism Studies*, edited by Gerard Delanty, 291–301. New York and Abingdon: Routledge.
- Balibar, Étienne, and Immanuel Maurice Wallerstein. 1991. *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*. London: Verso.
- Balibrea, Mari Paz. 2005. 'Rethinking Spanish Republican Exile. An Introduction.' *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies* 6 (1): 3–24.
- . 2007. *Tiempo de exilio: Una mirada crítica a la modernidad española desde el pensamiento republicano en el exilio*. Barcelona: Editorial Montesinos.
- . 2010. 'De los Cultural Studies a los Estudios Culturales: el caso del exilio republicano.' *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies* 11 (3–4): 251–62.
- . 2012. 'Hacia una historiografía del exilio republicano cultural: retos y propuestas.' *Iberoamericana. América Latina-España-Portugal* 47: 87–99.
- . 2014. 'Las condiciones del retorno o como se recupera el exilio en las políticas culturales del PSOE (1982-1996).' In *El exilio republicano de 1939: viajes y retornos*, edited by Manuel Aznar Soler, José Ramón López García, and Francisca Montiel Rayo, 224–38. Seville: Renacimiento.
- . 2017 forthcoming. *Líneas de fuga. Hacia otra historiografía cultural del exilio republicano español*. Madrid: Akal
- Barea, Arturo. 1937a. 'Sangre.' April.
- . 1937b. 'Madre.' *El Sol*, May 23.
- . 1937c. 'La caída de Bilbao.' *Hoja del Lunes*, June 21.
- . 1939a. 'Heroine of the Telephonic.' *Spain at War*, March.
- . 1939b. 'Letter to Denyse Clairouin,' May 9. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1939c. 'Letter to the Home Office,' May 10. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1939d. 'Boots.' *Life and Letters Today*, June.
- . 1939e. 'A Spaniard in Hertfordshire,' *The Spectator*, August 11.
- . 1939f. 'Letter to Leiper,' September 27. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1939g. 'Letter to Home Office,' December 27. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1940a. 'Brandy.' *Penguin Parade*, 7.
- . 1940b. 'The Spanish Mind and Gibraltar.' *Time and Tide*, July 6.
- . 1940c. 'Fifth Column.' *Reynold's News*, August 19.
- . 1940d. 'Spaniards and Morocco.' *Time and Tide*, October 12.

- . 1940e. 'The Scissors.' *Horizon* II (November): 253–57.
- . 1940f. 'West of Gibraltar.' *Time and Tide*, November 16.
- . 1940g. 'The Men Who Walk in the Streets.' *New Statesman and Nation*, November 23.
- . 1940h. 'Letter to Fredric Warburg,' December 11. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1940i. 'Spaniards at Home.' *Time and Tide*, December 28.
- . 1940j. 'La batalla de las patatas.' BBC Latin American Service. Box 3. London: AIBP.
- . 1941a. 'Letter to Charles Duff.' Box 6. London: AIBP
- . 1941b. *Struggle for the Spanish Soul*. London: Secker and Warburg.
- . 1941c. *The Forge*. London: Faber & Faber.
- . 1941d. 'Aliados.' BBC Latin American Service. Box 3. London: AIBP.
- . 1941e. 'Letter to Kingsley Martin,' January 24. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1941f. 'Spanish Catholicism.' *New Statesman and Nation*, January 25.
- . 1941g. 'Guardianes Del Hogar.' BBC Latin American Service. Box 3. London: AIBP.
- . 1941h. 'Tangier.' *Time and Tide*, March 29.
- . 1941i. 'Cosas de Chicos.' BBC Latin American Service. Box 3. London: AIBP.
- . 1941j. 'Not Spain but Hemingway.' *Horizon* III (May): 348–61.
- . 1941k. 'Letter to Tosco Fyvel,' May 3. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1941l. 'Letter to Tosco Fyvel,' May 3. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1941m. 'Letter to Fredric Warburg,' May 5. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1941n. 'Two Brave Men: The Legion.' *Horizon* III (June).
- . 1941o. 'Letter to Ricart,' June 26. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1941p. 'Letter to Ann Gimingham,' July 27. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1941q. 'Letter to Kingsley Martin,' August 18. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1941r. 'Letter to Mr. Tate,' September. 'Juan de Castilla': Talks: File 1 1940-1942. Juan de Castilla Papers. Reading: BBC Written Archives Centre (WAC).
- . 1941s. 'The Blitz.' BBC Latin American Service. Box 3. London: AIBP
- . 1941t. 'Democracia inglesa.' BBC Latin American Service. Box 3. London: AIBP
- . 1941u. 'Letter to Warburg,' 9 July 1941. Box 6. London: AIBP
- . 1942a. 'Notes on Federico García Lorca I.' *Horizon* V (March): 189–209.
- . 1942b. 'Notes on Federico García Lorca II.' *Horizon* V (April): 276–93.
- . 1943a. *The Track*. London: Faber and Faber.
- . 1943b. 'Review of *The Spanish Labyrinth* by Gerald Brenan.' *Horizon* VIII (September): 203–9.
- . 1944a. 'Letter to Lehman.' Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1944b. *Lorca, the Poet and his People*. London: Faber & Faber.
- . 1946a. 'Realism in the Modern Spanish Novel.' *Focus* 2: 61–75.
- . 1946b. *The Clash*. London: Faber and Faber.
- . 1947a. 'Carbón.' BBC Latin American Service Box 4. London: AIBP.
- . 1947b. 'Invierno.' BBC Latin American Service Box 4. London: AIBP.
- . 1947c. 'Letter to Jean Malaquais,' February 17. Austin: International PEN Archive, Harry Ransom Center, University of Texas (HRC).
- . 1947d. 'Registro.' BBC Latin American Service Box 4. London: AIBP.
- . 1947e. 'Decadencia.' BBC Latin American Service Box 4. London: AIBP.
- . 1947f. 'The Rediscovery of Latin America.' *Tribune*, September 19.

- . 1947g ‘Ortega y Madariaga,’ *University Observer* (Winter): 29-36.
- . 1947h ‘The Spanish Mind,’ *World off Duty*: 73-6.
- . 1947i. ‘Letter to Ramón J. Sender,’ March 1. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1947j. ‘Letter to Ramón J. Sender,’ May 28. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1948a. ‘Balance.’ BBC Latin American Service Box 4. London: AIBP.
- . 1948b. ‘Millonarios.’ BBC Latin American Service Box 4. London: AIBP.
- . 1948c. ‘Alta Política.’ BBC Latin American Service Box 4. London: AIBP.
- . 1948d. ‘Letter to Galy and Jean Malaquais,’ June 28. Austin: International PEN Archive, HRC
- . 1948e. ‘Un doctor.’ BBC Latin American Service Box 4. London: AIBP.
- . 1948f ‘An Andalusian Poet,’ *Times Literary Supplement*, 6 May.
- . 1948g ‘The Imaginative Realism of R.J. Sender.’ Introduction to Ramón J. Sender, *The Dark Wedding*. London: Grey Wall Press.
- . 1951. *The Broken Root*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- . 1953 ‘A quarter Century of Spanish Writing,’ *Books Abroad XXVII* (Spring), 117-28.
- . 1954a. ‘La obra de Camilo José Cela.’ *Cuadernos para la libertad de la cultura* 7.
- . 1954b. ‘Letter to Phyllis Santamaria.’ Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1955a. ‘L’œuvre de Camilo José Cela.’ *Previews* 58.
- . 1955b. ‘Letter to Ronald Boswell Esq., Talks Booking Manager,’ April 9. ‘Juan de Castilla’ Files, Talks file VII: 1955. Juan de Castilla Papers. Reading: BBC WAC.
- . 1957. ‘Una historia de tiempos futuros.’ *Cuadernos para la libertad de la cultura* 23.
- . 1972. *The Forging of a Rebel*. London: Davis-Poynter.
- . 2000. *Palabras recobradas: Textos inéditos*, edited by Nigel Townson. Madrid: Debate.
- . *Broadcasting Britain: Juan de Castilla’s BBC radio scripts (1940-1957)*, edited by Nigel Townson and Eva Nieto McAvoy [under preparation]
- . n.d. ‘Letter to Ricart.’ Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . n.d. ‘Literary Notes.’ London: AIBP.
- Barea, Arturo, and Ilsa Barea. 1952. *Unamuno*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Barea, Ilsa. 1939a. ‘Letter to the German Emergency Committee,’ March 29. Box 6. London: London: AIBP.
- . 1939b. ‘Letter to HM Cummings, Editorial Liaison Officer, Overseas News,’ July 25. ‘Juan de Castilla’ Files, Talks file I: 1940-1942. Juan de Castilla Papers. Reading: BBC WAC.
- . 1947. ‘Letter to Ramón J. Sender,’ Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1953. ‘Letter to Margarte Weeden,’ November 7. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1958. ‘Letter to J.B. Clark, Director of External Broadcasting,’ January 1. Juan de Castilla Papers. Reading: BBC WAC.
- Baroja, Julio Caro. 2004. *El mito del carácter nacional*. Edited by Bernard Traimond. Madrid: Caro Raggio.
- Basilio, Miriam. 2014. *Visual Propaganda, Exhibitions, and the Spanish Civil War*. Surrey, UK: Ashgate Publishing.
- Baxendale, John. 1999. ‘You and I – All of Us Ordinary People’: Renegotiating ‘Britishness’ in Wartime.’ In *‘Millions like Us’?: British Culture in the*

