Studies in Latin American and Spanish History
VOLUME 3

JOSÉ ANTONIO PRIMO de RIVERA

The Reality and Myth of a Spanish Fascist Leader

Joan Maria Thomàs

JOSÉ ANTONIO PRIMO DE RIVERA

Studies in Latin American and Spanish History

Series Editors:
Scott Eastman, Creighton University, USA
Vicente Sanz Rozalén, Universitat Jaume I, Spain

Editorial Board:
Carlos Illades, Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Mexico
Mercedes Yusta, Université Paris 8, France
Xosé Manoel Núñez-Seixas, Ludwig-Maximilians München Universität, Germany
Dominique Soucy, Université de Franche-Comté, France
Gabe Paquette, Johns Hopkins University, USA
Karen Racine, University of Guelph, Canada
David Sartorius, University of Maryland, USA
Claudia Guarisco, El Colegio Mexiquense, Mexico
Natalia Sobrevilla Perea, University of Kent, United Kingdom

This series bridges the divide between studies of Latin America and peninsular Spain by employing transnational and comparative approaches that shed light on the complex societies, cultures, and economies of the modern age. Focusing on the cross-pollination that was the legacy of colonialism on both sides of the Atlantic, these monographs and collections explore a variety of issues such as race, class, gender, and politics in the Spanish-speaking world.

Volume 3
José Antonio Primo de Rivera: The Reality and Myth of a Spanish Fascist Leader
Joan Maria Thomàs

Volume 2
Conflict, Domination, and Violence: Episodes in Mexican Social History
Carlos Illades

Volume 1

Metaphors of Spain: Representations of Spanish National Identity in the Twemtieth Century

Edited by Javier Moreno-Luzón and Xosé M. Núñez Seixas

José Antonio Primo de Rivera
The Reality and Myth of a Spanish Fascist Leader

Joan Maria Thomàs

Translated from Spanish by John Bates

berghahn
NEW YORK • OXFORD
www.berghahnbooks.com

Published in 2019 by
Berghahn Books
www.berghahnbooks.com

English-language edition
© 2019 Joan Maria Thomàs

Spanish-language edition
© 2017 Penguin Random House Grupo Editorial

Originally published in Spanish as
José Antonio: Realidad y mito

All rights reserved. Except for the quotation of short passages for the purposes of criticism and review, no part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system now known or to be invented, without written permission of the publisher.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Thomàs, Joan Maria, author. | Bates, John, 1961– translator.
Title: José Antonio Primo de Rivera: The Reality and Myth of a Spanish Fascist Leader / Joan Maria Thomàs; translated from Spanish by John Bates.
Other titles: José Antonio. English
Description: New York: Berghahn Books, 2019. | Series: Studies in Latin American and Spanish History; Volume 3 | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2019007350 (print) | LCCN 2019011517 (ebook) | ISBN 9781789202090 (ebook) | ISBN 9781789202083 (hardback: alk. paper)
Subjects: LCSH: Primo de Rivera, José Antonio, 1903–1936. | Primo de Rivera, José Antonio, 1903–1936—Political and social views. | Statesmen—Spain—Biography. | Fascists—Spain—Biography. | Falange

Española de las J.O.N.S.—Biography. | Spain—History—Civil War, 1936–1939—Biography. | Fascism—Spain—History—20th century. | Spain—Politics and government—1931–1939.
Classification: LCC DP264.P75 (ebook) | LCC DP264.P75 T4813 2019 (print) | DDC 946.081092 [B]—dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2019007350

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-1-78920-208-3 hardback
ISBN 978-1-78920-209-0 ebook

Contents

Introduction

Chapter 1 José Antonio Primo de Rivera and His People

Chapter 2 The Rise of the Firstborn: From Defending His Father's Memory to Molding a Second Primo De Rivera as the "Savior of Spain"

Chapter 3 Saving Spain

Chapter 4 José Antonio's Fascist Ideology

Chapter 5 The Most Important Myth and Hero Worship in Franco's Spain, Second Only to Franco Himself

Bibliography

Index

Introduction

Throughout the Franco regime, José Antonio Primo de Rivera was portrayed as the principal martyr of the "red barbarity" that Spain had experienced during the Civil War. The biographies written about their National Leader at the time by members of the Falange Española (Spanish Phalanx—hereinafter Falange) were so gushing in their praise and so lacking in critical content that they are of absolutely no use to historians for anything other than specific facts (and even some of these have been made up or are simply not mentioned). More than biographies, they are hagiographies: they depict their subject as some kind of saint. They are just one product of the hero worship felt for José Antonio by the Traditionalist Spanish Phalanx of the Councils of the National Syndicalist Offensive (FET y de las JONS)—Francoist Spain's sole legal party behind the National Movement (Movimiento Nacional)—and by the regime in general ever since he was executed by firing squad on 20 November 1936, an event that was only officially and publicly announced two years after it had taken place.

The hero worship to which he was subject was phenomenal, quite unmatched by anything before or since, and far in excess of the feelings expressed for other martyrs of the crusade, such as José Calvo Sotelo or the generals José Sanjurjo, Emilio Mola, and Manuel Goded. (The one exception to this, of course, is the eternal glorification of Caudillo Franco.) In fact, the posthumous adoration for José Antonio was merely an amplification of the esteem in which the Falange had held him while he had been its leader. The party was typically Fascist in that it was structured, in the military or paramilitary manner, around a strong, charismatic leader. But, however difficult it may be to believe now, things got so out of hand during the Franco dictatorship that José Antonio's having gone to the firing squad at the same age as Jesus Christ died on the cross led to the two of them being spoken of in the same breath. And the generations of young

people who were educated during the regime were taught about his exemplary life.

Against this background of hero worship, it is hardly surprising that many authors who wrote about José Antonio during the Franco regime, and even some who wrote about him later, had been so seduced and/or fascinated that the vision they gave was distorted, mythified, and acritical. He is often portrayed as a great thinker, the author of an extremely important political and philosophical body of work, and even the creator of a school of thought all his own. (Of course, all this work was unfinished because of his sudden death.) All this was greatly exaggerated: José Antonio was no more than a normal, educated person with intellectual concerns that included an interest in literature. For some time both before and after he decided to dedicate himself to politics, he produced a corpus of articles, the vast majority of which were self-published in the press of the party of which he was the undisputed leader. José Antonio was clearly able to study, think, and express himself orally and in writing, although his use of language was often criticized for being a mixture of literature and politics that was not altogether clear or comprehensible, quite unlike what was expected of a Fascist leader.

His reading provided him with the rudiments of a personal political doctrine, although he owed much to the theories of others, which he adapted to his specific needs. Much of this doctrine he drew up as he went along, at the same time as he was founding a Fascist-style party and becoming its undisputed leader. So, while he was playing the role of a Fascist, he gradually became a Fascist, and then increasingly more so. His written work was a response to—and a rejection of—his father's: Miguel Primo de Rivera had had several notorious confrontations with some of the most prestigious intellectuals of the age and had produced various texts in his irrepressibly verbose style that were duly published in the press—the famous *notas oficiosas*—during his time as dictator (1923–1930). It is not difficult to see in his firstborn son's continuous display of erudition and careful expression, and a touch of literary frustration, a desire to distance himself from his father.

José Antonio had professional aspirations—he earned his living by practicing as a lawyer and working in the legal world in general—but also literary ones. He was interested in reading, the theater (he had even been an amateur actor), and writing novels, plays, and poetry. But nothing could

compare to his passion for politics. In the field of law, he wrote numerous reports, some of which he had to submit to the Supreme Court of Spain. In the field of literature, he did not publish anything, although he did outline several novels. Nevertheless, paradoxically, he managed to gather around him a considerable group of professional and prolific men of letters. Like him, they too were passionate about politics,[1] and they found in José Antonio not only a political leader but one to whom they were devoted.

He was certainly not lacking in capacity of seduction or charisma, largely because he was his father's son—being the heir of Spain's dictator held a certain sway—and his personality was what it was. As I shall explain throughout this book, he combined seriousness, thoroughness, shyness, friendliness, and outbursts of violent biblical rage, all wrapped up in an impeccable physical appearance. But what was to define his life as much as how it ended in a corner of the courtyard of Alicante prison was his desire to emulate and better his father's political career. This desire meant that political action became the driving force of his life, and he worked tirelessly to draw up a doctrine that would support his political project and to create and lead a party that would bring it to a successful conclusion.

His aim was to solve all of Spain's problems and save the country from the internal and external dangers that were allegedly threatening it, just as his father had tried to do. José Antonio, however, believed his mission was even more crucial because he was convinced a Communist revolution was imminent and would do away with Spain as he knew it. The country, then, was in urgent need of being saved, even at the cost of his life and the lives of other *falangistas*. Unavoidably, the project was enshrouded in a persistent but fluctuating sense of tragedy. There were moments of euphoria when he was convinced he would ultimately be successful and take power, and others of realistic pessimism when he became aware of his party's lack of real influence, of the little chance he had of succeeding to power, and of the political shortcomings of at least some of his comrades in leadership positions.

In contrast to what has been said ad nauseam, José Antonio did not go into politics because the death of his father just a few weeks after he had been "unjustly" and "ungratefully" (according to family and supporters) ousted from power awoke in him a sense of filial duty—a conviction that he should defend, at considerable personal sacrifice, the memory of his humiliated and defenseless father. Far from it. He went into politics in

response to a deep desire to emulate and exceed his father, a desire that marked him and impelled him to act messianically. He threw himself into politics as soon as he knew he had found the formula he needed, a formula he never stopped developing and improving. He entered politics just as many before him had, not just his father, so there was something quite familiar about what he did. He started out as a Fascist because he felt he was fulfilling his obligation as an aristocrat, as a gentleman—although not as a gentleman of leisure, a figure he was extremely critical of. In this way, he played the historical and heroic role of guide, defender, and savior that was inherent in the nobility. The fact that he was a parvenu was simply irrelevant, since he believed he came from noble stock.

Nevertheless, although his political career was the tangible result of what he had always wanted, not something he resigned himself to, he sometimes considered giving it all up or complained about the price he was having to pay. According to a friend and fellow *falangista*:

> José Antonio used to say: “What I would really like to do is study civil law and in the evening go to a café or Puerta de Hierro to have a chat with friends.” All his life—which was heroic, self-sacrificing, full of fantasy and vigor—he was impregnated with a bourgeois-cum-literary nostalgia, some sort of combination of methodical toil and personal chats. He did realize, however, that he was destined for other things, that it was no longer possible for him to go back, that he had to sacrifice everything. Because you must choose between your life’s work and your happiness. And José Antonio chose the former. We would all like to conquer Peru but on the condition that we could tell our friends all about it that very night.[2]

José Antonio occasionally thought he could give up the heavy burden of saving Spain because others (e.g., Manuel Azaña, Indalecio Prieto, a Republican government) could relieve him of the task and do it in his stead. This suggests there were two José Antonios, one of whom was even open to Democratic-Reformist solutions. This second José Antonio, however, was clearly subordinate to the other, more dominant supporter of Fascism.

All Fascist political projects have some features in common and others that are peculiar to the national reality on which they were based, but José Antonio’s was quite specific. Some aspects of his doctrine concerning fundamental questions were difficult to glean from his writings. For example, what role should his party, the Falange, play once it succeeded to power? Should it act as a single party like the Nazis and the Fascists in the only two Fascist regimes existing at the time? What should his role be as

the new leader of the country? He made no mention of these issues, but, of course, this does not mean he had not given them any thought. However, he did write about the type of state he was going to create, which he sometimes described as totalitarian. He said it was going to be Syndicalist in nature and based on vertical syndicates and the three natural entities: family, municipality, and the syndicate itself. The type of state, then, was to be quite new, neither a capitalist regime nor a Communist proletarian dictatorship. However, he did not specify exactly how it was to be structured. Perhaps he did not do so because he thought, as he generally tended to think, he could make decisions on these issues as the need arose and as part of an important minority in possession of the one and only true doctrine that would reveal to him the solutions that were most appropriate to Spain's problems. Of this he was convinced. He could not have been more messianic.

In the pages that follow, I give my interpretation of José Antonio Primo de Rivera and what I believe were the driving forces behind his life and politics. I discuss his political career, his thinking, the myth, and the fact that his party worshipped him not only during but also after his years as its leader, which would be of particular significance. His myth was fueled by the aura of heroism that surrounded him—at once messianic and tragic—but also exploited by the Franco regime to which he probably would not have been sympathetic, or at least not totally.

This book is the result partly of the persistence of this myth and partly of the continued interest shown in José Antonio by professional historians and the public. But interest is even greater among nonprofessionals and publicists who are constantly publishing books on him. With little attempt at critical analysis, these publications often reproduce the myth or make wild speculations based on spurious evidence in an attempt to attract readers. My intention was not to write an exhaustive biography of José Antonio but to provide an interpretation based on his defining political actions and on those features of his personality that spurred him on and fundamentally marked him. While I was engaged in this task, I felt neither empathy nor hostility for the object of study. I merely give the reader my interpretation of a Fascist leader who aimed to implement a political regime in Spain, of which he was to be the leader, and died in the attempt. While he was alive as a leader, he had limited personal and political influence, but

after the state took over his party, he was subject to a cult of commemoration.

On a strictly formal level, and to avoid excessive repetitions of his name, I tend to use the surname Primo as a synonym for José Antonio. I have reserved the use of his full surname, Primo de Rivera, to refer to his father the dictator (whom I also refer to as the General). In the case of Franco, and to avoid repetition, I have used Generalissimo or Caudillo, although this does not mean, of course, I identify with the use that the regime gave to these forms of address.

This book would never have been written if not for the brilliant work done by historians and intellectuals on the figure of José Antonio and the Falange. Stanley G. Payne was the first professional historian to study this subject, and his expertise is such that I have had much to thank him for during my own career in Spain and in the United States. Others who followed him are Javier Pradera, Ian Gibson, Julio Gil Pecharromán, Ismael Saz, José-Carlos Mainer, Paul Preston, Herbert R. Southworth, and Salvador de Brocà. My debt to all of them is considerable, although, of course, the interpretation given here is exclusively my own.

I would also like to acknowledge the lecturers and scholars Giuliana di Febo, Jeroni Miquel Mas Rigo, Miguel Ángel Gimeno Álvarez, José Manuel Romero Moreno, Julio Ponce Alberca, Macià Riutort i Riutort, Santiago Navarro de la Fuente, Antonio Cazorla-Sánchez, Manuel-Jesús Cachón Cadenas, Francisco Sevillano Calero, and Alfredo Valverde, who have all made this book more complete than it would have been without their help. I am grateful to Miguel Aguilar for all his good work, his patience, and welcoming me back to the publishing company he directs with such diligence. I would also like to thank Scott Eastman and Vicente Sanz Rozalén for the publication of this book in the Studies in Latin American and Spanish History series that they edit for Berghahn Books.

On a more personal note, this book owes a great deal to the constant support I have received from my wife, María Luisa Andreu; my children, Joan and Àngela; and the whole Andreu-Thomàs-Andreu family.

Notes

1. Mónica Carbajosa and Pablo Carbajosa, *La corte literaria de José Antonio: La primera generación cultural de la Falange* (Barcelona,

2003), 79.

2. Agustín de Foxá, “José Antonio: El amigo,” in *Dolor y memoria de España en el segundo aniversario de la muerte de José Antonio* (Barcelona, 1939), 217.

Chapter 1

José Antonio Primo de Rivera and His People

Fascism and the Desire to Exceed His Father

José Antonio Primo de Rivera y Sáenz de Heredia (1903–1936) was known as José by his family and friends, and as José Antonio by his colleagues in the Fascist party he founded, the Falange Española. At the party's inception, the members decided to copy Italy's Partito Nazionale Facscista (National Fascist Party—PNF) and address one another informally in their internal dealings. This decision was quite revolutionary for 1930s Spain and aimed to show that at the heart of the organization was a desire to create a new political society that was at once anti-Democratic, anti-leftist, and anti-separatist but also anti-Conservative. The idea was to remove unequal social treatment within the party, which was quite a novelty, but not the internal chain of command, which was of the extremely inflexible paramilitary type and, of course, unequal. This was an unexpected combination in right-wing organizations in general but not in the extreme left wing. Also unexpected was the emergence of a Fascist party in Spain at the end of 1933.

Before this time, Fascism had only been present in the form of factions that managed to gather just a few hundred supporters. One was the Juntas de Ofensiva Nacional-Sindicalista (Councils of the National Syndicalist Offensive—JONS), led by Ramiro Ledesma Ramos and Onésimo Redondo Ortega, who had previously founded two even smaller groups that the JONS subsequently subsumed: La Conquista del Estado (founded in February 1931), which also published a weekly magazine of the same name, and the Juntas Castellanas de Actuación Hispánica (Castilian Groups of Hispanic Action),[1] set up in August 1931. Although the latter group had experienced a slight increase in popularity, among university students in

particular, in 1933 after Hitler's rise to power in Germany and played an active part in such dramatic events as the attack on the Association of Friends of Russia and the robbery of its files, it was little more than a marginal group funded by anti-Republican Alfonsist monarchists who were interested in inciting as much of this sort of unrest as possible.

The Falange would be the most important of all the Fascist parties, even though it was marginal in terms of numbers until the spring of 1936. In this respect, it was quite unlike the Fascist parties of other European countries and simply incomparable with the Fascists in Italy and Germany, who had managed to seize power and create the only Fascist regimes in the world. One of the three initial leaders of the Falange, presented in public on 29 October 1933, was no less than the firstborn son of General Miguel Primo de Rivera, the Spanish dictator from 1923 to 1930. Like all Fascist parties, the Falange was founded with the ambition of "conquering the state"; ending democracy, left-wing revolutionary threats, and non-Spanish Nationalist movements (particularly in Catalonia and the Basque Country); and, of course, constructing a new Fascist state.

But what exactly did this involve? And what was the difference between the aims of Fascism and the political objectives of the right-wing parties when the Falange came into being? The right-wing forces—the extreme Comunión Tradicionalista (Traditionalist Communion) and Renovación Española (Spanish Renewal), and the somewhat more moderate Acción Popular (Popular Action), which was the backbone of the Confederación Española de Derechas Autónomas (Spanish Confederation of Autonomous Rights—CEDA)—all aspired to wipe out left-wing parties, end democracy (i.e., the Spanish Republic), and set up an authoritarian or semi-authoritarian regime in its place. Two of these groups' members were monarchists: the Traditionalist Communion consisted of Carlists (supporters of the dissident Bourbon branch who opposed the dynasty of Isabella II), and the Spanish Renewal of Alfonsists (supporters of Isabella's descendants, the last of whom had been Alfonso XIII). They had both been acting clandestinely to bring down the Republican regime and to this end had set up paramilitary militias: the Carlist Requetés and the Alfonsist militias. Of course, they also acted legally, taking part in elections and sending deputies to the Republican parliament.

However, the dynastic issue—the two branches of the House of Bourbon—was not the only point on which the two groups disagreed. Their models

of monarchy were also quite distinct. The Carlists believed in absolutism: that a king had a divine right to the throne and that Spain should go back to the model of the Ancien Régime, with its class-based parliaments, guilds, and autonomous councils. For their part, the Alfonsists were fighting for an authoritarian monarchy, a strong government (dictatorial or semi-dictatorial), and the definitive withdrawal of the Constitution of 1876, which would mean the end of Liberalism. Because both groups rejected democracy and Liberalism, they managed to get along to a much greater extent than would have been possible just fifty years earlier, after the end of the third of the civil wars—the Carlist Wars—in which they had clashed.

Popular Action—the right-wing group with the most voters, deputies, and members—also clearly opposed the Republic and its constitution. It was a Catholic and confessional party, but unlike the other two parties, which sought the complete destruction of the Republican regime and thus deserve the label of extreme, it merely wanted the regime to be more authoritarian and to follow the social and political doctrine of the Catholic Church. It also advocated a different system of parliamentary representation: the parliament would have a new corporate house in which professions, families, and municipalities, among others, would be represented. Its idea of a republic, then, was quite different from the reforming, left-wing republic that had been created on 14 April 1931. Moreover, although the party was not officially monarchist, many of its leaders, members, and voters were. The fact was that Popular Action, which merged into the CEDA, hoped to fulfill its aims by means of a gradual, electoral strategy that involved accepting the Republican regime—something that the monarchist parties did not approve of at all.

Neither the extreme nor the more moderate right-wingers were Fascists, although the left-wing parties referred to them as such, and there were several fundamental differences between them and the Falange. First, the former were not Fascists, because they believed in the Catholic confessional state. The Falange, on the other hand, wanted a clear separation between the state and the Church even though Catholicism heavily influenced its ideology and political program. Second, two of the right-wing parties were explicitly monarchist. The Falange was not. It made no pronouncement on the form the regime would take, and, over time and through the statements made by its National Leader, it would disassociate itself from the monarchy. Third, the right-wing forces were Conservative—extremely Conservative.

They defended the status quo and property at all levels and, with some slight exceptions in minority sections of the CEDA, opposed any form of structural social reforms. The Falange, however, aimed to make some nationalizations—in financial services (i.e., banking) and public services—and implement economic and social reforms, the most important of which was land reform.

All these policies were "anti-capitalist" approaches to financial, speculative, and usurious capitalism—in contrast to "legitimate" productive capitalism—and were, of course, compatible with private property, although not with the abuses perpetrated by owners against the less fortunate classes, who the Falange believed should be delivered from the misery in which they lived (referring specifically to landless peasants and day laborers). By no means did the Falange intend to bring about a left-wing revolution, but it did want to improve the country's general standard of living and wipe out the enormous pockets of poverty. This Falangist-Fascist "revolution" was known as the "National Syndicalist" revolution and aimed to end the class struggle by uniting employers and workers in a new, enormous, vertical syndical structure, under the supervision of the Falange, within which everybody would have a role in working for social justice. So, the Falange, a Fascist party, was differentiated from the rest of the right-wing forces by its (relative) anti-Conservatism.

There was a fourth difference, which was quite subtle with respect to the far right-wing forces but somewhat less so with respect to the right-wing Popular Action and CEDA: violence and its use as a political weapon. In this respect, the difference between the Falange and the far right wing (which practiced violence) was almost nonexistent but was quite clear between the Falange and Popular Action. The Falange defended violence as a new form of political struggle in the street. José Antonio regarded this as necessary, humanitarian, crude, and chivalrous and surgical. This violence included "squadron" missions by the Falange militias to break up left-wing meetings, lay siege to their headquarters, cause confrontations in the streets, and so on. He argued that violence should be used against the left-wing forces because they would not hesitate to use violence against the Falange. The wave of violence led to deaths, injuries, assassination attempts, and, above all, the preparation of coups to "conquer the state" with forces of their own or with the assistance of the Army, which was also an aim of the far-right monarchist parties.

Fifth, the Falange was interested in attracting all the social classes, including peasants and workers, whether or not they had been members of left-wing political groups or syndicates. This desire to unify, or reunify, was fundamental to the Fascist ideology: if the Fascists were to combat the divisions in the political parties that had sprung out of Liberalism and democracy, and the looming shadow of an Asian Communist revolution that threatened to destroy Western civilization, then they had to reunify the whole of Spain in a project that would regenerate the country and make it great again. So, they aimed to unify, reunify, and form a *fascio* to end the artificial divisions invented by theorists of democracy (e.g., Rousseau), achieve "social justice" in opposition to the egocentric wealthy classes and the Communist revolutionaries, and lead the country in the quest for further imperial expansion, thus restoring past glories.

The ultimate objective of all this was for the country to reencounter its essence, its internal flair. At the time, it was in a state of convalescence, but it was still possible to make a full recovery—to fulfill the "unity of destiny" of the whole population, of all the regions that, when they had worked together, had made Spain a world power, the greatest nation of its time, the nation of Catholic kings and the first years of the House of Hapsburg rule with its European and colonial empire. Unity, however, had come up against the obstacle of the peripheral nationalisms of some regions, the result of the ailing "unity of destiny." This obstacle had to be confronted and overcome by offering the inhabitants of these regions new projects and new missions that were Spanish in their conception. National issues were to be given priority, followed by imperial ones. This is what the Falange and its leader promised the country.

The Falange's Fascist project, then, was quite different from other right-wing options of the time. This difference was partly because the Falange's future National Leader, José Antonio, said the party was in neither the left nor the right wing. Indeed, he said it was not even a party but instead an "anti-party" or a "social movement." In general, and with some specific national distinctions, this difference placed his organization and political thought on par with general European Fascism. When José Antonio said, as he did on occasion, he was not a Fascist, he was referring to the term of Italian origin and to the fact that he did not apply the Fascist doctrine as did Mussolini in Italy or Hitler in Germany; he applied it to the reality in Spain. He wrote: "Fascism is not just an Italian movement: it is a total, universal

sense of life. Italy was the first to apply it. But is not the conception of the state as a permanent historic mission also valid outside Italy? . . . Who can say that only Italians aspire to such things?”[2] At other times, he pointed out differences with Nazism and the totalitarian state. This, however, does not mean he—or, after studying and analyzing his Falange ideology and practices, we—did not believe he was a Fascist, albeit with some slight nuances in his way of thinking (see chap. 4).

Of course, there were differences between the Falange’s Fascism and that of Germany, Italy, and other places in Europe. Racism was one of the most important distinguishing features of German Fascism, while the focus on the individual and Catholicism was a defining feature of Spanish Fascism. However, the similarities were far greater. For this reason, José Antonio, before he decided to launch his party, visited Mussolini in Rome and had an interview with Hitler and the leading Nazi theorist Alfred Rosenberg in Berlin.[3] In his heart, he felt closer to Fascism than to Nazism, closer to the Italian than to the German. And although he never explicitly said so and sometimes denied it,[4] he aspired to be a dictator like these two leaders. He never referred to the role his party would play in the new Fascist state that would have him at the head. He did, however, talk of the “natural entities”—the family, the municipality, the syndicate—as the pillars of a state he defined as Syndicalist, as opposed to capitalist or Socialist. This was quite consistent with his anti-political party stance, his anti-Democratism. But the fact that he did not refer to the existence of a single party or a social movement after succeeding to power does not mean he had not thought about it. Nevertheless, this lack of reference was subsequently exploited to cast doubts on his “Fascism.”

José Antonio’s ambition was to lead his party, restore national unity, and strive for imperial goals. He was convinced Spain, thanks to him and his Falange, would once again start to move in the same circles as the few nations in the world—like Italy, Germany, and England—with a national and imperial “unity of destiny.” Another ambition was for the population as a whole to accept the Falangist doctrine. Once the party succeeded to power, as tended to be the case in totalitarian states, the single ideology that governed it would spread to encompass society, family, and the world of employment. This is what Primo aspired to, even though at times he said he wanted to create a totalitarian state and at others cast doubt on the whole

concept. Whatever the case, he would be unreservedly adored after October 1934 as the National Leader of the Falange.

However, only the party respected him, and this respect was obviously on a much smaller scale than that afforded to the leaders of the only two Fascist regimes at the time, which had even gone so far as to formulate principles such as “Il Duce is never wrong” and “The Fuhrer’s word is law” (*Führerprinzip*). The adoration was real and was felt by many of his comrades, beginning with the intellectuals whom he had managed to attract to his party and who sincerely appreciated and admired him. Of course, it was quite different from the hero worship later accorded to him by the Franco regime—conveniently, when he was dead—which was on a far bigger scale than this first, “internal” outburst of affection, only surpassed in Spain by the homage paid to Franco—the Caudillo, Generalissimo, and head of state.

Like all other European Fascists, the Falangists had a liking for uniforms (their characteristic blue shirt made of nankeen brought to mind industrial workers—the proletariat—and was an expression of their desire to appeal to working classes and peasants). They also cultivated paramilitary structures and direct action; carefully planned rallies and meetings; the cult of the “fallen,” who were regarded as combatants and saluted with a rousing “Present!” whenever their names were called (this was copied from Italian Fascism); the Roman salute (also copied from Italy); symbols such as the yoke and arrows, a visual reflection of the Italian *fascio*, on the red-and-black flag (in this case, the colors were copied from Anarcho-syndicalism, considered the most “national” of syndicates, in contrast to Marxist internationalism); and the supposedly “revolutionary” slogans. This liking for uniforms, salutes, and rallies was by no means the only expression of the militarization of politics in the interwar years and was not exclusive to the Fascists; it was shared with the whole range of right-wing groups and even with the left-wing, Communist, and Socialist parties.

Militias were not exclusive to the Falange and the Fascists either. Left-wing groups had them, too, but they were for the Falange an expression of the cult of violence required to bring down democracy and the left wing. They were enveloped in an aura of masculine domination that glorified heroism, daring, bravery, and austerity and reserved for women the traditional role of mother and conveyor of the Fascist ideology within the family. Both the Falange and the Fascists viewed the young as a

generational force that was fundamental to the political transformation they were striving for. They aimed to combine tradition and modernity—in contrast to the "outdated Conservatism" and "egoism" of the wealthy classes—and their aspiration was to subordinate the economy to politics without questioning either the essence or the existence of the capitalist system. Their informal, friendly way of speaking to one another was precisely the expression of an internal camaraderie that was a taste of things to come once they succeeded to power.

José Antonio had another reason for encouraging informality, which became the official party line some months after it merged with the JONS. He decided to add "Antonio" to the name his family used for him ("José," never "Pepe") because he did not want to be known politically by the surname that was directly associated with his father, a dictator. This does not mean to say, however, that his political project, although more ambitious than his father's, was not partly a tribute to it. Unlike his father, he wanted to make a clean break with the Liberal-Democratic system and place himself at the head of a regime that would be not only authoritarian and dictatorial but also Fascist. This regime would continually use the party and its militias, syndicates, women's sections, and youth sections to organize and mobilize Spanish society and make the necessary economic and social reforms so that the country could resist what the Falange believed was the imminent Communist or left-wing revolution. This was how it planned to solve the country's two great "problems": nation and society. This new, reunited Spain, with no fragmenting political parties, would not eliminate class differences but would make them less pronounced, and the country would once again be in a position to play an important role in the world, just like other countries with similar (Fascist) regimes. José Antonio thought that, in this way, he would be able to emulate and, given time, surpass his father.

Formulating his ideology, building up his party, and assuming the leadership would take José Antonio some time—although not too much, as we shall see—and in the process, he would have moments of doubt and hesitation. Later on, in 1936, he seemed to be on the point of renouncing his aspiration to play a central role in the country's future, particularly when the militias, so fundamental to his party, were dismantled (at the beginning of the Civil War, when he was in Alicante prison). This raised doubts about how firmly he had assumed the role of Fascist leader and even suggested

the existence of two José Antonios. Whatever the case, the dominant José Antonio acted to satisfy his desire to create an alternative Fascist party, to become its one and only leader, and to rule the country as head of state—all out of a deep-seated need to emulate and outdo his father.

All the above suggests that the political figure of José Antonio cannot be understood without his father's influence. Although the father (and/or mother) figure always affects the personality of offspring, by no means do all children identify with their parents to the extent that José Antonio did. Neither do they feel such deep desires to emulate and surpass them. In fact, the opposite is quite often the case when children do not identify with their parents, or even actively reject them. Even when their instinct is to emulate, this does not mean they wish to reproduce, copy, or imitate all aspects of their paternal and maternal figures. And if they wish to show their superiority, then the difference is ensured. José Antonio wanted to be superior to his father in two aspects that I believe are crucial: a messianic nature (i.e., a desire to "save the mother country"—and to save it himself), and an intention to impose an authoritarian political program. In many respects, his personal political plans were different from those of his father, but they did share these two characteristics.

The young José Antonio had inherited his father's messianism, which in the General's case had culminated in nothing less than his becoming a dictator, the paradigm of the maximum possible concentration of political power in a single person. Primo de Rivera was convinced he had been entrusted with a personal mission and that he was simply doing his duty (i.e., he was ambitious). This sense of duty prompted him to lead a military uprising that aimed to take power by threatening to mobilize troops and displace the legitimate, constitutional authority. The uprising, which in the event required no actual mobilization, was successful: he succeeded to power in forty-eight hours and remained there for just over six years. And in both quantitative and qualitative terms, the power he held was enormous. For José Antonio, matching, and then surpassing, his father's achievements meant not only vindicating his legacy but also pointing out the shortcomings of his political program. And it required him to come up with his own program that was more authoritarian and palingenetic, and designed to create deeper rifts with the immediate past. Had José Antonio managed to gain power through a coup of his own (or with the help of the Army, which would have subsequently ceded all power to him), he no

doubt would have created and headed a form of government completely new to Spain: a Fascist regime.

However, his hopes would not be realized. Unlike his father, who did manage to gain power and set up a regime, he failed in his attempt. Even so, in terms of his political status and idealized image, if we go by how Francoist Spain hero-worshipped him after his death and for many decades afterward, he did not fail but rather was a resounding success. He was praised, worshipped, lauded, and put on an unimaginable pedestal by the new Franco regime and the Falange. Thus, José Antonio, an object of such postmortem adoration, would eclipse his father.[5]

José Antonio's siblings did not share his intense identification with his father as a politician or his desire to emulate and eclipse him. The dictator's second son, Miguel, named after his father and one year younger than José Antonio, took after his father in ways his brother did not: he was kindhearted (but without the General's clear paternalistic traits), easygoing, highly likeable, and extremely fond of women[6] (especially if they were of high social status). In fact, among his youthful conquests was Infanta Beatriz[7] (a daughter of Alfonso XIII), a dalliance that prompted his father to send him to the United States to study economics and art (he was apparently quite passionate about art, particularly sculpture and painting).[8] Likewise, years after the Civil War had ended, he was forced to resign as ambassador to the United Kingdom, a post he had occupied for seven years, because he had fallen in love with a married English woman whose husband accused him of adultery. He tried to avoid any responsibility by claiming diplomatic immunity. In stark contrast to his elder brother, who was a much better student,[9] his good looks, charm, manners, and spontaneity seemed to make him irresistible to many women.[10] Nevertheless, he, like his brother, had inherited from his father a certain fondness for using violence to settle personal disputes and defend his ideas, and the brothers were involved in various student skirmishes while studying law at the Central University of Madrid. Afterward, in 1930, they again resorted to force to defend the memory of their recently deceased father.

So, unlike his father, José Antonio was shy, serious, and somewhat curt. The two men were, in many ways, opposites, much to the admiration of his father, who was convinced "this boy will go down in history"[11] and that he and Fernando (the youngest) were the two "highfliers" in the family.[12] José Antonio was largely serious, organized, thorough, and hardworking. He

demanded a lot of himself. All these character traits came from his mother's side of the family but were also the outward expression of accepting the role of big brother, reinforced by the loss of his mother at the tender age of five. José Antonio's seriousness differentiated him from his father, and, once he became the Fascist leader, he deliberately cultivated it, adding a certain amount of pretense to what was a real part of his character. After his death, this is what he was most revered for. As a young man, he had an undeniable urge to be the leader of his siblings and was almost forced into this role by his father, who appointed him as their "director."[13] This must have been his first experience of being in charge, something that was quite common for the eldest child of a family (although not all of them were able to cope with their duties).[14] After his mother's death, his father's unmarried sister, María Jesús Primo de Rivera, known to the family as Aunt Ma, had taken over the role of homemaker. In later years, she gave the Primo brothers staunch support during their political adventures.

