
http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/69598/

Deposited on: 1 October 2012
Francoism and the Republican Exiles: the Case of the Composer Julián Bautista (1901–61)

EVA MOREDA-RODRIGUEZ

twentieth-century music / Volume 8 / Issue 02 / September 2011, pp 153 - 173
DOI: 10.1017/S1478572212000060, Published online: 31 July 2012

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S1478572212000060

How to cite this article:

Request Permissions: Click here
Francoism and the Republican Exiles: the Case of the Composer Julián Bautista (1901–61)

EVA MOREDA-RODRÍGUEZ

Abstract
Exile studies in musicology have generally focused on Central European exiles fleeing from Nazism; at the same time studies of the Republican exile following the Spanish Civil War have tended to deal primarily with writers rather than musicians. This article intends to address both these areas of neglect by focusing on the composer Julián Bautista, who settled in Buenos Aires in 1940. In the late 1950s, after more than a decade of oblivion in his home country, Bautista, like other anti-Francoist exiles, started to become the object of interest again in Spain, an interest which continued after the composer’s death in 1961. By exploring Bautista’s presence in the Francoist musical press and in high-profile, state-sponsored events such as the Festivales de Música de América y España, I shall explore the reasons for his rehabilitation – reasons that, far from amounting to straightforward liberalization, seem to have been closely aligned with the strategies of the régime, and the cultural values and historical narratives that underpinned them.

Julián Bautista (1901–61) was one of the many Spanish composers and performers who fled their home country after Franco’s victory in the Spanish Civil War (1936–9); other well-known names include the cellist Pau (Pablo) Casals, the composers Roberto Gerhard and Rodolfo Halffter, and the critic Adolfo Salazar. Like many other prominent Republican exiles, such as the poet Rafael Alberti, the painter and writer Luís Seoane, the playwright Alejandro Casona, and the composer Jaume Pahissa, Bautista settled in Buenos Aires. Although he never returned to Spain, the Franco régime made various attempts from 1957 onwards to secure his cooperation and reabsorb his work into the musical life and history of his home country. These attempts, which continued after the composer’s death, and the possible reasons behind them are the central focus of this article. While not reflecting the experience of all exiled Spanish musicians, Bautista’s case was not an isolated one. Indeed, during the 1950s the régime softened its attitude considerably towards the Republican exiles, giving a number of them honorary positions or inviting them to contribute towards its cultural programme. These episodes have been little explored in scholarship to date, even though they provide a valuable additional dimension to our understanding of the exiles’ relationship with their home country. Taking Bautista as an example, this article seeks to
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make an initial contribution towards the study of this wider phenomenon – the Franco régime's rehabilitation of exiled composers and their music.

Given that Bautista is little known in the anglophone world, the first section of the article will present a brief overview of his life and career, followed by a discussion of the musical and cultural policy of Franco’s régime during its first two decades (1939–59), and in particular its attitudes towards political exiles. I then turn my attention to Spanish exile studies, discussing why they have paid little attention either to musicians (as opposed to writers) or to the subsequent rehabilitation of exiles in general. I also explain how musicology has treated the exile of Spanish musicians, and how this article seeks to move the debate forward. This historical and theoretical context frames my discussion of the régime’s attempts to gain Bautista’s cooperation; in this discussion I make use of several hitherto unexamined documents (including letters, manuscripts, and press cuttings) from the Julián Bautista Archive at the Spanish National Library and the McCann Collection at the Royal Academy of Music.¹

**Julián Bautista: an overview**

Born in Madrid in 1901, Bautista studied the piano and composition at the Madrid Conservatory, where he met Fernando Remacha and Salvador Bacarisse.² The three of them, together with, among others, Gustavo Pittaluga and the brothers Ernesto and Rodolfo Halffter, belonged in the 1920s to a group of young composers who sought to broaden the horizons of contemporary Spanish music. Gathered under the aegis of the critic Adolfo Salazar, who dubbed them the ‘Grupo de los Ocho’ (Group of Eight), they were influenced by impressionism, neoclassicism, and, especially, Falla’s renewal of Spanish music. Falla’s *El sombrero de tres picos* (The Three-Cornered Hat, 1920) was a decisive influence on the 1921 ballet score *Juerga* by Bautista, who at the time was also trying his hand at Debussyan impressionism (*Colores*, 1922; *Tres preludios japoneses*, 1927) and Stravinskian neoclassicism (*Sonatina-Trío*, 1924). Between 1928 and 1932 Bautista focused on film music, before returning to neoclassicism in 1932 with *Obertura grotesca* and *Suite all’antica*.³

Bautista, like several other composers of his circle, was committed to the progressive ideals of the Second Republic. In the summer of 1936, at the start of the Spanish Civil War, the Republican government requested his cooperation, using the composer Carlos

---

¹ The McCann Collection, amassed by the music agent Norman McCann (1920–99), contains correspondence of Argentine composers, including Juan José Castro and Alberto Ginastera.


³ Other works from Bautista’s early years include his two string quartets (1923 and 1926, both awarded the National Prize for Composition) and *Primera sonata concertata a quatro* (1933–4). These works were lost during the Spanish Civil War, in which Bautista’s house in Madrid was bombarded.
Palacio as intermediary. In 1937 Bautista became a member of the Consejo Central de la Música (Central Music Council), which regulated musical activities (including music education) in the Republican part of the country. Because of this appointment Bautista had to move to Valencia in southeastern Spain, where the Republican government had been reconstituted. When in late 1938 Bautista was awarded the first prize of the International Chamber Music Competition held in Belgium, he invested the eight thousand francs of prize money in getting to France, where he was initially held at the St Cyprien concentration camp. On his release he travelled to Brussels, from there to Paris, and finally (in 1940) to Buenos Aires, which was already home to a sizeable community of Spanish exiles.

In Argentina Bautista succeeded in integrating himself quickly and seamlessly into the country’s musical life, a process in which his friendship with the Argentine composer and conductor Juan José Castro was crucial. He benefited from Falla’s help as well: in 1943 Falla asked Castro to replace his own Noches en los jardines de España (Nights in the Gardens of Spain) with some songs by Bautista at a concert of the Asociación Wagneriana de Buenos Aires, a generous gesture for which Bautista wrote Falla a grateful letter. At the same time Bautista was attracting increasing attention as a film music composer, receiving the prize for best film score from the Academia de Artes y Ciencias Cinematográficas (Arts and Cinema Academy) of Argentina in 1943 for Cuando florezca el naranjo (When the Orange Tree Flowers, directed by Alberto de Zavalia), and again the following year for Cuando la primavera se equivoca (When Spring Makes a Mistake, directed by Mario Soffici); he was named a member of the Academia in 1944. Meanwhile his prestige as an orchestral and chamber music composer was on the rise, with performances at major concert venues in the city. It was also at about this time that Bautista turned to Spanish myth and history as an inspiration for his work, as will be discussed below.