- Second World War*, edited by Nick Hayes and Jeff Hill, 295–322. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- BBC. 1955. 'A Broadcasting Record?' *BBC London Letter*, May.
- Beck, Ulrich, and Natan Sznaider. 2006a. 'Unpacking Cosmopolitanism for the Social Sciences: A Research Agenda.' *The British Journal of Sociology* 57 (1): 1–24.
- . 2006b. 'A Literature on Cosmopolitanism: an Overview'. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 57 (1): 153–164.
- . 2010 [2016]. 'Unpacking Cosmopolitanism for the Social Sciences: A Research Agenda.' *The British Journal of Sociology – The BJS: Shaping Sociology Over 60 Years*: 381–403.
- Beddoe, Deirdre. 2004. 'Thomas, Margaret Haig, Suo Jure Viscountess Rhondda (1883–1958).' In *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and B. Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Accessed May 12 2013. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/36479>.
- Behr, Shulamith, and Maríán Malet. 2005. *Arts in Exile in Britain 1933-1945: Politics and Cultural Identity*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Bender, Elzbieta. 2014. 'La Intrahistoria de la Guerra Civil española de 1936 según Arturo Barea.' *Roczniki Humanistyczne* 62 (5): 145–54.
- . 2015. 'La violencia en el testimonio bareano de la guerra del Rif.' In *Narrativas de la violencia en el ámbito hispánico. Guerra, sociedad y familia*, edited by Mariola Pietrak and Miguel Carrera Garrido, 53–65. Seville: Universidad María Curie-Skłodowska de Lublin; Editorial Padilla Libros.
- . 2016. *Historia del relato y relato de la historia. La obra autobiográfica de Arturo Barea*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Benjamin, Walter. 1968. 'Theses on the Philosophy of History.' In *Illuminations*, 253–64. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Bertrand de Muñoz, Maryse. 1982. *La guerra civil española en la novela: bibliografía comentada*. Madrid: J.Porrúa Turanzas.
- . 1994. 'Historia y ficción, historia y discurso: Doble dualismo. Análisis narratológico de tres novelas de la Guerra Civil Española.' In *Actas Irvine-92: De historia, lingüísticas, retóricas y poéticas*, edited by Juan Villegas Morales, 239–48. Oakland, California: University of California Press.
- Bevan, David, and Anthony Percival. 1990. 'The Spanish Civil War Story: From Neo-Realism to Postmodernism.' In *Literature and War*, 87–95. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Bhabha, Homi K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- . 1996. 'Unsatisfied: Notes on Vernacular Cosmopolitanism.' In *Text and Nationi*, edited by Laura Garcia-Morena and Peter C. Pfeifer, 191–207. London: Camden House.
- Biedermann, Zoltán and Strathern, Alan L. 2017 forthcoming. *Cosmopolitan Island: Sri Lanka at the Crossroads of History*. London: UCL Press.
- Bloch, Ernest, Walter Benjamin, Theodor Adorno, Bertolt Brecht, and Georg Lukacs. 1980. *Aesthetics and Politics*. London: Verso.
- Bolloten, Burnett. 1991. *The Spanish Civil War: Revolution and Counterrevolution*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press.
- Borkenau, Franz. 1937. *The Spanish Cockpit*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Borm, Jan. 2004. 'Defining Travel: On the Travel Book, Travel Writing and Terminology.' In *Perspectives on Travel Writing*, edited by Glenn Hopper

- and Tim Youngs, 13-26. Aldershot, Hants, England; Burlington, Vt., USA: Ashgate.
- Bou, Enric. 2005. 'Construcción autobiográfica y exilio: entre la memoria individual y la colectiva.' *Revista Canadiense de Estudios Hispánicos* 30 (1): 17–32.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1985. 'The Social Space and the Genesis of Groups.' *Theory and Society* 14 (6): 723–44.
- Boyd, Carolyn P. 1997. *Historia Patria: Politics, History, and National Identity in Spain, 1875-1975*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Brenan, Gerald. 1967. 'Hispanophilia: Review of Richard Ford's *Handbook* (1845).' *New York Review of Books*, January. Accessed June 17 2016. <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/1967/01/26/hispanophilia/>.
- . 1975. 'An Honest Man.' *New York Review of Books*, March, 3–4.
- Briggs, Asa. 1985. *The BBC: The First Fifty Years*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 1995. *The History of Broadcasting in the United Kingdom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brinton, Henry. 1937. *Christianity and Spain*. London: United Editorial.
- 'British Cartoon Archive.' 2016. *University of Kent*. Accessed August 15 2016. [www.cartoons.ac.uk](http://www.cartoons.ac.uk).
- Brothers, C. 1997. *War and Photography: A Cultural History*. New York and Abingdon: Routledge.
- Bruccoli, Matthew Joseph, and Judith Baughman. 2006. *Hemingway and the Mechanism of Fame: Statements, Public Letters, Introductions, Forewords, Prefaces, Blurbs, Reviews, and Endorsements*. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press.
- Buchanan, Tom. 1993. 'A Far Away Country of Which We Know Nothing.' *Twentieth Century British History* 4 (1): 1–24.
- . 2007. *The Impact of the Spanish Civil War on Britain: War, Loss and Memory*. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press.
- Burke, Peter. 2009. *Cultural Hybridity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Butts, J.J. 2011. 'Missed Connections: The Collective Novel and the Metropolis' 5 (2). Accessed March 13 2013. <http://www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/5/2/000092/000092.html>.
- Cahill, Rowan. 2013. 'Rupert Lockwood (1908-1997): Journalist, Communist, Intellectual.' PhD diss., University of Wollongong.
- Calder, Angus. 1992. *The People's War: Britain 1939-1945*. London: Pimlico.
- Calhoun, Craig. 2002. 'Cultural Capital.' Oxford: Oxford University Press. Accessed July 25 2015. <http://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780195123715.001.0001/acref-9780195123715-e-401>.
- Callaghan, John. 2004. *The Labour Party and Foreign Policy: A History*. New York and Abingdon: Routledge.
- Campoy-Cubillo, A. 2012. *Memories of the Maghreb: Transnational Identities in Spanish Cultural Production*. New York: Palgrave.
- Cárcel, Ricardo García. 1998. *La leyenda negra: historia y opinión*. Madrid: Alianza.
- Carpenter, Victoria. 2010. *(Re)collecting the Past: History and Collective Memory in Latin American Narrative*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Casanova, Pascale. 2004. *The World Republic of Letters*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Castellet, Jose María. 1958. 'En la muerte de Arturo Barea, novelista español.' *Papeles de Son Armadans* III (22): 101–06.
- Castells, Manuel. 2010. *The Rise of the Network Society*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Caudet, Francisco. 1998. 'Dialogizar el exilio.' In *Exilio literario español de 1939. Actas del primer congreso internacional*, edited by Manuel Aznar Soler, 31–55. Barcelona: GEXEL.
- Censura. 1951. Report of *La forja de un rebelde*.
- Chalmers Mitchell, Peter. 1940. 'Letter to Arturo Barea,' June 12. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- Charle, Christophe, Jürgen Schriewer, and Peter Wagner. 2004. *Transnational Intellectual Networks: Forms of Academic Knowledge and the Search for Cultural Identities*. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.
- Cheesman, Tom. 2007. *Novels of Turkish German Settlement: Cosmopolite Fictions*. London: Camden House.
- Churchill, Winston. 1940. 'Churchill's Speech at the House of Commons.' June 18.
- Cifuentes, Luis Fernández. 2007. 'Southern Exposure: Early Tourism and Spanish National Identity.' *Journal of Iberian and Latin American Studies* 13 (2–3): 133–48.
- Clairouin, Denyse. 1939. 'Letter to Arturo Barea,' May 23. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- Clavin, Patricia. 2005. 'Defining Transnationalism.' *Contemporary European History* 14 (4): 421–39.
- Clements, R. 1951. 'Letter to Francis Colligan (Division of Exchange of Persons),' December 5. Box 6. London: London: AIBP.
1953. 'Letter to Arturo Barea'
- Clifford, James. 1988. *The Predicament of Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- . 1994. 'Diasporas.' *Cultural Anthropology* 9 (3): 302–38.
- . 1997. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cole, Robert. 1990. *Britain and The War of Words In Neutral Europe 1939-45: The Art Of The Possible*. New York: Springer.
- Cole, Sarah. 2009. 'People in War.' In *The Cambridge Companion to War Writing*, edited by Kate McLoughlin, 25–37. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2012. *At the Violet Hour: Modernism and Violence in England and Ireland*. New York: Oxford University Press USA.
- Connolly, Cyril. 1941a. 'Comment.' *Horizon* III (January).
- . 1941b. 'Comment.' *Horizon* III (June) : 375–77.
- . 1941c. 'Letter to Arturo Barea,' August 8. Box 6. London: London: AIBP.
- Conway, Martin, and José Gotovitch. 2001. *Europe in Exile: European Exile Communities in Britain, 1940-1945*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Costello, David R. 1989. 'Searchlight Books and the Quest for a "People's War," 1941-42.' *Journal of Contemporary History* 24 (2): 257–76.
- Cunningham, Valentine. 1980. *The Penguin Book of Spanish Civil War Verse*. London: Penguin Books.
- . 2009. 'The Spanish Civil War.' In *The Cambridge Companion to War Writing*, edited by Catherine Mary McLoughlin, 185–96. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Damrosch, David. 2003. *What Is World Literature?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 2013. *World Literature in Theory*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