José Antonio may have been passionate—although there are some differences of opinion in this respect,[15] and he made excessive use of the adjective in his writings—but what he exuded above all was control. He needed to exercise considerable self-control because he was prone to violence, sometimes expressed in outbursts, which he could not always restrain, and in the use of irony, which frequently developed into biting sarcasm. Both characteristics must have been his way of letting off steam after all the effort he always made to seem serious and well mannered.[16] Moreover, "José Antonio was like all his family: easily excitable. For no reason at all, he was capable of blowing his top, and he could be extremely violent."[17] And all these features of his character were apparently compatible with a personality that was "childish, polite," and capable of whiling away a summer evening in San Sebastián "laughing and dancing."[18] The politician José María de Areilza recalled that he seemed "to live a straightforward life, with lots of plans involving women, and nonstop summer meetings and society celebrations."[19] José Antonio, then, was a hodgepodge of seriousness, pride,[20] high standards, thoroughness, anger, aggressiveness, irony, sarcasm, cheerfulness, indifference, friendliness, and shyness. He undoubtedly had a strong character, but he was also attractive, seductive, and charismatic, for at least some of those who knew him.

Perfectionism was one of his most obvious character traits. He applied his "desire for perfection" to projects, speeches, political and literary texts,

and his profession as a lawyer. In this respect, he was quite the opposite of his father, who was undoubtedly more "easygoing." This perfectionism involved rigorous work and perseverance, which he demanded of himself and theorized about: "Spanish people . . . have the urge to set everything in motion, which is a form of laziness. And laziness may be the muse of many a revolution. Instead of setting everything in motion, you should first set about patiently tying up the loose ends."[21] One of the more formal results of this perfectionism was his "desire for a style" expressed in his writings and reinforced by the proximity—and attraction—of writers of archaic prose such as Rafael Sánchez Mazas, José María Alfaro, Agustín de Foxá, Eugenio Montes, and Jacinto Miquelarena. The aim of his literary perfectionism was to make up for his father's shortcomings in this respect (he did not write at all), and he adopted a style that made many of his and the Falange's pronouncements frankly incomprehensible to most mortals who were not among the chosen few or "ruling minority" (including many party members). To sum up, José Antonio applied himself with rigor and perfectionism to design his own political project—the expression of his fervent, ambitious desire to emulate his father—that he would gradually perfect before and after he became leader of the Falange. And although he resoundingly failed in his attempt to gain power, he occasionally proved to be a fine political analyst. Most of his mistakes were made because of his own ideas and obsessions, one of which was his belief that a Communist revolution was imminent.

The second of his brothers, Fernando, the youngest of the Primo de Rivera y Sáenz de Heredia family and familiarly known as *el nene* (our kid), was five years younger than José Antonio and the protégé of the three eldest children (José, Miguel, and Carmen). Like José Antonio, he was serious and hardworking, and he had followed in the professional footsteps of his father and a great-uncle, Fernando Primo de Rivera y Sobremonte, the family patriarch and protector of all the Primo children and their father. He became a career soldier, first in the cavalry like his great-uncle and then a pilot. At the beginning of the Second Spanish Republic, however, there was a great deal of hostility toward his father because of the various conflicts with different sections of the Armed Forces (the Artillery in particular) during the dictatorship,[22] so he gave up his military career and dedicated himself to medicine. Later, he even worked with Dr. Gregorio

Marañón. José Antonio admired Fernando and said he was “the best of them all”[23] and “the bravest one in the family.”[24]

The two sisters, Carmen and Pilar, were quite different from each other. Carmen, the third born, managed to fulfill her life’s ambition. All she wanted was “to be a normal person,” which in her case meant getting married and having children.[25] She did some work for the Falange but much less than did Pilar, the twin sister of Ángela, who died when she was five years old. Like Fernando, Pilar was taken under the wing of the three eldest. She felt particularly close to José Antonio (and he to her), which was surely why she followed his political career so closely. Fernando did likewise. In the months before the outbreak of the Civil War, he became his brother’s right-hand man and took over the leadership of the party when José Antonio was imprisoned in Alicante. Pilar ended up accepting a post of considerable responsibility during the Franco dictatorship: she was the perennial and only national delegate of the Women’s Section (Sección Femenina) of the regime’s single party, the Traditionalist Spanish Phalanx of the Councils of the National Syndicalist Offensive (FET y de las JONS).[26]

José Antonio, Pilar, and Fernando seemed to have the most Castilian character—“more austere, more prone to melancholy and self-absorption”—while Miguel and Carmen were “more Andalusian, more cheerful, more full of life and laughter.”[27] They all admired their father, whom they regarded as not only a good man but also an authentic hero. Professionally, José Antonio initially wanted to follow in the footsteps of his father, his uncle Fernando Primo de Rivera y Orbaneja (married to María Cobo de Guzmán and whose sons were like brothers to José Antonio),[28] and his great-uncle Fernando, all of whom had had military careers. The last of these men appreciated his seriousness and even started to dictate his memoirs to him on his El Encinar estate in Robledo de Chavela. There, on the outskirts of Madrid, “Uncle Fernando” taught José and his brothers horseback riding, hunting, and other sports with the sons of the Fernández-Cuesta y Merelo family. One of these boys, Raimundo Fernández-Cuesta, was seven years older than José Antonio and was first a friend and then a comrade in the Falange.

The stories his great-uncle and father told José Antonio undoubtedly influenced this early vocation for a military career, a vocation that, despite everything, would not become a reality.[29] His father saw no reason for his son to join the Armed Forces that had so disappointed him, and apparently

he did everything he could to change his mind. Later, in different circumstances, he did not react similarly to the desires of his youngest son, Fernando. Nevertheless, the fact that José Antonio did not embark on a military career does not mean he, as the son, grandson, nephew, and great-nephew of soldiers, did not fully embrace military values or would not apply these values to his Fascist party militia in the future. Apparently, the young José Antonio was finally advised to become a lawyer by his uncle Antón Sáenz de Heredia and Fernández-Cuesta. He also considered becoming an engineer, but Antón—who had already instilled in him an interest for literature and theater, as a homespun reader, writer, and actor—made him opt for a more humanistic profession, in this case, law. There was already a certain family tradition because Antón had worked as a lawyer, and José Antonio's maternal grandfather had been a judge. After graduating in law, Fernández-Cuesta had taken the examinations for the Armed Forces legal office and then for the profession of notary, which influenced José Antonio. Fernández-Cuesta went on to become his general secretary in the Falange and an executor of his will, and he had a long political career in Franco's Falange.

Despite opting for a legal career, José Antonio never forgot his frustrated interest—vocation, even—for literature and theater as both an author and actor. According to his cousin Nieves Primo, he wrote a play, *La campana de Huesca,* as a young man, and in the last few years and months of his life, he wrote the outlines of several novels.[30] An educated man, with a strong, sidelined—but always present—literary inclination, he managed to gather around him a group of learned men of letters whom he provided with political leadership. They were in sincere admiration of him for not only the Fascist program he was preparing but also his ideas, culture, and character, all of which made a considerable contribution to the cult of personality that José Antonio as a Fascist leader encouraged within his party. His encounter with these men of letters had been a fortunate one: they were in search of a strong leader and an authoritarian project, and he was fleeing what had happened to his father as a dictator and the opposition of some of the country's most important and influential intellectuals in an attempt to construct a political project with solid foundations from the intellectual point of view and with the support of other intellectuals. He was not given this support by all those he would have liked (e.g., his much-admired José Ortega y Gasset and Miguel de Unamuno), but he did manage to gather a

solid group, led from the beginning by Sánchez Mazas. He was even supported by some who were not party members (e.g., Eugenio d'Ors, one of the greats of the literary scene). This says a great deal about his ability to attract support, which was obviously increased by the glamour of being his father's son. More important than who he was, though, was the Fascist political project he was in the process of constructing, which was extremely attractive to many. Some of the men he attracted helped him lay down the lines of the project. There was, then, a mutual interest: some men were looking for a leader, and the leader needed men.

José Antonio also took an interest in the aristocracy, to which he believed—with some foundation—he belonged. When he inherited a title in 1930, he wrote texts in defense of the role of the "authentic" nobility as opposed to empty *señoritismo* (which only involved playing at being a gentleman). In fact, the family's somewhat straitened circumstances never allowed him, or his father or uncles before him, to enjoy the leisurely life of the well-to-do families from Jerez or Madrid. For example, the boys and girls in his family wore hand-me-downs from elder brothers and cousins, respectively, because the family could not afford to buy new clothes.[31] And from the end of his secondary education until his third year of law school, José Antonio had to work to get by. A company that sold North American machinery hired him because his uncle Antón had shares in the company and because he could speak English—thanks to the family nanny—and French.[32] After he completed his military service and until he reached the required age to practice law, he remained in the same company. Although he was not a "man of leisure," he did live the life of a member of the upper classes during his father's dictatorship (he was earning a lot of money from his legal practice; he could even be said to have been a member of what today we would call the jet set). Even so, he always had to work.

José Antonio completed his primary and secondary studies, as well as the first two years of his law degree at the Central University of Madrid, without attending classes and only turning up for the final exams. He only decided to register as an official university student when he reached his third year. And when he did, he, like many others before and since, started to take an active interest in politics. He became the leader of the Official Association of Law Students, a Liberal body that had been set up in application of the 1919 official decree on university associations issued by Minister of Public Instruction and Fine Arts César Silió in Prime Minister

Antonio Maura's "national government."[33] In response to these official associations, the Asociación de Estudiantes (Association of Catholic Students) set up others that were explicitly confessional and modeled on the ecclesiastical hierarchy and, in particular, on the Jesuits and the National Catholic Association of Apostles of the Faith.[34] In late 1920, José Antonio was elected general secretary of his faculty's association, the president of which was his colleague and friend Ramón Serrano Suñer. At the time, Serrano Suñer's second surname was written as it is here, but he added an accent (Súñer) to remove all traces of its Catalan origin when he was given a position of power in the Franco dictatorship.[35] He was the president of the José María Gil-Robles y Quiñones Section for Catholic Law Students. The fact that Primo and Serrano Suñer were not members of the confessional student organization does not mean they were not Catholics (they were). Rather, they believed the Church should not get involved in professional or student matters and that the separation of the Church and the state should be respected. In later years, Primo stuck to this viewpoint as a member of the Falange, unlike Serrano Suñer, who joined the confessional and Catholic Popular Action and CEDA under the leadership of Gil-Robles. The three of them would meet in 1933 as members of the Republican parliament.

As a member of the Federal Union of Students, José Antonio was heavily involved in a confrontation with the leader of the official student association of the School of Agricultural Engineering and future opponent of the dictatorship, Antoni María Sbert i Massanet. José Antonio had convinced the Faculty of Law not to support a strike called by the special schools in response to a government decree that awarded officers from the Field Artillery Command and the Engineers Command a degree in civil engineering.[36] On this occasion, José Antonio for the first time used violence as a means of political struggle. The events occurred when the Association of Catholic Students attempted to make Thomas the Apostle the patron saint of all the faculties, a proposal that the rector had refused to accept. José Antonio and his brother Miguel played a leading role in defending the right to academic activity on that day in their faculty, and, armed with sticks, they took on the Catholics, led by the Martín-Artajo brothers[37] (one of whom would later be a minister under Franco). Years later, when he was working as a lawyer during the dictatorship, José Antonio was involved in another confrontation with the same brothers. This time, after a public examination for the post of professor of commercial law

at the University of Madrid, the votes cast by the professors Felipe Clemente de Diego and Felipe Sánchez Román in favor of the candidate Joaquín Garrigues—an Official Association of Law Students member—prompted the Catholics to pelt them with eggs and meringue. Their former students, including José Antonio, rushed to their defense.[38]

In the final years of his degree, which he finished in 1922 at the age of nineteen, José Antonio was heavily involved in student politics but also put his heart into his studies. He began to show a preference for civil law, which was taught by the two aforementioned professors, and, to a lesser extent, for criminal law, which was taught by the Socialist Luis Jiménez de Asúa. Despite his hard work, however, he always lagged a bit behind the brilliant Serrano Suñer. At the beginning of José Antonio's time at university, in 1917 and 1918, his great-uncle Fernando had been minister of war for five months but died in 1921 (the same year his uncle Fernando died at the Battle of Annual), so Primo de Rivera inherited his title of Marquess of Estella, and it became clear that the title would someday be handed down to José Antonio.

Adolescence and early adulthood were important times for José Antonio because, through the influence of his great-uncle Fernando, a minister, he managed to get some work with the government and state administration. Military interventionism (or praetorianism) had declined after the start of the Restoration but had been rising since the first decade of the twentieth century and was rife in Spanish politics at the time. This was the result of not only the Morocco crisis but also the setting up of the so-called defense councils, pseudo-syndicates consisting of Army officers who questioned some aspects of military policy but were always prepared to join forces when the increasingly mobilized left-wing rabbles or the Catalan "separatists" had to be put in their place. They were tumultuous times. The last years of World War I, the Russian Revolution, and the beginning of the first postwar period in Spain were characterized by extreme economic, social, and political conflict. This so-called period of *pistolerismo* (the practice, used by Spanish employers, of hiring thugs to solve their problems with employees and syndicates) saw workers' protests, as well as demands for a genuine Democratization of politics, the end to *caciquismo* and corruption, and, in Catalonia, a statute of autonomy. In the meantime, the monarchy was on the defensive.

During these years, José Antonio's father took the final and decisive steps in his military and political career, which would culminate in his becoming dictator of Spain in September 1923. In 1920, he was elected Conservative senator for Cadiz and promoted to lieutenant general, the highest rank in the Army. As such, he was in a position to be appointed to a captaincy general (i.e., the highest authority of one of the military regions into which the country was divided). He was very soon in charge of the third captaincy general, which was headquartered in Valencia; he was then made responsible for the first (Madrid) and, finally, the fourth (Catalonia), which is where he would initiate his coup. The General and his family found that both Valencia and Barcelona were being rocked by social tensions and terrorist violence perpetrated by anarchist gunmen and thugs in the pay of the employers' associations. This violence was partly the result of the harsh economic and working reality that was making life extremely difficult for the working classes during and after World War I.

To combat this wave of *pistolerismo* and to stand up to the "scum," the General opted to take measures of doubtful legality, as he was wont to say in private and as he communicated by letter to Conservative Prime Minister Eduardo Dato. These measures soon led to the infamous Ley de Fugas (a law that allowed prison guards to shoot escaping prisoners and was often abused to cover up what were, essentially, executions). In his letter, the General communicated to Dato that, in response to the terrorist activity and the murder of the Conde de Salvatierra, who had not been replaced, "the secretary of the civil government, the colonel of the Civil Guard, and I agreed to take measures that worked wonders because they put an end to all the terrorist attacks."[39] He went on to refer to the Ley de Fugas: "A raid, a transfer, an escape attempt, a few bullets, and that was the beginning of the solution to the problem. At first, things got worse. It is not pleasant to see cultured cities abandoning themselves to such acts, but there is no other option because ordinary justice and legislation are powerless. What's more, the savagery of terrorism, which spares no one, is all the justification we need."[40] None of this met the opposition of the generals, other Army officers, and many Conservatives, but it is significant that Primo de Rivera informed the head of a constitutional government—albeit in a private letter—and that no consequences were to be paid. Nevertheless, and most importantly, the events prompted Primo de Rivera to consider taking extreme political action—a coup or uprising. He subsequently wrote:

> I first started to think that I should intervene in Spanish politics in some way other than the usual channels while I was in command as the captain general of Valencia in 1920. There was no need for me to believe I had the ability or the character to change the course of politics in the normal fashion when men of great talent, some of whom were undoubtedly of good faith, had all, one after the other, failed in their attempts to do so.[41]

The root causes underlying this decision to rise up against the established order were problems of public order, the desire to restore authority and bring down the *caciques*, and the Battle of Annual (aka Disaster of Annual), where the Army had suffered more than ten thousand casualties and the defeat had instilled the nation with a sense of shame. Also important were his opposition to the reforms made by Prime Minister Manuel García Prieto's Liberal government and the imminence—in September 1923—of the Picasso Report (Expediente Picasso) being submitted to the parliament, drawn up by General Juan Picasso González to investigate the events at Annual. It revealed that the king was largely responsible for encouraging General Manuel Fernández Silvestre's reckless offensive that had ended in disaster.

The military disaster had had a seismic effect on Spanish political life and on Primo de Rivera. His younger brother, Fernando, at the head of the light cavalry unit Cazadores de Alcántara no. 14, had died in action at Monte Arruit trying to protect the chaotic, disordered, and pathetic retreat of the officers and soldiers. Many of the former, by the way, had been running faster than the latter, or leaving the scene by car and abandoning the troops and wounded to their fate. In the aftermath, Primo de Rivera had given a speech in the Senate in which he proposed that Spain give up the protectorate. Conservative Minister of War Juan de la Cierva y Peñafiel's response was to sack him. He would not be out of work for long, however. In 1922, there was a change of government. García Prieto became prime minister, and Primo de Rivera was asked to take command of the fourth military region in Barcelona. One year later, he was back in Madrid after heading the bloodless uprising that would make him Spain's dictator for more than six years, during which time his family's intervention in politics would reach new heights.

José Antonio, who had recently graduated in law,[42] did not go with his father to Barcelona. He did spend the summers of 1922 and 1923 there, but he otherwise lived in Madrid, studying for his doctorate and waiting to be old enough to practice law. Because no courses were available in the

specialty of civil law, which is what most attracted him, he had to choose others, and he became particularly interested in social politics, taught by Luis de Olariaga.[43] However, he did not complete his doctorate: he never got around to writing his dissertation. After he had finished his course, he went to Barcelona to do his military service and, as a “one-year volunteer,” was allowed to serve as a junior officer. In Barcelona, with his brother Miguel, he joined a cavalry regiment, the Santiago Dragoons, and this is when his father staged his uprising. On its successful completion, José Antonio moved back to Madrid with all the family, after he had requested a transfer[44] to the Húsares de la Princesa regiment. He finished his military service in 1924 with the rank of second lieutenant.

During his time in Barcelona, he mainly mixed with the families of high-ranking military officers of the captaincy general (e.g., the sons and daughters of General Eulogio Despujol y Dusay) and the middle-class families of industrialists or businesspeople with patriotic Spanish attitudes. Among others, his best friends were Jorge Girona[45] and Pedro Conde Soladana (whose family owned the El Siglo chain of stores).[46] These young people would, during the Republic, support Alfonsist authoritarianism represented in Catalonia by the parties Peña Blanca (White Rock), Derecha de Cataluña (Right of Catalonia), and Spanish Renewal. The months José Antonio spent in Barcelona and the friendships he made there revealed a reality he deeply disapproved of: the widespread nature of political Catalanism in Catalonia and, to a lesser extent, separatism. Acció Catalana (Catalan Action), an offshoot of the Lliga Regionalista de Catalunya (Regionalist League of Catalonia), came into being at this time, later spawning Francesc Macià’s party, Estat Català (Catalan State). José Antonio also became aware of the power of Syndicalism in the form of the clandestine Anarcho-syndicalist Confederación Nacional del Trabajo (National Confederation of Labor—CNT). All these experiences would serve him well in the future, during the Republic, and allowed him to adopt an informed position on the Catalan question. As we shall see, his opinions were much more nuanced and detailed than those of the other extreme right-wing forces (e.g., Spanish Renewal or Dr. José María Albiñana’s Partido Nacionalista Español [Spanish Nationalist Party—PNE]). As the regional leader of Catalonia’s extremely small Falange party, he appointed Roberto Bassas Figa, a lawyer like himself and a former Republican supporter of Catalan autonomy.

Back in Madrid, while his father was beginning his period as dictator, José Antonio went back to his job at the North American company for which he sometimes worked, although always in support of the staff lawyer, Adolfo Rincón de Arellano. At the same time, he continued to attend classes taught by some of his former lecturers (e.g., Clemente de Diego, Sánchez Román, and Olariaga) and by a lawyer for whom he always had a great deal of respect, Antonio de Goicoechea, the future leader of Spanish Renewal. In 1925, he was finally allowed to register at the Ilustre Colegio de Abogados de Madrid (Madrid Bar Association—ICAM). He set up his own professional practice and spent most of his time representing and defending civil causes, so he did not follow the example set by Fernández-Cuesta and Serrano Suñer (who became a state lawyer) and take the competitive examinations for the civil service, because he hated this sort of rote, learning-based assessment. He was also much more interested in forensic practice, which he began at the height of the dictatorship and which almost certainly had more advantages and fewer problems. Apparently, he refused to accept cases that were mainly interested in exploiting the influence and connections of the dictatorial regime, but, even so, it is difficult to believe that being the dictator's son did not bring in a lot of custom. Even so, his professional success was largely because he was extremely competent.

A Saga of Committed Soldiers: From Great-Uncle to Father (Minister to Dictator)

The fact that José Antonio did not follow his father's example and join the Army was one reason why his involvement in politics could not be the same. His father had come to power by means of an atypical military uprising, but an uprising nonetheless, while he would have to reach the same objective by a different route. Even so, the option of resorting to the Army was always on his mind, and he entertained the idea quite seriously on several occasions, but only because lack of numbers meant his own party was incapable of carrying out a coup of its own. José Antonio's somewhat naive aim was to enter the political scene with the Falange and lead a movement that could take power by its own means (a Falange-led coup)—a

joint Falange-Army coup or a military coup. He hoped that, once power had been seized, the rebels would hand all political power over to him.

The Primo de Rivera family had a tradition of using force to influence politics that can be traced back to the great-grandfather José Joaquín Primo de Rivera y Ortiz de Pinedo, who had been minister of the Navy. Two of José Antonio's direct relatives—his great-uncle Fernando Primo de Rivera y Sobremonte and his father, Miguel—had done so to great effect. Primo de Rivera, as father and dictator, was not José Antonio's only point of reference, although he was the most influential and, in turn, had been influenced by his uncle and grandfather. This tradition of military intervention, particularly during the dictatorship, and the careers of José Antonio's relatives require further analysis if their influence on subsequent events is to be determined. His great-uncle Fernando, a father figure to the future dictator and the family as a whole, was born in 1831 and had taken part in the Glorious Revolution of 1868, led by General Juan Prim, that deposed Isabella II and ushered in a Democratic six-year period. However, paradoxically, in 1874 he also took part—albeit more passively, by not offering any resistance—in the uprising led by his friend General Arsenio Martínez Campos that restored Alfonso XII, the son of the overthrown queen, to the throne.

He was appointed minister of war for the first time from 1874 to 1875. He fought in the Third Carlist War, and, after taking Montejurra and, on 16 February 1876, Estella (the traditionalist stronghold), he was promoted and given the title of Marquess of Estella. And like other high-ranking Army officers of the Restoration, he was a member of the parliament as a senator, acting as minister of war in the Conservative governments of Maura (1907) and Dato (1917). He was also president of the Supreme Council of War and Navy (i.e., Supreme Military Court). Before, in 1897, he had been captain general of the Philippines in substitution of General Camilo García de Polavieja and had signed the Pact of Biak-na-Bato under which the revolutionary leader Emilio Aguinaldo agreed to end the armed struggle and go into exile in the British colony of Hong Kong (China) in exchange for a considerable sum of money. The agreement, however, did not prevent the insurrection from starting up again in response to the 1898 war with the United States. Spain ended up losing not only the Philippine archipelago but also the rest of its colonies. Despite this, Fernando Primo de Rivera y

Sobremonte was rewarded for his work with a new title of nobility: the count of San Fernando de la Unión.[47]

After his colleagues Valeriano Weyler and Martínez Campos—the latter of whom, thanks to one of the two parties alternating in power, the Conservatives, served as minister of war (on three occasions) and a senator—Fernando was one of the most influential generals in the Army. He first got involved in politics after taking part in an uprising and stayed involved because he actively refused to resist the revolt that marked the start of the Restoration, the last military intervention of this sort for almost fifty years because the successive governments awarded the Army a great deal of autonomy and influence. For much of this time, Uncle Fernando was a leading figure. The period of nonmilitary intervention was brought to an end by the uprising initiated by his favorite nephew, Miguel, which would mark the beginning of a new fateful period in Spain's history. A rich man with no sons, Uncle Fernando acted as the family patriarch. He lent considerable amounts of money to his brother, the future dictator's father, and took two of his sons—Miguel and Fernando, the youngest—under his wing. Miguel embarked on his career by his side. It was on his estate in Robledo de Chavela that the young Miguel would engage in horseback riding, hunting, and other sports.[48] The stories his great-uncle told about his life and daring deeds surely had some influence on his early military vocation.

The second and most important family precedent of political intervention for José Antonio was his own father, Miguel Primo de Rivera y Orbaneja, sixth son of Miguel Primo de Rivera y Sobremonte, from Seville. The dictator's father, José Antonio's grandfather, had also been a career soldier, although he left the Army after he had been posted to Jerez de la Frontera, where he met and married Inés Orbaneja y Pérez de Grandallana, a local landowner's daughter. Two of their offspring became famous: Miguel, of course, and Fernando, "the hero of Monte Arruit." He decided to leave the Army to administer his wife's estates, but did not take to his role as administrator, and the family fell on hard times. His responsibility for the estates—Jédula, El Rosario, and Berlanguilla (aka La Huerta del Coronel)—obliged him to ask his brother the marquess for loans. In fact, circumstances were so straitened that the marquess, like his brother-in-law José before him, had to take in some of the family's sons to give them food and an education. Apparently, four of his sons went to live with them in

Madrid: Sebastián, José, Miguel (the future dictator), and, later, Fernando. All this reveals that, although the Primo de Rivera y Orbaneja family were "respected," they were not very wealthy. In fact, they went into decline and became an upper-middle-class family who were going through a period of economic difficulty, so their sons had to work to support themselves. Although they were *señoritos* from Jerez, they were not "men of leisure" with considerable private incomes.

In Madrid, the future dictator did not manage to finish his secondary education, and, with his brother José, he entered the General Military Academy in Toledo. (Some years later, the young Fernando also opted for a military career after he had struck up a close friendship with his uncle Marquess of Estella.) Miguel was an officer in the infantry, while Fernando joined the cavalry, as his protector had done. After the events, the dictator revealed he was well aware he had been his uncle's favorite: "If I was my Uncle Fernando's favorite, it was because I managed to win his affection. Sebastián and Pepe were his nephews just like I was, and they were also older, but he chose us younger ones, perhaps because he thought Fernando and I were more of a reflection of him and his career."[49] Most important, however, was that his uncle's predilection for Miguel and their close relationship would have a considerable influence on Miguel's career. Although Miguel was undeniably a good soldier, for years he had to put up with people saying his abilities had been greatly exaggerated and that he had been given the unfair advantage of sudden promotions from his family connections.

All this is probably true. In fact, Miguel was never too popular among his colleagues, who believed he had been shown favoritism and that his family's influence was clear. They regarded him as a social climber, a flatterer, and an opportunist.[50] Family connections allowed him to be given strategic posts for his career, but he did show courage and initiative in combat conditions. Of course, many others were similarly courageous, but he was better positioned to take advantage of it. As a result, he went through the ranks as quickly as the other twentieth-century Spanish dictator, Francisco Franco. Whereas Franco's meteoric rise was largely due to the favors bestowed on him by Alfonso XIII, Miguel had his uncle to thank, obviously a much less important figure but by no means insignificant. Whatever the case, Primo de Rivera, like Franco, was already well known outside the Army before he became a political dictator.

Apparently, his interest in politics had been awakened in the period after the Disaster of 1898 (Spanish-American War), and he took a Conservative stance toward the regenerationist atmosphere that prevailed even among some members of the dynastic political elites. However, his attempts to enter the political game were always disappointing. In 1907, taking advantage of the fact that his uncle was a minister and perhaps suffering the delusion that his influence could be a decisive factor, he tried to get elected as a Conservative member of the parliament for the district of Écija (Seville). Ten years later, he did manage to make himself known thanks to the speech he made accepting membership of the Royal Spanish American Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters of Cadiz, which would cost him his posting. On this occasion, his uncle could do nothing to protect him. In the speech, he criticized, for the first time in public, the government's policy on Morocco and its continual attempts to consolidate the so-called protectorate. He argued that Spain should abandon the new colony and cut a deal with Great Britain exchanging Ceuta for Gibraltar. In his speech, he also proposed to end the enormous expense required to maintain the Spanish presence in Morocco and use the money saved to improve education and infrastructures in Spain. A lack of political courage, then, was not a criticism that could be leveled against him.

The year 1917 was a turbulent one. At the same time as a general strike was called, an alternative parliamentary assembly of Republicans, Catalanists, Socialists, and Reformists met in Barcelona, all demanding in-depth changes to the system. There was also strong pressure from the military defense boards, corporate military bodies made up of officers who aimed to influence military policy, particularly the question of promotions for meritorious action in the face of the enemy. The atmosphere of change that prevailed in the street was in stark contrast to the inanity of the dynastic governments of the time. Moreover, 1917 was when, for the first time in history, a Communist revolution would be successful. The overthrow of the Russian tsar and the tsarist state, and the establishment of the first Communist state, was an unprecedented event that sent shock waves throughout Europe and marked the history of the twentieth century. The fear that it might spread was by no means new; although it had only recently come about, the Conservative sectors, Liberal or otherwise, had been living in fear of a revolution by the "underlings" for some time. In previous years, the dynastic elites who were in power (and the General) had

been well aware of the need to “do something” to maintain the economic and social order, and they had made some failed attempts, although somewhat haphazardly.

So Miguel Primo de Rivera was an extreme Conservative, but also a “top-down” regenerationist, who liked to quote Joaquín Costa’s ideas on education and other issues. At some point, he may have been regarded as the *cirujano de hierro* (iron surgeon) whom Costa had said was required to carry out a revolution “from above” and remove the vices of the oligarchic political system, but he was quite ready to indoctrinate anyone who was willing to listen with his points of view and personal formulas. However, after his speech in Cadiz, shortly after the death of his brother Fernando at Annual, he was once again relieved of his post for his opinions about the protectorate and the need to abandon it to its fate. As things turned out, he was not out of work for long. The following year, he was appointed captain general of Catalonia and transferred to Barcelona. The year 1921 had also witnessed the death of his uncle Fernando and his inheritance of the title of Marquess of Estella, grandee of Spain by the grace of Alfonso XIII. Nine years later, he would hand the title down to his firstborn son, José Antonio. In turn, his brother Fernando, the other of his uncle’s protégés, inherited the second title, the count of San Fernando de la Unión, although he was not to enjoy it for very long, because he died in battle.

In Barcelona, Primo de Rivera did not restrict himself to carrying out his professional duties. In fact, the captaincy general of Catalonia was not just a military body; it was also a real regional political-military power base set up by General Joaquín Milans del Bosch, who had been in charge from 1918 to 1920 and, after the general strike of 1919, had combined military power with a good understanding with the forces driving the local region. He got on particularly well with the Catalanist and non-Catalanist middle classes, who since 1909 had been funding the *somatén* (a local paramilitary militia) to maintain law and order and take a stand against strikers and Anarcho-syndicalists. During the years of *pistolerismo*, Milans had often clashed with civil governors who were more prepared to reach compromises with strikers than to take decisive action. So, he had imposed and supported unscrupulous police chiefs in Barcelona as well as military men (such as General Miguel Arlegui), and he had even managed to get other military hardliners like General Severiano Martínez Anido into the civil government of the province (given the civil nature of the institution,

this was quite exceptional). Another area in which Milans had been active was the struggle against Macià's Catalan separatists, a minority group compared with the Conservatives of the Regionalist League who were in favor of greater autonomy. This regional Barcelona-Catalonia military power base has been referred to as an authentic "military party"[51] or an influential lobby within the Army. At the time, Arlegui bragged about how powerful he was to the chief of protocol of the Barcelona City Council: "Tell all those fighting for the Catalan cause that they have won because I take action without taking a blind bit of notice of the orders from Madrid. That's how well things have gone."[52] Or, as Milans would remember it, "Martínez Anido had to fight not against those who were disturbing the peace in Barcelona but against the governments in Madrid."[53]

In Barcelona, Primo de Rivera had exploited this power. He learned how to manipulate it, and he won victories for the local elites and the government in Madrid. His greatest victory was the public transport strike in the spring of 1923 in which he clearly defeated the workers. In fact, a member of the Catalan militia had died during the confrontations brought about by the strike, and when his fellow militiamen attempted to avenge his death by lynching Civil Governor Francisco Barber at the funeral, Primo de Rivera saved his life. The feelings between the two of them had been extremely tense, and some even suggested the captain general had encouraged the strike.[54] They were called to Madrid to explain the differences between them, but only Primo de Rivera returned to take up his post again. However, during his stay in Catalonia, maintaining law and order was not his only focus of activity. While he was in Barcelona, he decided to stage the uprising that would culminate his ambition for power, an ambition that the de facto powers in the city had praised and encouraged because of all the work he had put in on their behalf. His aim had been to convince them to back his project with promises he would not keep (this is how he kept the Catalanists satisfied).

Encouraged by his "successes" in the public sphere, he made a fundamental change in the relation that Milans had with sectors of the Catalan Conservative middle classes: he started accepting, or gave the impression that he was accepting, the demands of the monarchic autonomists of the Regionalist League and the Autonomist Monarchic Federation, one of which was to maintain and increase tariff protectionism. In fact, when these sectors had approached him seeking greater power for

the Commonwealth of Catalonia, which had been created in 1914, Primo de Rivera had seemed open to the idea. And he had even shown so much enthusiasm for some of the demands, that some of the people involved began to suspect he was not being honest. He did, however, manage to convince the majority, among whom were nearly all the leaders of the Regionalist League, the Catalanist Conservative party that controlled the Commonwealth with Josep Puig i Cadafalch as its president.[55] He also had the support of the nonautonomist monarchic sectors that were in favor of the Commonwealth. They were led by such figures as Juan Antonio Güell y López (Marquess of Comillas, Count of Güell, and Count of San Pedro de Ruiseñada), who was constantly encouraging him to make a decision. Day after day, he would say things like, "Miguel, you have got to rise up. We can't put up with this anymore. You've only got one option: a coup." In particular, he helped him get over a personal issue that had made him unwilling to lead a coup: he had a sizeable gambling debt hanging over his head. Juan Antonio and his brother Santiago paid it off for him.[56]

So, Primo de Rivera managed to obtain the support of a regional civil political base. However, once he seized power, he made no attempt to take care of this base. Quite the contrary. Even so, to be able to carry out the coup, he needed support from within the Army, particularly from the fourth military region. To win over the Barcelona garrison—and all the garrisons in Catalonia, which were not just anti-separatist but also anti-Catalanist—he portrayed himself as one of them. At the same time, the General was careful to cultivate good relations with not only the defense boards (Barcelona was where they had first been set up, and the main leaders lived in the city) but also the "African" sector, frustrated because a plan to disembark in Morocco presented to the government by Martínez Anido, the military commander in Melilla, had been rejected. In Madrid, the leaders of the pro-African sector—the generals José Cavalcanti, Leopoldo Saro, Antonio Daban, and Federico Berenguer (brother of Dámaso Berenguer who, with Silvestre, was largely responsible for the Disaster of Annual)—assured them that "going there was not a good idea, but just at the moment backing out is difficult."[57] In fact, this group, known as "the Quadrilateral," had already begun to plan the coup. They counted on Primo de Rivera and José Sanjurjo (stationed in Zaragoza) and were seeking the support of the most prestigious generals in the Army: Weyler and Francisco Aguilera. Finally, Weyler, who was eighty-five years old, was not approached, and Aguilera

was discounted because he was involved in a parliamentary incident with the politician José Sánchez Guerra and, in the conspirers' opinion, proved too weak.