During these years Bautista was appointed to several short-term advisory roles with musical and cultural institutions in Argentina. The fact that he was included in the Argentine delegation sent to the Festival de Música Latinoamericana held in Caracas in 1957 testifies to his thorough integration into the musical life of his host country. Roberto García Morillo, one of the other delegates, wrote on the occasion of the festival that ‘although of Spanish origin [...] maestro Julián Bautista, who has lived here for approximately 20 years, is perfectly assimilated to the Argentine musical movement, of which he is nowadays one of the most qualified representatives.’ In support of his claim he argued that Bautista had

---

4 The composer Carlos Palacio (1911–97) was a member of the PCE (Spanish Communist Party) who during the Civil War collaborated with the Spanish government through the Milicias de la Cultura. He composed several hymns for the Republican forces (including the hymn of the International Brigades) and also persuaded fellow composers and musicians to contribute their own compositions to the cause.

5 Bautista, autograph letter to Manuel de Falla, 21 May 1943.

6 For example, in 1943 his Suite de danzas del ballet Juerga was given its first performance at the Teatro Colón of Buenos Aires conducted by Juan José Castro, and in 1952 his Obertura para una ópera grotesca was first performed by the Orquesta Sinfónica de la Ciudad de Buenos Aires under Manuel Rosenthal.

7 García Morillo, ‘Coloquio con Julián Bautista’, La Nación. In speaking of ‘the Argentine musical movement’, García Morillo seems not to be referring to any particular stylistic tendency but simply to art music composed in Argentina.
composed some of ‘his most significant works’ in Argentina: the list included *Catro poemas galegos* (Four Galician Poems) and *Romance del rey Rodrigo* (The Romance of King Rodrigo), both discussed later in this article.

At the end of 1959 Bautista was appointed to a professorship in composition at the newly founded Puerto Rico Conservatory, directed by his fellow exile Casals. Bautista commuted between Argentina and Puerto Rico for about a year and a half, until his death in Buenos Aires in July 1961. Since leaving in 1939 he had never again set foot in Spain.8

**The Franco régime, 1939–59: from oblivion to tolerance**

For most of the 1940s Bautista and his fellow Republican exiles had been ignored by the Franco régime and its press. Only during the first few months of the dictatorship, when memories of the Spanish Civil War were still raw, were certain exiles subject to direct attacks in the Spanish musical press for what critics saw as their anti-Spanish modernity. In October 1939, barely six months after the end of the conflict, Joaquín Turina, a senior composer who had recently been made director of the Comisaría de la Música (Commission for Music), expressed it thus: ‘The victory of our soldiers has swept away, at least in music, all the modernist mess, but, in doing so, it has created a void that must be filled as soon as possible’.9 Turina’s animosity towards the most innovative composers of the 1920s and 30s was, however, nothing new: during the Second Republic, as music critic of the Catholic newspaper *El Debate*, he had criticized Bautista for his lack of musical personality, and Rodolfo Halffter for his ‘strange’ dissonances and ‘burlesque’ approach to composition.10

Bautista, like most of his exiled colleagues, was neither criticized by name nor identified with the ‘leftist hordes’, as the critic Antonio de las Heras dubbed the exiles.11 Well after the end of the Civil War, Casals was the object of a diatribe on the front page of the newspaper *Informaciones* because of his ‘anti-Spanish attitude’, but this was the exception rather than the norm.12 It was no doubt the international significance and openly anti-Francoist stance of the cellist that made it necessary for the régime to discredit him openly; the other exiles, Bautista included, did not enjoy the same level of exposure and were therefore spared these attacks.

The initial attitude of the Francoist musical press towards the exiled musicians must be understood in the context of state control and the censorship of music and the press more generally. During the 1940s, rather than explicitly censoring particular composers or idioms, the régime’s musical policy was to promote certain musical styles, for example through composition prizes or the creation of the Comisaria de la Música.13 This led many

---

8 De Persia, *Julián Bautista*, 52–70.
11 Heras, ‘Música’. Antonio de las Heras worked as a music critic for *Informaciones* throughout the 1940s; he was named secretary of the Comisaría de la Música in 1943 and became its director in 1956.
12 [Unsigned], ‘Propósito de la actitud antiespañola de Pablo Casals’, 1.
13 See Pérez Zalduondo, ‘La música’ and ‘El nacionalismo’.
composers to abandon the more innovative styles typical of the 1920s and 30s in favour of *neocasticismo* (the tendency represented mainly by Joaquín Rodrigo)\(^\text{14}\) or, more generally, traditionalist nationalism.

In the musical press, subject at the time to the control of the Delegación Nacional de Prensa of the Falange and to a censorship apparatus, oblivion seems to have been more widely used as a strategy than open attack or interventionism; it is in such a context that the very rare mention of the exiles must be understood. The Falange, initially founded as a fascist party in 1933 by José Antonio Primo de Rivera, was in full force inside the Franco government from 1939 to 1942, promoting friendship with the Axis countries and controlling the press and educational and cultural policies. Although the influence of the Falange declined from 1942 onwards, the organization still had considerable power in certain areas of public life (such as women’s education, youth, and trade unionism), and was still identified, nominally at least, with the régime itself, with Franco being its Jefe Nacional (National Chief).

The Falange also contributed one of the main ideological foundations of Francoism: the ‘mythical notion that the nation’s history was an inauthentic deviation from origins’.\(^\text{15}\) Falangists celebrated the Middle Ages – especially the ‘Reconquista’ (Re-conquest), which had won the Iberian peninsula back from the Muslims and opened the way for the political unification of Spain – as well as the first century of the Spanish Empire (until approximately 1600). Thereafter, it was considered, Spain had started to decline, to deviate from its origins. Franco was portrayed as the leader who could restore Spain’s grandeur: his legitimacy was therefore based on myth, understood in the Barthesian sense of a socially constructed reality that is passed off as ‘natural’.\(^\text{16}\)

With regard to the exiles, Francoism evolved from silence at the beginning of the 1940s to a timid politics of tolerance – or even, in some respects, reconciliation – towards the end of the decade. Critics started to report on the activities of exiled composers and performers abroad, though such references were usually very brief and never mentioned the fact that these musicians had fled Spain for political reasons. Similarly, some of the Francoist institutions started to show a slightly friendlier attitude towards exiles: this was the case, for example, with Jaume Pahissa, a composer and biographer of Falla, who was named an honorary member of the Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando while in exile in Buenos Aires (1951). Pahissa, feeling threatened because of his allegiance to the intellectual, Catalanist, and Republican circles of Barcelona, had left Spain in 1937.\(^\text{17}\)

---

14 The term *neocasticismo* was first coined by Joaquín Rodrigo with reference to his *Concierto de Aranjuez*; the word creates a deliberate parallel with *neoclasicismo*, using instead the adjective *castizo*, which means ‘typically Spanish’. After Francoism, however, the word acquired a pejorative meaning, as in Marco, *Spanish Music in the Twentieth Century*. Marco defines *neocasticismo* as ‘a kind of nationalism that tends to develop the aspects of popular urban or historictic picturesque or local colour, or sometimes evokes an eighteenth-century atmosphere’ (242).