- Davies, Alan. 1999. 'The First Radio War: Broadcasting in the Spanish Civil War, 1936-1939.' *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television* 19 (October): 473–513.
- DC Benson and Campbell. 1938. 'Letter to Arturo Barea,' November 28. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1939. 'Letter to Arturo Barea,' March 6. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1941. 'Letter to Arturo Barea,' June 13. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- Deacon, D. 2008. *British News Media and the Spanish Civil War: Tomorrow May Be Too Late*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Deacon, Desley, Penny Russell, and Angela Woollacott. 2010. *Transnational Lives: Biographies of Global Modernity, 1700-Present*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Delanty, Gerard. 2006. 'The Cosmopolitan Imagination: Critical Cosmopolitanism and Social Theory.' *British Journal of Sociology* 57 (1): 25–47.
- Delanty, Gerard. 2012. 'Introduction: The Emerging Field of Cosmopolitanism Studies'. In *Routledge Handbook of Cosmopolitanism Studies*, edited by Gerard Delanty, 1–8. New York and Abingdon: Routledge.
- Delgado, L. Elena, Jordana Mendelson, and Oscar Vázquez. 2007. 'Introduction: Recalcitrant modernities – Spain, Cultural Difference and the Location of Modernism.' *Journal of Iberian and Latin American Studies* 13 (2–3): 105–19.
- Delgado, María M. 2008. *Federico García Lorca*. New York and Abingdon: Routledge.
- Deli, Peter. 1985. 'The Image of the Russian Purges in the *Daily Herald* and the *New Statesman*.' *Journal of Contemporary History* 20 (2): 261–82.
- Denselow, Jadzia, Andrew Taussig, and Marie Gillespie. 2010. 'Career Trajectories at the BBC World Service: Managing Diversity. Confidential Report for the BBC World Service.' The Open University & BBC World Service. Accessed April 6 2016. <http://oro.open.ac.uk/27444/>.
- Derrida, Jacques, and Anne Dufourmantelle. 2000. *Of Hospitality*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Devlin, John. 1958. 'Arturo Barea and Jose María Girondeña – Two Interpreters of the Spanish Labyrinth.' *Hispania* XLI: 143–48.
- . 1966. *Spanish Anticlericalism: A Study in Modern Alienation*. New York: Las Americas.
- Dieta Pérez, Javier. 1959. Censorship report: *El centro de la pista*.
- Driberg, Tom. 1937. *Daily Express*, October 7.
- Doherty, Megan. 2011. 'PEN International and its Republic of Letters, 1921–1970' PhD diss., Columbia University.
- Domínguez, César. 2011. 'World Literature and Cosmopolitanism'. In *The Routledge Companion to World Literature*, edited by Theo D'haen, David Damrosch, and Djelal Kadir, 242–52. New York and Abingdon: Routledge.
- Duff, Charles. 1938. *Spain against the Invaders: Napoleon 1808 – Hitler and Mussolini 1936*. London: United Editorial.
- . 1940. *A Key to Victory: Spain*. London: Victor Gollancz.
- . 1944. *Spain, the Moral Touchstone of Europe: A Footnote on Mr. Churchill's Recent Speech*. London: V. Gollancz.
- . 1947. *No Angel's Wing*. London: Cobbett Press.
- Eaude, Michael. 2001. *Arturo Barea: triunfo en la medianoche del siglo*. Mérida, BA: Editora Regional de Extremadura.

- . 2011. *Triumph at Midnight of the Century: A Critical Biography of Arturo Barea: Explaining the Roots of the Spanish Civil War*. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press.
- Echevarría, Megan. 2004. 'La obra narrativa de Arturo Barea.' PhD diss., University of North Carolina.
- . 2006. 'El nuevo romanticismo en *Valor y miedo*.' *Ojancano: revista de literatura española*, 29: 37–61.
- . 2009. 'La evolución de la narrativa histórica española: Benito Pérez Galdós y Arturo Barea.' *Congresos Internacionales de Estudios Galdosianos* 0 (9). November 2 2012.  
<http://actascongreso.casamuseoperezgaldos.com/index.php/cig/article/view/2113>.
- Edelmayer, Friedrich. 2011. 'The "Leyenda Negra" and the Circulation of Anti-Catholic and Anti-Spanish Prejudices.' *European History Online (EGO)*. Accessed July 25 2016. <http://www.ieg-ego.eu/edelmayerf-2010-en>.
- Elliott, Sydney R. 1940. 'Letter to Arturo Barea,' June 11.
- Ellis, Steve. 2014. *British Writers and the Approach of World War II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Espina, Antonio. 1930. '¿Incompatibles?: la cultura y el espíritu proletario.' *El Sol*, July 18.
- Esteban, José, and Gonzalo Santonja. 1988. *Los Novelistas sociales españoles (1928-1936): antología*. Barcelona: Anthropos Editorial.
- Ette, Ottmar. 2016. *Writing-between-Worlds: TransArea Studies and the Literatures-without-a-Fixed-Abode*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Ette, Ottmar, Mercedes Figueras, and Joseph Jurt. 2005. *Max Aub – André Malraux*. Madrid and Frankfurt: Iberoamericana/Vervuet.
- Faber, Sebastiaan. 2002. *Exile and Cultural Hegemony: Spanish Intellectuals in Mexico, 1939-1975*. Nashville, Tennessee: Vanderbilt University Press.
- . 2006. 'The Privilege of Pain: The Exile as Ethical Model in Max Aub, Francisco Ayala, and Edward Said.' *Journal of the Interdisciplinary Crossroads* 3 (1): 11–32.
- . 2008a. 'The Novel of the Spanish Civil War.' In *A Companion to the Twentieth-Century Spanish Novel*, edited by Martha Eulalia Altisent, 77–90. Woodbridge: Tamesis.
- . 2008b. *Anglo-American Hispanists and the Spanish Civil War: Hispanophilia, Commitment, and Discipline*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Faber, Sebastiaan, and Cristina Martínez-Carazo. 2009. *Contra el olvido: el exilio español en Estados Unidos*. Instituto Franklin de Estudios Norteamericanos.
- Fairfax. 1939. 'Letter to Ilsa,' February 6.
- Fair-Schulz, Axel, and Mario Kessler. 2011. *German Scholars in Exile: New Studies in Intellectual History*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Fernández, Horacio. 2014. *Fotos y libros: España 1905-1977*. Madrid: Museo Nacional Centro de Arte Reina Sofía, Acción Cultural Española (AC/E) y RM.
- Fernández, José María, and María Herrera. 1988. *La narrativa de la Guerra Civil: Arturo Barea*. Madrid: Promociones y Publicaciones Universitarias.
- Fernández, Uría. 2010. 'La metralla imborrable'. *Vallecas Bombardeada*. Vallecas: Vallecas Todo Cultura.
- Fish, Stanley. 1976. 'Interpreting the "Variorum".' *Critical Inquiry* 2 (3): 465-485.