Primo de Riva, prepared to rise up in any way and at any price, was the most determined and proactive of them all. The Quadrilateral informed the king of a plot to take power, and he gave the plot his wholehearted approval. In fact, since 1918 he had developed authoritarian ideas and even considered leading a coup himself and becoming a king-dictator.[58] For several months, he had been scheming in an attempt to force an uprising and avoid his responsibility for the events in Annual. However, Primo de Rivera was far from being his first choice as leader. He put his trust in the Quadrilateral, and when Primo de Rivera finally led the revolt, on 13 September 1923, the king took measures to avoid handing over power. He only backed down when the General countered with measures of his own, among them a veiled threat to remove him from the throne and replace him with the Prince of Asturias. The Quadrilateral were in contact with Primo de Rivera through an artillery commander, José Cruz Conde, whom Cavalcanti sent to Barcelona with another emissary. They arrived on 12 September after stopping in Zaragoza to speak to Sanjurjo. Things were not looking good in the Madrid garrison, and everything was going to depend on the energy and determination of Primo de Rivera, supported by Sanjurjo. Primo de Rivera had the bit between his teeth, he had set the date,, and he had been spurred on even more by the events of 11 September, the National Day of Catalonia, when protesters had caused some serious incidents by shouting their support for the Moroccans and against the Army.

To set the coup in motion, a telegram was sent to the Ministry of War. In view of most of the captaincy generals' lack of response, Prime Minister García Prieto attempted to stop it by ordering Weyler to go from Palma to Barcelona, but the king refused to give his permission. García Prieto also ordered the captain general of the third military region in Zabalza to march from Valencia to Barcelona with his troops, and the Navy to send ships to the scene. To counter this, Primo de Rivera had arranged for two regiments to neutralize the troops coming from the south and for the heavy artillery in Montjuic to open fire on any warship that should come into range. While he was giving these orders, according to Cruz Conde, he said: "They don't know me! They are going to have to go all the way to get me to back down now."[59] And while he was waiting to see how things were going to turn out,

accompanied only by his assistants, some officers, and Cruz Conde, he spoke

> about everything; about the sorrows and misery of small-minded, mean, and impure politics; about the shame of colonial wars; about Morocco; about Catalonia; about *pistolerismo*; about the endless capitulations of all the governments; about the absolute lack of grand national ideals; about the quashing of the spirit of the people, smothered by the weight of the base interests of political parties; about the Fatherland, which was always relegated to second place by those whose obligation it was to serve it. But that's enough of meekly suffering a decadence that has been going on for so long that it seems as if it were a divine curse. Today I shall bring this shame to an end, or I shall die in the attempt!

Meanwhile, Cruz

> silently listened to that long diatribe, a precise reflection of the man's personal truth, because there was no audience to impress. He was speaking because of some sort of physical need to provide an outlet for the almost mystical exaltation of his great patriot's soul. Although he was aware of the failure of the Madrid uprising, of fundamental importance, and he did not know what was happening in the rest of Spain, not once did he consider desisting, negotiating an agreement, fleeing for his life. He had to be victorious to save Spain or he would die for his country! He needed a clear, decisive triumph or he would bequeath his Army jacket riddled with the holes made by the bullets of the firing squad to his children. This is what he said in a short text that he gave me for the press in Madrid.[60]

Primo de Rivera asked the generals in Madrid to join the coup, even if they could only do so in small units, and he envisaged setting up a military government led by a prestigious general such as Weyler. This shows how lonely he felt. But the government finally backed down and gave up its hold on power by sending its resignations to the king, who accepted the coup de facto. He appointed a military government, which included not Primo de Rivera but the Quadrilateral plus General Ramón Nouvilas. By doing this, he was directly attempting to deprive the General of power before he had the chance to get to the capital and take it for himself. However, Primo de Rivera traveled to Madrid immediately and, with the support of Sanjurjo and Milans—who was a member of the king's military committee—threatened the king and took what he considered his due.

To sum up, Miguel Primo de Rivera led the uprising Alfonso XIII had been seeking (in his own peculiar style, with no real movement of troops outside the barracks), even though he had not wanted Primo de Rivera to be the leading player. The General's skill lay in the fact that he perceived that

the time was right and took advantage of it. The monarch adopted the same strategy in 1930. Unhappy with what Primo de Rivera was doing, he conspired against him and then did not lift a finger to keep him in his post when he presented his resignation. In his place, he appointed General Dámaso Berenguer, who by that time had become a member of the Quadrilateral. Primo de Rivera, then, was not a member of the military elite that had earned the trust and the friendship of the monarch, even though Alfonso had to accept him and unconstitutionally hand him the reins of power. Despite his reluctance, the king enjoyed the benefits of the first stage of the new regime, which was not without its successes. A mixture of envy and contempt always characterized his relationship with the dictator, as was made patently clear in 1925 when he was informed of the Alhucemas landing, the beginning of the military "solution" to the Moroccan issue. He blurted out to José Antonio in public: "Your pig of a father has had a real stroke of luck!"[61] José Antonio would never forget it. Primo de Rivera himself felt he had had the luck—perhaps better defined as criminal recklessness—that he had not had four years earlier when he had brought about the disaster by ordering Silvestre to advance at the Battle of Annual. And, of course, attributing the success to luck is indicative the king's contempt for Primo de Rivera's ability.

The relationship between Alfonso XIII and Primo de Rivera is key to understanding why José Antonio, as leader of the Falange years later, would drift apart from the monarchy. Like his father, he was made to feel "he was not a part" of the elite or of the king's entourage. He was constantly reminded that he was his father's son and that simply inheriting one of the "new" noble titles (and from a parvenu general to boot) did not mean he automatically became a member of the most reactionary nobility. Although the General's original aim had been to head a government of prestigious members of civil society, he, after he seeing what the king had tried to do in Madrid, worked to get himself appointed as the president and universal minister of a military government whose members he would appoint himself. He wanted to work only with brigadier generals (i.e., his subordinates) and not with the "courtiers."[62] His intention at first was to be in power for only a few months, so he did not give up his post as captain general of Catalonia until May 1924. Nevertheless, he remained in power for more than six years, and when he finally decided to resign, he did so much against his will. All this would impact José Antonio.

After the uprising, Primo de Rivera published a manifesto in which he expressed his regret at not having been able to act within the confines of the law to lead the “liberation of the country from the professionals of politics, from those who . . . have set a scene of misfortune and immorality that goes back to the year 1898 and threatens Spain with an impending tragic and dishonorable end.” So, the country needed to be saved “from the densely woven web of political concupiscence that has it in a stranglehold, holding it at ransom and even refusing to acknowledge the royal will.” His would be “a movement of men: he who does not feel himself to be the most masculine of men should wait calmly in the corner for the good times that we are preparing for our country.” The frenzied prose that would become his trademark—to José Antonio’s secret shame—included a jumble of explanations for the uprising that mixed causes of questionable significance (one of which was a problem he had experienced firsthand: gambling) with the real reasons behind the movement:

> There is no need for us to justify our actions, which all right-thinking people have demanded and obliged of us. Prelates, former governors, agents of authority, businessmen, foremen, and workingmen have all been murdered; audacious crimes have gone unpunished, the currency has depreciated, millions in reserved funds have been frittered away, and suspect import duties have been implemented by authorities who are proud to display their brazen immorality; there have been base political intrigues on the pretext of the tragedy in Morocco, and uncertainty on how to cope with this most grave national problem; there is social indiscipline, which makes work ineffective and hopeless; agricultural and industrial production is precarious and crippling; Communist propaganda goes unpunished, ungodliness and ignorance are rife, separatists are brazen in their aims; responsibilities arouse tendentious passions, and . . . finally, let us be fair, the Government has just one thing in its favor: for the last nine months, thanks to the inexhaustible goodness of the Spanish people, there has been a weak and incomplete persecution of the vice of gambling.[63]

Among other issues, political regeneration and a refusal to bow to the threat from the Left and the separatists were the mainstays of his authoritarian program, if it can be referred to as such, which he innocently expected to be able to apply successfully in a very short time. He said nothing, however, of his plans to stop reformist programs such as the one García Prieto and Minister of Finance Santiago Alba Bonifaz had been implementing since December. His anti-Democratic and authoritarian term in office would shut off this channel even though he did make some proposals for change. Of course, there was no real need for a coup at that time (or at any other time in Spain’s history for that matter). The economic,

social, and Liberal-Democratic political system was under no particular revolutionary or separatist threat. The worst of the troubles caused by the working classes during World War I and the initial postwar period were over by this time, and the insurrectional capacity of the revolutionary groups was somewhat limited. The coup could also not be justified by the radical Catalanists' demands. And, initially at least, Primo de Rivera was prepared to listen to the pro-autonomist Catalanists. There was deep discontent with the prevailing constitutional political system, elitist and far from Democratic, which García Prieto's government was planning to submit to a series of social reforms in 1923. Primo de Rivera's uprising brought these plans to a halt.

According to Carolyn P. Boyd: "The regime was clearly evolving toward greater representivity, and this had obvious consequences for the survival of those who had benefited most from the old system, including the Crown and the Army. The uprising, then, nipped any threat to their power in the bud."[64] It was a response not to Republicanism, which at this time was not enjoying the boom of just a few years later (1930 and 1931), or to the fact that the organized groups of the working classes (Socialists, Anarcho-syndicalists, and Communists) were strong enough and capable enough to bring down the economic or political system. On the contrary, the uprising was Primo de Rivera's way of halting the government's reformist-regenerationist agenda. García Prieto was demanding responsibilities for what had happened at Annual, and his fiscal reform envisaged a direct tax on rural and urban landowners, a special tax on war profits, a new agrarian law, taxation on the Church, real and effective freedom of worship, legalization of all workers' organizations, social interventionism (inspired by David Lloyd George in Britain, and he was even prepared to accept the Institute for Social Reforms suggestion to give workers a share in company profits and to make payments to fund retirement pensions), parliamentary permission for governments to suspend constitutional guarantees, and Senate reform (in an attempt to prevent major landowners from habitually quashing all reform measures). On top of all this, his taxation policy was against the interests of the Catalan bourgeoisie, as well as a source of concern for the king and some sectors of economic and political power.[65] This is where Primo de Rivera came in, although it could just as well have been any other general. He, however, saw his chance and took it.

Primo de Rivera’s Dictatorship

So, José Antonio’s father stood up to Democratization and social reform with authoritarianism and a desire for his own reform and regeneration. I fully agree that Primo de Rivera was “an intelligent politician, capable of convincing widely different groups that he was the right man . . . He had a perfect understanding of the social and political transformations resulting from World War I, and he understood that the only way of controlling the masses without paying the price of democracy was to set up a dictatorship to ‘educate’ the people in the values of authoritarian nationalism with a combination of the sword and the pen.”[66] He was skillful enough to set himself up as leader and to crystallize the desire to halt Democratic reforms and replace them with authoritarian and, in their way, regenerating reforms. And although many of his projects led nowhere, he managed to implement some effective reforms, which created problems for him with the king and the elite sectors of society that had given him support. He proved to be both ambitious and bold. He found support from sectors of the Army, from the Conservative Catalanist sectors seeking autonomy and greater tariff protectionism, and from the sectors of “law and order”—all anxious to scotch any ideas of democracy and fiscal and employment reforms that would directly impact their interests. Some of these reforms directly opposed the Catalanists’ demands for greater autonomy.

Primo de Rivera’s uprising ended the country’s fifty years without a coup. In his desire “to do something” and respond to the doubts about the status quo that were gripping the system, he opened a Pandora’s box that would open once again six years after a group of Franco-led generals forced him to resign. This second time, however, the consequences would be much more enduring and bloodier. So, Primo de Rivera destroyed the legal continuity of Liberalism, revived Republicanism, and initiated a period of radicalization in Spanish politics that—thanks to a new national military hero, his colleagues, and civil paramilitary forces, among which his son’s Falange would play a particularly important role—would end in civil war.[67] Even though he had quite different political aims, José Antonio learned several lessons from his father’s coup and the ensuing dictatorship, one of which was that the coup was a means of seizing power. He wanted to be the new leader, the new dictator, just like his father, but he would not make the

same mistakes. To understand his political aims, we must take a close look at his father's dictatorship and the conflicts it was involved in. Only then can we see whether José Antonio was providing continuity to his father's time in power or treading a different path.

When José Antonio's father seized power, he had several objectives in mind: to defend law and order, to regenerate politics, to limit the power and influence of local political figures, to find a solution to the military problem in Morocco and "social problems," and to solve the "regional" problem (which, in fact, was the Catalan problem). But the only "problem" he actually managed to solve, and at the cost of many human lives, was Morocco, after first organizing a strategic retreat and then landing in Al Hoceima. In this cruel pacification, he made widespread use of poisonous mustard gas against the Riffian people.[68] Not completed until 1927, it became a main asset of the regime. As far as Catalonia was concerned, Primo de Rivera at first managed to satisfy the middle-class Catalanist and non-Catalanist sectors by awarding them a sizeable loan, prohibiting free cotton imports, appointing Martínez Anido as minister of the interior and Arlegui as director general of security, and spreading the *somatén* militia throughout Spain.[69] He did absolutely nothing to extend political regionalization. In fact, he did exactly the opposite: he suppressed the only interprovincial authority that existed in the country, the Commonwealth of Catalonia, even though young Director General of Local Administration and future Minister of Finance José Calvo Sotelo had envisaged creating supra-provincial organizations based on the Catalan model when he drew up the new municipal and provincial statutes, with which the regime hoped to limit the power of local political leaders. In fact, as director general, Calvo had already attempted to set up supra-provincial commonwealths in Valencia and Galicia but had not managed to get the necessary support.

As far as the "Catalan problem" was concerned, the military sectors that were most hostile to Primo de Rivera's civil accomplices at first bowed to his initial desire to adopt a more open, flexible attitude. Later, he convinced himself of the need for change, and when the provincial statute suppressing the Commonwealth of Catalonia was passed in 1925, he said: "I am now convinced regionalism leads to separatism and that all doctrines that recognize the personality of individual regions are dangerous."[70] The Conservative Catalanist sectors had trusted him, and their disappointment was enormous. Moreover, the dictatorship's policy on Catalonia was

peppered with symbolic issues. Catalans were prohibited from singing anthems, displaying flags, dancing the so-called Nationalist *sardana*, and using Catalan in education and in corporate and official written communication. However, Catalan was tolerated in the theater, books, and the press, even though, like all over the country, it was subject to previous censorship. So, whereas Catalan institutions such as the Institute for Catalan Studies had their funding cut off, the Royal Spanish Academy promoted figures who represented "regional" languages and literatures (one of which was Catalan). In other words, Catalan was accepted as a "Spanish" language, but any sign of officiality or nationalism in Catalonia, real or alleged, was persecuted. In light of what would occur under Franco, the dictatorship's action on language issues has been quite rightly described as a "rehearsal."[71]

José Antonio learned two lessons from his father's "Catalan experience" and his short stay in the Catalan capital. First, a considerable sector of the Catalan population's desire for a degree of autonomy should not be pandered to because it threatened the unity of Spain. Second, this desire for autonomy was one thing, but the Catalans' strong attachment to their language, traditions, literature, and culture in general was quite another and had to be respected as long as it posed no threat to the unity of the "Spanish nation." When José Antonio designed his own political project, he sought and found an approach that reconciled these two issues and incorporated them into a new, Fascist regenerating vision. In this, he was by no means oblivious to the influence of Catalan thinkers such as Eugenio d'Ors.

The dictatorship's attempts to limit the power and influence of local political figures and to clean up the political scene left much to be desired. Political parties were banned, and a provincial and local network of military governmental delegates was set up. However, the members of this new system simply combined with the civil governors to create new chains of influence and favoritism. Primo de Rivera's desire to find a solution to the ills of society would prompt him to repress Anarcho-syndicalist *pistolerismo* and the strike movements, and instigate new, corporate-based employment legislation inspired by the Italian model. With young Minister of Labor Eduardo Aunós, he set up the Organización Corporativa Nacional (National Corporate Organization) to deal with labor issues. This organization consisted of joint committees of employers and workers in which both Catholic and free syndicates, such as the Socialist Unión

General de Trabajadores (General Union of Workers—UGT), took part. At the same time, some of the union leaders such as Francisco Largo Caballero, who were also leaders of the Partido Socialista Obrero Español (Spanish Socialist Workers' Party—PSOE), were promoted to state advisory positions. Despite all this, the dictatorship was relentless in its persecution of the CNT and the separatists. Law and order was maintained by repression. However, unlike the Franco regime, very few death penalties were meted out. As Xavier Casals has explained, Primo de Rivera's repressive policy was a bad example for Franco and was quite unlike the brutal repression of the Franco years in which 150,000 lives were lost for political reasons.[72]

Nevertheless, Primo de Rivera did resort extensively to censorship, fines, exile, and imprisonment. He imbued everything he did with an aura of paternalism, which confirmed him as a do-gooder who, as he said himself, had learned how to govern in the casino in Jerez.[73] This was largely the too-good-to-be-true image of Primo de Rivera that the political analysts of the age had been required to portray during his years in power: a general with a heart of gold,[74] a sort of protective father who had become a dictator because of the circumstances and was very careful not to spill the blood of his disobedient children.[75] In fact, he was a man who spent much of his time writing lengthy *notas oficiosas* (unofficial notes),[76] which the press had no choice but to publish and which explained his proposals and measures, criticized the opposition, gave his opinion on anything and everything, and occasionally responded to unpublished articles that only he and the authors were familiar with because they had been censored. He often gave orders and laid down the law on a whim or driven by personal obsessions, as we have seen on the issue of gambling (when he himself had been a compulsive gambler and lost enormous sums of money).

All this made him the object of derision, jokes, and stories, which could not have been much to the liking of his serious-minded son José. Nevertheless, the reputation the General had acquired as a drinker seems to be the product of his enemies' imagination, although his reputation as a womanizer was accurate, as he was involved in several scandals. For example, he tried to protect a woman named La Caoba when an examining magistrate prosecuted her, which did much to discredit him. He was an honest man who did not take advantage of his position to make an illicit fortune, and he referred to himself as a dictator much against his will. On

the other hand, he quite unashamedly confessed he believed he was the savior and concealed his eagerness to steal the limelight by saying such things as the following: “I am neither vain nor proud. I am well aware of the little I am worth, and I accept and proclaim that I have had divine help, which enables me to cope with the extremely difficult task of governing and administering twenty-five million Spaniards who did not know how to administer for themselves.”[77] Quite.

All these issues came up during his regime. What had allegedly begun as a movement to make quick, surgical, healing changes ended up as not only a long dictatorship but also one that planned to become institutionalized and codified at the expense of the Constitution of 1876. Moreover, an initiative by the Catholic sectors from Valladolid led to the creation of a political force to support the regime known as the Unión Patriótica Española (Spanish Patriotic Union—UPE). The General sometimes referred to the UPE as the National Movement, a denomination José Antonio would use for his Falange and Franco for his single party.[78] Primo de Rivera directed himself through the Ministry of the Interior under the motto “Fatherland, Religion, and Monarchy,” a fairly unimaginative reflection of the Carlists’ “God, Fatherland, and King.” Strictly speaking, however, the UPE was not a party but a loosely defined group, in name only, of faithful followers intent on personal political advancement. Its flexible nature placed it at the opposite end of the spectrum compared with the party José Antonio would set up ten years later, the Fascist Falange Española, a militia-style party ruled with an iron rod. The UPE ideologists, both from Cadiz, were a relative and an old acquaintance of the General: José Pemartín Sanjuán and José María Pemán.[79] The right-wing, authoritarian UPE was never Fascist, but it did share regenerationist and corporate aspirations with Fascism (although Fascism, as we have seen, was much more than this). It was one of the dictatorship’s two civil organizations (the other was the *somatén*, the civil militia whose aim was to keep law and order) and had the inestimable collaboration of the Information Office (in charge of censorship, communicating unofficial notes, and contacting the press and the newspapers they controlled, the main being *La Nación*) and the Board of Propaganda for the Fatherland and the People, which coordinated all the efforts put into singing the dictator’s praises and expressing patriotic support for the regime.[80]

This latter body was institutionalized in 1927 by the creation of the Asamblea Nacional Consultiva (National Consultative Assembly—ANC), which would definitively replace the parliament. The ANC was a fundamental step on the path to severing all ties with previous legality, as well as a source of great distress for the king because it was a clear sign of his flagrant and highly personal lack of compliance with his constitutional duties. Primo de Rivera had pushed ahead with this particular project after calling and winning a plebiscite on the issue, in which he had managed to convince more than seven million voters out of an electorate of thirteen million. The ANC was made up of UPE members, was structured along corporate lines, excluded dynastic politicians and parties, and was set up to draft a bill (completed in 1929 but never enacted) for a semi-authoritarian constitution that would provide for a pseudo parliament made up equally of corporate and universal suffrage. In its desire to usher in modern times, the dictatorship had made considerable investments in education (universities doubled the number of students in those years), services, social housing, insurance for workers, and a great deal of public works. On the local and provincial levels, councils were allowed to get into debt, which allowed them to do many other things, although this abruptly halted with the change in the world scenario at the end of the 1920s. As we shall see, José Antonio staunchly defended the policies that his father's regime carried out and the role his father played in the world of politics.

Primo de Rivera had serious trouble implementing his policies in the sectors that had initially given him support. He had to learn, at considerable personal cost, that solving the country's problems was not quite as straightforward as he had been made to think by his military "command-and-control" mentality and his authoritarian regenerationist ideas. His firstborn son, anxious to assume his father's role, took good note of all this. In 1926 and 1927, Calvo failed in his attempt to reform the fiscal system because of the wealthy's opposition. This was hardly surprising; Calvo largely took his idea of creating a treasury to collect taxes and promote development from Alba, who had attempted to create a standard tax on income and another that would make the wealthy pay more. Agricultural issues gave rise to a similar conflict. On the issues of tax reform and agriculture, then, "all the forces of the moribund oligarchic structure of the old Restoration clique joined together, and the wealthy classes refused to contemplate a transaction of any sort."[81] Another increasingly obvious

problem was the relationship between the king and the dictator: Alfonso XIII, jealous of his power, did not get along with Primo de Rivera and, concerned about preserving the throne, actually plotted against him in the final stages of the regime.

Another problem was the Army. Some of his companions-in-arms—including such leading figures as Weyler and Aguilera—opposed Primo de Rivera, who was unable to heal the internal divisions that had been in evidence before he seized power. Even his announcement of amnesty for those involved in the Disaster of Annual or the extension of the merit-based promotion system had no effect. This latter issue caused such a bitter conflict with the Armed Forces, which favored maintaining the traditional system of promotion, that the Field Artillery Command had to be dismantled, purged, and set up again. The artillerymen did not take this lying down, however, and some took part in one of the most important plots against the regime, led by the Conservative Sánchez Guerra in January 1929. It failed. Before this, the dictatorship had had to break up other attempts such as the so-called Sanjuanada in 1926 with Weyler, Aguilera, and leading Liberal politicians such as the Count of Romanones or Melquíades Álvarez among the conspirers. Apart from the aforementioned economic stakeholders, Primo de Rivera's other major political opponents were the Liberal and dynastic Conservative sectors, Catalanists and separatists, Republicans, Communists, and Anarcho-syndicalists, intellectuals, and university students. Of all these, the intellectuals, who had several major figures in their rank and file, would have the greatest impact on José Antonio.

The leader of the students and the most famous opponent of the dictatorship was someone with whom José Antonio had tangled while at university in Madrid: Antoni María Sbert, a Majorcan studying agricultural engineering. The student conflict was as significant as the conflict with the Field Artillery Command but lasted longer. Some faculties and even whole universities were forced to close, the students who went on strike lost their places, and influential professors gave up their chairs. Leading the struggle was the Federación Universitaria Escolar (University College Federation—FUE),[82] which was set up at the beginning of the 1926–1927[83] academic year and had largely inherited the official student associations that José Antonio had been a member of. From the very start of the dictatorship, Sbert, like many of the members of the official associations, had wanted

nothing to do with a patriotic university youth movement. Later, in 1926 while in his sixth year, he was expelled and exiled to Fernando Poo, or Guinea, although, thanks to his family's influence (he was the son of a rear admiral, grandson of a senator, and nephew of a bishop),[84] he was eventually sent back to his hometown of Palma. The expulsion had been triggered by the events that took place on the day of Isidore the Laborer, the patron saint of agricultural engineers. While the king and the dictator were inaugurating the new School of Agricultural Engineering building, Sbert asked Primo de Rivera for a reform of the curricula and for land consolidation throughout the country. The manner in which he presented his demands and the fact that he had dared to do so during the inauguration offended the General, who refused to acknowledge Sbert and compared him to a soldier who had tried to communicate with a superior without going through the official channels. And in the process, he showed that his understanding of possible agrarian reforms was rudimentary at best.[85]

It is difficult to say whether the fact that José Antonio was on bad terms with Sbert had any influence on his father's attitude, but it cannot be discounted. Whatever the case, the most serious student conflict broke out in May 1928 when a decree was passed on university reform after Minster of Education Eduardo Callejo had failed to get a bill through the ANC. The decree contained a controversial article (no. 53) that gave official status to the exams taken at the only two private universities in existence (both Catholic), the University of Deusto and the Escorial-María Cristina Royal University Center (aka El Escorial), which prompted a student strike that led to all FUE leaders being placed under arrest and Sbert being barred from any further study for the rest of his life,[86] giving rise to his nickname "the eternal student." But the issue caused ire not only among students: more than a hundred lecturers joined the protest by signing a letter of solidarity, which "gave the protest a sheen of respectability."[87] The staff from numerous universities gave their support, so the conflict lasted for the entire 1928–1929 academic year, as well as the next one. Professors such as Felipe Sánchez Román and José Ortega y Gasset[88] (two of the lecturers whom José Antonio most admired), Jiménez de Asúa, Fernando de los Ríos, and Alfonso García Valdecasas (future cofounder of the Falange) renounced their chairs to express their solidarity with the students in the spring of 1929. Although the dictator gave some ground, the protest movement demanded Sbert be reinstated and lecturers be allowed to return

to their jobs, and there were even massive demonstrations in front of the Primo de Rivera family home in the Calle de los Madrazo.[89]

The opposition to the dictatorship by some of the country's leading intellectuals was a source of considerable stress for José Antonio, trapped between the admiration and esteem he felt for his father, and the enmity of some of the people he most respected. The fact that figures such as Miguel de Unamuno, Gregorio Marañón, José Blasco Ibáñez, Ramón Pérez de Ayala, and Eduardo Ortega y Gasset were opposed to the regime could not be taken lightly. Also opposed were the Republicans and Socialists, soon mobilized by the text *Appeal to the Republic*, written by Manuel Azaña, Jiménez de Asúa, José Giral, Luis Bagaría, Juan Negrín, Luis Araquistain, and others. He also must have been distressed when the dictatorship closed various cultural centers, one of which was the Ateneo de Madrid (Scientific, Literary, and Artistic Athenaeum of Madrid) to which he belonged. But above all else, he was affected by the change in attitude of the intellectual whose thought most attracted him: José Ortega y Gasset. In conjunction with Nicolaás María de Urgoiti, editor of *El Sol* and *La Voz* newspapers, he had occupied "a zone of dangerous complicity" with the regime because of the threat it posed to "the old politics" he had constantly railed against since his famous 1914 speech, "Old and New Politics," delivered at the Teatro de la Comedia. But this affinity to the cause suddenly transformed into determined opposition.[90]

The first confrontation, between the dictator and Unamuno, was not long in coming. It occurred in early 1924 because of the incident with La Caoba. At that time, Primo de Rivera's loquacity, his inability to restrain himself, and his arrogance had let him down. La Caoba was a fille de joie who had been arrested for drug trafficking, and Primo de Rivera's friend Tirso Escudero, the entrepreneur running the Teatro de la Comedia, had come to him for help. Primo de Rivera believed what he said and, as he had done on previous occasions, did not hesitate to send a handwritten note to the examining magistrate, boldly saying, "Without detriment to correct procedure, I sincerely believe that the lady in question should not have been arrested until the charges against her had been fully confirmed." Annoyed, the judge told various friends, and the dictator's intervention soon became public knowledge. Primo de Rivera, instead of keeping his head down so that the rumor would not spread, ordered the undersecretary of justice to open an investigation for daring to suggest he had recommended a course of

action and for slander. Not content with this, he gave his version of events in an unofficial note in the press:

> About a month ago, a friend of mine came to the Ministry of War complaining of an injustice that had been committed against a young lady whom he trusted implicitly and who had been arrested after being accused of a misdemeanor. I always want accusations to be checked before arrests are made, so I sent a note to the magistrate saying that if he could, without breaking any laws, and if no other crimes were to be considered, he should release the young lady. Well, I have just found out that the judge has been showing the note to his friends and acquaintances, saying that it is a recommendation and remarking that notes of this sort were common in the old regime . . . My life has always been an open book, so I cannot be at the mercy of such accusations. For almost thirty years now I have enjoyed a certain influence in public affairs, and it has always been a rule of mine to make no recommendations concerning injustice.[91]

This was not the end of it. Rodrigo Soriano, a former member of the parliament whom Primo de Rivera had tangled with in 1906 to defend his uncle Fernando, continued to discuss the issue in the Ateneo de Madrid. It was also the talk of the Casino La Peña and even of the capital's working-class neighborhoods. And on top of all this, Unamuno, rector of the University of Salamanca and dean of the Faculty of Philosophy and Arts, sent a letter to his friend Antonio Solalinde, a guest lecturer in Buenos Aires, in which he referred to the incident and called Primo de Rivera a "real oaf." The letter was published in *Nosotros,* a left-wing magazine in Buenos Aires. He had published another letter attacking the dictatorship in France and had given some openly critical lectures in early 1924.[92]

Moreover, an article was published on 30 January in the Buenos Aires newspaper *La Nación,* which was extremely critical of Primo de Rivera's coup. Beside himself, Primo de Rivera ignored everybody who advised him not to react violently. He closed the Ateneo de Madrid, banished Soriano and Unamuno to Fuerteventura island, issued a royal order removing Unamuno from his academic posts, and suspended him without pay.[93] These measures immediately prompted some of Unamuno's fellow lecturers (e.g., Jiménez de Asúa, Ríos, and García del Real) to come out in his support, so they too were suspended. And Primo de Rivera did not stop here. True to form, he responded in various unofficial notes to the criticism in Unamuno's private correspondence, which was being intercepted by the censors. Of course, this correspondence was unknown to the public, who were only aware of the dictator's public responses. He railed against the writer with assertions such as the following: "In my opinion, Unamuno is

simply not a learned man, and everybody is convinced of this in Spain, where there is no longer any need to unmask him . . . A little Hellenic culture does not give him the right to venture an opinion on everything under the sun and talk nonsense about everything else."[94]

A few months later, in July 1924, in another demonstration that he was a "do-gooder," he granted Unamuno—and Soriano—amnesty, but he had already fled to France. From there, and until the fall of the dictator, he became one of his fiercest critics alongside Blasco Ibáñez, Eduardo Ortega y Gasset, and others.[95] For his part, the dictator refused to give up, and continued to reply to Unamuno's criticisms in his unofficial notes, which shows the extent to which they affected him.[96] Of all this, his son José Antonio was fully aware and must have been caught between filial loyalty and the high regard he had for Unamuno and his work. In fact, some years later, when he was the leader of the Falange, he visited Unamuno in Salamanca not only to express his admiration but also to make amends and offer an apology. Although Unamuno was the most notorious case, he was by no means the only one. The problems Primo de Rivera had with intellectuals got steadily worse, and the public examinations organized to find a replacement for Unamuno gave rise to a terrible scandal—police arrests included—and ended up with Jiménez de Asúa being banished to the Chafarinas Islands. The protest in response to the closing of the Ateneo de Madrid, led by Gregorio Marañon, also caused considerable uproar. And while all this was going on, the political exiles were constantly on the move, criticizing Primo de Rivera and his regime from publications printed abroad such as *España con Honra* and *Hojas Libres*.[97]

José Antonio was twenty-six years old when his father was forced to resign. Many factors had affected this decision, not least of which were the attitudes adopted by the elite sectors (as we have seen) and the monarch. But even though the economic difficulties were getting worse, Calvo had resigned, student unrest was on the rise, and new plots to overthrow him were afoot, there was nothing to suggest Primo de Rivera would step down at the end of January 1930. In fact, his reasons for doing so are still unclear.[98] Apparently, the key issue was his confrontation with Alfonso XIII, who was concerned about the changes that had been implemented in the political system. He was anxious to return to constitutional normality and save himself from the declining authority of the dictatorship precisely at a point in time that Primo de Rivera was hoping to institutionalize the

dictatorship and end the Constitution of 1876. In particular, the General had already suggested a political process to the king. It consisted of a progressive series of elections—first local, then provincial, and finally national—and, on 13 September 1930 (the regime's anniversary), another election to a five-hundred-member parliament that would replace the ANC, with the remit to provide Spain with a new constitution within two years.[99] The king, however, decided not to approve the scheme immediately, and Primo de Rivera must have felt he was being called into question. There was also talk of a coup being prepared against him by a general who was close to the king, Manuel Goded.

At this point, Primo de Rivera did something that profoundly irritated Alfonso XIII. On Sunday, 26 January 1930, he published an unofficial note in which he invited all the captain generals and other military commanders to say whether they still had faith in him. And in a show of bravado, he said if they had lost their faith, he would not hesitate to resign. The publication of the note meant he had not respected the hierarchy of the supreme commander of the Armed Forces—the king himself—and was his way of responding to the king's involvement in plots and conspiracies. It also served as a warning to all the others involved. And, of course, it was yet another example of his impulsiveness, which he was well aware of.[100] His real intention in publishing the note was for the generals to reinforce his authority. But they did not, just as they had not on 13 September 1923. Like all the coups in Spain's history, there had been considerable uncertainty in 1923 about who supported Primo de Rivera, who was neutral, and who was against, but in January 1930, he believed he had majority support. When he found this support lacking, he felt obliged to keep his promise and resign, even though he immediately started planning his return. This return, however, would never happen.

In the note, he had complained about the "gossip and tittle-tattle" being spread and, without mentioning him by name, denied that Goded was involved in a conspiracy:

> For the good name of the highly deserving generals, I must speak out against the attitude that some say they have. Not only is it not true, it also flies in the face of common sense . . . The student protests, so out of place and so lacking in reason; the constant attempt to spread financial despondency, even though the reality is that the price of stocks and shares remains high, and exchange rates have improved slightly; plans for riots, which will be quashed in proportion to the attitudes that are behind them, whatever the occasion and the place; *intrigues from high or low places* . . . None of this will have the slightest effect on the serenity of the

> Government, concerned as always with problems of greater substance and importance. On questions of repression we had no desire to overdo it nor to be found wanting: our aim was not to brutally do away with hereditary ills or indiscipline in a few sectors of little quality, and neither was it to grant them impunity.[101]

Most commanders who responded to Primo de Rivera's request expressed loyalty and obedience to the Crown, and avoided any direct approval of the dictator. This may have been because of the intervention of politicians like Francesc Cambó.[102] And as a result—noblesse oblige—on Tuesday, 28 January 1930, Primo de Rivera presented his resignation to Alfonso XIII, who did not think twice about accepting it. But after seeming to accept that Dámaso Berenguer would succeed him,[103] Primo de Rivera in a fit of anger drafted another note, a manifesto entitled "Al pueblo y al ejército" (To the people and the Army), which has come to light only very recently. In it, he explained why he needed to remain in power for a few more months and announced he was prepared to relieve "Spanish public life" of "that eternal obstacle" (i.e., the king). Such was the hostility he felt for the king that he even went on to refer to the need, sometime in the future, for a republic.[104] The fact that he did not get around to publishing it did not mean he did not believe what he said or that he was not preparing another coup to return to power. He did, and he was.