The same thing happened in other areas of the arts, humanities, and intellectual life, with exiles re-establishing relations with their home country, visiting or even settling in Spain again. The relative liberalization of the régime vis-à-vis the Republican exiles must be understood in the context of the initial years of the Cold War, when Franco’s government was attempting to gain the United States as an ally and establish its position in the Western bloc. Artistically, the 1950s brought changes to the musical scene as well. Most noticeable, perhaps, was the change in attitudes towards the avant garde. The foundation in 1952 of the association Juventudes Musicales, chaired by the pianist Fernando Ember, was a first step towards a more consistent presence for composers such as Ramón Barce, Luis de Pablo, Antón García Abril, and Cristóbal Halffter in Spanish musical circles. A number of them eventually formed the group Nueva Música in 1958, making the Aula de Música of the Ateneo in Madrid an emblematic venue for the performance of Spanish avant-garde music. Although the avant garde had been regarded with suspicion or indifference by most music critics during the 1940s, it rapidly gained prominence during the 1950s, to the point of being promoted by the music press and the régime as the main new development in Spanish music – demonstrating in the process that Spain, while maintaining its unique artistic personality, was also a modern country, able to play a full part in the Western bloc.

Another significant event during the 1950s, which shows the change in attitude of the music press, was the visit of Igor Stravinsky to Madrid in March 1955. Stravinsky, who had last come to Spain in 1924, conducted the Orquesta Nacional in a programme of his own works, including the Symphony in Three Movements, Orpheus, and two works performed for the first time in Spain: Scènes de ballet and Ode. Stravinsky’s visit to Madrid was heavily publicized, showing that the régime now welcomed and celebrated one of the central representatives of musical modernism. (Although he had been named a fellow of the Instituto de España back in 1939, his music had been controversial among Spanish critics during the 1940s.)

Julían Bautista and Spanish exile studies
During its short existence, the interdisciplinary academic field of exile studies (Exilforschung) has grown up predominantly around the experiences of German émigrés who left their country after Hitler’s accession to power. Indeed, and to give just one example, the North American Society for Exile Studies names its primary area of scholarly enquiry ‘the emigration resulting from the terror of Nazi Germany’. However, politically motivated mass emigration (and particularly the emigration of an intellectual and cultural élite, a phenomenon characteristic of the twentieth century) was not confined to German-speaking lands, and

18 Faber, Exile and Cultural Hegemony, 37–8.
19 The promotion of avant-garde music by the Franco régime from the 1950s onwards has been studied extensively in Sacau, ‘Performing a Political Shift’.
Spanish scholars have recognized this fact in a number of studies reflecting the experience of, in particular, Republican exiles. The six volumes of *El exilio español de 1939*, edited by José Luis Abellán and published between 1976 and 1978, can be considered a foundational work of Spanish exile studies; since then, the scholarly literature in this area has grown to include thousands of books and articles. Typically the focus has been either on pre-eminent political, intellectual, and artistic personalities or on linguistic or cultural communities, such as the Spaniards held in French concentration camps immediately after the end of the war, or the Basque, Catalan, or Galician exiled communities.

In the arts the focus of Spanish exile studies has been on literature – an understandable emphasis, given that a number of the most prominent twentieth-century poets and novelists were exiled (among them Rafael Alberti, Max Aub, Francisco Ayala, Jorge Guillén, Pedro Salinas, and Ramón J. Sender). For example, a pioneering collection of essays on the culture of Spanish Republicans in France (*Literatura y cultura del exilio español de 1939 en Francia*, 1998) includes just three articles that are not about literature, all of which deal with the visual arts as opposed to, say, music or cinema. There is no doubt that literature enjoys a hegemony in Spanish culture and intellectual life, while music has a more limited role. But another reason for the centrality of literature in Spanish exile studies is perhaps that the experience of displaced Republicans can be conceived not just in terms of exile but also as an example of ‘transstierro’: for José Angel Ascunce, both ‘transstierro’ and exile involve a geographical and political rupture, but, unlike exile, ‘transstierro’ entails linguistic and cultural continuity. This was the case with Spanish writers in Latin America, who were able to keep their language and an important part of their culture and thus to become integrated in the literary circles of their host country, which was not necessarily the case, for example, with exiled German writers in English-speaking countries.

One of the leading Spanish experts on the Republican exile, Francisco Caudet, has tried to explain why there is more research on exiled writers than on exiled scientists – who represented a sizeable proportion of the émigré community as well – on the basis that ‘writers need to be in contact with the social fabric about which they write’, and therefore displacement would have a greater impact on a writer than it would on a researcher or scholar. This somewhat puzzling conclusion, however, does not take into account the fact that environment shapes academic and research work too. Nor does Caudet discuss why musicians have been neglected. Do composers not need to be in contact with their ‘social fabric’, and does displacement therefore not have an impact on their work?

Leaving aside the particularities of the Spanish context, in the broader field of historical musicology exile studies has only recently begun to make a significant contribution. This is partly because of the influence of ethnomusicology, which ‘has increasingly reminded

---

21 This research has tended to be disseminated through hispanophone journals, thus making it less accessible to the international academic community and reducing considerably its potential to contribute to theoretical, methodological, and historical debates about the phenomenon of exile.
22 Alted and Aznar Soler (eds), *Literatura y cultura del exilio español*.
23 Ascunce, ‘El exilio como realidad plural’, 270.
musicologists of the importance of place, just as musicology continues to remind ethno-
musicology of the importance of history’. A further reason has been the continued interest
in the history and impact of Nazi cultural policies on a level that transcends the biographies
of individuals. Jim Samson has pointed out that the perception and study of exile in music
typically swings between two narratives. The narrative of transplantation assumes that
everybody belongs to a place (generally, the place in which they were born), and that we
subsequently define our identity by ‘constructing our proper place in our present place,
which is tantamount to constructing the past in the present’. This narrative would lead
the work of composers in exile to be read as a replication of their experiences in the places
of their birth. There seems to be a hint of this in Bautista: while in exile he turned to themes
of Spanish history and myth, as will be discussed below. The narrative of acculturation, on
the other hand, assumes that ‘we are creatures of the places we inhabit, shaped more by our
present than our imagined past’, thus opening up the possibility that exiled composers can
become part of the musical life and music history of their host country in their own right.
There is a hint of this too in Bautista, in that García Morillo and others considered him an
Argentine composer. Bautista’s case suggests, therefore, that the two narratives proposed by
Samson are not mutually exclusive.