- Fisher, Jaimey, and Barbara Caroline Mennel. 2010. *Spatial Turns: Space, Place, and Mobility in German Literary and Visual Culture*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- 'Foreign Gen. Latin American Propaganda Policy Committee.' 1941. File E2/380: Juan de Castilla Papers. Reading: BBC WAC.
- Forster, Edward Morgan. 1969. *Howards End*. London: Forgotten Books.
- Fuentes, Víctor. 2006. *La marcha al pueblo en las letras españolas, 1917-1936*. Edited by Manuel Tuñón de Lara. Madrid: Ediciones de la Torre.
- Fussell, Paul. 1982. *Abroad: British Literary Traveling between the Wars*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 1990. *Wartime: Understanding and Behavior in the Second World War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fyvel, Tosco R. 1941. 'Foreword.' In *Struggle for the Spanish Soul*, by Arturo Barea, 5–6. London: Secker and Warburg.
- . 1968. *Intellectuals Today: Problems in a Changing Society*. New York: Schocken Books.
- . 1982. *George Orwell: A Personal Memoir*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Gallop, Rodney. 1943. 'Divided House: Review of The Track.' *Times Literary Supplement*, August 14.
- . 1944. 'Poet of the Spanish People: Review of Lorca.' *Times Literary Supplement*, April 8.
- . 1946. 'Civil War: Review of The Clash.' *Times Literary Supplement*, March 23.
- García, Hugo. 2007. 'Seis y media docena: propaganda de atrocidades y opinión británica durante la Guerra Civil Española.' *Hispania. Revista de Historia* LXVII (226): 621–79.
- . 2010. *The Truth About Spain!: Mobilizing British Public Opinion, 1936-1939*. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press.
- . 2015. '¿La República de las 'pequeñas diferencias'? cultura(s) de izquierda y antifascismo(s) en España, 1931-1939.' In *Del franquismo a la democracia: 1936-2013*, coordinated by Manuel Pérez Ledesma and Ismael Saz Campos, 207–37. Madrid: Marcial Pons; Zaragoza: Prensas de la Universidad de Zaragoza.
- García-Obregón, Omar. 2009. 'Partículas de azogue: movilidad y desplazamientos sígnicos del exilio cubano.' In *Nuevas formas de conocer y reconocer los exilios europeos y americanos*. Mexico City: Universidad Iberoamericana.
- Gemie, Sharif, Laure Humbert, and Fiona Reid. 2012. *Outcast Europe: Refugees and Relief Workers in an Era of Total War 1936-48*. London: A&C Black.
- George, Daniel. 1941. 'Where Truth and Fiction Meets, Review of Arturo Barea's The Forge.' *Tribune*, July 25. Accessed July 25 2016. <http://archive.tribunemagazine.co.uk/article/25th-july-1941/18/where-truth-and-fiction-me>.
- Gil Casado, Pablo. 1997. 'La Raíz Rota, de Arturo Barea: destierro, retorno, represión.' In *La Chispa '97: Selected Proceedings*, 71–78. New Orleans, LA: Tulane University.
- Gili, Joan. 1941. 'Letter to Arturo Barea,' February 18. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- Gillespie, Edward. 1964. 'Arturo Barea y la generación de 1898: su crítica social sobre España.' MA diss., University of Houston.

- Gillespie, Marie. 2010a. 'Diasporic Creativity: Refugee Intellectuals, Exiled Poets and Corporate Cosmopolitanism at the BBC World Service.' Accessed February 3 2012. <http://oro.open.ac.uk/26754/>.
- . 2010b. 'Diasporic Creativity: Refugee Intellectuals, Exiled Poets and Corporate Cosmopolitanism at the BBC World Service.' In *Diasporas: Concepts, Intersections, Identities*, edited by Kim Knott and Seán McLoughlin, 236–43. London: Zed Books.
- Gillespie, Marie, and Gerd Baumann. 2006. 'Diasporic Contact Zones at the BBC World Service.' In *CRESC 2nd Annual Conference 'Media Change and Social Theory,' Unpublished Conference Paper, Oxford, England*, 6–8. Accessed May 16 2014. [http://www.open.ac.uk/socialsciences/diasporas/publications/diasporic\\_contact\\_zones.pdf](http://www.open.ac.uk/socialsciences/diasporas/publications/diasporic_contact_zones.pdf).
- Gillespie, Marie, and Eva Nieto McAvoy. 2016. 'Digital Networks and Transformations in the International News Ecology: A Critique of Agent-Centred Approaches to Soft Power.' In *Routledge Handbook of Soft Power*, edited by Naren Chitty, Craig Hayden, Li Ji, and John Simons, 203–18. New York and Abingdon: Routledge.
- . 2017 forthcoming. 'The BBC's Corporate Cosmopolitanism: Diasporic Voices between Empire and Cold War.' In *Cosmopolitanism in Conflict: Imperial Encounters between the Seven Years' War and the Cold War*, edited by Dina Gusejnova. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gillespie, Marie, and Alban Webb. 2013. 'Corporate Cosmopolitanism: Diasporas and Diplomacy at the BBC World Service, 1932-2012.' In *Diasporas and Diplomacy Cosmopolitan Contact Zones at the BBC World Service*, edited by Marie Gillespie and Alban Webb, 1–20. New York and Abingdon: Routledge.
- Gillespie, Marie, Alban Webb, and Gerd Baumann. 2008. 'Broadcasting Britishness, Strategic Challenges and the Ecology of Overseas Broadcasting by the BBC.' *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television* 28 (4): 453–58.
- Gilroy, Paul. 1993. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . 2005a. *Postcolonial Melancholia*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- . 2005b. 'A New Cosmopolitanism.' *Interventions* 7 (3): 287–92.
- Gimingham, Ann. 1939. 'Letter to Ilsa Barea,' October 9. Box 6. London: Arturo and Ilsa Barea Papers (AIBP).
- . 1941. 'Letter to Arturo Barea,' August 5. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1942. 'Letter to Arturo Barea,' April 16. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- Glondys, Olga. 2012. *La guerra fría cultural y el exilio republicano español: Cuadernos del Congreso por la Libertad de la Cultura, 1953-1965*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Gorkin, Julián. 1956. 'Letter to Arturo Barea.' Box 6. London: AIBP.
- Gracia, Jordi. 2010. *A la intemperie: exilio y cultura en España*. Barcelona: Anagrama.
- Gracia, Jordi, and Domingo Ródenas. 2011. *Historia de la literatura española: Derrota y restitución de la modernidad, 1939-2010*. Barcelona: Crítica.
- Granata de Egües, Gladys. 1993. 'Arturo Barea en la Argentina.' In *Actas del III Congreso Argentino de Hispanistas 'España en América y América en España,'* vol. 2, edited by Lois, Elida, Martínez Cuitiño, Luis, 597–601. Buenos Aires: Instituto de Filología y Literaturas Hispánicas.