As we know, Berenguer was a general of the Quadrilateral whom the king trusted and regarded as a friend. He was also one of the generals who had been held responsible for the Disaster of Annual and had avoided being put on trial thanks to the royal amnesty during Primo de Rivera's time in power. He was entrusted with restoring the 1876 constitutional system and started by taking steps to distance himself from everything his predecessor had done. First, he offered the minister of finance position to Cambó, who rejected it, because, among other reasons, he felt his being a member of the Consejo de Ministros (Council of Ministers) could trigger a furious reaction and a new coup from the captaincy general in Catalonia led by Lieutenant General Emilio Barrera, one of Primo de Rivera's most faithful servants ably assisted once again by Milans and Martínez Anido.[105] Cambó was not too off the mark. Meanwhile, Berenguer's government made gestures of goodwill toward some members of the opposition to Primo de Rivera and enacted measures that upset him quite considerably (e.g., a decree granting general amnesty). This amnesty meant political prisoners were released, exiles were allowed to return, professors deprived of their chairs were

reinstated, and cultural centers such as the Ateneo de Madrid were reopened. He also appointed a new director of public prosecutions, a prosecutor whom Primo de Rivera had suspended. Unamuno's return to Salamanca on 13 February 1930 is a graphic example. Although the government did its best to keep the situation under control, the crowds went wild, and the police and the Civil Guard had to make several charges.

Of course, the former dictator, José Antonio, and the rest of the family were outraged and pained by these events. They felt affronted and ridiculed. Their daily life underwent a sudden change: friends started avoiding them, taxi drivers did not give them rides, and so forth. Spurred on by what he and his family were being subject to, Primo de Rivera spent the days after his resignation preparing the new coup he hoped to carry out with the support of the generals Barrera, Martínez Anido, Milans, and Sanjurjo, who had led the troops at Alhucemas. He took a lonely train journey to Barcelona, where he planned to organize another coup. According to one of his sisters in Madrid: "He was half crazy when he left. It was as if he could see his mother about to fall off the edge of a cliff and he was running as fast as he could to save her." When he left his home, he told his family they would once again be in power in a few hours' time and put right all the wrong being done to Spain.[106] When he got to Barcelona, he went straight to the captaincy general. There, however, Barrera, who must have been feeling quite uneasy about the whole situation, managed to persuade him not to call all the battalion leaders to arms but to leave the country for Paris, arguing that it was too soon to take new action. He probably felt the political situation would quickly deteriorate and that, once it had, the time would be right. Also, since the General was in danger of being prosecuted by the new authorities, he would be saved if he left the country.

Whatever the case, Primo de Rivera followed the advice and left the country immediately, on 10 February 1930, just eleven days after relinquishing power. According to one of his biographers-cum-hagiographers, former Minister Aunós, he had already drafted the manifesto in which he was going to explain his new coup to the nation, describe the maneuver by which a group of former politicians had seized power from him as a trick, and announce his decision to win it back by working tirelessly toward the sole objective of saving Spain from the destruction that was lying in wait.[107] As he was crossing the border, he happened to meet one of his sisters, Carmen, a nun and one of his confidantes, who was on

her way back from Rome. He said: “You have no idea how many people I have been deceived by, how much ingratitude I have been shown! The people I have done most for have shown nothing but coldness!” By that time, he had aged prematurely. He was a sad—or even depressed—old man, suffering from diabetes that he had done nothing to keep in check. Nevertheless, true to form and incapable of taking a back seat, he sent a telegram to the country before he crossed the border: “May this be the channel by which I can take my leave of Spain as I am about to go abroad for a short time. I wish our country peace and progress. I believe that one month will be enough for me to organize my ideas and soothe my shattered nerves if I can get the silence and the calm that I need.”[108]

Those who saw him at that time, staying in the Hotel Pont Royal in the French capital, described him as “quite different, looking much worse,” sporting “a beard that transformed him completely.” He was nothing like the Miguel Primo de Rivera of just one month earlier, who had been “extremely strong, vigorous, and determined, despite the fact that he was suffering from a deep-seated restlessness.”[109] He was constantly receiving news of the hostility that some of the media in Spain felt toward him, which drove him to distraction. In Paris, he was given what could be considered an official welcome by the Spanish ambassador and other French personalities, one of whom was Marshal Philippe Pétain, an old acquaintance from joint military projects in Morocco. However, on 16 March 1930, his son Miguel and his daughters Carmen and Pilar went to visit him only to find him dead in his hotel bed. He had only stepped down from power six weeks prior. The news came as a complete shock to the family. They had witnessed the impact that certain events had had on their father’s state of mind, and they believed this is what killed him. They directed their resentment toward those who opposed the dictatorship, and the elite sectors and colleagues who had allegedly treated him so badly. Of course, the king was one of their main targets. And even before their father had died, José Antonio and his brother Miguel had already physically confronted some of his critics.

José Antonio and His Father’s Dictatorship

Apart from José Antonio’s concerns about his father’s confrontations with the intellectuals and the closure of cultural centers and other institutions of

which he had been a member, what was his experience of the dictatorship? When his father set himself up as Spain's dictator, he was twenty years old and living in Barcelona. There, he had personally experienced an illegal takeover of power by someone whom he deeply admired and who had justified his actions by offering the country a far-reaching program of reform. When his father stepped down in 1930, José Antonio was twenty-six, and three years later, in 1933, he founded a political party, the Falange, which had dictatorial aspirations and was set up as "the savior Spain." And just like his father before him, José Antonio was convinced he was the only one up to the task. His essential idea was not to make the same mistakes as his father and, above all, make up for the shortcomings of his authoritarian and right-wing program with a superior program of his own. Also, from the very beginning, he wanted to give his project the intellectual tone and theoretical base he felt the previous project had lacked, as well as a well-defined look and style. He did this by associating with men of letters and thinkers from the very moment he started organizing his project and by attracting others as it slowly took form and expanded.

Throughout most of the dictatorship, José Antonio and his siblings had maintained a relatively low profile largely because of the pride their father took in not using his authority to grant any favors to his family. The General adopted this attitude in an attempt to portray an image of regenerationism and change, and not to re-create with his own family the situation he had experienced with his uncle Fernando (i.e., criticisms of nepotism and defamatory remarks about his military career from his comrades in arms) even though at that time he had much more power than this mentor. Despite this attitude, he encountered criticism on some incidents involving José Antonio. And it should not be forgotten that the family kept a low profile only relatively speaking, since the reality was what it was: the Primo de Rivera y Sáenz de Heredia children were the dictator's offspring, with everything that this implied. In fact, they became part of the Madrid elite during the dictatorship.

The incidents involving José Antonio took place in the dictatorship's first year and became public knowledge in September 1924. At the time, former Minister of Development Ángel Ossorio y Gallardo—a fervent opponent of Primo de Rivera from the very beginning—had the censors intercept a personal letter addressed to former Conservative Prime Minister Maura in which he criticized "the immorality and the barbarism [that] are

spreading so shamefully.” By way of example, on 25 August 1924, he awarded the country’s telephone and telegraph monopoly to the Compañía Telefónica Nacional de España (National Telephone Company of Spain—CTNE), a subsidiary of the North American International Telephone & Telegraph (ITT). He made especial mention of José Antonio’s appointment as the company’s lawyer: “I am sure you will have seen the award, without auction and without competition, of the telephone service to the Compañía, where I have been reliably informed that the dictator’s young son has been employed as a lawyer (!) with a monthly salary of twenty or twenty-five thousand pesetas. And it’s like this everywhere.”[110] Because of this letter, Ossorio was arrested and thrown in jail, although not for very long. Primo de Rivera violated the secrecy of correspondence and revealed the content of the letter in an unofficial note in which he defended his eldest son:

> As far as the exclamation mark affixed to the word “lawyer” is concerned, I would like to say that he is a young man who has a degree and a doctorate [*sic*] in law. He was often awarded grades of excellent and distinction by professors as learned and respectable as Posada, Clemente de Diego, and [José] Gascón y Marín, among others, who were never asked to give this particular student any special treatment. Everything else is a lie, in other words, the absolute opposite of the truth. Indeed, the son of General Primo de Rivera, who speaks English and French as well as he does Spanish, and who for two years had been in the employ of a North American machinery company, found the job in the telephone company that has now been awarded the state concession thanks to a friend of his, Mr. [Juan] Maroto [y Pérez del Pulgar]. But as soon as the head of the military government realized that the company had made a tender, he rang its director and told him he would have to do without his son’s services, and then convinced his son that he should resign his position, and told him to apply to be readmitted to the regiment in which he was serving as a noncommissioned officer.

The text contained errors in the drafting and in the content (e.g., saying José Antonio had a doctorate), but it confirmed that the company had offered him a job even though the offer was later withdrawn. For his part, José Antonio apparently reacted in the family tradition and challenged Ossorio to a duel, but, on his father’s insistence, he retracted. He published a note in *La Voz* in which he attempted to deny he had been given a job. He began by saying things had recently been said about him with the sole intent of attacking his father, but then he went on to conceal the true relations he had with the company. However, with regard to Ossorio’s accusation, he was right when he said:

> Some time ago, the president of a North American telephone company, Mr. [Sosthenes] Beus [*sic* for Behn] (for whom I feel only respect and gratitude) spoke to a friend of mine about wanting to take a Spanish boy to the United States for work. My friend was good enough to recommend me and introduce me to Mr. Beus. He seemed to like me, and we arranged that when I had completed my military duties I would go with him to America. At that time, neither Mr. Beus nor the American company had any connection with Spain. However, sometime later, the National Telephone Company of Spain was set up, and Mr. Beus, among others, was part of it. He applied for the concession of the national telephones and promised to make considerable improvements. As soon as the company started working with Spain, my father told me to withdraw from the planned journey to America despite the fact that my respectable job there had nothing to do with the telephone company or with Spain. I would like to point out that I have not worked for the Spanish company for even a minute. If you search through their books, salary sheets, and papers, you will not find any sign of my name. I was thinking of going to the United States as soon as I finished the military service, and many people are aware of the sacrifice forced on me by my father, and which I accept gladly, of renouncing this future. I have done so out of an extreme sense of decency. So rather than acting in a shameful fashion, my father should have been patted on the back for his behavior, but he had no interest in announcing the facts to the world because he is not after applause. He is quite satisfied just to have done the right thing.[111]

Indeed, the CTNE had never employed him, but he had been one of ITT's legal advisers in Spain, probably recruited by US Army Lieutenant Colonel Sosthenes Behn—who cofounded the company with his brother Hernan—precisely because his father was who he was. After the monopoly contract had been awarded to the CTNE, which had taken part in the tender with the Swedish telecommunications company Ericsson and the new Antwerp Telephone and Electrical Works, José Antonio's father had indeed forced him to turn down Behn's offer of going to the United States. However, he did not reveal that, in the process before the concession and creation of the strategically named National Telephone Company of Spain (paradoxically, a largely foreign company), he had acted as adviser. Since José Antonio was an extremely young lawyer of just twenty-one years at the time, the United States representatives had probably sought him out as a way of exerting influence on the dictator, so he was closely involved in Behn's interest in being awarded the concession.

Gumersindo Gómez Rico, an executive from another telephone company who was representing ITT, had offered José Antonio the adviser post. Contact had been made through the Marquess of Pozoblanco (the Mr. Maroto in the dictator's unofficial note), a veteran of the 1921 Moroccan campaign. José Antonio was introduced to Rico in the Real Club de la Puerta de Hierro and, his "activity in relation to ITT was limited to providing Rico with legal advice on all the legal issues affecting the

telephone tender.” According to Rico, “José Antonio stopped being involved at the very moment the CTNE submitted to General Primo de Rivera’s government the project for the reorganization of the national telephone system.” That is, the real reason for contacting a rookie lawyer like José Antonio was probably not the need for legal advice—regardless of whether it was given—but rather his proximity to, and possible influence over, the dictator. The job offer in the United States was likely made after the concession award, because legal consultancy had also been sought from other lawyers of much greater prestige in Madrid and Barcelona, such as Melquíades Álvarez, José Hernández Pinteño, José Bertrán y Musitu, and Eugenio Barroso Sánchez-Guerra.[112]

This affair would dog José Antonio for a long time afterward, even during the Republic.[113] He must have learned from it, because throughout his professional practice, which he initiated after becoming a member of the ICAM in April 1925, he allegedly refused to accept cases in which he felt the client was seeking favors from the dictator. Of course, since he was the son of the dictator and had the corresponding contacts within the aristocracy and bourgeoisie of the Spanish capital, this did not prevent him from acquiring an extensive clientele, and he was never short of work, so, in just a few years, he became extremely wealthy. At its height, his firm employed at least three clerks.

Apart from this incident, his father placed José Antonio—and in some cases, his brother Miguel—in the public eye on only a few occasions during the dictatorship. One was when Primo de Rivera wanted to give an impression of normality when fighting intensified near Tétouan (Morocco) at the end of the summer of 1924. The General traveled to the area accompanied by his two eldest sons in an attempt to show that everything was under control.[114] The dictator also often attended social events in the company of José Antonio and his brothers, and in some events, the fact that he was the son of an aristocrat, a grandee of Spain, gave José Antonio the right to act as a peer at the king’s service. On another occasion, José Antonio and his brothers were made knights of the Military Order of Santiago.[115] During these years, he and his siblings joined the “well-to-do” Madrid set. In José Antonio’s case, this whole process of “going up in the world” was made much easier by his increasingly buoyant economic situation, which allowed him to join sports, hunting, and gastronomic societies and associations, including the exclusive Royal Polo Club of

Barcelona, where he practiced polo and horseback riding.[116] He was also a regular at the racetrack and other places frequented by the elites of the capital. He could also afford to run his own motorcar.[117] None of this, however, prevented some aristocrats from seeing him as the son of parvenus to the nobility and of a general on bad terms with the king who had the unconditional support of the majority.

José Antonio was not just one more "rich young man of leisure," of whom there were so many in this part of society. He was not only a hardworking professional but also had intellectual and literary concerns that had prompted him to become a member of the Ateneo de Madrid and of the Real Academia de Jurisprudencia y Legislación (Royal Academy of Jurisprudence and Legislation) and to continue his training in law, philosophy, economics, literature, and politics. All this would stand him in good stead for constructing his own political project. But just because he was not "of leisure" does not mean he was not a "rich young man." He was, and of a particular kind: the kind who was responsible for leading and guiding society. As I shall discuss later, this idea came from his personal concept of aristocracy, which he applied to himself because of his family precedents and was fueled by the experiences of his close relations. In particular, he looked to his great-uncle Fernando, who had twice been given a title on "merit"; his uncle Fernando, who had inherited one of these titles and had died heroically "on active service" at Annual; and his father, who had inherited the other title and was serving the country at enormous personal sacrifice and expense. That was how José Antonio viewed things. He felt he had been called to follow the same path, and he concluded that the role of the "true" aristocracy was "to serve." He had first heard the call at a very young age. As a child, he had loved reading epic novels about nobles and monarchs, and he did his best to behave in accordance with the "lineage" he believed he belonged to. There are numerous anecdotes in this vein from his childhood (e.g., how he responded to his family's joking about his jockey's outfit when he went for riding lessons).[118]

Largely because of his fascination with the aristocracy "at the service of society" and his awareness that he was a parvenu, his first "serious" romantic relationship occurred in 1927 or 1928.[119] He fell deeply in love, not surprisingly, with a young woman five years his junior from one of the most traditional noble families in the country: María del Pilar Azlor de Aragón y Guillamas, the eldest child and heir of the Duke of Villahermosa

y Luna, and niece of the Marquesses of Romana. It is difficult not to see a desire to perpetuate and improve his own lineage by joining the "old" nobility. However, the young woman in question, who, as befitting her station, resided in San Sebastián and Madrid (in the Palace of Villahermosa, which currently houses the Thyssen-Bornemisza Museum),[120] came up against her father's staunch opposition to the relationship. He was an immensely rich man, a former senator, a peer under Alfonso XIII,[121] and, above all, one of the General's bitterest enemies because of the discredit he was bringing on the monarchy. And he was violently opposed to the son of the dictator and a noble parvenu courting his daughter.[122] Apparently, he particularly dreaded José Antonio would one day hold—albeit only as the husband—the main family title (Luna),[123] although José Antonio might not have agreed to renounce his own title of marquess, ranked under that of duke, according to Serrano Suñer[124] (which is questionable). The couple were obliged to see each other in secret,[125] but they eventually split up around 1933. Two years later, Pilar Azlor married Mariano de Urzáiz, a Navy officer and son of the Countess of Puerto.

At about this time, José Antonio also became involved romantically with no less than Elizabeth Asquith, the English wife of Prince Antoine Bibesco (the Romanian ambassador in Madrid between 1927 and 1933) and daughter of former Liberal UK Prime Minister Herbert Henry Asquith. They had met during the dictatorship and remained friends until José Antonio's death. Toward the end of his life, he had one or two relationships with members of the Women's Section of the Sindicato Español Universitario (Spanish University Union—SEU), apparently with no aristocratic lineage. This might have been the consequence of his "failure" with Pilar Azlor (which must have come as a real shock to him, because he had been deeply in love and had even started to plan their future) or his half-hearted relationship with Bibesco (with whom marriage was out of the question, because she was already married). Or it might have been because he became more involved in the party in 1935, the year in which he took great strides in his personal Fascistization and made a clean break with the Alfonsist monarchists. We shall never know the real reason, as we shall never know much about the mysterious "I." or "María Santos Kant" (see chap. 5). Whatever the case, he was a single man when he was brought before the firing squad, which was quite uncommon for his age of thirty-three. By 1936, his brothers Miguel and Fernando both were married.

Throughout the dictatorship, Primo de Rivera's sons determined not to intervene in the domain of public politics, but in the regime's final year, José Antonio relaxed this determination: he did get involved in public affairs, which indicates a change in attitude on his part and his father's. In May 1929, for example, he published an article (unsigned) in the regime's unofficial newspaper, *La Nación*, in which he heaped praise on Cadiz Mayor Ramón de Carranza and the leader of the local UPE, José María Pemán: "The city is reviving. But it is reviving because of what we said before: because there is a regime that enables towns to grow, that does not suffocate them with politics; because there is a regime that selects the best. The head of government selected Pemán and, in turn, Pemán selected the mayor."[126] The two men named in the article were his friends, and the first was a relative. Four years later, in 1933, José Antonio would become a member of the Republican parliament for Cadiz as part of the electoral candidacy that was headed by Carranza.

However, his most outstanding intervention, the one that would really put him in the public eye, occurred in November 1929, after the courts-martial following Sánchez Guerra's attempted coup when his father was at his lowest ebb. To show that this father identified with a certain sort of intellectual, he organized a tribute to the brothers Manuel and Antonio Machado at the Hotel Ritz, Madrid,[127] presided over by him, the dictator, and Sanjurjo. As he would say in his speech, the Machado brothers were "intellectuals filled with human emotion, the receivers and transmitters of grace, joy, and sadness for the people," and they had "a sense of style," quite unlike the "inhospitable, cold intellectuals, locked away in their ivory tower, distant, insensitive to the vibrations of the true people." Clearly, this was a scarcely veiled allusion to the intellectuals his father had punished or exiled (with Unamuno as their leader) and whose contempt for the dictator José Antonio found deeply offensive. The tribute was a well-orchestrated production, and José Antonio made various comments about the work of the Machado brothers:

> I think it is my duty to point out that this tribute is to the poets. Of course it is. But it is also to the dramatists. We should put an end to this shortsighted criticism that whenever a Machado play is performed, it is seen as a triumph of poets. And the more this criticism wants to seem to be free of prejudice, the more conventional it is. No! The people who acclaim the Machados are people who love theater, and they admire them because dramatists excite and delight them.

> We have known for many years that they are great poets. Some writers can only be admired. Others, like Manuel and Antonio Machado, are admired and loved.[128]

So, he took the opportunity to make his literary tastes known to the public. At the time, he was putting a great deal of effort into novels and the theater, and he took interest in acting. What gradually emerged was a copious body of political publicity, all written or spoken in his extremely careful language. His attempt to create a style all his own was influenced by Sánchez Mazas and other literary collaborators of the future Falange and was designed to show the alleged depth of his thought. It is not difficult to see in all this his desire to improve on his father's disordered, out-of-control, and sometimes even incoherent discourse, which mortified him. His aim was to be an intellectual politician. When he did find his own political language, it was so full of poetic license and rhetorical twists that the "uninitiated" (i.e., most mortals and many Falangists) could barely understand it. However, this was not a problem for José Antonio. As we shall see, this was how he conceived the ruling minority whose duty it was, with him as their leader, to save Spain. His language and discourse differentiated him from the other European Fascist leaders, who were much clearer, more direct, and more understandable to the masses whom they were hoping to convince. José Antonio also wanted to convince the masses, but he was captivated by his need to find his very own style.

José Antonio's support for his father as dictator did not prevent him from noticing certain inconsistencies and contradictions, which, of course, he kept to himself. A significant incident between the two men occurred in the final stages of the dictatorship, toward the end of 1929. According to Pemán, who described the incident at a much later date, the dictator indignantly mentioned during a meal at the Primo de Rivera family home to which Pemán had been invited that Sánchez Guerra had not only been absolved on 28 October 1929 by the court-martial that had judged the case of his attempted coup with other artillery officers and Liberal and Republican politicians the previous January but also taken advantage of the occasion to hold "a political meeting." Although the accuracy of the report is somewhat doubtful because at home José Antonio called Primo de Rivera "Father," not "Dad," Pemán says José Antonio responded:

> Look, Dad, dictatorships have their own physical laws that make them slide down a ramp toward their undeniable real nature. Your inaugural manifesto and the first steps you took were sprinkled with Catalanism. You then shifted toward absolute centralism. You thought of your patriotic movement, and you acquired a devoted brotherhood. You spoke of a sincere, representative parliament, and we ended up with an assembly that is more like a family gathering. Even you feel that you will not be able to do anything heroic with such moderate approaches. It no longer matters that violence can be effective; it is too late for what matters: it would be serious and unjust.[129]

José Antonio took his father to task about the inconsistencies in his political management and made him so angry that he was ordered to leave the table.

But José Antonio was not only aware of some inconsistencies; he was also disappointed. And this disappointment partly fueled his future political activity and inspired him to set up a project that would be better than his father's, a project inspired by the shortcomings he perceived in his model. In fact, the last words José Antonio would ever pronounce in public, during the trial that condemned him to death in Alicante, were a reference to the dictatorship "not finishing off its work on welfare. It was a frustrating experience: the objective was not reached, and the expectations of the young Spanish workers and students who believed the break with the old regime had been made to undertake a new social revolution, of whom I was one at the time, were not fulfilled."[130] This would be a main point of his subsequent Fascist ideology. Although José Antonio had combined private misgivings with public support during the dictatorship, he took direct action once it was over in defense of his father and his work. While the General was in Paris, he did this in three ways: he wrote texts and made sure they were published, he engaged in semipublic violence (he got into fights), and he engaged in private violence. He was also extremely resentful about how his father's political career had ended because he felt he had been toppled by "court intrigues" from within, not without, the establishment, exactly the sort of thing that had hindered his father's regenerationist and social initiatives. On this topic, six years later during the trial that would sentence him to death, he said:

> My father was dismissed, or cowardly deposed, by virtue of a whole series of intrigues with which everyone is familiar. General Primo de Rivera's dictatorship was not toppled by the clear, open opposition of the people but by evil scheming that led to the formation of a court-controlled government of old politicians. Everybody is aware of this. General Primo de Rivera was succeeded not by the Republic but by General Berenguer with all the well-known old politicians, Romanones, García Prieto, etcetera, etcetera. My father—the dictator or president,

> there is still a lot to be said about that—was reduced to a state of infinite sorrow for how he had been paid for what he believed to be services to the monarchy. He went to Paris, and such was his state of melancholy that there he died just six weeks later. He died from despair, without . . . the palace sending him even a postcard inquiring after his health in the month and a half that he lived in exile . . . The truth of the matter is that all the Conservative classes, the court, and the wealthy who initially supported the dictatorship, believing it would be an instrument of class, domination, and authority, gradually started to drift away when they realized all the work that the dictatorship was doing for society. Many of the social policies maintained by the Republic were initiated during the dictatorship.[131]

José Antonio first defended his father by writing in *La Nación*. On 24 February 1930, he wrote an article attacking Jiménez de Asúa for having refused to give a lecture at the Ateneo de Albacete because José Antonio had given a speech there the previous week. The article went over the top and the argument was blown out of proportion, but it is a good example of how José Antonio had reacted to the loss of power and the relaxed censorship that allowed the public to express criticisms of the dictator and the dictatorship that would have been unthinkable just a short time before. Of course, Jiménez de Asúa, whom Primo de Rivera had disciplined, felt a great deal of hostility toward the former dictator and, less understandably, his family. To his exiled father's great satisfaction, José Antonio wrote:

> And exactly why does Mr. Asúa refuse to speak? Because of political incompatibilities with me? I would be very surprised, because the people who speak at the athenaeums are from across the political spectrum, and they do not necessarily feel any sympathy for one another. But Mr. Asúa does not even know what my political ideas are. I was very careful not to air them in the lectures I gave, which, as far as my education allowed, were only a relaxing excursion through the fields of thought in pursuit of philosophers and jurists.
>
> So it is not my political ideas that so offend the well-known professor: it is my surname. He reveals as much in the telegram when he refers to me as "son of Primo de Rivera" (which for me is a great honor). Mr. Asúa feels he cannot set foot in the same place as a Primo de Rivera or make his voice heard where a Primo de Rivera has spoken. If he did, he would be corrupted. So, what Mr. Asúa wants is that the members of the monstrous family to which I belong renounce all hope of civil life. No longer shall we be able to dedicate our lives to the law, mathematics, or music. Our duty is to die in silence, shut away, like the lepers of antiquity.
>
> Of course, all this is not easy to understand. Mr. Jiménez de Asúa, as the jurist he is (and very distinguished in his specialty, if truth be told), should rejoice if those of us who come from bloody dictatorial lineages decide to distance ourselves from the family tradition and dedicate our lives to the law. What sort of priest does not wish to convert the unfaithful?
>
> Moreover, it does not seem to me that Mr. Asúa, who as a bitter enemy of aristocracy detests hereditary privileges, can defend hereditary persecutions. If it is unjust for one surname to bestow privileges, how can it be just for another surname to confer disadvantage? This is a marvelous way of using blood to create an inverted aristocracy.
>
> Well, we should not worry ourselves too much over this. These contradictions between the liberalism of ideas and the inquisitorial intransigence of behavior are quite common in those of

> a nervous disposition. But there is one thing that concerns me: how long will Mr. Asúa's curse hang over me? Ten years? Twenty years? Will it be passed on to my children? Or perhaps even my grandchildren?[132]

José Antonio also defended his father through semipublic violence, the strategy he used when he came up against the lawyers who, in the general assemblies of the ICAM (significantly presided over at the time by Ossorio, another opponent of the dictatorship) made critical references to Primo de Rivera's period in power that he regarded as tremendously insulting. The most serious incident in which he was involved was his furious attack on former Conservative Minister of Development Luis Rodríguez de Viguri for having mentioned La Caoba. ICAM Secretary Miguel Maura—son of Antonio Maura and future minister of the interior of the provisional Republican government—spoke of the incident, which was indicative of José Antonio's violent temperament:

> Rodríguez de Viguri was speaking from the front row, and José Antonio was sitting in the middle of the room, just behind me. I heard him ask one of the friends with him who the speaker was and call him an unprintable name. His friend didn't know who he was either, and I felt under no obligation to tell them. Suddenly, I felt a blow to my head, as if the roof had fallen in on me. José Antonio scrambled over me, like a cat, and jumped over the three seats between him and the speaker. When I had recovered from the blow and the surprise, José Antonio was out of reach, but I clearly saw the act of aggression. He punched him and then grabbed him by the lapels while struggling against the men who were attempting to separate them, which they eventually managed to do.

At the request of the aggressor, José Antonio, the two men agreed to a duel to sort out their differences. Maura, however, managed to get them to desist, which prompted José Antonio to spit, "Well, I really must give you my thanks. But for as long as I live I shall never forgive you for preventing me from putting a hole in this citizen's belly." And when he was told perhaps it would be a good idea "not to attend any more assemblies so that things could calm down," he said, "Don't even think about it. I'm not going to miss a single one. Just wait and see."[133]

The final way in which José Antonio defended his father was violence in private, which he carried out by himself or with the help of his brother Miguel[134] and a distant relative, Sancho Dávila Fernández de Celis, who was from Seville and whom the two brothers referred to as "cousin" in the Andalusian fashion. The target for their violence was General Gonzalo

Queipo de Llano, and Luis Bolarque gave an account of the first incident in 1938:

> At that time we used to see José Antonio every afternoon. The dictatorship had just started, and we were rehearsing a play. José Antonio was a good actor, and he used to take all the roles of handsome young men. One day he said, “I’m afraid I’m going to have to leave the rehearsal for twenty minutes. I have some urgent business to attend to, but I’ll be back as soon as I can.” And off he went. The next day we found out that he had used those twenty minutes to beat up someone who had had the effrontery to bother his father. When he got back to the rehearsal, he didn’t show the slightest sign of exertion, and he carried on rehearsing as if nothing had happened. This was undoubtedly the first time he had done anything of this sort in the street, and, like all the following times, he went about it with the greatest arrogance and driven by a noble cause.[135]

As far as the second incident was concerned, Queipo was an old friend of the General, but their friendship transformed into open hostility when he was stripped of his command because of his antagonism toward General José Villalba Riquelme. Primo de Rivera decided on this particular course of action to show he would not allow himself to be swayed by friendship. From that moment on, Queipo became an adversary and in 1930 took part in a plot to end Berenguer’s regime and establish a republic. The incident with the Primo brothers came about when Queipo found out the General’s brother José had allegedly spoken ill of him. Angry, Queipo sent him an insulting letter. When he read it, “Tío Pepe,” sixty-two years old and apparently ailing, contacted his nephews and asked them for help. They were quite happy to swing into action, spurred on by the fact that the letter ended with “Nobody has ever dared to take me on” and Queipo’s private address. The two brothers and their “cousin” Sancho took a cab to the general’s home. José Antonio knocked on the door, handed him a card, and asked to meet in a public place. Queipo said the Lion d’Or café, and the three of them were there at 9 p.m. to face him. José Antonio asked him if he had written the letter, Queipo said he had, José Antonio hit him, and they both started slugging it out. Queipo’s friends joined in, and Miguel and Sancho rushed to support José Antonio. They ended up at the police station, and things looked bad for the Primo brothers and their cousin when the police found out they were cavalry officers (José Antonio was in the reserve, and Miguel and Sancho were doing their military service in the Húsares de la Princesa regiment).[136] Because they had assaulted a superior, all three were confined to barracks and eventually court-martialed. In an

attempt to stop the process, José Antonio wrote an explanatory letter to Berenguer but to no avail. Eventually, they were all stripped of their rank.[137]

The confrontation soon became public knowledge, and a well-known reporter, César González-Ruano, interviewed José Antonio for the *Heraldo de Madrid*. During the interview, significantly entitled "New Values," José Antonio criticized Queipo and other opponents of the dictatorship such as Sbert and Miguel Maura. In Maura's case, he focused on the fact that he had declared himself a Republican and was quite offensive:

> Miguel Maura has proved to be an outstanding egomaniac. He is nothing. Since he turned forty, he has done nothing of any great responsibility. How important is it that he has come out in favor of the Republic? What does his vote mean for the Republic? Nothing at all. It means only that one of Mr. Antonio Maura's sons has said it. He is no more and no less important than poor León Daudet's son who flirted with Communism, only to be brought down by a bullet full of hate fired as a consequence of clumsy and vile resentment.

He took advantage of the interview to mention his father and his work: "He is a man of good faith who believes, perhaps mistakenly, he can save the country and he is attempting to do just this. Of course, he may get things wrong and make mistakes. But nobody can deny he has accomplished three fundamental achievements in three important areas: Africa, terrorism, and the national treasury."[138] But this apparent, slightly critical sincerity lasted only twenty-four hours because *La Nación* published the next day a short item denying that José Antonio had said "the Marquess of Estella 'mistakenly' felt he was able to save Spain. He had never said 'mistakenly.'"[139] In the same interview, José Antonio said something his biographers have not noticed and his hagiographers have deliberately "forgotten." When asked whether he might get involved in politics, he said: "We'll talk about politics a few years from now. You don't announce you're going to punch someone: you just do it. We'll have plenty of opportunity to discuss it when I am dictator of Spain."[140] According to González-Ruano, he was only joking, but I am not so sure. It seems to me he was expressing a personal ambition and making a secret declaration of intent. This is in stark contrast to what he said and wrote on numerous occasions, which has often been repeated: that he only got involved in politics at enormous personal cost, that his political career was a sacrifice that he imposed on himself at the expense of professional practice, his real vocation. This version is often accompanied by the idea that he was not really attracted to politics and only

got involved out of an unavoidable sense of filial duty to defend his father's memory. Moreover, he would have decided on this course of action immediately after finding out by telegram that his father had died in Paris, just three days after the interview had been published. His analysts have endlessly repeated this version, which has sometimes been supplemented with another idea: that he acted out of a sense of patriotism and, like his father, felt obliged to embark on a political career to save Spain.

I do not believe this to be the case. I believe he was prompted into action by the desire to emulate his father and to hold a position of authoritarian political power, although it is plausible he was initially spurred on by what he regarded as unfair attacks on his father's work. But at a deeper level and from many years before, he had wanted to emulate his father and hold an important post of his own, such as the one his great-uncle and then his father had held. He hoped to fulfill this ambition by following in the wake of his father's project; analyzing his mistakes, shortcomings, and setbacks; and then implementing his own improved project that would be more radical, national, regenerative, and "social." And all this was wrapped up in a partly new, Fascist-type package. It is highly unlikely, however, that in 1930 he had already planned and defined this ambition in the same way in which he presented it three years later when he founded a Fascist party and became its single leader. He had not planned it, but he did desperately want to have a project of his own. And, suspiciously, in the interviews he gave during those years (such as when he was a candidate in the 1931 elections or when he spoke to a journalist in 1932), he systematically said his true vocation was the practice of law. He insisted too much to be credible, or at least to be completely credible; too often he denied a desire and an aspiration that were gradually becoming more important to him than his professional practice. His persistent denials were successful, because he is believed even today, despite the fact that, from 1930 to 1933, when he decided to set up a new force and become its leader, he was constantly involved in politics. The journey he undertook from being an active supporter of his father to Fascism, then, was not a particularly long one, but it was highly satisfactory, because he was on his way to achieving his ambition.