Accounts of the Spanish Republican exile have tended to be shaped by the narrative of
transplantation. This tendency was fuelled to a great extent by the arrival of democracy in
1975: it was necessary to represent the Spanish exile in a way that provided an element
of reparation to those who had left, to rehabilitate them in Spain after the régime had
repeatedly portrayed them as the ‘anti-España’. The transplantation narrative was founded
on the assumption that the exiles belonged to Spain after all. But at the same time, as Mari
Paz Balibrea has pointed out, it was modelled on a dichotomy of the vanquished and the
victors (or victims and oppressors) that stemmed from the aftermath of the Civil War. The
trajectories of the Republican exiles, in all their diversity, are thus unified by ‘narratives of
flight, of historical ineffectiveness, of sterility, even when they are explained from a position
of sympathy with the victim’. Even if a few, privileged exiles are considered successful in
their life trajectories, that is mainly because they were able to return to Spain and to integrate
themselves in the democratic state after 1975. Of course, such stories of success were in some
cases appropriated by the Spanish government or by local or regional governments following
the creation of the ‘estado de las autonomías’ in the early 1980s, or by the host country’s
governments, as Sebastiaan Faber explains when describing what he calls ‘interferences’ of
‘official’ or ‘diplomatic’ discourse in Spanish exile studies. By this he means that many
studies of Spanish exiles were commissioned by government institutions in Spain or in the
host countries, which proceeded to exaggerate their own role in the harmonious integration
of exiles, thus tending to perpetuate rather than challenge existing narratives of exile.

25 Scheding and Levi (eds), Music and Displacement, 1.
26 Samson, ‘Little Stories from the Balkans’, 188.
27 Balibrea, ‘De los Cultural Studies’, 259.
28 For a few years after the Constitution of 1978 Spain was organized into seventeen autonomías (autonomous regions)
with different degrees of self-government.
29 Faber, Exile and Cultural Hegemony, 10.
However, in the case of Spain we do not need to wait until post-1975 democracy to observe the reintegration of émigrés into the cultural and intellectual life of the country. Specifically in music, during the late 1940s and 1950s we find examples of individuals (such as Adolfo Salazar, Jaume Pahissa, or Bautista himself) being approached by the régime. It might be argued that such attempts to reassimilate exiled composers were isolated and confined to the private sphere, rather than systematic and openly celebrated, but even then they had to be supported by particular narratives that have not yet been sufficiently explained by scholarly research. During its early years the Franco régime relied strongly on a rhetoric of purification, which called for a purging of those elements it considered detrimental to the historical and spiritual self-realization of the nation. Why did the same régime start to reintegrate some of these detrimental elements as it entered its second decade, and what changed in order to make this reintegration possible?

**Musicology and the Spanish exile**

Historians of Spanish music have engaged to a certain extent with the phenomenon of displacement and the questions it poses. This is the case, for example, with Falla scholars such as Carol A. Hess in her biography of the composer, and Jorge de Persia, who has also uncovered interesting information on the composer’s final years in Argentina, though his study is focused on archival research rather than on interpreting or redefining the concept of displacement in the history of Spanish music. But, as other recent studies dealing with Falla’s emigration have shown, to classify him as a political exile is somewhat problematic, owing to his alleged apoliticism and the fact that he always claimed financial and health reasons rather than political motivations for remaining in Argentina. Christiane Heine has been one of the few scholars of Spanish music to use exile as a central category of analysis (albeit very briefly) in her research on the composer Fernando Remacha. Remacha moved from Madrid to his home town of Tudela in Northern Spain after the end of the war. He abandoned composition for almost twenty years until his appointment as director of the Pamplona Conservatory in 1957, a fact that has led Heine to regard him as an internal exile who chose to turn his back on music and musical life for political reasons during Franco’s first two decades in power.

Many stories of the Spanish exile still have to be told, analysed, and compared, including those not only of the best-known musicians, such as Casals and Roberto Gerhard (a Catalan who settled in Cambridge), but also of figures such as Rodolfo Halffter, Jesús Bal y Gay, and Salvador Bacarisse (the former two exiled in Mexico and the latter in Paris), who demonstrated different degrees of political engagement. Figures in popular music were also

---

30 See Richards, *A Time of Silence*.  
33 See Heine, ‘Fernando Remacha’.  
34 Recent academic interest in Roberto Gerhard, with the conferences devoted entirely to him held in Huddersfield in April 2010 and Barcelona in April 2012, suggests that his exile might soon be the object of more extensive research.
affected, the best-known example probably being the *copla* singer Miguel de Molina, who was persecuted both for performing to the Republican troops during the war and for his homosexuality, and who went into exile in Buenos Aires in 1942. However, what remains insufficiently explored in the case of exiled musicians is the extent of their rehabilitation in the culture of their homeland at a time when many of them, such as Rodolfo Halffter and Adolfo Salazar in Mexico or Salvador Bacarisse in France, had already become active contributors to the musical and intellectual life of their host countries. This phenomenon poses a number of questions. First of all, can we speak of reintegration when most of the exiles, while they may have resumed cultural relations of some sort and even travelled back to their home country, did not physically settle in Spain again, at least not before Franco’s death? Is ‘acceptance’ the word that best defines the change of attitude towards the exiles in the late 1940s, or would it be more fitting to speak of ‘tolerance’? And to what extent was the régime interested in appropriating the exiles’ work for self-validation rather than for its own artistic merit?

**Histories of music: approaching Bautista from 1957 onwards**

After eighteen years of absence from Spain Julián Bautista was little more than an obscure name for all those Spanish composers, musicians, and music critics who had started their careers after the Civil War. Evidence of this is provided by Federico Sopena’s letter to him of 31 October 1957:

> My dear Sir: although I do not have the pleasure of knowing you personally, I hope my name is not completely unknown to you. I am finishing a ‘History of Contemporary Music’, and in the appendix I would like to include the whole list of works of each composer. I would be infinitely grateful if you could send me as soon as possible a list of your works detailing the date of composition.35

Sopena had started his career as a music critic in 1939, at only twenty-two years of age, under the auspices of the Falange; he had not had the chance to meet the composers active during the 1920s and 30s who had gone into exile after the start of the Civil War. Bautista duly replied to his request, sending Sopena some concert programmes, scores, and other information, and he was included in Sopena’s *Historia de la música española contemporánea* the following year, a book whose chronology began with the return of Falla and Turina to Madrid in 1914, after their formative years in Paris, and ended with the younger generation active in the 1950s. The book project was clearly modelled on *La música contemporánea en España* by the critic Adolfo Salazar, for whom Sopena felt profound admiration, even though Salazar was himself a Republican exile. In modelling his work after Salazar’s, it is understandable that Sopena wanted to end his account with the so-called Generación de la República (Generation of the Republic), most of whom were living in exile by 1957.