- Greer, Margaret R., Walter D. Mignolo, and Maureen Quilligan. 2008. *Rereading the Black Legend: The Discourses of Religious and Racial Difference in the Renaissance Empires*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Grillo, Ralph. 2007. 'Betwixt and Between: Trajectories and Projects of Transmigration.' *Journal of Ethnic & Migration Studies* 33 (2): 199–217.
- Gusejnova, Dina. (2017 forthcoming). *Cosmopolitanism in Conflict: Imperial Encounters between the Seven Years' War and the Cold War*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hannerz, Ulf. 2007. 'Cosmopolitanism'. In *A Companion to the Anthropology of Politics*, edited by David Nugent and Joan Vincent, 69–85. Malden, Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Harris, Johnathan. 1939. 'Letter from Editor of *The Spectator* to Arturo Barea,' August 24. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- Headland, Thomas N., Kenneth L. Pike, and Marvin Harris. 1990. *Emics and Etics: The Insider/Outsider Debate*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hemingway, Ernest. 2004. *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. London: Arrow Books
- Herrera de la Muela, Teresa. 2012. 'Un plato demasiado crudo: epistemología y guerra en *La Forja de un rebelde* de Arturo Barea.' *Cuadernos de ALDEEU* 24: 89–106.
- Herzberger, David K. 1991. 'Narrating the Past: History and the Novel of Memory in Postwar Spain.' *PMLA* 106 (1): 34–45.
- . 1995. *Narrating the Past: Fiction and Historiography in Postwar Spain*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hill, Andrew. 2010. 'The BBC Empire Service: The Voice, the Discourse of the Master and Ventriloquism.' *South Asian Diaspora* 2 (1): 25–38.
- Holguín, Sandie Eleanor. 2002. *Creating Spaniards: Culture and National Identity in Republican Spain*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Holman, Valerie. 2008. *Print for Victory: Book Publishing in England, 1939-1945*. London: British Library.
- Holmes, James S. 1988. *Translated!: Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Holub, María-Theresia. 2007. 'Beyond Boundaries: Transnational and Transcultural Literature and Practice.' PhD diss., State University of New York at Binghamton
- Home Office. 1939. 'Letter to Arturo Barea,' August 18. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- Hooper, Kirsty. 2014. "'Percy" Galdós and his British Readers, 1870-1920.' 1–18. Sheffield University Galdós Lecture, 8 December. Accessed June 7 2015. <http://www.gep.group.shef.ac.uk/2014%20Galdos%20Lecture%20Hooper.pdf>
- Ilie, Paul. 1981. *Literatura y exilio interior (escritores y sociedad en la España franquista)*. Madrid: Fundamentos.
- Indian Editor. 1941. 'Internal Memo of the BBC,' August 29. Juan de Castilla Files Copyright File I: 1941-1962. Reading: BBC WAC
- 'Internal Memo of the BBC.' 1940. Juan de Castilla Papers. Reading: BBC WAC.
- Jackson, G. 1939. 'Letter from Editor of *Lilliput* to Arturo Barea,' July 10. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- Jameson, Fredric. 2014. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

- Janz, Oliver, and Daniel Schönplflug. 2014. *Gender History in a Transnational Perspective: Networks, Biographies, Gender Orders*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Jong, Louis de. 1952. *The German Fifth Column, 1933-1945, a Summary*. Netherlands State Institute for War Documentation.
- Jouini, Khemais. 2005. 'La experiencia marroquí de Arturo Barea.' *Aldadis* 5: 21–29.
- Jover Zamora, José María, Juan Pablo Fusi Aizpurúa, and Guadalupe Gómez-Ferrer Morant. 2001. *España: sociedad, política y civilización (Siglos XIX-XX)*. Madrid: Debate.
- Judt, Tony. 2006. *Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945*. London: Penguin Books.
- Kamen, Henry. 2008. *The Disinherited: The Exiles Who Created Spanish Culture*. London: Penguin UK.
- Kenwood, Alun. 1993. *The Spanish Civil War: A Cultural and Historical Reader*. Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Kerr, Douglas. 2002. 'Orwell's BBC Broadcasts: Colonial Discourse and the Rhetoric of Propaganda.' *Textual Practice* 16 (3): 473–90.
- Kershen, Anne J., and Centre for the Study of Migration. 1997. *London, the Promised Land?: The Migrant Experience in a Capital City*. Aldershot, Hants; Brookfield, VT.: Avebury.
- Knickerbocker, Hubert Renfro. 1937. 'Interview with Captain Gonzalo de Aguilera.' *Washington Post*, May 10.
- Knight, Katherine. 2011. *Spuds, Spam and Eating for Victory: Rationing in the Second World War*. Stroud, UK: The History Press.
- Koestler, Arthur. 1941. 'Review of Arturo Barea's Struggle for the Spanish Soul.' *Horizon*, September, 219–20.
- Kresse, Kai. 2012. 'Interrogating "Cosmopolitanism" in an Indian Ocean Setting: Thinking Through Mombasa on the Swahili Coast.' In *Cosmopolitanisms in Muslim Contexts: Perspectives from the Past*, edited by Derryl N. MacLean, Sikeena Karmali Ahmed, 31-50. Aga Khan University-ISMIC; Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Labanyi, Jo. 2011. 'Being There: The Documentary Impulse from Ayguals de Izco to Galdós.' In *Studies in Honor of Vernon Chamberlin*, edited by Mark A. Harpring, 95–110. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta-Hispanic Monographs.
- Laguna, Antonio Iglesias. 1970. *Treinta años de novela española: 1938-1968*. Madrid: Prensa Española.
- LaPrade, Douglas Edward. 2007. *Hemingway and Franco*. Valencia: Universitat de València.
- Larraz, Fernando. 2009. *El monopolio de la palabra: el exilio intelectual en la España franquista*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.
- . 2014. *Max Aub y la historia literaria*. Berlin: Logos Verlag.
- Leventhal, F. M. 1973. 'H. N. Brailsford and Russia: The Problem of Objectivity.' *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 5 (2): 81–96.
- Lieber, Maxim. 1953. 'Letter to Arturo Barea.' Box 6. London: AIBP.
- Lipgens, Walter, and Wilfried Loth. 1988. *Documents on the History of European Integration: The Struggle for European Union by Political Parties and Pressure Groups in Western European Countries, 1945-1950*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Lockwood. 1939. 'Letter to Ilsa Barea,' April 25. Box 6. London: AIBP.

- López Aranguren, José Luis. 1953. 'La evolución espiritual de los intelectuales españoles en la emigración.' *Cuadernos Hispanoamericanos* 38: 123–57.
- López, Francisca. 2009. 'La guerra civil en la TVE de los ochenta.' In *Historias de la pequeña pantalla: representaciones históricas en la televisión de la España democrática*, edited by Francisca López, Elena Cueto Asín, and David R. George (Jr.), 91–120. Madrid and Frankfurt: Iberoamericana Editorial.
- Lough, Francis. 2009. 'Introducción: Poética y estética en la novela de avanzada'. In *Siete Domingos Rojos*, by Ramón José Sender, edited by José Miguel Oltra Tomás, I–LVII. Zaragoza: Universidad de Zaragoza.
- . 2012. 'Aesthetics and the "Other" in Recent Novels of the Spanish Civil War'. *Bulletin of Spanish Studies* 89 (2): 233–52.
- Loureiro, Ángel G. 2000. *The Ethics of Autobiography: Replacing the Subject in Modern Spain*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- . 2003. 'Spanish Nationalism and the Ghost of Empire.' *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies* 4 (1): 65–76.
- Lunsford, Kern Lovingood. 1990. 'La forja de un rebelde' de Arturo Barea: relato autobiográfico de las causas ideológicas de la guerra civil española.' PhD diss., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- MacLean, Derryl N. and Sikeena Karmali Ahmed. 2012. *Cosmopolitanisms in Muslim Contexts: Perspectives from the Past*. Aga Khan University-ISMIC; Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Madariaga, Salvador de. 1931. *Englishmen, Frenchmen, Spaniards: An Essay in Comparative Psychology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mandler, Peter. 2006. *The English National Character: The History of an Idea from Edmund Burke to Tony Blair*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Mansell, Gérard. 1982. *Let Truth Be Told: 50 Years of BBC External Broadcasting*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Marklew, Ernest. 1938. 'Letter to Ilsa Barea,' July 19. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- Marra López, José R. 1963. *Narrativa española fuera de España: (1939-1961)*. Madrid: Ediciones Guadarrama.
- Martin, Kingsley. 1939. 'Letter to Ilsa Barea,' August 18. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1941. 'Letter to Arturo Barea,' August 15. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- Mattingly, Garrett. 1946. 'Autobiography of a Spanish Exile.' *The Saturday Review*, December, 11.
- McLoughlin, Catherine Mary. 2007. *Martha Gellhorn: The War Writer in the Field and in the Text*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Mengham, Rod. 2009. 'British Fiction of the War.' In *The Cambridge Companion to the Literature of World War II*, edited by Marina MacKay, 26–42. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mercer, Kobena. 2010. 'Cosmopolitan Contact Zones.' In *Afro Modern: Journeys Through the Black Atlantic*, edited by Tanya Barson and Peter Gorschliiter, 40–48. Liverpool: Tate Liverpool.
- Mignolo, Walter. 2002. 'The Many Faces of Cosmo-Polis: Border Thinking and Critical Cosmopolitanism'. In *Cosmopolitanism*, edited by Sheldon Pollock, Dipesh Chakrabarty, Homi K. Bhabha, and Carol A. Breckenridge, 157–88. Duke University Press.
- Mignolo, Walter. 2012. 'De-Colonial Cosmopolitanism and Dialogues among Civilizations'. In *Routledge Handbook of Cosmopolitanism Studies*, edited by Gerard Delanty, 85–100. New York and Abingdon: Routledge.