Notes

1. Joan Maria Thomàs, *Los fascismos españoles* (Barcelona, 2011), 63.
2. Stanley G. Payne, *Franco y José Antonio: El extraño caso del fascismo español* (Barcelona, 1997), 262; Xosé Manoel Núñez Seixas, “Falangismo, Nacionalsocialismo y el mito de Hitler en España (1931–1945),” *Revista de Estudios Políticos* 169 (2015): 32.
3. Primo may have visited Fascist leaders in countries other than Italy and Germany. The English Fascist leader Oswald Mosley says in his autobiography that José Antonio visited him “in the 1930s.” See Ian Gibson, *En busca de José Antonio* (Barcelona, 1980), 174n18.
4. During the preparation for the trial that would sentence him to death in Alicante in November 1936, José Antonio questioned—in particular, in a text entitled “Guión,” which listed the arguments he used in his defense—the use of “dictatorial”: “Dictatorial character . . . Where has he got that from? . . . Modestly, I would say some parallel can be drawn (but that’s about it: not that imaginary inherited dictatorial ambition that the judge attributed to me; neither my father nor I have ever had the slightest inclination to be dictators).” This document was not found in the famous “Mexican suitcase” that Indalecio Prieto kept and then delivered to Primo’s descendants in the 1970s. It was published for the first time—albeit with errors—in Miguel Primo de Rivera y Urquijo, *Papeles póstumos de José Antonio* (Barcelona, 1996), 184. The correct quote can be found in Jorge Bonilla, *La historia no contada de los Primo de Rivera* (Madrid, 2016), 225, 230.
5. Ramón Tamames and Xavier Casals, *Miguel Primo de Rivera y Orbaneja* (Barcelona, 2004).
6. During his time as ambassador to the United Kingdom, he told a subordinate: “The fact of the matter is that all I think about is women. And they can tell.” Rocío Primo de Rivera, *Los Primo de Rivera: Historia de una familia* (Madrid, 2003), 254.
7. Ibid., 253; Ana de Sagrera, *Miguel Primo de Rivera: El hombre, el soldado y el político* (Jerez de la Frontera, 1974), 310; Miguel Primo de Rivera y Urquijo, *No a las dos Españas: Memorias políticas* (Barcelona, 2003), 42.
8. By the time he returned to Spain, the romance had fizzled out. However, Miguel and Infanta Beatriz remained friends for the rest of their lives. Bonilla, *La historia no contada*, 161–162. Apparently,

Miguel had gone back to Spain because his father had sent him a telegram inviting him to the christening of a "colored" child of his. This caused him some concern, but it turned out to be just a joke. At least, this is the version his nephew gives in his memoirs. Primo de Rivera y Urquijo, *No a las dos Españas,* 41. For more information on his sculpting, see R. Primo de Rivera, *Historia de una familia,* 253–254, 306.

9. R. Primo de Rivera, *Historia de una familia,* 149.
10. Ibid., 305–308.
11. Felipe Ximénez de Sandoval, *José Antonio: Biografía* (Madrid, 1949), 25–26; Nieves Sáenz de Heredia, "En la vida familiar," in *Dolor y memoria de España en el segundo aniversario de la muerte de José Antonio* (Barcelona, 1939), 176.
12. Primo de Rivera y Urquijo, *No a las dos Españas*, 40.
13. Raimundo Fernández-Cuesta, "Raimundo Fernández-Cuesta nos habla de José Antonio," in *Dolor y memoria,* 179.
14. He is described as "energetic, serious, organized, and bossy." Ximénez de Sandoval, *Biografía,* 21.
15. "José Antonio was not a passionate man, and when it seemed he was, it was because his intellectual capability had managed to conjure up this impression." José María Pemán, *Mis almuerzos con gente importante* (Barcelona, 1970), 48–49. However, a colleague from the student association of which he was general secretary thought him to be "emotional, always passionate, and vibrant." Emilio González López, *Memorias de un estudiante liberal (1903–1931)* (La Coruña, 1987), 101.
16. According to Fernández-Cuesta: "He never picked on me when he was in one of his foul moods . . . He could be extremely ironic when the occasion demanded." Fernández-Cuesta, "Raimundo Fernández-Cuesta nos habla," 180.
17. Miguel Maura, *Así cayó Alfonso XIII: De una dictadura a otra* (Madrid, 2007), 161.
18. Claude G. Bowers, *Misión en España* (Barcelona, 1977), 29.
19. José María de Areilza, *Así los he visto* (Barcelona, 1974), 153.
20. He did not like to lose even when he was playing games. He never played cards. When he was in prison, he tried not to play chess with

Julio Ruiz de Alda, a founding member of the Falange, because he always lost. He played with Raimundo Fernández-Cuesta, a close friend from childhood and a politician within the Falange, who hardly knew how to play. He also loved soccer and would play as center-forward for the team of political prisoners against the common prisoners (for whom, somewhat paradoxically, the Anarcho-syndicalists and Communists played) even though he was not very good. According to Fernández-Cuesta: "He was pretty useless; but he was so proud and he loved the game so much that he would get angry if he wasn't asked to play." See Felipe Ximénez de Sandoval, "José Antonio en la cárcel modelo," in *Dolor y memoria,* 226–232.

21. Alfonso García Valdecasas, *José Antonio y la vida española (Conferencia pronunciada dentro del ciclo Hombres de España en el Colegio Mayor Diego de Covarrubias el día 6 de mayo de 1963)* (Madrid, 1964), 24.
22. R. Primo de Rivera, *Historia de una familia,* 255.
23. Doctor Pardo, "José Antonio y su hermano Fernando," in *Dolor y memoria,* 216.
24. And when his interlocutor and comrade Foxá responded, "You're brave, too," he said, "Bah! It's all down to adrenaline; I take too long to react." Agustín de Foxá, "José Antonio: El amigo," in *Dolor y memoria,* 217–220. On his discovery of adrenaline through his brother Fernando, see Pardo, "José Antonio y su hermano."
25. Even so, in 1931 she was a member of the women's youth section of Acción Nacional (National Action), the precursor to Popular Action and the CEDA. José Ramón Montero, *La CEDA: El catolicismo social y político en la II República*, 2 vols. (Madrid, 1977), 1:116.
26. Ibid., 1:149–150.
27. A classmate and friend of José Antonio's adds: "Although he also felt close to Carmen and Miguel, their relationship was largely one of camaraderie. Much more than Fernando, Miguel was his inseparable companion for enjoyable excursions, nighttime strolls, good-humored chats in the bar, and nights in the dance hall. I have never seen José Antonio in Bakanik, in the Bar Club, or in Casablanca with Fernando, but I have seen him with Miguel. Whenever I have seen him in the

cinema or theater, he has never been with Pilar, always with Carmen." Ximénez de Sandoval, *Biografía*, 29.

28. Pilar Primo de Rivera, *Recuerdos de una vida* (Madrid, 1983), 22.
29. Julio Gil Pecharromán, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera: Retrato de un visionario* (Madrid, 1996), 41.
30. Ximénez de Sandoval, *Biografía*, 21.
31. P. Primo de Rivera, *Recuerdos de una vida*, 22.
32. For more information on the General's interest in his children learning English and French, see Sagrera, *Miguel Primo de Rivera*, 177. His wife, Casilda, also spoke French and English. He spoke only French, with some difficulty.
33. Ximénez de Sandoval, *Biografía*, 38.
34. For more information on his time as a student, see Ramón Serrano Suñer, "José Antonio, estudiante, enamorado y parlamentario: Conversación con el ministro del Interior," in *Dolor y memoria*, 193–207.
35. Joan Maria Thomàs, "Ramón Serrano Suñer: El personaje real y el personaje inventado," in *Ramón Serrano Suñer*, ed. Adriano Gómez Molina and Joan Maria Thomàs (Barcelona, 2003), 201.
36. González López, *Memorias de un estudiante*, 104–105.
37. Ibid., 110–111.
38. Ibid., 212–213.
39. Sagrera, *Miguel Primo de Rivera*, 194.
40. Carlos Seco Serrano, *Militarismo y civilismo en la España contemporánea* (Madrid, 1984), 291.
41. Ibid., 191.
42. His official degree certificate of 20 January 1923 had to be sent back to the university to be corrected because the name printed was "José" and not "José Antonio." Ximénez de Sandoval, *Biografía*, 35.
43. Ibid., 42–43; Ramón Serrano Suñer, *Entre Hendaya y Gibraltar* (Barcelona, 1973), 457.
44. Miguel temporarily interrupted his military service at this point because of illness. Ximénez de Sandoval, *Biografía*, 52.
45. Interview with María Mercedes de Despujol Magarola, a friend of José Antonio's from the Women's Section of the Falange, Barcelona, March 1986.

46. Interview with Pedro Conde Genové, Barcelona, March 1986.

47. Sagrera, *Miguel Primo de Rivera*, 21.

48. Gil Pecharromán, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera*, 44.

49. Sagrera, *Miguel Primo de Rivera*, 22. Unlike Miguel and then Fernando, his brother Pepe dropped out of the academy without completing his studies.

50. See Enric Ucelay-Da Cal, “La Diputació durant la dictadura: 1923–1930,” in *Història de la Diputació de Barcelona*, vol. 3, ed. Borja de Riquer (Barcelona, 1987), 188.

51. Ibid., 179.

52. Manuel Ribé, *Memorias de un funcionario* (Barcelona, 1963), 104.

53. Ucelay-Da Cal, “La Diputació,” 182.

54. María Teresa González Calbet, *La dictadura de Primo de Rivera: El directorio militar* (Madrid, 1987), 37.

55. Borja de Riquer, *Francesc Cambó: Entre la monarquia i la república (1930–1932)—Com les memòries s’acomoden a les circumstàncies polítiques* (Barcelona, 2007), 16; see also Borja de Riquer, *Alfonso XIII y Cambó: La monarquía y el catalanismo político* (Barcelona, 2013).

56. One day . . . Primo de Rivera felt obliged to mention he had some personal difficulties and problems that somewhat limited his freedom of movement as far as the uprising was concerned. I kept quiet. At first I assumed it was some sort of affair of the heart, but the next day I saw he was worried and I dared to ask him to be frank. Then Primo de Rivera confessed he had several debts—because he liked to gamble—and he was an honorable man. He wanted to pay, but he did not have the money. He feared that, if he led a coup, demanding the regeneration of the country and presenting himself before the king, somebody could discredit him and force him out. I decided I would remove my friend’s preoccupation, which was by no means insignificant. I did not have enough to cover the debt, so I took out a loan in my name and in my brother Santiago’s. When the General had paid off his debts of honor, he assured me he felt free to take action. (Juan Antonio Güell y López, quoted in José María Ramón de San Pedro, *Conversaciones con el conde de Güell*, 125, cited in Andreu Farràs, *Els Güell: La història d’una de les famílies més influents a Catalunya els últims dos segles* [Barcelona, 2016], 110)

57. Javier Tusell, *Radiografía de un golpe de Estado* (Madrid, 1987), 94.
58. José Luis Gómez Navarro, *El régimen de Primo de Rivera: Reyes, dictaduras y dictadores* (Madrid, 1991), 347.
59. Julio Ponce Alberca, *Del Poder y sus Sombras: José Cruz Conde (1878–1939)* (Cabra, 2001), 50.
60. Enrique Aguilar and Julio Ponce, *Memorias de José Cruz Conde: Notas de un asilo diplomático (Madrid, julio 1936–enero 1939)* (Córdoba, 2011), 315. Cruz Conde was rewarded during the dictatorship with decorations, the appointment as mayor of Córdoba in 1924, the civil governorship of Seville in 1926, and the management of the Ibero-American Exhibition of Seville of 1929.
61. Gil Pecharromán, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera*, 121.
62. Seco Serrano, *Militarismo y civilismo*, 291.
63. Ana de Sagrera, *Miguel Primo de Rivera*, 215.
64. Carolyn P. Boyd, *La política pretoriana en el reinado de Alfonso XIII* (Madrid, 1990), 319.
65. Ramón Tamames, *Ni Mussolini ni Franco: La dictadura de Primo de Rivera y su tiempo* (Barcelona, 2008), 67–69.
66. Alejandro Quiroga Fernández de Soto, “Cirujano de Hierro: La construcción carismática del general Primo de Rivera,” *Ayer* 91, no. 3 (2013): 161. See also Alejandro Quiroga Fernández de Soto, *Haciendo españoles: La nacionalización de las masas en la Dictadura de Primo de Rivera (1923–1930)* (Madrid, 2008).
67. Payne, *Franco y José Antonio*, 109–110; see also Enrique de Aguinaga and Stanley G. Payne, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera* (Barcelona, 2003), 164–165.
68. Sebastian Balfour, *Abrazo mortal: De la guerra colonial a la Guerra Civil en España y Marruecos (1909–1939)* (Barcelona, 2002), 214. However, as Balfour explains, these gases were already in use before Primo de Rivera came to power.
69. Shlomo Ben-Ami, *La dictadura de Primo de Rivera 1923–1930* (Barcelona, 1984), 60.
70. Ucelay-Da Cal, “La Diputació,” 204.
71. Josep M. Roig Rosich, *La dictadura de Primo de Rivera a Catalunya: Un assaig de repressió cultural* (Barcelona, 1992), 3.

72. Xavier Casals, “Miguel Primo de Rivera, el espejo de Franco,” in Tamames and Casals, *Miguel Primo de Rivera y Orbaneja*, 125.
73. Sagrera, *Miguel Primo de Rivera*, 50.
74. Julián Cortés Cavanillas, *La dictadura y el dictador: Rasgos históricos, políticos y psicológicos* (Madrid, 1929), 303–310, cited in Quiroga Fernández de Soto, *Cirujano de hierro*, 29.
75. Miguel Gandarias, *Perfiles síquicos del dictador y bosquejo razonado de su obra* (Madrid, 1929), 8–9. See also Emilio Rodríguez Tarduchy, *Psicología del dictador: Caracteres más salientes morales, sociales y políticos de la dictadura española* (Madrid, 1929); José Pemartín Sanjuán, *Los valores históricos de la Dictadura española* (Madrid, 1929).
76. Dionisio Pérez, *La dictadura a través de sus Notas Oficiosas* (Madrid, 1930), 3.
77. Tamames and Casals, *Miguel Primo de Rivera y Orbaneja*, 182.
78. Ibid., 192.
79. Gonzalo Álvarez Chillida, *José María Pemán: Pensamiento y trayectoria de un monárquico (1897–1941)* (Cádiz, 1996), 3.
80. Quiroga Fernández de Soto, “Cirujano de Hierro,” 153, 158; Quiroga Fernández de Soto, *Haciendo españoles*, 306.
81. Tamames, *Ni Mussolini ni Franco*, 260.
82. *Escolar* refers to the so-called special schools (for engineering, architecture, etc.).
83. According to its first general secretary, González López, *Memorias de un estudiante*, 163.
84. Josep Massot i Muntaner, *Antoni Maria Sbert (1901–1980)* (Barcelona, 2008), 11.
85. González López, *Memorias de un estudiante*, 120.
86. Ibid., 22; José López Rey, *Los estudiantes frente a la Dictadura* (Madrid, 1930), 51.
87. Eduardo González Calleja, *La España de los Primo de Rivera: La modernización autoritaria 1923–1930* (Madrid, 2005), 92. For the full list, see López Rey, *Los estudiantes*, 51.
88. Jordi Gracia, *José Ortega y Gasset* (Madrid, 2014), 432–433.
89. González López, *Memorias de un estudiante*, 238.
90. Gracia, *José Ortega y Gasset*, 334.

91. Sagrera, *Miguel Primo de Rivera,* 236–237 (this and the previous quotation).
92. Jon Juaristi, *Miguel de Unamuno* (Madrid, 2012), 358–359.
93. Colette Rabaté and Jean-Claude Rabaté, *Miguel de Unamuno: Biografía* (Madrid, 2010), 454.
94. Ibid., 460.
95. Nevertheless, as we shall see, Unamuno toward the end of his life and in one of his characteristic changes of opinion felt he had made a mistake by positioning himself against the dictatorship. Biographers believe he had been upset by the dictator appropriating various arguments against the Restoration that he believed were his own. See Juaristi, *Miguel de Unamuno,* 353–354; Ana Urrutia, *La poetización de la política en el Unamuno exiliado: De Fuerteventura a París y Romancero del destierro* (Salamanca, 2003), 42–57.
96. Rabaté and Rabaté, *Miguel de Unamuno,* 477.
97. Ibid., 515, 524–525.
98. Tamames and Casals, *Miguel Primo de Rivera y Orbaneja,* 209.
99. Stanley G. Payne, *Los militares y la política en la España contemporánea* (Paris, 1967), 257.
100. In the last unofficial note he published, on 29 January 1930, he said: "On Saturday morning, I picked up my pencil and dashed off the unofficial note that was published on Sunday. And without checking it with anybody, not even myself, without reading it through, I gave it to the cyclist to take it to the press information office so as not to waste a minute." Sagrera, *Miguel Primo de Rivera,* 344–346, emphasis added.
101. The note began:

> The dictatorship was proclaimed by the military, in my opinion responding to the healthy desires of the people who were quick to show their enthusiastic support at the time and who are still very much in favor today. As the support of the people is not easy to determine quickly and accurately, but the support of the military is, ten captain generals, the commander-in-chief of the forces in Morocco, three captain generals of maritime departments, and directors of the Civil Guard, Carabiniers, and Invalids are, after a brief, discreet investigation that should involve nobody other than the heads of units and services, authorized and invited to inform in

> writing or, should they prefer, in a meeting in Madrid whether the dictatorship continues to deserve the trust and the respect of the Army and the Navy. If it does not, within five minutes, the powers of the head of the dictatorship and of the government will be returned to His Majesty the King, for it is he who grants them in accordance with the will of the people . . . But if the highest authorities of the Army and the Navy, with whom I have made no attempt to curry favor, communicate to the head of government the opposite opinion—*and in this judgment votes against will have greater value than votes for*—I shall have a clear conscience and be content to have carried out my duty, God's will, and that in the last seventy-two months Spain has been what it always should have been. (Ibid., 344–346, emphasis added)

102. In a text that was not published until 2007, Cambó says:

> On 26 January I left Paris for Barcelona. I bought a copy of *Le Temps* at D'Orsay station. In the section on latest news, I was shocked to read the circular that Primo de Ribera [*sic*] had sent to the captain generals. It gave me the impression that the fall of the dictatorship was imminent. When I got to Barcelona on the 27th, I immediately got in touch with Madrid to convince some of the generals they should not answer the question the dictator was asking them and that they should restrict themselves to saying they would always be at the service of the legally constituted authority. (Riquer, *Francesc Cambó*, 160)

103. He said to his confidant Juan Antonio Güell y López: "I must take things slowly; my time has not come yet. First, there will be an intermediate situation, which I will give my full support. The crisis is over. This evening Berenguer will be forming a government." José María Ramón de San Pedro, quoted in Farràs, *Els Güell*, 120.

104. See the text from the general's collection of documents—in possession of the Primo de Rivera family—recently published at Jorge Bonilla's request. The rough draft of the note or manifesto contains paragraphs such as the following:

> I do not believe this government's mission to be over. Nor the dictatorship's for that matter . . . The dictatorship should remain in power in a slightly adapted form for a few more years. And so should I for a few more months. But what has happened today, if it

> is successful, has the inevitable consequence that the king will cease to be the king and that he and his family will leave the country immediately, in which case I call on all concerned to behave with nobility, composure, decorum and good manners, especially for the Queen and her children.

These words were a premonition if ever there was one, as were the following:

> Subsequently, the republic must be proclaimed and the position of president must be occupied by a good, wise, impartial, and just man, who will be loyally assisted by all Spaniards, even those with deep feelings for the monarchy and who have strong ties with the royal family. The Fatherland is above everybody. A king without the stupidity or the fallacies or the pedestrian grasp of economics of Alfonso XIII would have satisfied the monarchic feelings of much of the Spanish population. The old politicians could not cope with this king and the future ones will not be able to either, if I do not finish off my work by relieving Spanish public life of this eternal obstacle. (Bonilla, *La historia no contada,* 82–83)

105. It is not true, then, that he rejected the post because he had been informed he had throat cancer. He found out the day after, by which time he had already returned to Barcelona. Riquer, *Francesc Cambó,* 164–165.
106. Sagrera, *Miguel Primo de Rivera,* 355 (this and the previous quotation).
107. Tamames and Casals, *Miguel Primo de Rivera y Orbaneja,* 214.
108. Ibid., 356–357.
109. Sagrera, *Miguel Primo de Rivera,* 362–363.
110. He also mentioned an alleged mutiny of troops in Castellón, who were said to have refused to set sail for Morocco. Ibid., 255; see also Ángel Ossorio y Gallardo, *Mis Memorias* (Buenos Aires, 1946), 138.
111. Sagrera, *Miguel Primo de Rivera,* 255–256.
112. Antonio Pérez Yuste, “La Compañía Telefónica Nacional de España en la Dictadura de Primo de Rivera (1923–1930)” (PhD diss., Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, 2004), 128.
113. Gil Pecharromán, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera,* 73n27.
114. Sagrera, *Miguel Primo de Rivera,* 251.

115. Gil Pecharromán, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera*, 77.

116. Ibid., 73.

117. In fact, he had two. The first was a Chevrolet, which he probably bought secondhand in 1929 and sold in 1933, and the second was a smaller, red model. For this information, I am grateful to Miguel Ángel Gimeno Álvarez, a scholar of the Falange. The first motorcar still exists and is in Spain. The second is in the United States.

118. Sancho Dávila, *José Antonio, Salamanca y otras cosas* (Madrid, 1967), 18.

119. José Antonio may have fallen in love before, with Pilar de Arteaga, whom he met at university. She did a doctorate in history, although in 1934 she entered a convent. Her father held two Infantado duke titles, which supports my argument here. On Arteaga, see José María Zavala, *La pasión de José Antonio* (Barcelona, 2011), 83.

120. R. Primo de Rivera, *Historia de una familia*, 251.

121. He was first made Duke of Villahermosa and then Duke of Luna. In 1895, he had managed to have the second dukedom re-created, which until that time had only been held by a nephew of Ferdinand II of Aragon, at the end of the fifteenth century. He was an ancestor of Pilar Azlor's father, whose family historically held the dukedom.

122. Gibson, *En busca de José Antonio*, 228.

123. Zavala, *La pasión de José Antonio*, 30.

124. Cited without a source in ibid., 31.

125. The following cryptic text conceals what really occurred:

> I remember the day he told me in a devilishly adolescent sort of way. And his constant conversations about "her" for months and years; how he praised her color, her figure, her accent, and, especially, her letters, "which were full of literary rigor." I also remember his furtive attempts to meet her or send her a letter or a present in the middle of the Pilar chapel. His Romeo-and-Juliet approach, his self-torturing, his doubts, decisions, and nostalgia. Rarely have I seen a man with so many qualities; but his demanding nature and ill luck denied them the definitive meeting. (Serrano Suñer, "José Antonio," 203–204)

126. "Bajo el nuevo Régimen. Cómo resurge Cádiz: Los hombres nuevos," *La Nación*, 27 May 1929, in Obras Completas de José Antonio

(OCJA), http://www.rumbos.net/ocja/jaoc2003.html.

127. For a glowing account of José Antonio's intervention written at the beginning of the Franco regime and after his death by firing squad had been announced, see Manuel Machado, "José Antonio, el poeta," in *Dolor y memoria*, 105–106.

128. *La Nación*, 28 November, 1929.

129. Pemán, *Mis almuerzos*, 48.

130. José María Mancisidor, *Frente a frente: José Antonio Primo de Rivera, frente al Tribunal Popular—Texto taquigráfico del Juicio Oral de Alicante, Noviembre 1936* (Madrid, 1963), 57.

131. Ibid., 55–57. José Cruz Conde, a former colleague of Primo de Rivera's, put forward a similar argument of resistance to reform and defense of privilege, which would also lead to civil war, in the notes he wrote as a diplomat in Madrid during the struggle. Referring to Alfonso XIII and the "privileged classes":

> A frivolous and mistaken king in the final analysis and . . . an incomprehensible, wild, selfish, almost illiterate right-wing horde with no idea about the Fatherland. But they all paid for their errors! As God is my witness, none of this gives me any joy; but, I must confess, thinking of their errors, it does not make me feel any great sorrow. Monarchy and privileged classes! These are the unwitting instigators of the tragedy we are now experiencing! May God forgive them! History will not be benevolent in its judgment of them. The way they persisted in their mistakes, their refusal to release unsustainable privileges, their blindness to danger . . . and when danger is upon them, their woeful lack of decision to face up to it or to suffer defeat gallantly. They don't even know how to lose. May they go with God and not come back if they are not capable of remorse and amendment. (Aguilar and Ponce, *Memorias de José Cruz Conde*, 318–319)

132. José Antonio Primo de Rivera, "El señor Asúa no quiere contaminarse," *La Nación*, 26 February 1930, cited in OCJA, http://www.rumbos.net/ocja/jaoc2010.html.

133. Maura, *Así cayó Alfonso XIII*, 161–162.

134. Sagrera, *Miguel Primo de Rivera*, 360–361.

135. Luis Bolarque, "José Antonio y la verdad de *Cara al Sol,*" in *Dolor y memoria*, 207–208.

136. A few days before, while the FUE was going through the motions of Primo's funeral, officers of the regiment and of the Húsares de la Pavía had taken on the protesters. Dávila, *José Antonio,* 86–88. On these and other confrontations between students and Húsares officers, see González López, *Memorias de un estudiante,* 272–273. On a duel "to first blood" between Miguel Primo and an Air Force officer by the name of Rexach who had insulted the former dictator, see R. Primo de Rivera, *Historia de una familia*, 233–234. His son confuses this incident with that involving Queipo de Llano. Primo de Rivera y Urquijo, *No a las dos Españas,* 40n13.

137. Dávila, *José Antonio,* 86–87.

138. César González-Ruano, "Nuevos valores," *Heraldo de Madrid,* 13 March 1930.

139. *La Nación*, 14 March 1930, 15.

140. González-Ruano, "Nuevos valores."

Chapter 2

The Rise of the Firstborn

From Defending His Father's Memory to Molding a Second Primo de Rivera as the "Savior of Spain"

Defending His Father's Memory and Work: The National Monarchist Union

His father's death had an enormous impact on José Antonio and added tremendous drama to the significance of the decision to relinquish power and leave the country. Almost immediately after his father died, José Antonio took his first "official" steps in politics, precisely to defend the work begun under the regime and to ensure it was continued within a party that was founded for this purpose: the Unión Monárquica Nacional (National Monarchist Union—UMN). On 24 March 1930, eight days after the General's death, José Antonio was a member of the National Board of Directors of the recently constituted UMN. He held the post of first undersecretary and president of the Board for Patriotic and Citizens' Propaganda, entrusted with the task of recruiting members throughout the country.[1] He remained in this party until it dissolved in April 1931 because of the disastrous results of the municipal elections on 12 April that would usher Spain into its Second Republic. The UMN was created to participate in the parliamentary elections that, it was thought, General Dámaso Berenguer would call relatively quickly as the way to return to the constitutional normality interrupted by the coup in 1923. It aimed to regroup the supporters of the dictatorship under an ideology/program that envisaged restoring the Constitution of 1876 (an important difference from the more recent dictatorial projects) but making it compatible with "a strong government, the supreme embodiment of the principle of authority,

effective enough to quell any attempts at violence, wherever they might come from." That is, the government would be authoritarian or semi-authoritarian, and there would be a new dictatorship. However, the UMN was created to oppose any future attempt to hold the leading figures in the Primo de Rivera dictatorship responsible for their political actions. Its leader was former Minister of Development Rafael Benjumea (Count of Guadalhorce), an engineer and the author of the regime's policies on public works, whom supporters of the regime held in high esteem. The other party leaders were former ministers, former UPE leaders, and high-ranking civil servants—and, of course, José Antonio, the representative of the nobility.

During the UMN's short existence (barely thirteen months), Primo combined his work as a lawyer with his tasks as a propagandist, participating in political rallies throughout the country and organizing his candidacy in the Cadiz elections alongside José María Pemán. At the rallies, he generally spoke before the party heavyweights, who tended to be Benjumea, José Calvo Sotelo, or other former ministers. In his speeches, José Antonio described the party's program and briefly explained the concepts of national unity, "which is indestructible, the supremacy of Spain's interests over all party interests, the exaltation of national feeling . . . , the struggle to win back Spain's economic independence; the creation of a conscious civil discipline and the existence of an army and a navy that can maintain the prestige of Spain at all times."[2] And he openly advocated a new dictatorship: "A government like the ones we used to have!" He encouraged people "to lose your fear. Do not waver and do not be afraid of words! Do not hesitate in the face of superstitions or the squealing of the legal institutions! Do not hold back, and if anybody ever says, 'May principles be saved and nations perish!' we must retort, 'Long live Spain even though all constitutional principles must perish!'"[3] And, of course, he made critical references to intellectuals: "Our intellectuals these days, deservedly finding fault with that poor Greek Plato, no longer believe supreme virtue is found in the combination of wisdom, fortitude, and temperance. Rather, they prefer to go without two of these features and deify only wisdom, intelligence. They forget that being intelligent is really very little when one is not also good and courageous." He was quite obsessed with attacking those he believed were his father's enemies and responsible for the end of the regime, and he expressed this obsession in

articles he wrote in *La Nación*. Making no distinctions, he denounced them all with absurd arguments:

> After the physical decline and all the unpleasantness, the intellectuals have arrived at the most devastating spiritual aridity; they have become cold and inhospitable. Unsociable, too, because they do not use the circles in which they occasionally move, as normal men do, to calmly cultivate friendship but to pour out the hostility they have amassed for everything in existence during their hours of reclusion. Intellectuals are poor, solitary beings of an entirely disagreeable nature. They are impervious to all forms of affection; they do not react like us to women, to children, to human joy and sorrow. They are dehumanized. For intellectuals, only their thoughts are worthy of respect.[4]

Likewise, on the first anniversary of his father's death, he wrote an article contentiously entitled "The Hour of the Dwarfs":

> God showed mercy by carrying him off to the regions of eternal peace. After a brief martyrdom came peace. His merits were too great for divine generosity not to release him from such a pitiful situation. Everything's in motion, like a can of maggots. It's as if nothing had happened. The same men, the same empty words, the same fuss. And it's all so petty! In contrast to the enormous work of six whole years—order, peace, riches, work, culture, dignity, joy—we now have the tired, moth-eaten formulas we are so used to hearing; the trivial, well-worn rhetoric; and the same pettifogging subtleties that even the law is not familiar with. The politicians all have familiar faces. They are all over sixty . . . The years will pass and only the highest peaks will emerge from the bubbling stream. All these small-minded people—good-for-nothing lawyers, politicians, and writers—will be washed away. Who shall remember them in one hundred years' time? He, on the other hand—simple and strong like his spirit—will rise up over the centuries, a great, serene figure bathed in the light of glory and martyrdom.[5]

This criticism by intellectuals, politicians, and other adversaries contrasted his own vision of his father's work. He could not understand why it was not given the recognition it deserved and was convinced he had "saved Spain" by persuading the Spanish people it was not true that their ills had no solution:

> He died after his life had been drained out of him drop by drop. But he has left behind a legacy: an optimistic Spain, a respected Spain, a rich Spain, a regenerated Spain. But the most important thing the dictatorship did was to convince Spain it is not old and outdated. It had been said so many times that Spain was a country that would never get over its decadence, that it had no spirit, that it was cowardly; the people were so lacking in confidence about their own abilities that most Spaniards passively waited for death and never even went to vote on election day. Why bother—they would say—if it's just going to be the same old thing? But in six years Spain has seen that it is a country that can win battles, that has become wealthy, that

> has got better, that has the respect of other countries, and that, if it wants, can be as great as any of the nations that regarded it as small, cowardly, and poor.[6]

So it cannot have been good news for him when, in February 1931, intellectuals of the stature of José Ortega y Gasset (one of his former lecturers), Gregorio Marañon, and Ramón Pérez de Ayala founded the Agrupación al Servicio de la República (Group at the Service of the Republic—ASR) and confirmed publicly and proactively their support for the new state.

At the time, apart from being in favor of extreme authoritarian Nationalism and critical of Liberal democracy, José Antonio publicly declared he was opposed to seeking a formula to replace this formal democracy, which he believed had failed. In a lecture entitled "The Form and Content of Democracy" and given on 16 January 1931 at the UMN headquarters in Madrid, he described true democracy as being "life in common not subject to tyranny, pacific, joyful, and virtuous" and pointed out two subsequent "deviations" in the concept: the divine right of kings and Jean-Jacques Rousseau's concept of popular sovereignty. With regard to the latter, he considered Liberal democracies "failures," arguing that "we may not have fulfilled [Ángel] Ganivet's prophecies of power falling into the hands of the worst," but

> there are two phenomena: on the one hand, the general ineffectiveness of the parliamentarians elected by universal suffrage even in such countries as England and Belgium, where it is at its most perfect. And on the other, the tendency of the electoral body to be swayed by extreme, warmongering parties like the Communists and the Nationalists (that is to say, by the "anti-Democratic" parties). So, the democracy is in form only, and, instead of giving rise to a democracy of substance, it threatens to put it out of our reach for ever more.

His aim, then, was to find a democracy "of substance":

> If democracy as a form has failed, it is, more than anything, because it has not been able to provide a truly Democratic life in its substance. Let us not fall prey to extreme exaggerations, which transform hatred of suffragistic superstition into contempt for all that is Democratic. Above and beyond all passing fashions, aspiring to a Democratic, free, and peaceful life shall always be the aim of political science. The attempts to deny individual rights, gained after centuries of sacrifice, shall not prevail. What science needs to do is to use constructions of "substance" to seek the Democratic result that a "form" has not been able to provide. We now know we must not take the wrong path; so let us look for another. But not by improvisation. We need persistent, diligent, and humble study, because the truth, like bread, can only be earned with the sweat of our brow.[7]

By rejecting a Liberal democracy he regarded as dangerous but did not know how to replace, he was looking for his own political formula. The way forward lay in an authoritarianism that sought the “common good,” supposedly by “interpreting” that the people desired a “peaceful, happy, and virtuous” life, which he believed was true “democracy.” He would not “deny individual rights,” but he would deny parliamentarianism.

Despite the UMN’s ambitions, Spanish politics was taking a course that was quite different from what the party had been preparing for. Amid a deteriorating economic situation and a fresh outbreak of social conflict that had been held in check during the six and a half years of the dictatorship, the revitalized Republican opposition started to coordinate with other parties. On 17 August 1930, the opposition of “old” radicals such as Alejandro Lerroux, new radical socialists such as Marcelino Domingo, Manuel Azaña’s Acción Republicana (Republican Action), neo-Republicans from the Derecha Liberal Republicana (Liberal Republican Right) led by the former monarchist politicians Niceto Alcalá-Zamora and Miguel Maura, and Catalan Republican organizations signed the Pact of San Sebastián, paving the way for an insurrectional movement to end the monarchy and establish the Republic. Two months later, the PSOE joined forces with these groups and set up the Revolutionary Committee entrusted with organizing a general strike and, in conjunction with another military committee led by General Gonzalo Queipo de Llano, a coup to end the regime. The date set for the strike and the coup was 15 December 1930, but two officers from the garrison in Jaca, captains Fermín Galán and Ángel García Hernández, acted early and rose up on 12 December. This led to a skirmish between their troops and those the government sent to quell the movement. They were defeated and two days later sentenced to be shot after a summary court-martial. On the same day, all the Revolutionary Committee members were arrested.