35 Sopena, autograph letter to Julián Bautista, 31 October 1957.
The way in which Bautista was presented by Sopena – as part of a musical generation rather than as a valuable composer in his own right – is in itself symptomatic of the terms under which Bautista and several of his fellow exiles were rehabilitated from the 1950s onwards. Traditionally, Spanish literary studies have tended to split writers and literary trends into generations – the Generación del 1898, the Generación del 1914, the Generación del 1927, and so forth. The years that identify each of the various generations do not refer to the approximate year of birth of their members, but rather to the year in which, being between roughly thirty and forty-five years of age, they reached literary or intellectual maturity. This follows José Ortega y Gasset’s concept of generation, defined as a cultured minority whose members share the same historical time and space, are of a similar age, have a degree of contact with one other, and are sensitive to the historical circumstances in which they live. The historiography of Spanish music has also tended to group composers into generations, starting from the so-called Generación de los Maestros (Generation of the Masters) – referring to composers born between 1870 and 1880, such as Falla and Turina – and finishing with the Generación del 1951, formed by composers such as Cristóbal Halffter and Luis de Pablo. Salazar had included Bautista in his Generación de la República, along with Ernesto and Rodolfo Halffter, Salvador Bacarisse, Fernando Remacha, Juan José Mantecón, Rosa García Asco, and Gustavo Pittaluga. Sopena, on the other hand, coined the name Generación del 1931 to refer not only to Bautista, Bacarisse, Pittaluga, Remacha, and Rodolfo Halffter, but also to composers who were not part of Salazar’s Republican generation, such as Enrique Casals Chapí and Federico Elizalde. While Sopena did not explain why he rejected the name Generación de la República, it is likely that he wished to avoid reference to the Second Republic, which had been constantly demonized by the régime in order to uphold Franco’s legitimacy, and chose instead to make a more opaque reference to 1931, the year in which the Second Republic was proclaimed.

In his Historia Sopena paid less attention to the particularities of Bautista’s compositional output than to what he perceived to be his generation’s contribution to the history of Spanish music. Indeed he kept his discussions of individual composers consistently to a minimum in order to focus instead on their collective role as a generation. The book upholds the idea that the history of Spanish music is one of forward-moving progress, involving both powerful leaders, such as Falla and Rodrigo, and minor figures who nonetheless serve specific and necessary functions in the advancement of musical composition. The Generación del 1931, according to Sopena, played its part by displaying ‘a shared attitude of joy and wit’ and by creating ‘a somewhat feverish environment, more or less mixed with politics, in which novelties replaced each other happily’ – hence their contribution as composers is subordinated to their function as cultural agitators. Writing at a time at which the régime had become somewhat more liberal but the issue of post-Civil-War retaliation was still taboo, Sopena missed the opportunity of discussing the impact of exile on this generation. Instead, he simply wrote that the group ‘lost its roots, and also the opportunity

---

36 Ortega y Gasset, En torno, 340.
37 Sopena, Historia, 196.
to transmit a message in the very years in which one should not be resting on one’s laurels’. Sopena was alluding to the fact that many of this generation were in their late thirties or early forties, and hence had not yet reached artistic maturity, when they went into exile; he therefore concluded that exile had truncated their development.38

After Sopena’s letter to Bautista, there is evidence that officials of the Franco government tried to get Bautista’s cooperation on at least two occasions before his death. The first was in July 1959, when Gonzalo Puente Ojea, the Spanish consul in the Argentine city of Mendoza, invited him to conduct a concert of Spanish music at the consulate, an offer which Bautista politely rejected, insisting that he was ‘not a conductor’ and, moreover, was not in good health.39 In the same year the Argentine composer Alberto Ginastera attended the annual festival of the International Society for Contemporary Music, held in Rome; there he met Antonio Iglesias, director of the Comisariedad de la Música, and the music critic Enrique Franco, who asked Ginastera to pass word to Bautista that the commission would like to include one of his works at a chamber music festival, ‘probably in Compostela’ (referring to the ‘Música en Compostela’ summer school and festival).40 Ginastera passed Bautista’s postal address on to Iglesias and Franco; however, neither the Archivo Julián Bautista nor the McCann Collection holds evidence of any communication between Bautista and the Comisariedad de la Música.

After Bautista’s death

When Bautista died on 8 July 1961, the obituaries published in Argentina followed García Morillo in treating him as a full member of Argentine musical life. Enzo Valenti Ferro wrote that ‘one of the most prominent figures of the Argentine musical movement has died’, and that ‘Spain lost [him] twenty years ago and the Argentine musical community has now lost him for ever’.41 Even a quarter century later in 1986, the twenty-fifth anniversary of his death went almost unnoticed in Spain, but it was marked with a concert at the Teatro Colón in Buenos Aires as part of a series of events designed to commemorate Spanish exiles in Argentina.42

Bautista’s death had not been widely reported in the Spanish press back in 1961. The music magazine Ritmo simply reproduced Valenti Ferro’s obituary from Buenos Aires Musical, while the weekly Blanco y negro published a short notice two days after his death and an extended article by Federico Sopena one month later.43 Arriba published a long obituary by Enrique Franco.44 Sopena in his obituary returned to the idea that Bautista’s

38 Sopena, Historia, 198.
39 Bautista, autograph letter to Gonzalo Puente Ojea, 22 July 1959.Indeed, Bautista’s conducting experience was rather limited.
40 Ginastera, autograph letter to Julián Bautista, undated.
41 Valenti Ferro, ‘Julián Bautista’.
42 De Persia, programme notes to the ‘Conmemoración Julián Bautista’.
43 Valenti Ferro, ‘Julián Bautista’; [Unsigned], ‘Música’ (Blanco y Negro, 29 July 1961); Sopena, ‘Música’, 45.
44 Franco, ‘Julián Bautista’.
generation had perhaps not been very significant musically, but had instead fulfilled a historical role and plugged a gap in the history of Spanish music. He wrote that ‘Thirty years ago, Bautista was part of the avant garde: an avant garde necessary for Madrid, but perhaps artificial abroad’. In writing thus, Sopena seemed to suggest that the role of this avant garde was mainly to provide a further link in the chain of Spanish musical development: his comment that this avant garde was ‘necessary’ reinforces the vision of Spanish music history as evolutionary, while the remark that it was ‘artificial abroad’ suggested that its legacy was of parochial interest and, therefore, of little lasting musical worth.

Enrique Franco echoed Sopena’s reservations concerning the purely musical contribution made by the Generación de la República, whose output he considered ‘a mere reflection of many other things’; however, he acknowledged their role in the modernization of Spanish music. Enrique Franco’s obituary reflects the need, noted above in connection with the centrality of the Generación del 1951 in Spanish music criticism of the 1950s, to construct a genealogy into which these composers can be inserted. Indeed, in many respects (for example, their interest in adapting European avant-garde trends to Spanish music) it is easier to connect the 1951 generation with exiled composers such as Bautista or Gerhard than with the neocasticismo of Rodrigo or José Muñoz Molleda that was prevalent in 1940s Spain.