- Miles, Jonathan. 2011. *The Nine Lives of Otto Katz*. London: Random House.
- Milla, Benito. 1956. 'Hojas de carnet.' *CNT*, June 24, 582.
- Miller, John C. 1978. 'Los testimonios literarios de la guerra español-marroquí.' PhD diss., Gettysburg College, Michigan.
- Monferrer Catalán, Luis. 1998. 'La colaboración de Arturo Barea, 'Juan de Castilla,' en la BBC.' In *El exilio literario español de 1939*, edited by GEXEL I: 159–68. Barcelona: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- . 2007. *Odisea En Albión: Los republicanos españoles exiliados en Gran Bretaña 1936-1977*. Madrid: Ediciones de la Torre.
- Monschaber, Eric. 1939. 'Letter to Arturo Barea,' June. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- Monteath, Peter. 1990. 'The Spanish Civil War and the Aesthetics of Reportage.' In *Literature and War*, edited by David Bevan, 69–86. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Moradiellos, Enrique. 1989. 'Las implicaciones internacionales de la guerra de España.' In *Homenaje a Carlos Cid*, 293–320. Oviedo: Universidad de Oviedo.
- . 1999. 'El espejo distante: España en el hispanismo británico contemporáneo.' *Revista de Extremadura* 24: 7–38.
- . 2002. 'The British Image of Spain and the Civil War.' *International Journal of Iberian Studies* 15 (1): 4–13.
- . 2011. 'Más allá de la leyenda negra y del mito romántico: el concepto de España en el hispanismo británico contemporáneo.' Accessed February 26 2015. <http://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=185005>.
- Moretti. 2004. 'Conjectures on World Literature.' In *Debating World Literature*, edited by Christopher Prendergast and Benedict Anderson. London: Verso.
- Naharro Calderón, J.M. 2005. 'Los trenes de la memoria.' *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies* 6 (1): 101–22
- Neubauer, John. 2014. 'A Europe of States and Statelessness.' In *European Encounters: Intellectual Exchange and the Rethinking of Europe 1914-1945*, edited by Carlos Reijnen and Marleen Rensen, 33–48. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Newsinger, J. 1999. *Orwell's Politics*. New York: Springer.
- Nieto McAvoy, Eva. 2010. 'Spain at War: Publishing the Spanish Civil War in Britain, 1936-1939.' MA diss., School of Advanced Study, University of London.
- . 2011. "'A Spaniard Discovers England": Arturo Barea and the BBC Latin American Service.' *Wasafiri*, 68 (December): 8–10.
- . 2014. 'Retorno al exilio, retorno al mundo: *La Raíz Rota* de Arturo Barea.' In *El exilio republicano de 1939. Viajes y retornos*, edited by Manuel Aznar Soler, José-Ramón López García, Francisca Montiel Rayo and Juan Rodríguez, 375–83. Sevilla: Renacimiento.
- . 2015. 'Arturo Barea, ¿un Bevanista en la BBC? exilio y tercerismo en la Guerra Fría.' In *Relaciones en conflicto. Nuevas perspectivas sobre relaciones internacionales desde la historia*, coordinated by Enrique Bengochea Tirado, Elena Monzón Pertejo and David G. Pérez Sarmiento, 120–24. Valencia: Universitat de València.
- Noakes, Lucy, and Juliette Pattinson. 2013. *British Cultural Memory and the Second World War*. London: A&C Black.
- Nora, Eugenio de. 1962. *La novela española contemporánea*. Madrid: Editorial Gredos.
- Núñez Seixas, Xosé-M. 2005. 'Nations in Arms against the Invader: On Nationalist Discourses during the Spanish Civil War.' In *The Splintering of Spain*:

- Cultural History and the Spanish Civil War, 1936–1939*, edited by Chris Ealham and Michael Richards, 45–67. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2006. *Fuera el invasor!: nacionalismos y movilización bélica durante la guerra civil española (1936-1939)*. Madrid: Marcial Pons Historia.
- Ortega, José. 1971. 'Arturo Barea, novelista español en busca de su identidad.' *Symposium* 25 (4): 377–91.
- Ortega, Julio. 2005. 'Respuestas a la revista *Guaraguao*.' *Guaraguao, Revista de Cultura Latinoamericana* 9 21. Accessed November 25 2012. [http://blogs.brown.edu/ciudad\\_literaria/2006/02/14/respuestas-a-la-revista-guaraguao/](http://blogs.brown.edu/ciudad_literaria/2006/02/14/respuestas-a-la-revista-guaraguao/).
- Orwell, George. 1941a. *The Lion and the Unicorn: Socialism and the English Genius*. London: Secker and Warburg.
- . 1941b. 'Review of Arturo Barea's *The Forge*.' *Time and Tide*, July.
- . 1941c. 'Review of Arturo Barea's *The Forge*.' *Horizon*, September, 214–17.
- . 1946. 'Voice of Madrid, Review of the *The Clash*.' *The Observer*, March 24.
- . 1970. *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell: My Country Right or Left, 1940-1943*. Edited by Sonia Orwell. London: Penguin Books.
- . 2001. *Orwell in Spain*. London: Penguin UK.
- País, El. 2014. 'Las cartas del exilio republicano en México.' *El País*. Accessed 11 June 2015. <http://elpais.com/tag/c/9bd6c58eee4150abdfba52bca4df98b8>.
- Passos, John Dos. 1939. 'Letter to Arturo Barea,' May 22. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- Pérez, Joseph. 2009. *La leyenda negra*. Madrid: Gadir.
- Pérez Minik, Domingo. 1957. *Novelistas españoles de los siglos XIX Y XX*. Madrid: Guadarrama.
- Pisón, Ignacio Martínez de. 2009. *Partes de guerra: antología*. Barcelona: RBA Libros.
- Pollock, Sheldon. 2006. *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men: Sanskrit, Culture, and Power in Premodern India*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Pollock, Sheldon, Homi K. Bhabha, Carol A. Breckenridge, and Dipesh Chakrabarty. 2002. 'Cosmopolitanisms.' In *Cosmopolitanism*, edited by Carol A. Breckenridge, Sheldon Pollock, Homi K. Bhabha and Dipesh Chakrabarty, 1-14. Durham, NC and London: A Millennial Quartet Book.
- Ponce de León, Jose Luis S. 1956. 'Veinte Apuntaciones de veinte años de literatura.' *Arriba* (July).
- Portes, Alejandro. 1998. 'Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology.' *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 1–12.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. 1991. 'Arts of the Contact Zone.' *Profession*, 33–40.
- Preston, Paul. 1984. *Revolution and War in Spain, 1931-1939*. Abingdon: Taylor & Francis.
- . 1996. *Franco: A Biography*. New York: Basic Books.
- . 1998. *Las tres Españas del 36*. Barcelona: Plaza & Janés.
- . 2009. *We Saw Spain Die: Foreign Correspondents in the Spanish Civil War*. London: Constable.
- Pritt, Denis. 1939a. 'Letter to Ilsa Barea,' June 3. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1939b. 'Letter to Osbert Peake,' July 27. Box 6. London: AIBP.