The execution of the two officers and the arrest of the Republican and Socialist leaders triggered an outburst of solidarity. The Republicans and Socialists declared they had no intention of presenting themselves as candidates on 1 March 1931, which largely invalidated the elections because they would not cover the whole political spectrum. Eventually, since he no longer had the king’s support, Berenguer resigned on 14 February. Then, after leading political figures such as the Catalan Conservative Francesc Cambó and the Liberal Santiago Alba had rejected

Alfonso XIII's requests to form a government, another military man, Admiral Juan Bautista Aznar, was put in charge of a new program designed to bring about the gradual restoration of the Constitution of 1876. Three successive elections were scheduled by universal suffrage: the first, on 12 April, were municipal elections; then, on 3 May, the elections to the provincial councils; and, finally, on 7 and 14 May, the elections of ministers and senators.[8] The political atmosphere throughout was extremely turbulent and not improved by the university students, led by Antoni María Sbert, who on this occasion were clearly in favor of an uprising. This was when the ASR was founded and when José Antonio got involved in another controversy in defense of his father, this time with General Ricardo Burguete. The controversy was played out in the press and without physical violence.

A former opponent of the dictatorship, Burguete had been appointed president of the Supreme Council of War and Navy by Berenguer's government and, at the trial of the Revolutionary Committee members, had ensured legal guarantees for all the accused and publicly voted in favor of their absolution. He had also published an article in which he made little attempt to disguise his contempt of Primo de Rivera's coup:

> All measures must be taken to calm the political situation; first, calm measures and then more energetic ones. But we must ensure that a sense of freedom and justice pervades the darkness that enshrouds its point of origin, and by which it was invaded and blinded. All hope was lost, and stormy winds from the east sent us astray. People had no faith in their knowledge, no faith in their feelings, no faith in the present or the future, and were obliged to join, without guidance or direction, the most tragic of all syndicates—the syndicate of disappointment, discouragement, and doubt—from which we must distance ourselves at all costs.[9]

He also demanded political responsibilities for what had occurred during the dictatorship. For doing so, he was stripped of his rank and arrested, which caused a public scandal and the official political atmosphere to deteriorate even further. Inevitably, given Burguete's underlying but clearly understandable allusions to the dictator, José Antonio published a note in *La Nación*:

> Defectors are generally given a warm welcome by revolutionaries. Not for any personal worth, but because the jacket of a former minister, a cassock, or a military uniform, seduced by revolution, open up a breach in the severe unanimity of the other jackets, cassocks, and uniforms. Those flattered are so desperate for the flatterers to write them some sort of note

> that, dressed in their finery and with their medals pinned to their chest, they dance on the table in the local inn. The aim, of course, is for the uniform to ridicule what it used to represent.[10]

The Burguete's response from the castle in which he was imprisoned made José Antonio even more furious. He said the CTNE had employed José Antonio as a lawyer, and he advised him to take "the mental baby food I recommend for shysters, but not too much because, until Nestlé brings out a product with just the right dose, mental childishness is a risk." He also advised him to save "his inheritance and his patrimony, to which we all contribute, and which will be quite considerable, my young former friend."[11] José Antonio counterattacked immediately by publishing a text in *La Nación* in which he denied the CTNE had employed him and reproduced letters that proved Burguete's previous friendship with his father and the repressive action he had taken in Asturias in 1917. He resorted to irony to avoid rising to the bait about his "mental childishness":

> In his letter, General Burguete makes some barbed remarks about me. With delightful modesty, he describes them as joyful. But nobody can force me to repeat them in the press. Discussing whether I believe I am stupid or smart is of absolutely no interest to the public at all. Some generals think that traveling with their back to the engine when traveling by train, or having seen the sun rise when they were lieutenants . . . are experiences from the history of the universe that their contemporaries should not be deprived of. I am a long way from believing myself to be so important. When I believe duty calls—and, in particular, my duty to defend my father's memory—I go to the press. I cast aside all thoughts of age and hierarchy. But I have never even considered discussing my qualities and defects in public. That would make me look as ridiculous as all the others who do just this.[12]

It was in this atmosphere that the first of the three scheduled elections was held. In the municipal elections on 12 April 1931, the Republicans were victorious in forty-one provincial capitals. So the Republic was installed, and the Revolutionary Committee came to power. This opened up a new political scenario that was radically different from anything that had preceded it. One month previously, José Antonio had inherited his father's titles and become the third Marquess of Estella and Grandee of Spain. Fully aware of the responsibilities these titles entailed, he went, first, to a warship anchored in Cartagena to bid farewell to Alfonso XIII before he left the country and then, with his two sisters, to the town of Galapagar (Madrid) to do the same to Victoria Eugenia and her children. We should not forget that the queen's leaving the country was a condition that General Primo de

Rivera had mentioned in his unpublished note-cum-manifesto written immediately after his resignation.[13]

The fact that José Antonio fulfilled his aristocratic obligations does not mean he had any sympathy for the king. The memory of how his father had been treated and of the events surrounding his resignation and death, inextricably linked, must have been very fresh in his mind. After his father had been relieved of his duties, he must have told his eldest son his intent to abolish with the monarchy, although this easily could have been merely a flash of indignation. Nevertheless, José Antonio undoubtedly felt some hostility toward Alfonso XIII, and in 1936, shortly before his death, he said to the court that would sentence him, "My memory of that last stage of the old regime is not, by the way, an affectionate one."[14]

José Antonio's new status as marquess was just what he needed to give definitive shape to his ideas about the role of the aristocracy and señores in society, which were closely connected to the political ideology he was constructing. On another level, he became the main shareholder of *La Nación*, the newspaper that had been printing his numerous notes and articles—about forty of them form 1930 to 1932.[15] There was a lot that he had to say, that he wanted to say. In fact, with the advent of the new regime, his worries had increased substantially. On the one hand, his expectations of establishing a dictatorship or semi-dictatorship, at least in the short and medium term, had been frustrated. And on the other, the criticism of his father's regime reached new heights after 14 April 1931, when free speech once again became the order of the day. But the worst thing for José Antonio was that the new government insisted on demanding criminal sentences for the politicians who had been at the forefront of the dictatorship. Of course, the death of his father meant he and his family had little to worry about on many, but by no means all, counts. And they must have received some satisfaction from the fact that Berenguer and Aznar—who in their opinion had ignored and humiliated the dictator's work—had been removed from power.

Making Himself Known

During the Republican period, José Antonio achieved political protagonism as a member of the parliament and the leader of a Fascist party that was

behind some of the practices that majorly contributed to debasing Spanish political life. This debasement culminated in the outbreak of a civil war in Spain. Just two years into the new Democratic regime, in 1933, he founded his Fascist-style organization—the Falange—of which he would eventually be its one and only leader. In this year, he also became a member of the parliament after his first frustrated attempt in 1931 and another failure in 1936. He was also arrested and imprisoned on various occasions during this period—in 1931, 1932, and, above all, 1936. The Second Spanish Republic, then, provided José Antonio with the backdrop and the opportunity to fulfill himself, although he would never achieve his ambition of taking power and leading the country as his father had: as he was journeying toward this goal, four months after the outbreak of the Civil War, he met his death. Again, like his father's, it was a personal tragedy. But José Antonio's end was even more tragic because it came before a firing squad, and even more frustrating because he had never held real power. In one respect, however, he did surpass his father's achievements: the victors of the Civil War and Franco and his followers idolatrized José Antonio after his death.

I shall describe the most important events José Antonio was involved in between the proclamation of the Republic on 14 April 1931 and his participation in the meeting held at the Teatro de la Comedia on 29 October 1933, when he announced the foundation of the Falange Española, the political platform that would launch his attempt to become the future leader of a Spanish Fascist state. In these two and a half years, he abandoned the sinking ship that had given him the opportunity to take his first steps in politics and of which he had not been the one and only captain—the UMN—and created his Fascist project. His ultimate aim was to become its leader, although he did not manage to do so in this period. He created the newspaper *El Fascio* and then the Spanish Syndicalist Movement, opportunely just after Hitler had taken power in Germany in 1933 and in the middle of the hubbub this had caused throughout Europe. The Nazis had emerged as a new Fascist regime to join the Italians, the only other regime of its kind, and in one of the most important nations on the continent.

This was the time that José Antonio started coming to the fore as a politician. He presented himself as a candidate for Madrid in the legislative elections of 1931 and, in 1932, acted as a defense attorney in the trials on political responsibilities under the dictatorship. These trials were the object of enormous media interest, and he defended himself, his brothers, and

some government members whom his father had presided over. He also continued to get involved in violent incidents in defense of his father's memory. For the first time, he was arrested by the police and even unjustly imprisoned, a circumstance that would distance him from the Republic in which he had initially, and somewhat paradoxically, placed some expectations and hopes. He became disaffected with the Republic shortly after it had been proclaimed, because he regarded the new policies on law and order, as well as defense against internal enemies, illegal (which they were to some extent). He would be one of the victims of these policies. But, most importantly, from 1931 to 1933, José Antonio took the ideological step from right-wing authoritarianism to Fascism (albeit at first of a rather rudimentary form).

With the advent of the Republic, there were so many criticisms of his father's time in power that confronting the critics as he had done in 1930 (and, in so doing, living up to the affectionate nickname Milhombres [Big Man] his father had given him as child)[16] became impossible. However, this did not prevent him from getting involved in new incidents such as the one reported by Vegas Latapié, the founder of the anti-Democratic, pro-monarchy Acción Española (Spanish Action). He described José Antonio's attempt to attack Álvaro Alcalá Galiano on 5 February 1932 during the inauguration of the association's offices in Madrid. In the party's magazine, also entitled *Acción Española* and directed at the time by the Marquess of Quintanar, Alcalá Galiano had published the first of a series of articles on the dictatorship in which he described all the fines and the deportations that had been imposed. After he had read the draft of the text, Vegas Latapié, unsure of himself, had shown it to José Antonio, who scarcely raised any objections and did not say it should not be published, even though he did mention that the number of sanctions alluded to was highly exaggerated. Nevertheless, on the day of the inauguration, when the magazine had already come out, he turned up at the offices and announced he had come to give Alcalá Galiano a hiding. Vegas Latapié was completely taken aback and had to ask one of the magazine's leading thinkers, Ramiro de Maeztu, to intercede. José Antonio eventually calmed down and left without delivering the promised hiding.[17]

José Antonio's disappointment and critical attitude toward the Republic just two months after it had been proclaimed can be monitored through some of his articles in *La Nación*. When the legal statute of the Provisional

Government of the Republic was passed—a document that recognized and listed public rights but at the same time empowered the government to suspend them in order to defend the regime from its enemies—he wrote:

> Individual rights have never been awarded less respect, and the legal consequences of our acts have never been less predictable: government prisons, spying, denunciations, the violation of secrets, the closing of newspapers, political persecution, and the dissolution of courts are much more widespread than ever before. Never has the legal statute of each Spaniard been such fragile protection as now. Even the principle that laws are nonretroactive is not respected. Nobody knows what rights they will have tomorrow. We are living in a dictatorship that cannot even be justified by the need to resist strong reactionary movements: no other monarchy accepted the Republic with such calm resignation as the Spanish monarchy did. So why do we have this? The Provisional Government of the Republic and the parliament can continue to ride roughshod over their adversaries; they can even decide to ignore the law and unfairly satisfy popular anger by offering scapegoats, as some recent, insensitive words have suggested. All this will earn some ragged applause from those people who are totally lacking in any legal sensibility and spiritual elegance and who detest tyranny not for what it is but because it is put into practice by their adversaries; the same people who produce resentful tin-pot tyrants as soon as they find that they have a little power in their hands. And to earn the applause of these people, the Republic will have sacrificed its true destiny. The Spaniards capable of perceiving this (that is to say, the only ones whose opinion is of any import) will find themselves, as usual, with no legal statute, and subject to the whim of dictators. Others are now in power, and therefore others are being persecuted. But so what? Distrust in the power of individual rights will emerge once again, and we shall return to our cowardly reliance on the caciques of the moment. In short, the revolution of 14 April will have failed in its destiny. Will it be able to improvise another one now that things are at fever pitch?

At other points in his argument, he accepted that the dictatorship or previous governments had not provided citizens with a genuine legal statute, but he insisted his father’s dictatorship was quite unlike the others, which “always based their decisions on some personal gain—for their family, party or class—and under the semblance of legal regimes.” The dictatorship was also “guided by the one and only aspiration of the public good and . . . [proclaimed] its firm intention to proceed from outside the law, a surgical tool that was essential if it was to repair the degradation it found when it came to power. This insistence on the regime’s dictatorial nature prompted several of the old politicians, sly dictators each and every one of them, to denounce that they were outraged by its illegal nature.” He went on to respond to the criticisms of his father’s regime and to justify the work his father had done:

> The criticism was extremely superficial, but its widespread acceptance by the public was due to two factors: the country’s lack of political culture and the incomprehensible clumsiness of

> our intellectuals, who still have not managed to understand the depth and the historical nature of the phenomenon of the dictatorship. When you read the anti-dictatorial press and you realize how vulgar its attacks are (all slander and insults mixed up with the remains of a political ideology that has been discarded throughout Europe by all those who did not stop reading twenty years ago), you begin to fear that a people guided by such newspapers will never be able to become a true political body. As time goes on, it will be seen that the dictatorship was no less legal than all the other governments, that it was better than others in terms of the honesty of its purpose (which means it did not favor any particular class or attempt to remain in power forever), that it weakened the seemingly impregnable redoubts of the old regime, and that it gave Spain six years of good government. If the dictatorship had removed the specters of Morocco, unemployment, deficit, and terrorism, Niceto Alcalá-Zamora would not be calmly playing at Republics now![18]

That is, if we ignore for the moment the hostility he felt toward the previous regime's intellectual opponents who had been unable to understand its essence,[19] his words seem to suggest he is arguing in favor of a "legal statute" within a state governed by the rule of law. It is by no means clear, however, that he is referring to a Liberal democracy. In his opinion, the Republic was much worse than his father's dictatorship because it was so arbitrary. Of course, the Republic's legal statute and, shortly afterward, the Law for the Defense of the Republic were highly debatable from the Democratic point of view, and some of their most vehement critics when they were passed had irreproachable Democratic credentials (e.g., Ángel Ossorio y Gallardo). These laws codified the new regime's policy to defend itself against its right-wing and left-wing enemies (the monarchists on the one hand and the Anarcho-syndicalists and the Communists on the other), giving wide-ranging powers to the executive and denying the right of legal appeal against its repressive decisions.[20] All this provided José Antonio with plenty of ammunition for his criticism of the new regime, but it could hardly be used to justify the numerous arbitrary legal decisions under his father's leadership.

After the Republic had taken power, the right- and far right-wing forces began to regroup but José Antonio did not fully identify with any of them. He felt no real bond with the far right-wing forces that aimed to topple the emerging regime or with the right-wing forces that tolerated it but wanted to make it become semi-authoritarian. He felt very little—if any—attraction for the Traditionalist Communion, the Carlist organization that defended its specific form of ultra-Catholic and neo-absolutist dynastic monarchy. He was a little more in tune with Alfonsist authoritarian monarchism, but more because of its dictatorial leanings than his belief in Alfonsist monarchism. It

was in this domain that the authoritarian monarchists and the Catholic fundamentalists operated and to which Vegas Latapié, Antonio Goicoechea, and Pedro Sainz Rodríguez, the founders of Spanish Action, belonged. Some Carlists were also members, but most were affiliated with Acción Nacional (National Action), a new, modern, and soon-to-be large-scale party with Catholic leaders from the Asociación Católica Nacional de Propagandistas (National Catholic Association of Propagandists), inspired by Ángel Herrera Oria and led by José María Gil-Robles, a former opponent of José Antonio at the Faculty of Law. The party defended the Church against the Republican anticlerical reforms, argued against agrarian reform, and advocated a "rectification" of the Constitution of 1931 that was only partly Democratic and would give it a greater corporate spirit.

In 1931 and 1932, however, National Action agglutinated the whole spectrum of right-wing forces, with the exception of Carlism, which always wanted to remain independent, even though some of its intellectuals collaborated in *Acción Española*. The right wing in general had been defeated in the 1931 general elections and was opposed to the new Constitution and the reforms that the governing Republican-Socialist coalition wanted to implement. Its rank and file consisted of disparate elements such as the far right-wing Alfonsist authoritarian monarchists and the Catholic monarchists who were inspired by the Church's Social-Christian and corporate doctrines. However, this coexistence would last only until late 1932 and early 1933, when the Alfonsist authoritarian monarchists withdrew because of "accidentalism" (the Vatican-inspired doctrine that the Catholic Church could accept all sorts of states, even a republic) and then renounced the defining hallmark of militant monarchists. After the separation, in March 1933, the Alfonsist monarchists founded another much smaller party—Spanish Renewal—that, like the Carlists, was prepared to use violence to bring down the Republic. At this point, the government forced National Action to change its name because political parties could no longer use "national." Thus, National Action now came to be known as Popular Action and became the mainstay of what soon was the CEDA, the major force of Catholic opposition to the Republican-Socialist government.

José Antonio did not feel at ease as a member of National Action or identify with the Catholic corporate majority, led by Gil-Robles and Herrera Oria, because they defended the confessionality of the state while he felt

state and religion should be kept separate. At that time, he was more at home among the Alfonsist authoritarian monarchists because, despite the aforementioned limitations, he had been a leader of the UMN. But in 1931 he was involved with National Action and in October managed to present himself as the only candidate for the party in Madrid at the by-elections held to fill the seats that had been vacated by members of the parliament elected in the previous month of June. As the candidate for the capital, he drafted a program based exclusively on the defense of the political figure of his father, whom he described as "unjustly mistreated" by the new regime on the issue of the political responsibilities. It was not a bad tactic, designed to capture the vote of whom he believed were the thousands of former dictatorship supporters and, more generally, the votes of the entire right wing, because his was the only candidacy within this political spectrum. In fact, he would get a considerable number of votes—more than 30 percent of all those cast—but not enough to win the seat, which eventually went to the left-wing candidate for the Republican-Socialist coalition, Manuel Bartolomé Cossío. (The Partido Comunista de España [Communist Party of Spain—PCE] candidate finished in third place.) This result must have been a great relief for the government, fully aware of how badly the election of a former dictator's son as one of its parliamentarians would have reflected on the emerging Republic.

Using his electoral program to defend his father had been even more opportune, given that the Republic was initiating the procedure to demand political responsibilities against the king for permitting the dictatorship and for events such as the Disaster at Annual and the shooting of the two captains who had been involved in the Jaca uprising. Although these disciplinary actions could not have any criminal effects for General Primo de Rivera, they did mean his regime was being subject to a political trial. Thus, when he agreed to present his candidacy at the by-elections, José Antonio felt he could satisfy his desire to "get into politics" and take advantage of the seat to defend his father from the most important platform of all: the parliament itself. This was a commendable task for the son of a well-to-do family, and one that various sectors of voters understood and respected. And although he failed, the electoral campaign greatly increased his public profile, in Madrid in particular. Of course, his candidacy and campaign received the full support of his family: his brothers did all they could to help him, as did hundreds of other people. It was only a short

campaign, and José Antonio did not deviate in the slightest from his strategy, even when a journalist asked him whether, once elected, he would take part in debates that had nothing to do with the political responsibilities being demanded:

> I do not believe I will. Although, naturally, this is not the best time to be discussing this. My opinions are still not fully formed. I do not believe myself sufficiently well informed to define my politics. If my father had not been the head of government, I would never have got into politics. My independence must be constant and absolute. I shall defend my father's administration and all those who helped him, and I shall rectify many dishonorable concepts that have been created rather crudely and with no solid basis. That is my obligation; afterward I do not know what I shall do.[21]

He certainly was right in some respects: if he had not been his father's son, he would not have taken an interest in politics, and he had still not shaped a fully-fledged project. But he was careful to conceal his desire to dedicate himself to politics.

Throughout the campaign and in his speeches, José Antonio constantly insisted his father would be denied a fair trial. "The memory of General Primo de Rivera in the parliament will have four hundred accusers and 'no defense.' All the other accused will at least be able to appoint someone to defend them; my father cannot. He is dead, so he is not even part of the process of demanding responsibility." In his opinion, the fact that his father had organized a coup and ended constitutional legality did not present a problem, because he had done these things "to save the Fatherland." What he did regard as bad, however, was to "take advantage" of power and remain at the helm forever, something that, according to José Antonio, his father had not done. But in light of all we have seen so far, the truth of this is questionable. He wrote:

> It is not dishonorable to rise up against the government—as General Primo de Rivera did in 1923—to save the Fatherland. On the other hand, it is dishonorable to take advantage of power for personal gain or to govern unwisely, and it is also a crime to insist on governing when constant mistakes are evidence of lack of ability . . . The whole host of savage accusations that have been made against General Primo de Rivera cannot be allowed to remain floating over his memory. The accusers must be required to back up their charges with proof. They should not be allowed to make vague accusations in informal gatherings and in the press and then shy away from their duty of justifying themselves. And they should then be required to listen to the defense.

And on the subject of his alleged lack of interest in politics:

> To defend my father's sacred memory is the sole reason for which I wish to go to the parliament (although this does not mean I shall neglect my duties to Madrid and my voters). I am aware that on my own merit I cannot aspire to a seat in the parliament in Madrid. But I am not running for office out of vanity or for the pleasure I take in politics, which attracts me less and less as time goes by. Because I was not attracted by it, I spent the six years of the dictatorship without popping into a ministry or acting in public in any way at all. As God is my witness, my vocation lies in my books, and casting them aside to throw myself momentarily into the frenzy of politics is truly painful.[22]

His argument was good, as was his electoral campaign. However, his insistence that he took little interest in politics and he had spent six years without "popping into a ministry or acting in public in any way at all" was hardly credible. First, he had acted in public in 1929, and second, if he had attempted to "pop into" a ministry after the storm of controversy over the North American job, his father would have forbidden him from doing so.

After the elections, José Antonio's second public activity in the first two years of the Republic was the one that most increased his public profile, not only in Madrid but throughout the country: his participation as a defense attorney in the 1932 trial on political responsibilities under the dictatorship. He did indeed defend some of the ministers who were brought to trial, but they were only a small part of those who had been involved in the dictatorial governments, because the others had fled into exile to avoid reprisals (although this did not prevent them from being put on trial and sentenced).[23] In his first case, judged by the Supreme Court, he defended himself, his family, the heirs of the Duke of Tetuán, and two former ministers, Eduardo Callejo and Benjumea. The latter did not turn up and was declared to be in default. In his second case, he defended former Minister of Justice Galo Ponte y Escartín, who was brought before a parliamentary court. José Antonio was a defense attorney for the twenty-six former ministers indicted for holding a post during the dictatorship. The first trial was held in April 1932, and the second six months later in November. *La Nación*—whose daily circulation was decreasing at the time—gave the proceedings of the first trial and his part in them a great deal of coverage, which must have been in José Antonio's interests. And the proceedings of the second were even printed and distributed as a leaflet.

The analysis of the "reports" he presented for the defense during the hearings reveals not only his legal-technical argumentation but also something more important: the progress he was making in formulating his political ideology. His lack of interest in politics and his career as a lawyer, which were a clear dichotomy in his interviews, tended to merge in the reports. In the first court case—a civil lawsuit brought before the Supreme Court by someone (a certain José Manuel Sánchez Vílchez) who was seeking damages because of the consequences of a dictatorship law—he had taken on the attorney for the prosecution, none other than Ángel Ossorio y Gallardo, a former adversary of his father's and a brilliant lawyer. *La Nación* reported Primo's performance in court in glowing terms as if he had revealed a fundamental piece of law:

> When he dealt with this issue, [José Antonio] converted the courtroom into a master class. He examined prescription in history, prescription in science, with incomparable competence and skill. He explored the concept of prescription in Rome, in the Middle Ages, in Germanic law, in positive law, in the French, Italian, and Spanish codes, and in jurisprudence. He touched on everything that had the slightest thing to do with this legal concept. Applied to the lawsuit in dispute, the doctrine favored the thesis of the defense.[24]

However, such exaggerated praise aside, it is interesting to follow the argumentation he used to defend the legality of a dictatorship decrees against the plaintiff's criterion that "law is only that which is legitimated by the legal system in place before the dictatorship was installed." To refute this argument, he referred to a leading philosopher of law, the German Rudolf Stammler (who at the time was affiliated with the Nazi Party), arguing that any break with the established legal system caused by conquests, revolutions, or coups could constitute a source of legal legitimacy.[25] This is indicative not only of his intention to justify the events of the past but of what he would attempt in the future.

In the second trial, a parliamentary court accused all the members of the General's military governments of high treason, an offence that carried a sentence of up to twenty years. José Antonio was not the most prestigious or the best known of the team of defense lawyers, because among his colleagues were the professor of political law Gil-Robles, the lawyer and Partido Agrario (Agrarian Party) member of the parliament José Martínez de Velasco, and the Galician Republican Leandro Pita Romero. Nevertheless, José Antonio's participation was particularly significant

because of who his father was and because his contacts in the media were quite willing to put the spotlight on him. In his defense of Ponte,[26] he argued in favor of not only his client but also the legitimacy of the acts of the dictatorship. In particular, and in response to the accusation of acting against the Constitution of 1876, he argued this had been revoked by the coup in 1923, using the same argument as the Republicans when the governments of Berenguer and Aznar had persecuted them: they could not have committed an offense against the Constitution, because it no longer existed. And he again used Stammler to support his argument:

> Would anyone dare suggest tsarist law is still in force in Russia because it has not been revoked in accordance with its own rules? But there is no need to resort to such remote examples: we have the example of the Spanish Republic at hand. Nobody can doubt its legitimacy, but there is no possible way of relating it to the legal system in force when it first came into being. Remember that there was no constitutional regulation in existence at the time that gave the municipal elections such an exorbitant defect as the change of regime. Remember, too, that the electoral majority of the whole country was not in favor of the Republican candidates. And, finally, remember the procedural defects by which the Republic was instated: *La Gaceta*[27] of 15 April 1931 published a decree signed by the Revolutionary Committee appointing Niceto Alcalá-Zamora president of the provisional government. And then, Mr. Alcalá-Zamora, by virtue of another decree, converted the members of the same Revolutionary Committee that had just invested him into government ministers. A punctilious legist would be able to point out numerous reasons for declaring the whole process null and void: the Revolutionary Committee was not a competent constitutional body for appointing a head of state; the head of state thus appointed could not appoint as ministers those who had granted him his authority. Therefore, the cabinet [Council of Ministers] and the parliament should be declared null and void. But who could seriously consider such thoughts? Just think of all the ridiculous outcomes understanding law in this way would have: the Spanish Republic does not legally exist, and there is no doubt that the dictatorship did not exist either, so Spain continues to be a constitutional monarchy under the Constitution of 1876 . . . Don Galo Ponte cannot be condemned for committing crimes against a dead constitution.

But he did not stop there, and he made the most of the situation to use one of his favorite arguments: the criticism of the foundations of Liberal democracy and, in particular, Rousseau’s concept of sovereignty. In his opinion: “The pure Rousseauian doctrine is accepted by nobody. It is rejected not only by those movements that could be described as backward but by all those in existence, even the most revolutionary. The dogma of national sovereignty is scorned by both Communism and Syndicalism.” Even though the number of Democratic regimes had indeed decreased in Southern and Eastern Europe during the 1930s, José Antonio was exaggerating his argument by ignoring the persistence of democracy in

other countries. He also exaggerated his arguments when referring to legal doctrines:

> If political-social movements lead on to trends in legal thought, nobody will find a contemporary writer who agrees with what underlies *The Social Contract*. The jurists of our age have put justice back in the realm of reason, not in the realm of the will of many or of just a few. So, unlike [Pierre] Jurieu, Rousseau's forerunner, who stated, "The people is the sole authority that has no need to be right to validate its acts," the new Kantians, in the words of Stammler, retort, "The majority is a relation of quantity; justice, on the other hand, implies quality. The mere fact that many proclaim something to be true or aspire to something does not necessarily mean it is just. Whether the majority is to be assisted or not by justice must be determined on the merits of every case."[28]

This premise was one of the bases of his political thought.

The dictatorship was also constantly accused of acting "against the public interest because it rode roughshod over individual rights; meted out undeserved fines, deportations, and imprisonments; enacted an iniquitous criminal code; suspended just sentences; and involved the Treasury in pernicious guarantees and monopolies." However, José Antonio argued that the injustice of each accusation had not been proved and in some cases not even investigated. He also pointed out that the new Republic had not annulled or repealed most of the dictatorship's decrees, so, once again, he was not limiting himself to making a strict legal defense but simply defending his father's regime. And he was proud to be able to do, as he said in court: "I have no desire to renounce this opportunity for communication, explanation, this call to the intelligence of all those who care to listen that I have so longed for so that I can invite them to discover a little more about the reality of the dictatorship and not be satisfied with the superficial banalities that have been put forward by way of commentaries." And he went on to give his version of what life in Spain was like before the dictatorship: "of little intellectual interest, stupid, idle, skeptical . . . , undermined by a lack of enthusiasm that was not even tragic but accepted with a sort of abject sarcasm. In Morocco, a festering sore, bloody and shameful . . . , the state had accepted defeat and was content to merely observe the anarchy that was fermenting before its very eyes." And he spoke at even greater length about what he believed was the collusion between politics and the nobility, a topic that he would raise on various occasions and was the outline of a vision that he would complete in the

future: the contrast between the “useful” aristocracy and the aristocracy “of leisure”:

> The tenth part of what could be the wealth of Spain, the produce of the poor fields of Spain, almost forgotten by their owners, was dedicated to allowing a few privileged families to live in luxury but with no nobility. These families had formed alliances with groups of old politicians whose mission was to keep the whole setup functioning for as long as was humanly possible, putting off its predictable demise by bargaining with anarchy. For several years, the mutual rendering of services worked perfectly: the old politicians guaranteed the privileged families temporary tranquility, and the privileged families gave the politicians the indescribable joy of dressing up in top hat and tails and occasionally sharing the society of duchesses, marchionesses, and countesses under the cobwebs in their mansions.

However, he did not tar all the “privileged families” with the same brush: “But note that I do not regard all aristocratic families, or only aristocratic families, to be of this type. Many aristocratic families are models of simplicity and domestic virtues. These families played no part in the goings-on of the old regime even though many influential upstarts did.” And while all this was happening, while “the old regime was breaking up . . . in a rather worrying fashion,” his father’s coup came.

The coup was something of a “personal” endeavor, but the privileged classes, the people, and the intellectuals had all focused their attention on it. The privileged classes had first thought Primo de Rivera had taken action to shore up the old order, not to reform it or change anything, not even the Constitution of 1876. This was just the opposite of what the General aimed to do. He felt he had responded to “the demands of the people” who were willing him not to miss his chance “but to firmly grasp the reins and lead Spain, joyfully, inexorably, toward a new life. Precisely for this reason, he had begun to prune and cut away the dead wood without ceremony and with such gusto that the privileged families and the old conspirers were soon in a state of shock.” This intent to “impose the popular desire for a new state” had first prompted them to withdraw their support. José Antonio illustrated his argument with such examples as, “With his decrees of 1926, how did Calvo Sotelo dare to oversee hidden wealth and even threaten culprits with expropriation?” or “How was the dictator so bold as to announce the agrarian reform for the following year in an article published in *ABC* at the end of 1927? What was the meaning of this socialist innovation of the parity committees?” By focusing on them, he exaggerated the (frustrated) reformist/regenerationist features of the dictatorship so that he could deny

that his father had been a representative of the “old order.” And he concluded that all the attempts at reform had led the “old regime to start conspiring against the dictatorship.”

On the other hand, “the people, who can show their will in many different ways with no need for elections,” had realized the dictatorship was theirs: “for the first time, the people in power were governing for them.” He quoted mothers who were relieved the war in Morocco had ended, day laborers who witnessed Spain ratifying international agreements about the right to work, “wretched places in Spain that saw the arrival of roads of joy to link them to the world, schools for their children, hospitals and clinics for the mistreated flesh of the working classes, water for the parched land.” In short: “The people felt [the dictator] was one of their own . . . Remember how his funeral parade covered half of Spain and passed through crowds that were weeping in silence.” However, unfortunately—and here he returned to his argument about “the intellectuals”—“the people alone, with no intermediaries, are not sufficient to sustain a regime.” The fact is that “the intellectuals”—whether they were fully to blame or whether the dictator was partly at fault is open to question—soon distanced themselves from the new regime. It had been “a movement of dislike” which, in his opinion, “has yet to be explained.” The intellectuals had withdrawn “into themselves with a grimace of repugnance and refused to recognize the deep, revolutionary sense of Primo de Rivera’s thought.” When the time came for José Antonio to take political action of his own, he would have two main targets: the aristocracy and the intellectuals. He now complained that the intellectuals, who were “the most sensitive to Spain’s pain,” had wasted the opportunity “of channeling that magnificent optimistic outpouring of popular enthusiasm that overwhelmed Primo de Rivera’s spirit between the banks of an elegant, strong doctrine.” The result of all this was that the dictator had found himself isolated:

> Between himself and the people, waiting passively, there was a desert of hostile silences and clandestine slander. The intellectuals were in front of him. The privileged families, the families with connections with the royal family, the most powerful, were all engaged in gossip and conspiracy. Where could Primo de Rivera find support? The only people who were genuinely at his side were those simple, exemplary aristocrats I spoke of before, and the small Spanish middle class . . . People who could only understand the Conservative side to the dictatorship but who did not have the strength to join him in his deep desire for renovation.

So, the General had undergone “the drama that Spain reserves for all great men: the drama that he was not understood by those who imagined they loved him and was not loved by those who could have understood him.” José Antonio would soon find himself in the same predicament with the intellectuals. In his own political project, he did his utmost to seduce and attract them, and he largely succeeded in convincing those who were well disposed toward Fascism to admire and regard him as their leader.

José Antonio continued his legal argument by claiming his father’s dictatorship had not been brought down by a popular uprising because “the people” had never been against it. On the other hand, Berenguer’s government had been “a cabinet of aristocrats and old politicians presided over by the head of the Palace Military Household.” This was the moment they had been waiting for to return to the old regime, to electoral manipulation and

> influential fathers [who] presented their offspring with political positions, aided by the Ministry of the Interior, in scarcely known places in our deserts and mountain ranges. Administrators and voters busied themselves with the preparations so that the young man in question would only have to appear at the last minute with his case full of banknotes and his British pronunciation and reel off a couple lame speeches, struggling with a lack of intellect and a shortage of vocabulary, before the expressionless countenances of the locals . . . Let’s erase all ideas of ambition and greatness! Let’s suspend the hydraulic works and stop the railways!

And he asked the court a direct question:

> And in response to this shameless renaissance, what did you do, all you revolutionaries, you intellectuals, who had once been so prolific in diatribes against the old regime? Did you rise up and resist? No, you only did this much later. What you did then was release all your bitterness against the fallen governor: you insulted him, slandered him as ruthlessly as can be remembered, dragged his name through the mud. And, meanwhile, he was being attacked by *La Gaceta* with insults and the ridiculous annihilation of all his dreams of a great Spain . . . And although he was strong as a great soldier, he was also as sensitive as a child; the man who resisted for Spain, working tirelessly without respite for the full six years of service, could not resist six weeks of affronts.