The first Festival de Música de América y España

In 1964 the régime gave a clearer sign that it was ready to reassimilate Bautista, together with other exiled composers, within the narrative of Spanish music. That year saw the first Festival de Música de América y España (American and Spanish Music Festival), held in Madrid and organized by the Instituto de Cultura Hispánica, with the support of the Spanish Ministries of Foreign Affairs, National Education, and Information and Tourism. More than sixty Spanish and American (including North American) composers, some of whom travelled to Madrid for the event, had their works performed by one of five participating orchestras. The programme included several European premières and twelve world premières. 1964 was a highly significant year for the régime: apart from the Festival, a number of other events took place to commemorate the ‘twenty-five years of peace’ that Franco had allegedly brought to the country. Another example is the ‘Concierto de la Paz’ (Concert of Peace), organized by the Ministry for Information and Tourism, which included works by representatives of the new Spanish avant garde, such as Miguel Alonso, Luis de Pablo, and Cristóbal Halffter. It was therefore a crucial moment for the régime to redefine itself before both its citizens and the rest of the world.

---

45 Sopena, ‘Música’, 45.
46 Franco, ‘Julian Bautista’.
47 The Instituto de Cultura Hispánica was an institution created in 1946 by the Franco government to promote cultural exchange between Spain and Latin American countries.
Spain, as the host country, was represented by sixteen composers, with Falla taking a principal role: the festival started with a talk by Enrique Franco under the title ‘Manuel de Falla between America and Spain’ and was complemented by an exhibition on Falla’s life. Falla’s reputation as the dominant figure of contemporary Spanish music was therefore consolidated, while at the same time his role as a mediator between Spain and America made him an appropriate figurehead for the festival. The others represented ranged from Falla’s contemporaries to the younger generation, the Generación del 51, who had started to experiment with European avant-garde trends from the 1950s onwards. The generation of exiled pre-Civil-War composers was represented by Rodolfo Halffter, Gerhard, and Bautista.\textsuperscript{48} Given the significance of the festival, this clearly suggests a reintegration of the exiles into the musical panorama from which they had been absent since 1939. But this seems to have come with certain provisos, the first being that the circumstances of their exile had to be discussed as little as possible. The programme of the festival, for example, simply mentions that Bautista ‘moved to Buenos Aires in 1940’, a formula typical in the Francoist press when referring to exiles. They simply ‘lived abroad’, with no mention whatsoever of the circumstances that had led them to do so.

The second proviso concerns the selection of works by exiled composers: Bautista’s \textit{Obertura grotesca}, written in 1932 and awarded a composition prize by Unión Radio, and Rodolfo Halffter’s Violin Concerto, written in 1939–41, were both several decades old by 1964. This was not the case, however, with the work chosen to represent Ernesto Halffter, a member of the same generation: his \textit{Canticum in memoriam P.P. Johannem XXIII} had been composed in 1964, and it received some of the most enthusiastic reviews of the festival in the Spanish press. The exiled composers were thus represented not by their most recent output but by works they had written long ago, before exile had irreversibly shaped their music. Their presence was acceptable for the purposes of filling in the gap that exile had left in the narrative of twentieth-century Spanish music between the 1920s and 1939, but they could not be seen to be contributing further to the shaping of post-Civil-War music history – unlike Ernesto Halffter who spent the Civil War in Lisbon but was reintegrated into Spanish musical life as early as 1940, when he returned to conduct Falla’s \textit{El retablo de Maese Pedro} (Master Pedro’s Puppet Show) at the invitation of the Comisaría de Música.

In the case of Roberto Gerhard a more recent work was chosen: his Second Quartet, composed in 1961. However, critics largely portrayed it as a sort of fossil from past times, reminiscent of the composer’s Schoenbergian, pre-exile youth: ‘Nowadays, Gerhard’s Second Quartet feels, perhaps, older than other works that try to be less innovative’, wrote the critic Antonio Fernández-Cid.\textsuperscript{49} He minimized Gerhard’s ‘discoveries’ in this quartet by arguing that they copied Bartók’s innovations of the 1910s and 20s. At the time serialism was by no means scandalous or even new to Spanish music critics: during the 1940s and early 50s
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\textsuperscript{48} Besides these composers, the programme included music by Carmelo Bernaola, Luis de Pablo, Conrado del Campo, Francisco Escudero, Óscar Esplá, Cristóbal Halffter, Ernesto Halffter, Federico Mompou, Joaquín Rodrigo, and Joaquín Turina.

\textsuperscript{49} Fernández-Cid, ‘Obras’, 7.
composers such as Joaquim Homs and Gerardo Gombau had tried their hand at it, though their efforts attracted little attention from the musical press. However, this changed from the mid to late 1950s onwards, when composers of the Generación del 51, notably Cristóbal Halffter, started to experiment with serialism. In this context Gerhard’s Second Quartet was unlikely to be read as too innovative or scandalous. However, in emphasizing the work’s connections with Schoenberg and Bartók, Fernández-Cid neatly separated Gerhard from the younger generation residing in Spain: unlike Cristóbal Halffter or Luis de Pablo, Gerhard was considered not an innovator but rather an imitator of already old-fashioned trends. This put him in a rather similar position to Bautista and Rodolfo Halffter: their works were interesting as testimony to the evolution of Spanish music, as a link in the evolutionary chain from Falla to the Generación del 51, but not on account of their current significance or lasting musical value.

Coinciding with the festival in 1964, the composer Luis de Pablo published an article on Bautista and his significance for the history of Spanish music in the magazine Aulas, published by the Service of Culture and Education of the Falange.50 He stated that Bautista had had ‘substantial influence on the evolutionary progress of Spanish music’ (italics mine); Bautista and Rodolfo Halffter, as generational contemporaries but from different perspectives, had confronted ‘the issue of the aggiornamento’ of Spanish music. De Pablo, therefore, followed Sopeña in highlighting Bautista’s contribution to Spanish music in terms of innovations or advances. He and Sopeña were the most vocal figures when it came to reclaiming a place for Bautista in the pantheon of twentieth-century Spanish music, De Pablo writing that he had been ‘unjustly ignored’ and that ‘his output is among the most important in Spanish music of recent years’. In analysing Bautista’s Second Symphony, he likened the composer to Schoenberg in his ‘concern for achieving large-scale form’. De Pablo was right in pointing out that Spanish composers had rarely cultivated extended forms, such as the sonata or the symphony, something that differentiated the history of Spanish music from the German and French musical traditions; his defence of Bautista as an innovator can therefore be considered justified to some extent. Bautista is again considered almost exclusively in terms of what he had been able to contribute to Spanish music, but De Pablo’s vindication went beyond that of other commentators in that he actively reclaimed Bautista’s music as ‘among the most important in Spanish music of recent years’. Sopeña, on the other hand, did not reclaim only Bautista but also – albeit selectively – a whole generation of displaced Spanish musicians, including Salazar, Halffter, Pahissa, and Falla,51 all of whom, he reminded the reader, he had already included in his Historia de la música contemporánea back in 1958: ‘I deemed it essential to include these names, because they are a symbol of both success and tragedy’.52 He even made a pioneering attempt to analyse Bautista’s work with

50 De Pablo, ‘En torno a un hecho’, 30.
51 It is interesting that Sopeña chose to include Falla in this list alongside the political exiles Salazar and Pahissa. This can be read as a way of downplaying the political commitment of Salazar and Pahissa, subsuming them within the general category of ‘displacement’, a kind of migration not exclusively motivated by political reasons.
52 Sopeña, ‘Música’, 45.
exile as a central category, writing that ‘loneliness and nostalgia created in him a need to return to nationalist criteria’ in such works as *Suite all’antica* or *Catro poemas galegos*.