- Quaggio, Giulia, ed. 2014a. *Volver a España. El regreso del exilio. Historia del presente* 23.
- . 2014b. *La cultura en transición*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- . 2015. 'Exilio y transnacionalidad: Otras ideas de lo "hispanico" en el destierro republicano de Francisco Ayala.' In *Politica y sociedad en el exilio republicano*, edited by Mari Carmen Serra Puche, Carlos Sola Ayape, and José Francisco Mejia Flores, 161–74. México: Cátedra del Exilio-UNAM.
- Quayson, Ato, and Girish Daswani. 2013. *A Companion to Diaspora and Transnationalism*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Rae, Patricia. 2007. *Modernism and Mourning*. Lewisburg, US: Bucknell University Press.
- . 2009. 'Orwell, World War I Modernism and the Spanish Civil War.' *Journal of War & Culture Studies* 2 (3): 245–58.
- Ranasinha, Ruvani. 2010. 'South Asian Broadcasters in Britain and the BBC: Talking to India (1941–1943).' *South Asian Diaspora* 2 (1): 57–71.
- Rawlinson, Mark. 2009. 'The Second World War.' In *The Cambridge Companion to War Writing*, edited by Catherine Mary McLoughlin, 197–211. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- R.B. 1952. 'Latin-America Hears of Topics Discussed in Faringdon Pubs.' *Evening Advertiser*, February 19.
- Reijnen, Carlos, and Marleen Rensen. 2014. *European Encounters: Intellectual Exchange and the Rethinking of Europe 1914-1945*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Renier, Gustaaf Johannes. 1931. *The English: Are They Human?* London: Williams & Norgate.
- Renier, Olive, and Vladimir Rubinstein. 1986. *Assigned to Listen: The Evesham Experience, 1939-43*. London: British Broadcasting Corporation.
- Ribeiro de Menezes, Alison. 2013. 'War, History, and Memory in Arturo Barea's *La forja de un rebelde*.' In *Memory and Trauma in the Postwar Spanish Novel: Revisiting the Past*, edited by Sarah Leggott and Ross Woods, 43–54. Lewisburg, US: Bucknell University Press.
- Richards, Michael. 2013. *After the Civil War: Making Memory and Re-Making Spain Since 1936*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rickett, Rosy. 2014. 'Refugees of the Spanish Civil War and Those Left behind: Personal Testimonies of Departure, Separations and Return since 1936.' PhD diss., University of Manchester.
- Robertson, Emma. 2008. 'I Get a Real Kick out of Big Ben': BBC Versions of Britishness on the Empire and General Overseas Service, 1932–1948.' *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television* 28 (4): 459–73.
- Robbins, Bruce. 1998. 'Actually Existing Cosmopolitanism'. In *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, edited by Pheng Cheah and Bruce Robbins, 1–19. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Robles, Rocío. 2014. 'Valor y miedo.' In *Fotos y libros: España 1905-1977*, edited by Horacio Fernández, 112–15. Madrid: Museo Nacional Centro de Arte Reina Sofía, Acción Cultural Española (AC/E) y RM.
- Rodden, John. 1990. 'On the Political Sociology of Intellectuals: George Orwell and the London Left Intelligentsia of the 1930s.' *The Canadian Journal of Sociology / Cahiers Canadiens de Sociologie* 15 (3): 251–73.
- . 2002. *George Orwell: The Politics of Literary Reputation*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

- Rodríguez-López, Carolina, and José M. Faraldo. 2012. *Reconsidering a Lost Intellectual Project: Exiles' Reflections on Cultural Differences*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Rodríguez Monegal, Emir. 1957. 'Arturo Barea, Una Voz.' BBC.
- Rodríguez Richart, José. 1992. 'Algunos aspectos de *La forja de un rebelde*.' In *Actas del X Congreso de la Asociación de Hispanistas, I-IV*, edited by Antonio Vilanova, 229-39. Barcelona: Promociones y Pubs. Universitarias.
- . 1993. 'Valor y miedo y *La forja de un rebelde*, de Arturo Barea.' *Anthropos* 148: 72-6.
- Rose, Sonya O. 2004. *Which People's War?: National Identity and Citizenship in Wartime Britain 1939-1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ruiz, Julius. 2014. *The 'Red Terror' and the Spanish Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ruiz Ayucar, Ángel. 1957. 'Arturo Barea, o la forja de un hombre.' *Arriba*, August.
- Sahuquillo, Ángel. 2007. *Federico Garcia Lorca and the Culture of Male Homosexuality*. Jefferson, NJ: McFarland.
- Said, Edward W. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon.
- . 2000. *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sánchez Zapatero, Javier. 2009a. *El compromiso de la memoria: un análisis comparatista Max Aub en el contexto europeo de la literatura del exilio*. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.
- . 2009b. 'La predisposición al testimonio en la literatura del exilio.' *Tonos digital: Revista electrónica de estudios filológicos*, 18. Accessed January 21 2012. <http://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=3212390>.
- . 2010. 'Autobiografía y pacto autobiográfico: revisión crítica de las últimas aportaciones teóricas en la bibliografía científica hispánica.' *Ogigia: Revista electrónica de estudios hispánicos* 7: 5-17.
- . 2015. 'Una historia de violencia: visiones de la Guerra Civil en *A sangre y a fuego* (1938), de Manuel Chaves Nogales.' In *Narrativas de la violencia en el ámbito hispánico. Guerra, sociedad y familia*, edited by Mariola Pietrak and Miguel Carrera Garrido, 67-88. Lublin: Universidad María Curie-Skłodowska; Sevilla: Editorial Padilla Libros.
- Sánchez Zapatero, Javier, and Jesús Gúzman Mora. 2015. 'Guerra, compromiso y amor: de 'La llama' (Arturo Barea, 1951) a 'La Noche de Los tiempos' (Antonio Muñoz Molina, 2009).' *Estudios Humanísticos. Filología*, 37: 139-60.
- Santamaria, Phyllis. 1954. 'Arturo Barea and his Interpretation of Spanish Literature.' MA diss. Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
- Santos, Juan Felipe García. 1980. *Léxico y política de la Segunda República*. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.
- Saunders, Frances Stonor. 2000. *Who Paid the Piper?: The CIA and the Cultural Cold War*. London: Granta Books.
- Schneer, Jonathan. 1984. 'Hopes Deferred or Shattered: The British Labour Left and the Third Force Movement, 1945-49.' *The Journal of Modern History* 56 (2): 198-226.
- Scott-Smith, Giles. 2002. *The Politics of Apolitical Culture: The Congress for Cultural Freedom, the CIA, and Post-War American Hegemony*. New York and Abingdon: Routledge.
- Secker and Warburg. 1941. 'Advert for Struggle for the Spanish Soul.' *Horizon*.

- Sedikides, Constantine, Tim Wildschut, Jamie Arndt, and Clay Routledge. 2008. 'Nostalgia Past, Present, and Future.' *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 17 (5): 304–7.
- Seigel, Micol. 2005. 'Beyond Compare: Comparative Method after the Transnational Turn.' *Radical History Review* 2005 (91): 62–90.
- Sender, Ramón J. 1947. 'The Spanish Autobiography of Arturo Barea.' *New Leader*, January 11.
- . 1951. 'Review of *The Broken Root*.' *New York Times Book Review*, March, 4.
- . 2006. *Imán*. Edited by Nil Santiáñez-Tió. Barcelona: Grupo Planeta (GBS).
- . 2016. *Viaje a la aldea del crimen*. Barcelona: Libros del Asteroide.
- Serrano Asenjo, Enrique. 2015. 'Espacios entre espacios en *La Forja*: Una cartografía íntima de Arturo Barea.' *Hispanic Review* 83 (3): 337–55.
- Shain, Yossi. 2005. *The Frontier of Loyalty: Political Exiles in the Age of the Nation-State*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Shaw, Tony. 2006. 'The BBC, the State and Cold War Culture: The Case of Television's *The War Game* (1965).' *The English Historical Review* 121 (494): 1351–84.
- Shelden, Michael. 1989. *Friends of Promise: Cyril Connolly and the World of Horizon*. London: Hamish Hamilton.
- Shelmerdine, Brian. 2006. *British Representations of the Spanish Civil War*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Shubert, Adrian, and José Álvarez Junco. 2000. *Spanish History since 1808*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Sinfield, Alan. 1989. *Literature, Politics, and Culture in Postwar Britain*. Oakland, California: University of California Press.
- . 2004. *Literature, Politics and Culture in Postwar Britain*. London: Continuum.
- Smith, Adrian. 1996. *The New Statesman: Portrait of a Political Weekly, 1913-1931*. Abingdon: Taylor & Francis.
- Smith, Daniel. 2013. *The Spade as Mighty as the Sword: The Story of World War Two's ? Dig for Victory? Campaign*. London: Aurum Press.
- . 2014. *Britain and 1940: History, Myth and Popular Memory*. New York and Abingdon: Routledge.
- Smith, Malcolm. 2014. *Britain and 1940: History, Myth and Popular Memory*. New York and Abingdon: Routledge.
- Smith, Paul Julian. 1999. 'Towards a Cultural Studies of the Spanish State.' *Paragraph* 22 (1): 6.
- Smulyan, Susan. 2007. 'Live from Waikiki: Colonialism, Race, and Radio in Hawaii, 1934–1963.' *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television* 27 (1): 63–75.
- Smyth, Deinis. 1999. 'Franco and the Allies in the Second World War.' In *Spain and the Great Powers in the Twentieth Century*, edited by Sebastian Balfour and Paul Preston, 185–209. Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Sobejano, Gonzalo. 1975. *Novela española de nuestro tiempo: (en busca del pueblo perdido)*. Madrid: Prensa Española.
- Soldevila Durante, Ignacio. 2001 [1980]. *Historia de la novela española, 1936-2000*. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Spain at War*. 1938. 'The Bible in Spain,' August.
- Spender, Stephen. 1941. 'The Real Spain.' *Cherwell*, June.