He finished his report by saying he had “needed to say all this.”[29] It must have been true, because in the dedication he wrote for his defendant on the final report (printed so that his supporters could read it), he said he was grateful “for the chance to say in public many things that were weighing on my soul.”[30]

José Antonio had done little more than repeat what he had already said in his *La Nación* articles and in electoral speeches, but this time was in the old Senate building, in front of a court made up of members of the parliament, so his words would have had more impact than ever. He had not only justified all the work done by his father's government (allegedly regenerative, anti-cacique, modern, and patriotic) and given an account of the (also alleged) injustice suffered at the hands of the aristocrats and Conservative parasites but also demanded, somewhat pathetically, understanding:

> You must be just . . . with the memory of that man, who between us we all managed to ruin. You must be intelligent and magnanimous. Understand him! Understand him! You occupy a privileged position in history, and you have a duty to be shrewd. You cannot ignore the hidden dramas experienced by the man you must judge. It is not reasonable to share in the superficial diatribes against the dictatorship and not use your intelligence to delve into its deeper meaning. This is the justice I seek from you: the ability and the disposition to understand. This is the only desire of those of us who still worship the same memory: we need you to restore peace to our spirits, which have suffered the mistreatment of so much slander. Our spirits need to feel the calm; they need to be filled with that absence, which is at once our fortune and our glory.[31]

Although his appearance in court had been a highly emotional experience for him and his family, he caused little more than indifference (or indignation) in his interlocutors. And all his efforts came to naught, because the absolution that he had sought was denied, and Ponte was sentenced to six years of exile at least 250 kilometers from Madrid and disqualified from holding public office for twenty years. Even the fact that the final sentence was significantly less than the twenty years the prosecutor had requested was not José Antonio's achievement: all the accused were given similar sentences.

His intervention in the parliamentary court came out in print, but its circulation was largely limited to friends and supporters of the dictatorship. Thus, and in an attempt to further spread his ideas, he published a lengthy interview on his court appearance in *Ellas*, a women's magazine directed by Pemán.[32] Apparently, however, he did not manage to reach a wide readership even with this ploy. In the publication, José Antonio repeated many of his arguments, describing the court case as "a game or a sad sham." He pointed out that the only thing of any importance from the hearing was the discussion of the memory of his father, which, he predicted, would increase in grandeur with the passing of time and "fill volumes and

be the object of celebration." His prediction, however, would not come true in the short, medium, or long term. In 1932, *Acción Española* and *Unión Patriótica* published issues exclusively on the dictator, but they only had any impact among his supporters. History would not be much kinder to him. Even Francoism, so concerned with demonstrating its (nonexistent) legal legitimacy, made very little effort to glorify Primo de Rivera's dictatorship as a precedent or the figure of the General as a forerunner because they were too busy extolling the virtues of the Generalissimo.[33]

In July 1932, before this interview and in the time between the interventions in the aforementioned two trials, the *ABC* journalist Blanca Silveira-Armesto interviewed José Antonio for *Crónica* magazine as part of the series "What advantages and disadvantages are there in being the son of a famous man?" When asked about his projects, life plans, and personal aspirations, he stressed that his main interest was his profession but did not flatly deny he had no political aspirations. He said he longed

> to know a little about law. My career is like my future bride in the sense that I have great hopes . . . There are times that I feel the desire to serve Spain in some great and intense way. It is true that Spain can be served from almost anywhere, but, with my vocation, I would prefer some position of responsibility from which I could put all my faith and energy at the service of my country. But these desires are all very vague because my career is more important to me, and I shall use my career to serve Spain.[34]

Given that he started work on creating a political movement of his own six months later, these words do not seem very credible.

His decision to enter politics may have been affected (although not decisively) by the fact that he was placed under arrest on two occasions during this period. In both cases, he was falsely accused of taking part in anti-Republican conspiracies and was released without charges. His two arrests and one imprisonment outraged him. He was first arrested on 11 November 1931 in his family home in connection with a police investigation into an anti-Republican military plot led by the generals Ponte, José Cavalcanti, Emilio Barrera, and Luis Orgaz Yoldi and Colonel José Enrique Varela and involving civilians such as the former secretary of the UMN Quintanar and UPE leader Santiago Fuentes Pila. The Republican-Socialist government dismantled the plot quite easily. The order for his arrest was issued by Director General of Security Ángel Galarza—a radical Socialist and former attorney general of the Republic—and he was

locked up in the cells at the security directorate general for a whole day. It was a blemish on his image as a lawyer, which he was quick to remedy by publishing a press release in which he pointed out that his legal training, his surname, his social standing, and "the seriousness with which I attempt to imbue my acts" were incompatible with "taking part in conspiracies resembling one-act farces."[35]

The second arrest, much more onerous for him, was connected to General Sanjurjo's attempted coup—the Sanjurjada—on 10 August 1932. At the time, Sanjurjo was director general of the police at the head of the Carabineers Guard, after he had been dismissed as general director of the Civil Guard for criticizing the government after the "events of Castilblanco" in Badajoz. There, a confrontation between peasants and the Civil Guard had ended up killing four Civil Guard officers. Sanjurjo's coup was only successful in Seville, and there were ten deaths. During the following repression, hundreds of people were imprisoned, and Sanjurjo himself was condemned to death after attempting to flee to Portugal. José Antonio and his brother Miguel were arrested in the Basque Country (where they were on the summer holiday, like most members of the aristocracy and well-to-do Madrid families), taken to Madrid, and locked up in La Modelo prison. Alongside such leading Alfonsists as Maeztu, Ponte, Juan Ignacio Luca de Tena (director of *ABC*), the Miralles brothers, and many others, they remained there for no less than two long months, even though no evidence had been found to suggest they had been involved in the attempted coup.[36]

The two events that brought José Antonio into the public eye—his participation as a candidate in the parliamentary election in 1931 and his acting as defense attorney in two political trials of former members of the dictatorship's military governments in 1932—were milestones in his political career. He was also marked by the two arrests and a period of imprisonment ordered by a Republican regime against which he had taken a stand shortly after it had been instated. In the following year, 1933, he satisfied his desire to enter politics with his own political movement and won a seat in the parliament, after which he would gain increasing prominence in public life. In fact, one of the political projects in which he was involved at this time would have a lasting influence and definitively raise his public profile: the foundation of the Falange. The party was Fascist, and its adversaries gave it a violent welcome. They were well

aware of what Fascism had meant for Italy, even before it gained power, and Germany, where it had just taken over the reins of government: violence was the preferred way of doing politics, before and after "conquering the state." The violent anti-Falange reaction took a rather naive José Antonio by surprise, since he was more concerned at the time with drafting and disseminating his political message through his writing and interventions in the parliament. But he was not slow to react. The Falange first responded to the negative reaction and then attacked, and they made a considerable contribution to the debasement of politics in a period in which both the right and left wings practiced violence. In José Antonio's case, violence shifted from being an individual tool for personal use to becoming a widespread strategy accepted by the party as a whole.

Becoming a Fascist: Fascism as a Platform

In 1933, it became clear that José Antonio's alleged lack of vocation for politics was precisely that: alleged. His political involvement during the first two years of the Republic (his electoral candidacy and his intervention in the trials for political responsibility) and the less significant public interventions in 1929 and 1930 culminated in a total dedication to politics that was only brought to an end by the firing squad in Alicante. This decision to enter politics raised some doubts about whether he was suited to the role of Fascist leader, but he soon resolved them. Even so, he was overcome by fresh doubts on several occasions during the following years. His desire to emulate and surpass his father was stronger than his interest in a legal career, and he was convinced he had hit on the right theoretical-political formula to solve the country's problems and prevent a left-wing revolution. Whether he initiated this political phase as an authentic Fascist also needs to be cleared up (the fact that he did not refer to himself as such is of no relevance now). At this stage, he was by no stretch of the imagination a fully-fledged Fascist, so it is more accurate to say he was still ideologically "becoming a Fascist" even while playing the role of one. Several factors were fundamental in this gradual process of development: the foundation of two organizations of the same sort, the study of Fascist doctrine, and the Falange's day-to-day political practice. He also had to make the effort to accept physical violence (not just verbal or written

violence) as a political tactic and learn how to not only deal with confrontations within the two organizations but also exercise what was, at that time, collegial power. In this period, he finally cleared the way toward achieving his life's ambition: to be the one and only leader of a Fascist party as a stepping-stone to becoming head of state. He would not get beyond the first part of this ambition.

Whether José Antonio had convinced himself he had a role to play in Spain's future because of his ambition to emulate his father and the solidity of his theoretical arguments, or because of the incipient devotion to his person that was emerging from within the second of the parties he had created, the Falange, is not clear. Neither is it clear whether, consciously or unconsciously, it was all a masquerade. Any doubts in this respect were revived by the proposal he made three years later, in early August 1936, to end the Civil War, the outbreak of which had signified the failure of his (Fascist) reunification strategy of Spain. His proposal obliged him to renounce his party's militias and his own leadership in the new scenario created by the victory of the Frente Popular (Popular Front) in the February 1936 elections. That is, it not only shows us he was prepared to sacrifice his policy but also another side to José Antonio: a tendency to reach compromises and agreements, which apparently was also a part of how he was and thought, even though it was often concealed beneath the self-imposed dominant role of Fascist leader and his quest to set up a Fascist dictatorship.

But let's start at the beginning. Why did José Antonio decide to enter the political arena in 1933? And why did he seriously set about launching a Fascist party in Spain early that year? Much of the answer to the latter is the impact that Hitler's rise to power in January 1933 had on supporters of Fascism in Europe and Spain because now two countries—Italy and Germany, with the second-largest population in Europe behind Russia—had Fascist governments. This showed that Fascism was not merely an Italian phenomenon.[37] Hitler's becoming the chancellor of Germany encouraged the emergence of new Fascist movements in Europe and/or gave fresh hope to existing ones. A wave of right-wing authoritarian regimes were set up all over the continent, and five years later, in 1938, they were in a majority, although only the Italian and German regimes could be described as truly Fascist.

This is why José Antonio Primo de Rivera decided to enter the political arena at this point: the time was right. Nevertheless, other factors influenced his decision: his frustration at not being elected to the parliament in 1931, his arrest and imprisonment twice in two years, his conviction that he had developed his own doctrine, and the fact that he could use Fascism to crystallize the ideological and political standpoint that would enable him to "save" and solve what he believed was the country's existential crisis. For him, everything boiled down to the survival of the Spanish nation, to saving a country that ever since the instauration of the Republic had been threatened with Marxist revolution and internal dismemberment (the Statute of Autonomy of Catalonia had been passed in the summer of 1932). He was convinced he could solve these internal problems and guide the nation along the historical path of its true "destiny" from which it had been diverted by Liberalism, democracy, left-wing ideas, and Conservative selfishness, all of which diluted the true Spanish national essence.[38]

Such was his determination that he launched a newspaper with a title that could hardly be misinterpreted, *El Fascio,* as the first step in the process of founding a powerful Fascist party that could reasonably aspire to government on a much larger scale than the party already in existence, the insignificant Councils of the National Syndicalist Offensive (JONS) led by Ramiro Ledesma Ramos and Onésimo Redondo Ortega. The widely accepted version of the founding of this new paper has Manuel Delgado Barreto, director of *La Nación,* as the person responsible for getting it up and running. Delgado had been a tireless supporter of the dictatorship, and as an employee of Editorial Católica, which published *El Debate* (Popular Action's official mouthpiece), he also directed the anti-Republican satirical magazine *Gracia y Justicia,* and *Bromas y Veras* when the government suspended the former after the Sanjurjada).[39] The latter magazine had published two editorials calling for the Republic to be substituted by a totalitarian state that received a great deal of support and inspired the idea of *El Fascio*.[40] However, if we are to trust the information Italian diplomatic sources sent from Madrid to Rome, not Delgado but José Antonio himself had the idea of setting up *El Fascio* and then founding a Fascist party. According to these sources' report sent on 30 March 1933:

> José Antonio Primo de Rivera, the eldest son of the deceased General, is a serious and courageous criminal lawyer who has earned the respect and the sympathy even of his adversaries, who recognize that he is more educated than his father, that he has a strength of

> will that is quite unusual in one so young, and that he has a good dose of ambition. At his initiative, a weekly publication is being prepared under the name of *El Fascio,* which will serve as the starting point for the creation of a new party of the same name.

It is difficult not to agree that José Antonio had great strength of will and was more educated than his father. Delgado was mentioned as "the close collaborator of the *founder,*"[41] and, according to the report, part of José Antonio's plan was "to give a series of public lectures on Fascism in which he will explain its origins and development, as well as its true essence. These lectures are the result of an in-depth study into the bibliography on Fascism that refutes the distortions that have so tendentiously been spread throughout Spain for ulterior motives." The aim, it insisted, was to found a party "the likes of which has never before been seen in Spain." One of José Antonio's contemporaries and a participant in the *El Fascio* project, Ledesma, had no doubts and two years later wrote, "José Antonio Primo de Rivera was clearly behind Barreto."[42] Another of the participants, Juan Aparicio, also a JONS member and a link between Delgado and Primo, describes José Antonio's interviews with Ledesma, Ernesto Giménez Caballero, and Rafael Sánchez Mazas. These four, together with Delgado and Aparicio himself, were the six people involved in setting up *El Fascio*.[43]

So, José Antonio had taken note of what had happened in Germany after two years in which he had become a relatively well-known public figure and suffered the consequences of being his father's son. Moreover, everything seemed to suggest another election was going to be held in 1933, which once again meant he could make his wish to be a member of the parliament, frustrated in 1931, come true. If he succeeded, he would enjoy parliamentary immunity and no longer have to put up with irritating arrests and imprisonments, which would predictably be rather frequent if he decided to go ahead with his plan to become the Spanish Fascist leader. Founding and having his own party would guarantee him not only independence from the other right-wing parties but also, if he were to win a seat, a voice in the parliament that, in addition to the *squadrismo* tactics that he planned to use in the streets, would raise his new party's public profile. He was, then, fully committed, putting everything he had into his project and convinced, as the savior of Spain that he was, he had a bright future. He also felt secure in the fact that he was following in the family tradition of

his great-uncle and, of course, his father, who had decided to take a risk, the consequences be damned. Now it was his turn.

El Fascio was an ambitious project and apparently involved a wider-ranging cast of characters than the group of six Aparicio mentioned. In fact, to get the project off the ground, José Antonio organized a gathering of proto-Fascists, philo-Fascists, and Fascists in Giménez Caballero's home on 23 February 1933. A writer and publisher, sometimes going under the pseudonym of Gecé, Giménez Caballero had spent a short time in a military prison after writing *Notas marruecas de un soldado,* for which a military court tried him. However, he was absolved and released as soon as the dictatorship took power, because the General had found the book much to his liking. He went on to found *La Gaceta Literaria,* which during its short lifetime (1927–1932) played a leading role in bringing the artistic and literary vanguards to Spain. In 1928, he had traveled to Rome, "discovered" Fascism, and become a devoted follower. In fact, he wrote *Genio de España* (1932), which became a point of reference for Hispanic Fascists in general and for José Antonio and the others who were about to launch *El Fascio* in particular. Nevertheless, he was paying a high price for his Fascist sympathies and had been left so isolated that he ended up writing *La Gaceta Literaria* by himself. With undoubted ingenuity, he managed to take advantage of this circumstance by referring to himself as "the literary Robinson Crusoe." Married to an Italian (Edith Sironi), he was the Fascist regime's and Il Duce's favorite Spanish writer. Gecé was a JONS member and had previously been on the organizing committee of Ledesma's first magazine, *La Conquista del Estado,* which was also the name of the political party. Apparently, he had written the two aforementioned editorials in *Bromas y Veras*.[44] He had been searching for a leader for the Spanish version of Fascism for quite some time and even contemplated such disparate figures as Azaña and, transferring the experience of former Socialist Mussolini to Spain, PSOE leaders Indalecio Prieto and Francisco Largo Caballero. He had met José Antonio in February 1933 at a banquet held in Pemán's honor[45] and Franco himself a few years later.

He was not the only JONS member at the gathering. Ledesma and Aparicio were also there. Ledesma, born in 1905 in Alfaraz (Zamora province), was a civil servant working for the post office who held a bachelor's degree in philosophy. He spoke German and had published articles in the *Revista de Occidente* (directed by Ortega y Gasset), *La*

Gaceta Literaria, and *El Sol*. After founding La Conquista del Estado in October 1931, he merged it with Redondo's slightly larger but still insignificant Valladolid-based JCAH, which had only a few dozen members and a weekly magazine entitled *Libertad*, resulting in the formation of the JONS. Redondo was also a civil servant and a lawyer, had spent the 1927–1928 academic year at the University of Manheim, and worked as the secretary and adviser of a syndicate of beet growers of Castilla la Vieja. Also attending were Italian Ambassador Raffaele Guariglia, Delgado, and Juan Pujol Martínez, director of *Informaciones* (owned by the Majorcan financier Juan March Ordinas) and *La Época* newpspaers and a correspondent for the German publication *Telegraphen-Union*. Another important figure present was Alfonso García Valdecasas—"the cherub of the parliament," as Azaña dubbed him, because of his childlike appearance and his twenty-six years of age—who was a professor of civil law at the University of Granada, a member of the parliament, a member of the committee that had drafted the Constitution, and former director general of Timbre for four months[46] with the Socialist Fernando de los Ríos as minister of justice. As a member of Ortega y Gasset's ASR until its de facto dissolution in 1932,[47] he was deeply disappointed by the Republican regime and, in March 1932, had been a founder of the Frente Español (Spanish Front). This group had first attempted to become the ASR's youth section but had ended up becoming an organization in its own right. It remained faithful to Ortega y Gasset's concepts but soon became more radical and drew closer to Fascism.

According to scholars, this group had evolved from adopting critical attitudes in the Ortega y Gasset tradition to embracing the Liberal-Democratic idea and, finally, to rejecting democracy—from conceiving the state as a national community to formulating a totalitarian model. In a clear display of philo-Fascism, it rejected capitalist and Marxist materialism, although this and the inability to attract members in its first year of existence led to its demise.[48] The group consisted of young intellectuals and lecturers such as García Valdecasas, Juan Antonio Maravall, Antonio Garrigues, Justino de Azcárate, José Ramón Santeiro, Abraham Vázquez, María Zambrano, Antonio Bouthelier, Salvador Lissarrague Novoa, Antonio Riaño Lanzarote, and Eliseo García del Moral.[49] And, perhaps most importantly, the final person to attend the gathering was the writer and José Antonio's friend and literary mentor Sánchez Mazas, married, like

Giménez Caballero, to an Italian (Liliana Ferlosio). As a journalist, and *ABC*'s correspondent in Rome in the 1920s (he arrived there in 1922, the year of the March on Rome), he was largely responsible for conveying the experience of the first years of Italian Fascism to Spanish society. A great admirer of the regime, he had become friends with some of the leaders, particularly Luigi Federzoni, former leader of the Associazione Nazionalista Italiana (Italian Nationalist Association), part of the PNF, and representative of its most Conservative wing.[50] Thanks to José Antonio, Sánchez Mazas, who in the first years of the Falange entered into a rivalry with Gecé, became "the Falange's first intellectual." In fact, the party's foundational document described him as the *delegado de studio*. José Antonio held him in high literary and personal regard so put a lot of trust in him. And as one of the several men of letters who gathered around José Antonio, Sánchez Mazas admired him and believed he would soon be the future (Fascist) Caesar of Spain.

The first and only issue of *El Fascio*—of which "about 100,000 copies" had been reserved, according to Aparicio[51]—came out on 16 March 1933, significantly the third anniversary of General Miguel Primo de Rivera's death. He justified the title of the publication, taken from the Italian, but immediately announced it would be changed to *Haz*:

> *Haz,* a historical, popular, country word meaning a "bundle of things" that can be used to refer to a sheaf of wheat . . . and even the symbolic "set" of "arrows" with which our Catholic kings united Spain in the Renaissance. When our readers have become familiar with the content of *El Fascio,* they should have no objection if we nationalize the word and use the Spanish word *haz. Haz* does not only mean the grouping of genuine Spaniards into committees to attack the enemies of Spain and defend us from them. It also means the imperative that Spaniards are in most need of: the imperative of the verb *hacer*. *Haz*! [Do!]

This text was probably the work of Giménez Caballero.[52] The next sixteen pages contained articles on the rise to power of Hitler and Mussolini, on Italy and Germany, attacks on Liberalism and democracy, explanations about the origins of Fascism in Spain (including Ledesma interviewing himself), and other similar topics. José Antonio contributed two articles signed with the initial "E" of his noble title of Estella, perhaps to avoid publication problems with the authorities (to no avail, as we shall see). The first was entitled "Orientaciones hacia un Nuevo Estado" in which he reiterated his rejection of Liberalism, the foundations of democracy as a

system and the functioning of the Liberal state, and his (alleged) strategy of encouraging divisions and strategies among the population. He expressed his thesis once again:

> I would like to make two points in this respect: first, for the Liberal, the law is justified not by its aims but by its "source." Other schools of thought that seek the common good consider laws good if they can be used to this end, and bad if they do not, regardless of whom they have been promulgated by. The Democratic school of thought—democracy being the system that best expresses Liberal thinking—regards a law as good and legitimate if a majority of voters have approved it, whether or not it is utterly monstrous. Second, Liberals consider what is right not a category of reason but a product of will. Nothing is right in itself. They never refer to a scale of values by which they can judge the rightness of the laws that are passed. It is enough if a sufficient number of voters have endorsed it.

In contrast to all this, José Antonio offered his own conception of the new state—a Fascist one, although he did not refer to it as such—based on the concept of unity:

> The Fatherland is a historic whole, which binds us all together, over and above any one of our individual groups. All classes and individuals must respect this unity. And the purpose of the state is to be a tool to serve that unity, in which it must believe. Any belief that goes against this precious and transcendental unity cannot be regarded as good, whether it is held by many or few . . . The state can only be established on the base of national solidarity, of vigorous and brotherly cooperation.

For José Antonio, "the class struggle and the festering conflict of party politics are not compatible with this notion of the state," so he was going to create "a new sort of politics that will bring these two principles together—that is the task that history has given our generation at this point in time." The Spanish people were to be reunited "in a great, totalitarian venture, for the benefit of the Fatherland" and in tribute to which "all classes and individuals must defer." It was time, then, for a "new politics"—time to construct a state at the service of unity and national solidarity and to stamp out class and party struggle.[53]

In his second, less theoretical article, "Distingos necesarios," he made his proposal clear: the state he was struggling for was a Fascist one and not "another trial run" as his father's dictatorship had been. He started out by saying that Mussolini's regime was not merely a personal project but something more "implacable": "Those who . . . believe Fascism is inextricably linked to the life of Mussolini do not know what Fascism is and

have not bothered to find out what corporate organization involves. The Fascist state, which owes so much to Il Duce's determination, will outlive him because it is an implacable and robust organization." On the other hand, the dictatorship "constantly put limits on its life and always gave the impression, of its own accord, that it was a temporary measure." And now José Antonio was trying to do something else—conquer the state:

> You should . . . not think, you should not even entertain the notion, that we are seeking to set up another trial dictatorship, despite the excellence of what we have already experienced. What we are seeking is the full and definitive conquest of the state, not for a few years but forever. The only remaining supporters of democracy, which has failed and is undergoing a crisis, are obviously and maliciously attempting to protect the last crumbling bastions by bringing confusion to people's thinking. We are here to prevent them from deceiving all those who do not want to be deceived. We are not proposing a dictatorship that will caulk the sinking ship, that will remedy the damage done in a single season, and that will provide a solution for the systems and practices of ruinous Liberalism. On the contrary, we are seeking a permanent national organization: a strong state, Spanish through and through, with an executive that governs and a corporate chamber that enshrines the true national realities. We are advocating not a transitory dictatorship but a well-entrenched, permanent system. The distinction is very important and should not be forgotten.[54]

In José Antonio's opinion, Spain needed to break away from the Liberal-Democratic state and set up an authoritarian and corporate dictatorship. He drafted an anti-Liberal, authoritarian, and corporate program that could have been attractive to the Alfonsist monarchists and even large sectors of Popular Action and the CEDA. Over the following two years, he gradually added the doctrinal aspects more specific to Fascism: anti-Conservatism and the "nationalization" of left-wing sectors. In this way, he attempted to lead the Left away from internationalism and their own revolutionary alternatives by appealing to their disappointed grassroots groups and bringing them into the Fascist, national, and Syndicalist fold.

El Fascio had an extremely short life: it was born and died almost on the same day it went on sale at newsstands. Most copies of its first and only issue were immediately confiscated by the police on the orders of Minister of the Interior Santiago Casares Quiroga, under pressure from the PSOE, the UGT, and the Juventudes Socialistas de España (Socialist Youth of Spain—JSE), who had declared war on the newspaper and the emergence of a Fascist movement in Spain. The person behind the project and José Antonio's involvement had led them to the correct conclusion that *El Fascio*—unlike the groups that had sprung up before—might just work and

significantly increase the far right-wing sectors opposed to the Republic. The explicit Fascism upheld by the newspaper reminded the Socialists and the Spanish Left as a whole what they already knew about how the Italian Fascists had treated the left-wing sectors in their country and how the Nazis had been dealing with them for the previous two months in Germany.

Despite the newspaper's confiscation, José Antonio managed to get himself featured in a leading national daily. He was the only one behind *El Fascio* to have the spotlight turned on him, because he cleverly worked things to his advantage. On the day after the confiscation, 17 March 1933, the Alfonsist monarchist newspaper *ABC* happened to have published a note issued by *El Fascio* that recounted what had happened, and went on to publish several articles on Fascism and an editorial entitled "Atmosphere of Violence," the author of which was *ABC* director Luca de Tena, who had been in La Modelo with José Antonio just a few months before. He criticized the attitude of the Socialists—"to prevent the Fascists from barbarizing the country, they started doing it themselves"—and the Fascists by invoking the law:

> We Spaniards are not frightened by suggestions of fashion and imitation; here the Fascist model will never take root or find itself at home. An organization has been set up within the legal framework and therefore has the right to the respect and tolerance of the authorities and the public. At present, it lacks volume and importance, but should its novelty give it wings, it will start to flounder as soon as it comes up against the country's deep legal sentiment. It is this sentiment that is rapidly dashing the hopes of the prevailing anti-Liberal politics, a crude form of coarse Fascism with no underlying ideology, and it is the same sentiment that prompted another well-intentioned and well-directed dictatorship to give up without a fight in the face of the passive repulsion of Spain's legal opinion.[55]

José Antonio replied in a letter to the director. He took up the legal argument that Luca de Tena had used, which he felt quite comfortable with. In this way, he managed to enter into a short but highly productive controversy that was published in a newspaper with a circulation of two hundred thousand. He used the scarcely credible argument of his intellectual interests ("my vocation as a student is completely unsuited to the role of leader") to deny that his ambition was to "gain a position among the leaders of the impending *fascio*." And taking advantage of the fact that he was on the biggest stage by far of any that he had occupied up to that point, he repeated his criticisms of Liberalism and sang the praises of Fascism: "Fascism has been born to kindle not a faith that belongs to the

right wing (which in its heart of hearts aspires to conserve everything, even that which is unjust) or the left wing (which in its heart of hearts aspires to destroy everything, even that which is good), but a faith that is collective, comprehensive, and national." He criticized the fact that Fascism was presented

> to the workers as if it were a movement of wealthy young men, but there is nothing quite so different from the members of a Fascist state, whose rights are recognized in terms of the service they render from their position in society, than those wealthy young men of leisure who have no function whatsoever. If anything deserves to be called a "workers' state," then it is the Fascist state. And in the Fascist state—and the workers will get to know this soon, despite all efforts—the workers syndicates are raised to the immediate dignity of organs of the state.

He finished by appealing to Luca de Tena, whose "spirit" he described as "receptive to noble passion" and opposed to "the cold, bland climate of Liberalism that believes in nothing" to adopt the new creed.

In his response, published in the same issue, Luca de Tena reminded José Antonio he had defended *El Fascio* against "the outrageous way it was being treated by the government and the organizations of socialism," and he denounced the dictatorial nature and abuses of the existing socialist regimes and the violent tactics the Fascists were using to take power. Nevertheless, he also defended the Liberal state by saying it had renounced neither its legitimate authority nor its duties—here he was paraphrasing José Antonio—and he could not preach "immorality, antipatriotism, or rebellion" (which was a criticism of the Republic). He reiterated his criticism of the Fascist concept of the workers' state, which he believed could be qualified as Socialist or Marxist. And he finished with a reprimand: "No importance should be attached to what comes from the heart. And I suspect that your Fascism has sprung from your great heart and not from your brilliant intelligence."[56] This comment was a direct reference to the leitmotif that was spurring him on: the consequences of what had happened to his father.

Once again, José Antonio decided to take advantage of the opportunity to reply, this time in *La Nación*. He decided to change newspapers because using the *ABC* again would have been "an abuse of hospitality."[57] However, *ABC* reproduced his article the next day along with Luca de Tena's latest response. Primo said he felt "discouraged" because he had not been able to convince Luca de Tena. He pointed out that, by condemning all forms of violence, he was moving along "instrumental channels, not at a deeper

level." He also said he was angered not by the prohibition on disseminating Fascist ideas in itself but because this prohibition had been imposed by the principles of a class or group (Socialist). And he reiterated his opposition to the "pure Liberal, the Liberal who 'does not choose,' who does not believe there is one 'good' historical destiny and another 'bad' one. The Liberal who is resistant to all sorts of violence," which was little more than a caricature. He insisted: "One only attains human dignity when one serves. One is only great when one plays a role in a great undertaking." He concluded: "Being oppressed by the victors of a civil war is humiliating; but not being allowed to freely express my admiration for a national, totalitarian, and integrating principle fills me with pride."

In his final reply, the *ABC* director repeated his arguments and defended the newspaper for criticizing the government's prohibition of *El Fascio* and for reasserting its opposition to Fascism and any other ideology that went against freedom and individual rights. He also expressed his opposition to the Republican government, which by imprisoning him and Primo had denied them these very rights. Nevertheless, after saying, "*ABC* rejects all policies, all organizations, and all regimes that go against human dignity and deny, as Fascism does in all its manifestations and forms, individual rights, which are imprescriptible, and take precedence over all legislation," he did his best not to burn bridges with José Antonio by pointing out that throughout the controversy he had not wanted "to give too much importance to discrepancy that stemmed more from a question of tactics than anything else" (i.e., violence). He congratulated himself for sharing with him "so many principles" just when "it is more necessary than ever to join forces against the common enemies of society, order, and our dearest ideas."[58] That is, he did his best to stress what was common to all the opponents of the Republic, its Constitution, its reforming and anticlerical laws, its Republican-Socialist government, and the revolutionary left wing and not the things that divided them. And he did this even though the defense he had made of Liberalism and freedom was no longer relevant to the Alfonists' monarchic authoritarianism, which at the time was not Liberal at all. As was only to be expected, and as we shall see, José Antonio eventually split from this sector over the issue of not violence but Conservatism.

El Fascio's short-lived existence did not prove to be an obstacle to José Antonio's plan to create a Fascist party. He met Julio Ruiz de Alda, a

former military pilot who had become immensely popular in 1926 after crossing the Atlantic in the *Plus Ultra* hydroplane—accompanied by Juan Manuel Durán, Pablo Rada, and Ramón Franco, younger brother of the future Caudillo—and signed him up for the cause. And with García Valdecasas, they founded the Fascist Movimiento Español Sindicalista (Spanish Syndicalist Movement—MES), whose propaganda leaflets bore the subtitle Fascimo Español (Spanish Fascism—FE).[59] The three of them acted as joint leaders of the party. In this way, in the early summer of 1933, Primo took his first steps toward fulfilling his political ambition. García Valdecasas's participation in the MES-FE and in the ensuing Falange did not last long, but while he was involved, he tried to attract other members of the Spanish Front, although, with the exceptions of Bouthelier and García del Moral, he had little success.[60] The new organization was not even allowed to use the name Front,[61] which was the founders' original idea. The three men behind the MES also unsuccessfully attempted to use Sánchez Mazas's influence to attract the writer José Bergamín.[62]

The MES-FE was funded by the anti-Republican, Alfonsist right wing, which was prepared to go to any lengths to destabilize the regime (even to finance tin-pot Fascist agitators). From the very beginning, the party claimed to be the Spanish version of Fascism and had hegemonic ambitions. Its first manifesto (most of which has been lost) announced it was "a national force, duplicated by an overwhelming universal force" with a long journey ahead ("Spanish Fascism seeks the force, unity, popularity, and authority of Spain to fulfill our destiny as a great nation in the world"); justified the use of violence ("we come with just the right amount of necessary, humanitarian, crude, and chivalrous violence that all surgical violence requires"); and unequivocally proclaimed its Fascism: "Our party is the authentically Spanish form of what in the great countries is the recognized crusade for rescuing Europe, the nations of Europe, from the spiritual degradation and material ruin into which they have been sunk by the poisonous and anti-national left, and the pusillanimous, obtuse, and selfish right." José Antonio summed up his ideology: "Unity and power of the Fatherland; a people's syndicate; hierarchy; class harmony; discipline; anti-Liberalism; anti-Marxism; local people; militia; culture; national statism; justice that gives everybody what is theirs and so allows the workers no anarchic excesses and much less the employers any chance to exploit their prey."[63]

The triumvirate immediately approached the JONS. They wanted to extend their membership and, given the Fascist nature of the JONS, it would have been difficult for them to start out on their political venture immersed in competition with another group of a similar ideology. Moreover, the two groups, both being funded by the Alfonsists, were interested in a merger that would give them a greater profit from their investment in terms of public awareness and political instability. The JONS was getting its money from a group of Alfonsist bankers from Bilbao through two members of the city's elite who were of a traditional literary bent and rather taken with Fascist ideas: José Félix de Lequerica,[64] a former Maurista and Primorriverista who at the time was a Spanish Renewal member, and José María de Areilza, who was also a member of Spanish Renewal and of the JONS.

However, the proposal to merge the MES-FE with the JONS was thwarted by Ledesma's refusal to entertain the idea. Ledesma and José Antonio set up a meeting to discuss the matter over lunch in San Sebastián, but they did not reach an agreement. Neither were they the best of friends by the end of it. The struggle for future leadership was on, although when Ledesma recalled the meeting in 1935, he referred only to the ambiguity and vagueness of the MES's program, which he qualified as far right wing and not Fascist. He described the José Antonio he met in 1933 as a young, Andalusian millionaire, a grandee of Spain, excessively dependent on the monarchic far right wing and excessively fond of Italian Fascism.[65] In contrast, he argued in favor of the (alleged) independence of the JONS, which was a sham given that it depended on external funding and he had his own preferences for Nazism.

The MES-FE's funding had been settled in August 1933 when José Antonio signed an agreement in El Escorial with the leader of Spanish Renewal, Antonio Goicoechea. The new party was given funds in exchange for not attacking the monarchy in their propaganda. Spanish Renewal was a small party but had members in the parliament and plenty of money. It was interested in helping Fascist groups because of their potential for stirring up unrest and destabilizing the Republican regime. And if they were capable of attracting the masses and taking votes off Popular Action, then all the better, because the key to the hegemony within the right wing lay not in finding a more accommodating solution but in destroying the Republic. Spanish Renewal was more concerned with ending the Democratic and

reforming regime than with potentially giving a boost to the Fascists, whose ideology to some extent contradicted the very nature of authoritarian Alfonsism: anti-Conservatism. At this point, however, neither José Antonio nor the MES, nor very shortly the Falange, had fully developed this component of their ideology, even though they were constantly repeating that they represented neither the Left nor the Right.