It is significant that both Sopen˜a and De Pablo were associated with the Falange, Sopen˜a, as we have seen, from his early career, and De Pablo as contributor to the magazine *Aulas*, published by the Delegación Nacional of the Falange. In spite of his career during the Franco régime, in which he held important offices and posts, Sopen˜a portrayed himself as a ‘Falange Liberal’,53 a member of a subset of the Falange that was trying to avoid a rupture in the intellectual tradition that had its roots in the Second Republic by reclaiming anti-Francoist intellectuals, a tendency observable in the Falange Liberals’ publication *Escorial*.54 In his two books of memoirs,55 Sopen˜a portrayed the Falange Liberals as a faction that opposed the prevailing cultural policies of Francoism, almost as a kind of internal resistance, which is puzzling in view of the fact that the Falange effectively controlled the régime’s cultural and information policies at that time.

However, even if we are tempted to take at face value Sopen˜a’s claim that the Falange Liberals were trying to revive the liberal tradition of Spanish culture, the claim is not without its problems. Santos Juliá has argued that the term ‘Falange Liberal’ is in itself an oxymoron, because ‘fascism is not simply the opposite of liberalism, it negates liberalism’.56 Furthermore, for Juliá, this alleged liberalism, which amounted to rehabilitating intellectuals of opposing political views but of excellent artistic calibre, has itself profoundly fascist roots. It recalls the situation in Italy, when in 1925–6 Giovanni Gentile tried to rally the non-fascist intellectuals under the banner of ‘national culture’. It was thus a matter of ‘destroying one’s enemies by absorbing them’.57 This aspect of the Falange’s policy caused clashes with the Catholic groups Acción Española and Opus Dei, which advocated the intellectual destruction of rivals, but, as Juliá notes, only in retrospect might the Falange’s stance be mistaken for liberalism: ‘Once they were stripped of power, and more than ten years after the reference point of fascism had disappeared, that cultural policy which had consisted of trying to understand the thinking of the defeated, purify it, and assimilate it in a common, totalitarian project could be interpreted only in terms of openness and liberalization’.58 Although the Falange Liberal project was dismantled in the mid-1940s, when the Falange lost its hegemony within the Francoist government, especially in the realms of culture and the press, Bautista’s reception suggests that, fifteen years on, writers and publications linked to the Falange remained the keenest to reclaim the exiles. However, as Juliá points out, this

53 Sopen˜a, *Escrito de noche*, 127.
54 *Escorial* was published between 1940 and 1950 by the National Delegation of Press and Propaganda of the Falange, focusing on the various aspects that the Falange deemed necessary for the construction of a fascist ‘New State’ (Nuevo Estado), including the arts, history, law, and philosophy. In its early years, under the leadership of the prominent falangist intellectual – and, later, dissident – Dionisio Ridley, it encouraged the collaboration of intellectuals from the liberal tradition, such as Julián Marías or Xavier Zubiri, who had not gone into exile.
55 See Sopen˜a, *Defensa de una generación* and *Escrito de noche*.
58 Juliá, ‘La Falange Liberal’, 130.
must be interpreted not as a matter of national reconciliation but rather of the recovery of those exiles who had something to contribute to the Francoist project.

**The second Festival de América y España**

The second Festival de Música de América y España was held in 1967, again in Madrid. At the first festival Bautista’s *Obertura grotesca* had received generally positive but extremely brief and by no means enthusiastic reviews; it was a short piece and it shared a concert with four other works, some of which generated far more interest, which explains why the *Obertura grotesca* went relatively unnoticed. In 1967, however, his *Catro poemas galegos* was one of the most favourably reviewed works of the festival, and was also enthusiastically received by the audience. Iglesias compared him to the later Falla and praised the work’s ‘accurate’ recreation of the medieval universe, whereas Fernández-Cid wrote ‘What a great musician Julián Bautista was!’, and stated that Bautista’s widow had received overwhelming ovations as she addressed the audience at the end of the concert.

Whereas the *Obertura grotesca* had been composed in the years of the Republic, *Catro poemas galegos* reflected the influence of displacement on Bautista’s work; indeed, it was only after his exile that Bautista turned to themes of national myth, which had been absent from his previous creative output. The *Catro poemas galegos* and the *Fantasía española* for clarinet and orchestra were, respectively, the first chamber and symphonic works Bautista composed shortly after going into exile in 1945–6, and both explore national themes. During the late 1940s he was also working on a myth-based cantata, entitled *Cantar del Mio Cid*, which remained incomplete. Absorbed by his film music commissions, Bautista did not compose any other concert works until 1956–8, when he wrote his last four works: *Sinfonía breve*, *Romance del rey Rodrigo* (a work which, as discussed below, is based on an epic poem of key national significance), *Sinfonía ricordiana*, and the Third String Quartet. National and mythical subjects, therefore, became a central component of Bautista’s output only after he had left Spain, and he was not the only exile to follow such an evolution: Salvador Bacarisse and especially Roberto Gerhard, who started to introduce flamenco in his compositions only after going into exile, constitute similar examples. Therefore, although I have previously named myth as one of the main ideological pillars of Francoism, the exiles also used it as a strategy for conferring legitimacy on their own project – which, like that of Franco, was still heavily dependent on ideas of pan-Hispanic grandeur and cultural hegemony over the Spanish-speaking nations of Latin America, even though they had become the host countries of many exiles.
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59 See Fernández-Cid, ‘Caamaño, con Odón Alonso y la Filarmónica’; Ruiz Coca, ‘Roberto Caamaño, Odón Alonso y la Filarmónica’, 9; and José María Franco, ‘Siguen los estrenos sinfónicos de autores americanos’, 35.

60 The other works were Manuel Simó’s *Rutas*, Roberto Caamaño’s Piano Concerto, Antonio Estévez’s Concerto for Orchestra, and Quincy Porter’s *New Episodes*. Of these it was Caamaño’s work that received the most critical attention.