- Stapleton, Julia. 2001. *Political Intellectuals and Public Identities in Britain since 1850*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Stradling, R. A. 2008. *Your Children Will Be Next: Bombing and Propaganda in the Spanish Civil War, 1936-1939*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Subrahmanyam, Sanjay. 1997. 'Connected Histories: Notes towards a Reconfiguration of Early Modern Eurasia.' *Modern Asian Studies* 31 (3): 735–62.
- Sutherland, F.J. 1939. 'Interlude in Navalcarnero.' *The Spectator*, July 21.
- Tarrago, Bartolomé. 1937, July 3. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- Taylor, Philip M. 1999. *British Propaganda in the 20th Century: Selling Democracy*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Tetuán. 1954. 'Letter to Juan de Castilla,' December 22. *The Spectator*. 1937, September 27.
- The Times*. 1941. 'General Franco Warned by Britain,' July 25.
- . 1948. 'Britain and the Powers,' January 5.
- Ther, Philipp. 2012. 'Comparisons, Cultural Transfers, and the Study of Networks: Towards a Transnational History of Europe.' In *Comparative and Transnational History: Central European Approaches and New Perspectives*, edited by Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka, 204–25. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Thomas, Gareth. 1990. *The Novel of the Spanish Civil War (1936-1975)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomsen, Mads Rosendahl. 2008. *Mapping World Literature: International Canonization and Transnational Literatures*. London: A&C Black.
- Time and Tide. 1939. 'Letter to Ilsa Barea,' September 4. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1941a. 'Letter to Arturo Barea,' January 11. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1941b. 'Letter to Arturo Barea,' July 25. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- Torre, Guillermo de. 1951. 'Arturo Barea, La forja de un rebelde.' *Sur* 205: 60–65.
- . 1967. 'Arturo Barea y su autobiografía novelesca.' *Al pie de las letras*, 186–97.
- Torrente Ballester, Gonzalo. 1956. *La novela española en el siglo XX*. Madrid: Pegaso.
- Torres Nebrera, Gregorio. 2002. *Las anudadas raíces de Arturo Barea*. Badajoz: Diputación Provincial de Badajoz.
- Townson, Nigel. 2000a. 'Introduction.' In *La forja de un rebelde*, by Arturo Barea. Madrid: Debate.
- . 2000b. 'Introduction.' In *Palabras recobradas: Textos inéditos*, by Arturo Barea, XXIII-XXXII. Madrid: Debate.
- . 2001. 'Introduction.' In *Cuentos completos*, by Arturo Barea. Madrid: Debate.
- . 2010. 'Preface.' In *The Truth about Spain!: Mobilizing British Public Opinion, 1936-1939*, edited by Hugo García, vi–vii. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press.
- . 2015. *Is Spain Different?: A Comparative Look at the 19th and 20th Centuries*. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press.
- Trapiello, Andrés. 2010. *Las armas y las letras: literatura y guerra civil (1936-1939)*. Barcelona: Destino.
- Tribune*. 2016. Accessed January 12 2016. <http://www.tribunemagazine.co.uk/>.

- Ucelay da Cal, Enrique. 1990. 'Ideas preconcebidas y estereotipos en las interpretaciones de la guerra civil española: el dorso de la solidaridad.' *Historia Social*, 6: 23–43.
- Ugarte, Michael. 1989. *Shifting Ground: Spanish Civil War Exile Literature*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.
- . 1999. *Literatura Española En El Exilio: Un Estudio Comparativo*. Madrid: Siglo XXI de España Editores.
- Umbral, Francisco. 1969. 'El retorno de los brujos.' *Ya*, October 30.
- Utley, Freda. 1939. 'Letter to Ilsa Barea,' October 31. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- Vaill, Amanda. 2014. *Hotel Florida: Truth, Love and Death in the Spanish Civil War*. London: A&C Black.
- Valis, Noël. 2000. 'Nostalgia and Exile.' *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies* 1 (2): 117–33.
- . 2010. *Sacred Realism: Religion and the Imagination in Modern Spanish Narrative*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- 'Valor y miedo.' 1938. Box 3. London: AIBP.
- van den Anker, Christien. 2010. 'Transnationalism and Cosmopolitanism: towards Global Citizenship?' *Journal of International Political Theory* 6 (1): 73–94. Accessed January 09 2017 <http://dx.doi.org/10.3366/E1755088210000443>
- Vayo, Julio Alvarez del. 1937. 'Letter to Camarada Antón,' March 2.
- Vertovec, Steven. 2009. *Transnationalism*. New York and Abingdon: Routledge.
- Vertovec, Steven, and Robin Cohen. 2002. *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Voice of Spain*. 1939. 'I Went to Mass in Spain,' March.
- . 1940. 'Report of Parliamentary Debates,' July 20.
- Volland, Nicolai. 2017. *Socialist Cosmopolitanism: The Chinese Literary Universe, 1945-1965*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Waller, Philip J. 2006. *Writers, Readers, and Reputations: Literary Life in Britain, 1870-1918*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Walton, John K. 1994. 'British Perceptions of Spain and Their Impact on Attitudes to the Spanish Civil War.' *Twentieth Century British History* 5 (3): 283–99.
- Warburg, Fredric. 1940a. 'Letter to Arturo Barea,' November 22. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1940b. 'Letter to Arturo Barea,' November 29. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1941. 'Letter to Arturo Barea,' January 14. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1942. 'Letter to Arturo Barea,' January 9. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- Werbner, Pnina. 2006. 'Vernacular Cosmopolitanism.' *Theory Culture & Society* 23(2-3): 496–498.
- . 2015. *Anthropology and the New Cosmopolitanism: Rooted, Feminist and Vernacular Perspectives*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Weinstein, Allen. 1997. *Perjury: The Hiss-Chambers Case*. London: Random House.
- Weintraub, Stanley. 1968. *The Last Great Cause: The Intellectuals and the Spanish Civil War*. New York: Weybright and Talley.
- Werner, Michael, and Bénédicte Zimmermann. 2006. 'Beyond Comparison: Histoire Croisée and the Challenge of Reflexivity.' *History and Theory* 45 (1): 30–50.
- Wessel, W.P. 1943. 'Letter to Arturo Barea,' March 31. Juan de Castilla Papers. Reading: BBC WAC.
- White, Antonia. 1941. 'Review of Arturo Barea's *The Forge*.' *Horizon*, September, 217–19.

- White, Hayden. 1984. 'The Question of Narrative in Contemporary Historical Theory.' *History and Theory* 23 (1): 1.
- White, José Blanco. 1822. *Letters from Spain*. London: Henry Colburn and Company.
- Wilford, Hugh. 1998. 'The Information Research Department: Britain's Secret Cold War Weapon Revealed.' *Review of International Studies* 24 (3): 353–69.
- . 2003. *The CIA, the British Left, and the Cold War: Calling the Tune?* New York and Abingdon: Routledge.
- Wilkinson, Ellen. 1939a. 'Letter to Ilsa Barea,' March 17. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- . 1939b. 'Letter to Ilsa Barea,' May 8. Box 6. London: AIBP.
- Williams, Raymond. 1985. *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ynduráin, Francisco. 1953. 'Resentimiento español. Arturo Barea.' *Arbor* XXIV (85): 73–79.
- Young, H.L. 1946. 'Internal File.' 'Juan de Castilla' Files, Talks file III: 1945-1947. Juan de Castilla Papers. Reading: BBC WAC.