62 For example, the ballet *Alegrias* (1942) and the Third Symphony (1960).

At least one of Bautista’s ‘mythical’ works has been read in this light. Bautista’s choral setting Romance del rey Rodrigo is based on the fifteenth-century oral poetry collection Romancero, which in turn draws on a selection of Spanish medieval epic poems. The legend of King Rodrigo narrates the defeat of the last Visigoth king of Spain by invading Muslims, who had formed an alliance with an internal enemy of the king, Count Don Julián. The work is based on medieval Spanish texts and, as such, reproduces the traditional perspective on the myth, in which the enemies, with the exception of Don Julián, are external aggressors. Jorge de Persia, however, has attempted to read the work as a veiled attack on Franco: the first movement of the work, ‘Imprecación’, repeats the words ‘Mother Spain, / oh, poor mother Spain! / you are all being burnt / by a perverse traitor’. These words, in De Persia’s opinion, refer not to Don Julián but rather to the ‘traitor’ Franco, who rebelled against the legitimate Republican government in 1936.

De Persia’s reading certainly fits well with the two other works that will be discussed below, Cantar del Mio Cid and Catro poemas galegos. It also mirrors Bautista’s commitment to the Republican ideals that had forced him to leave Spain at the end of the Civil War and his collaborations with such prominent anti-Francoists as Casals and Rafael Alberti. However, one should also note that, by cultivating the romance form, Bautista was inserting himself into the Argentine as much as the Spanish tradition: early modern romances made their way to South America during the conquest and were still very much alive in popular culture during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The Romance del rey Rodrigo must therefore be read not only as expressing nostalgia for the home country but also as a contribution to the culture of Bautista’s host nation.

Bautista’s Cantar del Mio Cid, planned as a work for choir and seven soloists, was to be based on the eponymous medieval epic poem, with texts from the original source especially rewritten by the exiled poet Rafael Alberti. All that has survived of the work is a copy of Alberti’s texts with annotations by Bautista, now held at the Archivo Julián Bautista. The myth of El Cid had obvious resonances for the Franco régime: the medieval flavour, the fight against Islam, and the unification of various Christian communities under a strong and honest leader (the Cid himself), who had been unjustly banned by the King of Castile. However, it can be argued that the legend had interesting connotations for the exiles as well: Alberti’s adaptation opens – as does the poem – with the exile of El Cid, who has been banned from Castile by the king but is being followed and supported by many among both the aristocracy and the common people. The first of the three movements, as indicated in Bautista’s annotated text, was to be called ‘El destierro’ (The Banning). The theme of exile is repeated in the third and last movement (‘Muerte del Cid’), in which El Cid dies having demonstrated his honesty and loyalty, in return for which he had been not only repatriated and reconciled with the king but also accorded a higher social position, with his daughters married off to the kings of Navarre and Aragón.

Historical myth is also the foundation of Catro poemas galegos. However, this work deviates from the two preceding examples in that its mythical aspect concerns the legitimacy and status not of Spain as a nation but of Galicia. Catro poemas galegos was based on a set of

64 De Persia, Julián Bautista, 93.
four poems by Lorenzo Varela, themselves based on engravings by Luís Seoane. Both Varela and Seoane were prominent Galician nationalists exiled in Buenos Aires. Between 1939 and the 1960s the Argentine capital was home to a number of individuals who can similarly be defined as Galician nationalists, but who had rather different backgrounds. Some of them, like Seoane and Varela, were artists, intellectuals, or politicians who had fled Spain as a consequence of the Spanish Civil War. Others, such as the writer Eduardo Blanco Amor, had come to Buenos Aires before 1939, mainly for financial reasons. A third and younger group arrived in the late 1940s and 1950s, attracted by both the job opportunities and the political and cultural climate of the country. This community in Buenos Aires, following the tradition of Galician nationalism established in the late nineteenth century, agitated for increased self-government and autonomy for the region, and reclaimed its history and culture (including the Galician language) as the markers that identified it as a nation in its own right.

Varela and Seoane focused on four historical figures traditionally reclaimed by Galician nationalists against the hegemony of Spanish myth, heavily centred on Castile. María Pita (the only non-medieval figure of the series), a seventeenth-century urban heroine who repelled Sir Francis Drake’s attack on Coruña; Ruy Xordo, who commanded a revolt against a feudal lord in the fifteenth century; María Balteira, a prostitute frequently named in Galician medieval cantigas; and Adauñfo, a bishop who survived an ordeal after being charged with homosexuality. However, although Varela was consciously making use of indigenous myths that had long kept alive the vision of an autonomous Galicia, his poems do not explicitly oppose Galicia and Spain, which would be anathema to the Francoist tenet of the indissoluble unity of Spain. It was for this reason that Bautista’s songs could still be safely included in a high-profile event such as the Festival de Música de América y España and celebrated for their medieval flavour; in isolation, in a context in which nationalist claims from Galicia, Catalonia, and the Basque Country were ignored or repressed, they could easily be read as mere celebrations of picturesque historical figures rather than nation-building myths.

**Conclusion**

This case study of Julián Bautista and his rehabilitation into the musical life and historiography of his home country in his final years and after his death offers interesting insights into the broader process of reaccommodating political exiles, with which the régime experimented from the early 1950s onwards. Bautista’s case is emblematic of several aspects of this process. Above all, it raises the question of whether or not this reintegration reflects a relative liberalization or softening of attitude. On one hand the role of the Falange, over and above other factions of the régime, in reabsorbing exiles into the history of twentieth-century
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65 The significance of Castile as the region that had provided the foundation of Spanish history and identity was not new to the Franco régime; from the late nineteenth century onwards the Generación del 98, in its search for the core identity of Spain as a means of moral regeneration, had focused on Castile. This process is perhaps best exemplified in Miguel de Unamuno’s statement from 1895: ‘Whereas Castile formed the Spanish nation, the nation has increasingly hispanicized Castile.’

66 López García and Aneiros Díaz, Lorenzo Varela, 15.
Spanish music and culture strongly challenges any simple liberalization argument. Indeed, Bautista’s example illustrates the ways in which the exiles, their biographies, and their works were accommodated within, and often adapted to fit, existing narratives: the focus on generations rather than on individuals, the selection of particular works that filled a gap in the musical timeline, and the omission of important biographical information such as the causes of their exile or, in Bautista’s case, his relationship with another, more threatening exile, namely Casals.

But, on the other hand, the fact that some exiles turned to nationalist themes after having fled Spain could be used, paradoxically, to align them with the ultra-nationalist régime in a way that makes their works seem more easily acceptable in that context – even though their use of myth might have served different purposes. Ultimately Bautista is just one of a long list of musical exiles: further study of such figures as Gerhard, Bacarisse, Remacha, Casals, Rodolfo Halffter, and Miguel de Molina might enable more comprehensive answers to the questions posed by Bautista’s exile. In doing so, it might also help to broaden the scope both of Spanish exile studies, by providing a counterpoint to the predominant focus on literature, and of musicological exile studies, by offering it an alternative, non-Germanic geographical focus.
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