A good example of the extent of José Antonio's doctrinal elaboration in this initial phase—as well as of his desire to give continuity to, and distance himself from, his father's regime—is the text he had published in *La Nación* on 13 September 1933, the tenth anniversary of his father's coup:

> Although he expressed himself imperfectly, General Primo de Rivera "was right." Of course, the way in which he presented his doctrine was rather naive and incongruous . . . But there are those whose obligation it is to clarify and understand, but they did neither . . . General Primo de Rivera was not so lucky. The intellectuals turned against him, and he attempted to combine his duties as a governor with those of a speaker. He produced an enormous number of unofficial notes, he wrote articles, he published leaflets . . . on top of all his state duties. So, he had very little time to rest. He was like a fruit that is squeezed until it has given up the last drop of its juice. It was almost as if his love for the Fatherland sustained him just as a drug artificially prolongs life. Hardly had he ceased in his endeavors when he drew his last breath. And in a hotel in Paris, he silently gave up his spirit to God.

However, a new age had arrived: "Our generation clearly sees the way ahead now. Europe is being reconstructed in integral states, with no parties, no hesitations. Once again, there is widespread belief that the state must have an authoritarian faith and be supported by cheerful civil militias. Once again, there is a desire for the organized producers to be the state itself."[66]

In October 1933, José Antonio decided to take another step toward fulfilling his ambition to become the leading figure of Spanish Fascism: with Sánchez Mazas, he went to Rome to visit Mussolini. Ambassador Guariglia's recommendation was fundamental to setting up the visit. The declared aim of their meeting was to ask Il Duce and the PNF for advice and assistance in launching a similar party in Spain. Before he saw Mussolini, Primo phoned an Italian friend: "I am like a student who goes to see his teacher. He could do me, my movement, and my country a power of good if he were to be so inclined. And I am sure he will. He was a friend of my father's. I am sure he will help."[67] He went all the way to Italy not only to introduce himself to Mussolini as the future leader of Fascism in Spain but also to gain a deeper understanding of the Italian party and regime. In

fact, when he applied to the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs for an audience, he expressed his "desire to make contact with the leaders of the National Fascist Party to get information about Italian Fascism and the regime's achievements, as well as to receive advice on how to organize a similar movement in Spain."[68] Indeed, he visited the institutions belonging to the party and the regime, and he met Malpicati, the vice secretary of the PNF.[69]

José Antonio's interview with Il Duce took place in private on the afternoon of 19 October[70] in the Palazzo Venezia and, at the time, was enveloped in great secrecy. José Antonio had a meeting with the person who had met his father in 1923 on his visit to Rome with Alfonso XIII, an event that Mussolini would recall throughout the visit.[71] A few months later, José Antonio wrote his impressions of the day in the prologue to the 1934 Spanish edition of Mussolini's *The Doctrine of Fascism,* first published in Italy in 1932. This was one more step in his attempt to make Spanish Fascism his own personal crusade, although Ruiz de Alda, the author of the epilogue, in this instance also played a part.[72] José Antonio wrote:

> I saw Mussolini in person, one October afternoon in 1933, at the Palazzo Venezia in Rome. The meeting did more to make me understand Italian Fascism than a great many books would have done . . . We talked for about half an hour . . . When we reached the door, he said to me with paternal calm and without the slightest emphasis: "I wish you the very best, for yourself and for Spain." Then he slowly went back to his desk, back to his silent work. It was seven o'clock in the evening. At the end of the workday, the streets of Rome were teeming with people in the warm evening air . . . Il Duce seemed to be the only person still at work by the light of his lamp, in a corner of a huge empty room, protecting his people, protecting Italy, whose breathing he listened to as if it were his youngest daughter.[73]

Nevertheless, in mid-October 1933, the task of launching the MES involved publishing a second manifesto and a weekly publication entitled *FE*—funded by the Alfonsists and José Antonio—and two of its members (José Antonio and García Valdecasas) presenting themselves as candidates to the parliamentary elections called for 19 November. The elections had been brought forward because President of the Republic Alcalá-Zamora had dissolved the parliament, bringing the government by the Republican-Socialist coalition to an end. If the MES were to win the two seats, its public profile would be raised quite considerably. But early on in the electoral campaign, it became clear that José Antonio was better positioned to reign supreme in the new party. Of course, García Valdecasas was by no

means an inconsequential opponent: he was quite capable of expressing his own ideas, he was a university lecturer and a lawyer, and, apparently, he was ambitious for power. Ruiz de Alda was different: intellectually he was no match for them—as he freely admitted—although this did not mean he renounced anything.

José Antonio first tried to join a list of candidates for Madrid, a right-wing coalition that included Popular Action and the CEDA, the Agrarians, the Alfonsists, and the Carlists. However, he soon decided against this and refused the place he was offered on the list because (according to him) he would feel freer if he could follow his ideals. This was probably just an excuse so that he could join a candidacy that would guarantee his election, and he promptly joined a right-wing coalition from Cadiz and Jerez with a strong local Primorriverista influence. For his part, García Valdecasas, who had been included in the right-wing candidacy for Granada, was eventually dropped in favor of Ramón Ruiz Alonso, "CEDA's workingman," a former JONS member, and subsequently famous for the part he played in the Francoist repression in Granada and the murder of Federico García Lorca, who had dedicated a poem in his *Romancero Gitano* to García Valdecasas, a personal friend.[74] Why was he dropped? Essentially because he had taken part in an event held at the Teatro de la Comedia in which he had stated publicly he supported Fascism. So, he did not go on to become a member of the parliament, unlike José Antonio, who eventually got the votes required to win the seat, thus tipping the internal balance in his favor. (José Antonio's electoral campaign was full of incident, and left-wing rabble-rousers even fired a few shots at one of the rallies.)

Something else that happened at this time was that the name of the MES-FE was changed to Falange Española. Apparently, García del Moral suggested the name, even though *falange* had previously been used in Spanish Fascist circles (in particular, in JONS propaganda), from various options based on acronyms of "Fascismo Español." The movement's first decision under its new name was not to publish a new manifesto[75] but to hold a foundational rally, making the most of the greater tolerance with which the Republican authorities were treating the extreme right- and left-wing groups during the electoral campaign. They tried to set it up in Valladolid but could not get the necessary authorization from the province's civil governor.[76] It was eventually held on 29 October 1933 in Madrid, at the Teatro de la Comedia, owned by Tirso Escudero, a friend of José

Antonio's father. The rally was regarded as a "national affirmation" and, according to García Valdecasas,[77] was broadcast on the radio to have maximum impact on the country. The name Falange Española was not used during the proceedings because they had submitted their statutes to the Ministry of the Interior—copied from the statutes of the Spanish Front to avoid any unnecessary problems—and official approval had not yet been given. For the same reason, they made no mention of Fascism.

The foundational rally was held on a Sunday at 11 a.m. The choice of venue had also been influenced by the fact that it was the theater where Ortega y Gasset had given his famous "Vieja y nueva política," the foundational speech of the short-lived Liga de Educación Política Española (Political Education League) with which he had attempted to bring back national feeling into Spanish political life but without renouncing Liberalism (as other Falangist speakers would do that day). The event did not have the impact or the importance its organizers had hoped for (despite all the subsequent Falangist liturgical and grandiloquent literature, they did not manage to fill the theater to capacity). Some threats had been made,[78] which may have been one reason why. The government, which had given permission for the rally to be broadcast on the radio, took considerable precautions to prevent any altercations, and none took place. There was the odd incident after the ceremony had finished but not in the immediate vicinity.[79]

According to Ramiro Ledesma, José Antonio, of the three leaders who gave speeches that day, went down best: "Primo was head and shoulders above the others. He raised the tone of the proceedings, and I would even go so far as to say he saved the meeting from being a political failure." He also pointed out: "When they were on their way to the meeting, none of them would voluntarily allow either of the others to walk in front." By doing this, they aimed to show they were all competing to be leaders.[80] As far as the speeches were concerned, José Antonio spoke last, which suggests superiority. In the opinion of one audience member, Vegas Latapié, the only one of the three who was clearly not up to the occasion (because the speech was "absurd") was Ruiz de Alda, who, to make matters worse, also had problems with diction.[81]

García Valdecasas had opened proceedings:

> It has been said this is a Fascist act. I say that as long as it is Spanish through and through, you can call it what you like. In the future, we may find affinities and similarities with the foreign experience of Fascism; but . . . we Spaniards do not want to live from foreign formulas . . . we want to discover the authenticity of our being . . . Nations must save themselves by discovering their own truth . . . and greatness.

He went on to say the previous centuries had been times of withdrawal "in the face of enemy attacks" (we assume the enemies are the Liberals and foreigners) and years of "governments without faith." The Republic was full of skeptical, hateful men who spoke of freedom when he believed the only freedom possible was that of the people of a strong, free nation, which, at that time, Spain was not. Moreover, the Republicans, under the leadership of former Prime Minister Azaña, had begun to dismember "the Fatherland" by passing the Catalan statute. He was also highly critical of bourgeois capitalist selfishness, spawned from Protestantism, Spain's great enemy, and Socialism, which "had created the proletariat." However, the time had now come to react and rise up so that Spain could once again "impose its norms on the world" as it had done in the glorious past. García Valdecasas finished his speech: "If our will is firm and our thoughts passionate, then Spain will once again show the world the ways of the spirit."[82] He had used adjectives the Falange would use a great deal, like "passionate" and "firm," but in the context of a clear, political speech that was much more intelligible and less "poetic" than José Antonio's. He was therefore not lacking in ability. Whether he could compete with José Antonio, however, was quite another matter.

The next to speak was Ruiz de Alda, who started by confessing his discomfort with speaking in public and that this was his first participation in a political meeting. He justified his presence by saying he was there to talk about something he "felt very deeply . . . and that I believe can also be useful for striking off in a new direction on a constructive and optimistic undertaking." He explained, rather clumsily, this undertaking was "the superior ideal that joined the peoples of Spain, which we must create, which we must have, or which we must invent, because there is one thing that we Spaniards can be sure of. If we carry on as we have been doing, Spain will break apart. We have been living on what our parents created four centuries ago. And now that this capital has been exhausted, we must work and struggle to recoup it." This may have meant he was particularly concerned about the Catalan question and, in general, about the divisions between

Spaniards. He went on to say the monarchy was the symbol of all that was past, that it had fallen, and that the Republic, which had presented itself as the revolutionary alternative, had failed “because of nepotism and the excessive use of official cars.” The nation was being “held at gunpoint” by two “anti-national” parties: the Socialists and the Esquerra Republicana de Catalunya (Republican Left of Catalonia—ERC). This whole situation required a revolution—not the left-wing one everybody was expecting, which would force a “reaction,” but the one he and all the other speakers were advocating, the one that would construct a “state of solidarity, of brotherhood, in which internal struggle would not be tolerated” and the youth would reconquer Spain. His speech-cum-harangue appealed to patriotism and the unity of Spaniards to reconstruct “the Fatherland” and save it from the left-wing revolution by means of their own revolution, of which, however, he gave no details.[83]

Finally, it was José Antonio’s turn to bring the rally to a close, and he chose to do so by giving a legal-political speech that would have been barely understandable to nonexperts and hardly suitable to what was supposed to be the presentation of a new party in the electoral campaign. He started by responding to the audience’s applause and setting the military tone he wanted the rally and the party as a whole to have: “I do not intend to give a whole paragraph of thanks. Briefly, as becomes the military conciseness of our style, I merely say thank you.” Immediately, he repeated his criticism of the “pernicious” Rousseau, who had said justice and truth were not permanent categories of judgment but rather time-conditioned decisions of the will. He also repeated that this doctrine had meant the Liberal state was no longer “the staunch executor of the country’s destiny” and had become the “spectator of the electoral battle.” This same Liberalism, applied to the economy, had brought “slavery” upon the workers, which in turn and as a reaction, had led to the emergence of Socialism—“and rightly so”—and ended up by going astray by “opting first for a materialistic interpretation of life and of history, second for a spirit of reprisal, and third for the promulgation of the dogma of the class struggle.” The result was “a world split asunder by all sorts of differences” within which Spain was also “morally bankrupt, assailed by all sorts of hatred and conflict,” which he exemplified by saying: “Hence, we have had to sob to the very bottom of our souls as we travel around the villages of our splendid country, where under the most humble of cloaks people can still be found

with a rural elegance that is not prone to extravagant gestures or redundant words, . . . plagued by the local nobility, forgotten by all the factions, divided and poisoned by tortuous doctrines." This whole situation had prompted him to create a movement that would be not really a "party" but rather an "anti-party," which fell in neither the right nor the left wing because "the Right essentially believes in maintaining an economic structure, however unjust it may be, while the Left believes in subverting that economic structure, even though in so doing they may destroy much that is worthwhile." The new movement, on the other hand, "will under no circumstances tie itself to the vested interests of the groups or classes that underlie the superficial division into Right and Left."

These divisions meant "the Fatherland is no less than a transcendental synthesis, an indivisible synthesis with purposes all its own; and . . . what we want is for the movement and the state it will set up to be the effective, authoritarian tool at the service of an indisputable whole, a permanent, irrevocable unit." All the peoples of Spain, "whatever their differences," should be "joined in an irrevocably common destiny." Achieving all this would involve violence, which the new movement would not shy away from. At this point in his speech, he uttered a sentence that would indeed go down in history, although for reasons he could not possibly have imagined on that day: "I understand that dialectics should be the initial instrument of communication, but when justice or the Fatherland is profaned, the only acceptable dialectics are the dialectics of fists and pistols." He then explained the movement was also "a way of being": "We should not only strive for the construction, the political architecture, but at all times and in all our actions, we must adopt an attitude to life that is deeply and completely human. This attitude is the spirit of service and sacrifice, the ascetic and military understanding of life. So, nobody should think all those we recruit here will be given sinecures; nobody should think we are gathered here to defend privileges." He ended his speech by directly referencing another of his favorite topics: the concept of nobility, of *señorío*, of señores. He attempted to respond to the recurring accusation of *señoritismo* and explain his own status as a grandee of Spain. From the very depths of his elitism, which he alleged was at the service of the Fatherland, he said:

> We bring our fighting spirit to bear precisely on what interests us as *señoritos*; we are ready to fight for harsh and fair sacrifices to be imposed on many of our own class; and we are prepared to fight so that a totalitarian state can be used to the benefit of the powerful and the humble. This is what we are like, and it is what the *señoritos* of Spain have been like throughout history. This is how they came to be real gentlemen, because, in faraway countries and in our own, they risked life and soul and undertook the most arduous of tasks for the simple reason that, as *señoritos*, such things were of little or no consequence.

He used his last words to say the foundational assembly taking place at that very instant "had hoisted the flag." He did not actually say so, but the flag hoisted was implicitly understood as the Fascist one. And that the very real danger of left-wing revolution and the dismemberment of the country required a new mystic: "In the face of imminent revolution, some believe they can unite the people with the tamest of solutions. This is a serious error of judgment! The people have only ever been moved by poets, and woe be to those who cannot combat the poetry of destruction with the poetry of promise!" He added that his place was not in the elections, for which he had no respect, but "out in the open, under the clear night sky, gun at the ready, and the stars above. Celebrations are not for us! Outside, tense, enthusiastic, confident, and on guard, we already feel the dawn breaking in our hearts."

He had opted to use poetic and literary language in an attempt to transmit suggestive images, but it was so convoluted that it was barely comprehensible. The deliberately "elevated" political "style" was only decipherable to those initiated in the new faith. He had assigned himself and his literary collaborators—like Sánchez Mazas—the role of high priests. This soon led to criticism from within the organization and, in the final analysis, would lead to irreconcilable differences. It was certainly true that "the flag had been hoisted," but the meeting had been given very little coverage, at least in the press; the impact of the radio broadcast is unknown. Even so, José Antonio benefited from some of the subsequent attempts to make up for the shortcomings of the day. In particular, Vegas Latapié wanted to publish two of the three speeches in *Acción Española*, but, so as not to offend Ruiz de Alda (because his speech was too "lame"), he finally decided to publish only José Antonio's. García Valdecasas had to accept that his speech did not appear. José Antonio's did, under Vegas Latapié's headline of "The Flag Is Hoisted," which prompted a response by the Carlist Víctor Pradera under the same headline but with a final question mark in which he wrote that the speech had been little more than pure, traditional Carlist doctrine.[84] This was an exaggeration, but there was some

truth to it: the address had been much more anti-Liberal and ultrapatriotic than distinctly Fascist.

The Teatro de la Comedia rally culminated in a lunch for a chosen few during which some Falange membership cards (and menus) were signed,[85] but little more was immediately done for the party because José Antonio was absorbed in his election campaign in Cadiz and Jerez. This time around, he was successful and was elected as a member of the parliament. Pemán was also elected (with a few more votes than José Antonio), as was Francisco Moreno y Herrera, Marquess of Eliseda (son of the Count of the Andes, a former minister under the dictatorship), who joined the Falange. In the elections, Ramón de Carranza—a former Conservative member of the parliament during the Restoration—had resorted to his usual corrupt practices of paying Anarcho-syndicalists not to vote, regardless of whether he really needed to do so. This so delighted José Antonio that he started to write a comic novel (*The Anarcho-Carranzist*) about it.[86]

From this point on, Eliseda and José Antonio, both marquesses, were members of the parliament for the Falange. The CEDA had won the general elections, although it did not have enough seats to govern on its own, or even much influence on government, because of Alcalá-Zamora's animosity. It did, however, have a decisive influence on the policy of the Council of Ministers, which was assigned to the right-wing party that had received the second most votes, the Partido Republicano Radical (Radical Republican Party—PRR). The prime minister, then, was its leader, Lerroux, who, with the support of the CEDA, would halt or slow many of the reforms of the previous two years. The general atmosphere against reform but in favor of maintaining the Republic did nothing to encourage the development of a Fascist alternative such as the Falange.

With José Antonio's election as a member of the parliament, García Valdecasas had clearly lost out. He was the only one of the movement's leading figures who was his intellectual match. Had he been elected, with his experience, he could have played a more decisive role in the new parliament than the inexperienced José Antonio. He left the party soon after. Many years later, in 1979, in a conversation with Ian Gibson, he explained he decided to leave because he had not liked José Antonio's allusion to violence ("the dialectics of fists and guns"), which he described as "unfortunate." This comment is a little too far-fetched to be believed and seems to be more of an afterthought, expressed in the context of the

subsequent Civil War. In fact, before the elections, on 2 November 1933, just five days after the Teatro de la Comedia ceremony, he had been a signatory of the Falange Constitution,[87] alongside the other two speakers, as members of the "high command." Apparently, he married at this time and, when he came back from a long honeymoon, found that José Antonio had become the main de facto (not de jure) leader. So, he decided to leave without putting up a fight, probably because he thought there was little point in competing for the leadership or that he could not accept José Antonio's dominant position. In 1935, Ledesma wrote regretfully about García Valdecasas's decision to withdraw: "It was, of course, a setback for the Falange because Valdecasas had a clear and effective talent, something the Fascist organization did not have in abundance."[88] His departure left Ruiz de Alda—a symbol of military courage, heroism, and bravery—and José Antonio, known because he was his father's son and was attempting to become an intellectual and a Fascist political leader. There is nothing to suggest they were friends. Indeed, if we are to believe another leader of the time, Juan Antonio Ansaldo, José Antonio, "always jealous of his initiative and position," in fact "did not get on" with Ruiz de Alda.[89]

By this time, José Antonio was finding his father's legacy to be quite a burden because it clashed with his own aspirations and his desire to be the focus of attention. According to Felipe Ximénez de Sandoval—his "passionate" biographer, devoted admirer, former university classmate, and Falange member—José Antonio said to him at this time:

> If only my name were like yours or someone else's! An unknown surname in politics. I wouldn't care if it were fine sounding or vulgar as long as it were unknown. I feel sure I could get people to show it consideration and respect, attention, and admiration perhaps; hatred, for sure. For the name and me, that's all! But my name is Primo de Rivera. I am the son of the dictator. In everybody's eyes, his successor. All those who loved and loathed him see me only as his heir. They all assume that my doctrine and my thinking are my father's, and although this does not offend me as his son because I am proud to be of the same blood, it humiliates me intellectually. Do they not believe me capable of conceiving a doctrine? By following me, are they going to follow the surname and not the man who bears it?

This is where his political name—José Antonio—came from, eschewing the more familiar "José" and the surname that was used within the party and in other circumstances. Ximénez de Sandoval adds that he also told him:

> Let's assume I can somehow get around the lure of my surname and manage to get people to call me just José Antonio as they have done in several places. At university, for example. Do you remember? Don't you think this letter is right [in reference to one of the many he had been sent after his Teatro de La Comedia speech] when it says the leader of a revolution—even when it is a national revolution—must come from the people? Can I be that leader, a *señorito* by birth and habits, a gentleman, and a grandee of Spain? Could the people ever regard me as their leader?[90]

Whether this conversation can be relied on is unclear, because it seems to be unaware that informality was standard throughout the Falange and affected not only José Antonio. Whatever the case, José Antonio continued to play a central role in the organization. Despite the doubts about his suitability, he continued in his endeavor. And precisely in order to fulfill his deepest desire—to be the new Fascist leader of Spain—he made the intellectual effort to develop an argument that would reconcile his origins with his ambition. It was not going to be difficult for him to shine, because he was sharing power in the Falange with Ruiz de Alda and a seat in the parliament with Eliseda. He did not believe either of them would overshadow him.

Notes

1. Julio Gil Pecharromán, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera: Retrato de un visionario* (Madrid, 1996), 106.
2. *La Nación*, 2 July 1930.
3. *Unión Patriótica* 93, 4 August 1930, cited in Gil Pecharromán, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera*, 111.
4. José Antonio Primo de Rivera, "Los solitarios sin amor y sin humildad," *La Nación*, 29 July 1930.
5. José Antonio Primo de Rivera, "La hora de los enanos," *ABC*, 16 March 1931.
6. "Resumen del discurso pronunciado en Barcelona, en el local del cuarto distrito de la Unión Patriótica (en la Rambla de los Estudios), el 3 de agosto de 1930," *La Nación*, 4 August 1930; *Unión Monárquica* 13, 4 August 1930.
7. *La Nación*, 17 January 1931; *Unión Monárquica*, 1 March 1931.
8. Gil Pecharromán, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera*, 115–117.
9. Ibid., 122.

10. *La Nación*, 28 March 1931.
11. Gil Pecharromán, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera*, 215.
12. *La Nación*, 1 April 1931.
13. The queen had decided to leave from the Galapagar station after discounting the north Madrid station because she was afraid there might be incidents. The president of the Compañía de los Caminos de Hierro del Norte de España, José Moreno Osorio, played a decisive role in this change of plans because he had been in the station offices and saw that a crowd was beginning to gather. Moreno Osorio, Count of Fontao, was a servant of the royal household (his official title was Gentleman of the Bedchamber) and was entrusted with accompanying the king and queen on their railway journeys within the country. I am grateful to his nephew José Manuel Romero Moreno, the present Count of Fontao, for this information.
14. José María Mancisidor, *Frente a frente: José Antonio Primo de Rivera, frente al Tribunal Popular—Texto taquigráfico del Juicio Oral de Alicante, Noviembre 1936*, 56.
15. Ian Gibson, *En busca de José Antonio* (Barcelona, 1980), 43.
16. Gil Pecharromán, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera*, 29.
17. Eugenio Vegas Latapié, *Memorias políticas: El suicidio de la Monarquía y la Segunda República* (Barcelona, 1983), 130.
18. José Antonio Primo de Rivera, "Lo jurídico: El destino de la República," *La Nación*, 12 June 1931.
19. See also José Antonio Primo de Rivera, "Los intelectuales y la dictadura," prologue to *La Dictadura de Primo de Rivera juzgada en el extranjero: Opiniones de hombres de estado, diplomáticos, técnicos, periodistas, etc*. (Madrid, 1931).
20. For an analysis of the law, see Eduardo González Calleja, *En nombre de la autoridad: La defensa del orden público durante la Segunda República española (1931–1936)* (Granada, 2014), 190–199.
21. Interview with Luis Muñoz Lorente, *La Nación*, 30 September 1931.
22. *ABC* (Andalusia edition), 29 September 1931.
23. Goicoechea, who was in court for the first time with José Antonio, defended Calvo. Antonio Goicoechea, "José Antonio, abogado," in *Dolor y memoria de España en el segundo aniversario de la muerte de José Antonio* (Barcelona, 1939), 188–189.

24. José Antonio Primo de Rivera, “Segunda sesión ante el Tribunal Supremo en pleno en la demanda contra todos los ex ministros de la Dictadura: Reclamación de indemnización civil,” *La Nación*, 4 April 1932.
25. “Ante el Tribunal Supremo en Pleno: Una demanda contra todos los ministros de la Dictadura. Reclamación de indemnización civil,” *La Nación*, 2 April 1932.
26. Gil Pecharromán, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera*, 149.
27. At the time, this was the title of the official state gazette, now the *Boletín Oficial del Estado*.
28. José Antonio is citing Rudolf Stammler, *Tratado de Filosofía del Derecho* (1925; repr., Madrid, 2008), 526.
29. “Informe de José Antonio Primo de Rivera en la defensa de Don Galo Ponte, ante el Tribunal de Responsabilidades Politicas de la Dictadura,” 26 November 1932, in Obras Completas de José Antonio (OCJA), http://www.rumbos.net/ocja/jaoc0004.html.
30. Felipe Ximénez de Sandoval, *José Antonio: Biografía* (Madrid, 1949), 115.
31. “Informe de José Antonio Primo de Rivera en la defensa de Don Galo Ponte.”
32. José Antonio Primo de Rivera, “Las responsabilidades políticas,” *Ellas* 28, 4 December 1932.
33. See Eduardo Aunós, *El General Primo de Rivera: Soldado y gobernante* (Madrid, 1944); César González Ruano, *Miguel Primo de Rivera: La vida heroica y romántica de un general español* (1935; repr., Madrid, 1940).
34. Blanca Silveira-Armesto, “Qué ventajas y qué inconvenientes tiene el ser hijo de un hombre célebre? Lo que nos dice Don José Antonio Primo De Rivera,” *Crónica* 138, 3 July 1992, cited in OCJA, http://www.rumbos.net/ocja/jaoc2049.html.
35. José Antonio Primo de Rivera, “Mi primer drama policíaco,” *La Nación*, 12 November 1931, cited in Gil Pecharromán, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera*, 142.
36. During their imprisonment, José Antonio and Miguel had written a letter to the examining magistrate in charge of the investigation in which they said:

> The authors of these words had absolutely no involvement with the [Spanish Syndicalist] Movement. It is absurd to think that, if they had been involved, and considering their youth and the importance of their family name, they would have left their colleagues to face the dangers of combat while they were enjoying their summer holidays. Moreover, if some were to think this was just a precaution, then it would have been much more logical to wait over the border (one of us actually went into France the day before the coup; the other was just a few kilometers from Gibraltar) and not to allow ourselves to be captured so innocently after the coup had failed. And one of us would not have spent the night of the events in question on a train, and the other would not have frequented such popular places as the Hotel Continental in San Sebastián and Irun station (for a crowded funeral parade) the day afterward. Finally, the court will surely take the following into consideration: Fernando Primo de Rivera, an Air Force officer and brother of the signatories, was on guard duty at the Getafe aerodrome on the night of the attempted coup, and he has been publicly praised for how promptly he followed the orders he had been given. It is highly unlikely that a family, all brothers, orphaned of mother or father, sharing the same place of residence, would have divided into two camps on an issue as serious as the rebellion of the 10th. (Joaquín Arrarás, *Historia de la Segunda República Española,* vol. 1 [Madrid, 1956], 458)

37. "For the ordinary Spanish people, Fascism had to be solid and robust, smelling of the garrote and castor-oil purgative." "Fascism was a European phenomenon because it had just been established by Germany." Juan Aparicio, "Mi recuerdo de José Antonio," in *Dolor y memoria,* 255–256.
38. José Félix de Lequerica wrote expressively about this period and José Antonio's decision to enter politics:

> It must have been around the year 1933, before the Falange had been founded. José Antonio, calm and in good humor, spoke about politics throughout the meal. He believed the only thing to do in the face of the horror of the Republic was to sit around a table, eat and drink, discuss ideas, and gradually start preparing the formulas for the national opposition. But at the end of the meal, he flew into a rage, and in the terrible nasal voice that he spoke in when he was in

a foul temper, he said more or less the following: “We need to find three or four thousand young men who are prepared to die, and attack Madrid. You will come with me, and if you retreat, I shall shoot you down. We will take over the capital. There is no other way.” (José Félix de Lequerica, “Aportación decisiva del creador de la Falange,” in *Dolor y memoria*, 33)

39. Gil Pecharromán, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera*, 163–165.
40. It has been said Juan March Ordinas funded Delgado with the support of his newspaper *Informaciones*, directed by Juan Pujol Martínez. On the interest shown by *El Debate* director Ángel Herrera Oria, see ibid., 164.
41. “Delgado, a well-known polemicist, is the director of *La Nación* and the weekly *Bromas y Veras* and *Gracia y Giusticia* [*sic*].” “Avv. José Antonio Primo de Rivera: ‘El Fascio,’” Archivio Storico Diplomatico degli Affari Esteri (ASMAE), Politica, Spagna, busta 5 (emphasis added). I am grateful to Ismael Saz for providing me with a copy of the original document, of which one of the three typed pages is missing. I am also grateful for Álex Saldaña’s translation from the Italian. For more on this document, see Ismael Saz, *Mussolini contra la Segunda República: Hostilidad, conspiraciones, intervención (1931–1936)* (Valencia, 1986), 109.
42. “Don’t forget that Delgado Barreto had been connected with the General. And now, in this Fascist venture, he put himself at the service of the political objectives of his son, José Antonio, who at this time had begun to dream of a Fascist party of which he was the sole leader.” He added, somewhat mischievously: “Even so, at the time Delgado Barreto did not have absolute faith in José Antonio’s ability, and very wisely avoided staking everything he had on him.” Ramiro Ledesma Ramos, *¿Fascismo en España? Discurso a las juventudes de España*, ed. Roberto Muñoz Bolaños (1935; repr., Madrid, 2013), 223–224.
43. Aparicio, “Mi recuerdo,” 255.
44. Saz, *Mussolini contra la Segunda República*, 106.
45. Ernesto Giménez Caballero, *Memorias de un dictador* (Barcelona, 1979), 74.
46. See Leandro Álvarez Rey, *Los diputados por Andalucía de la Segunda República, 1931–1939*, vol. 2 (Seville, 2010), 169–170.

47. His parents were related to Ortega y Gasset. According to a report from May 1943 about his signing a letter written by the parliamentary lawyers asking for the monarchy's restoration in the person of Juan de Borbón y Battenberg, he came from a family of rich landowners from Montefrío (Granada province) related to the cacique Joaquín de Montes y Jovellar. A student of Fernando de los Ríos and Felipe Sánchez Román, García Valdecasas had been a boarder at the Free Educational Institution in Bologna and in Germany, after which he joined the ASR and helped found the Falange. He lost touch with the Falange after marrying the daughter of the Marquess of Cartagena and in the following years fluctuated between monarchism and Falangism. The report described him as opportunistic and "sneaky." Alfonso García Valdecasas, leg. 27557, Fundación Nacional Francisco Franco (Francisco Franco National Foundation) archive.
48. Antonio Elorza, *La razón y la sombra: Una lectura política de Ortega y Gasset* (Barcelona, 1984), 220.
49. Ibid., 216–217; Gibson, *En busca de José Antonio,* 59.
50. Mónica Carbajosa and Pablo Carbajosa, *La corte literaria de José Antonio: La primera generación cultural de la Falange* (Barcelona, 2003), 46–47; Gregorio Morán, *Los españoles que dejaron de serlo: Euskadi, 1937–1981* (Barcelona, 2003), 114.
51. Aparicio, "Mi recuerdo," 256.
52. Reproduced in Gibson, *En busca de José Antonio,* 5. I agree with Gibson that Giménez Caballero is the author.
53. José Antonio Primo de Rivera, "Orientaciones hacia un Nuevo estado," *El Fascio* 1, 16 March 1933, cited in OCJA, http://www.rumbos.net/ocja/jaoc0005.html.
54. José Antonio Primo de Rivera, "Distingos necesarios," *El Fascio* 1, 16 March 1933, cited in OCJA, http://www.rumbos.net/ocja/jaoc0006.html.
55. Juan Ignacio Luca de Tena, "Atmósfera de la violencia," *ABC,* 17 March 1933, 17.
56. *ABC,* 22 March 1933, 17.
57. *La Nación,* 22 March 1933.
58. *ABC,* 23 March 1933, 19.
59. Gibson, *En busca de José Antonio,* 58.

60. Ibid., 64.
61. Elorza, *La razón y la sombra,* 221.
62. Gibson, *En busca de José Antonio,* 60.
63. Photograph of the MES-FE's first manifesto in ibid., 66.
64. For his connections with the journal *Hermes* and the literary atmosphere in Bilbao, see Carbajosa and Carbajosa, *La corte literaria de José Antonio,* 9.
65. Gil Pecharromán, *Retrato de un visionario,* 184.
66. José Antonio Primo de Rivera, "Han bastado diez años para que resplandezca la verdad: 1923–1933," *La Nación,* 13 September 1933.
67. Manlio Barelli, *José Antonio P. de Rivera, precursore et eroe* (Roma, 1940), 23, cited in Saz, *Mussolini contra la Segunda República,* 115.
68. José Antonio Primo de Rivera, "Per Sua Eccellenza il Capo del Governo," ASMAE, Gabinetto, busta 2045, cited in Saz, *Mussolini contra la Segunda República,* 115.
69. The whole visit was monitored by the Spanish ambassador in Italy, Gabriel Alomar, who was aware of José Antonio's interview with Il Duce. Saz, *Mussolini contra la Segunda República,* 116.
70. Ibid., 114. At some other moment in November 1933, Mussolini also received the Marquess of Eliseda. Stanley G. Payne, *Franco y José Antonio: El extraño caso del fascismo español* (Barcelona, 1997), 180.
71. See *Il lavoro fascista,* 25 May 1935, cited in Saz, *Mussolini contra la Segunda República,* 115n76.
72. Benito Mussolini, *El fascismo* (Madrid, 1934). For further information on this edition, published by San Martín, see http://www.libreria-argentina.com.ar/libros/benito-mussolini-el-fascismo.html. The second edition, published in 1935, no longer contained the prologue or the epilogue .
73. José Antonio Primo de Rivera, "En una tarde de Octubre," prologue to Mussolini, *El fascismo,* in Agustín del Río Cisneros, *Obras Completas de José Antonio Primo de Rivera,* 704.
74. The poem was no. 18 ("Thamár y Amnón"). Fernando de los Ríos was also a friend of García Valdecasas's. After the poet had been arrested in Granada, in August 1936, García Valdecasas and the composer Manuel de Falla, friends of his, went to ask Lieutenant Colonel Nicolás Velasco Simarro, who had been acting as de facto civil governor in the absence

of the *falangista* José Valdés Guzmán, what had happened to him. According to the historian who heard García Valdecasas tell his story in 1970:

> Velasco excused himself of all responsibility for the fate of Federico, about which he gave no information whatsoever. However, he did say his authorship of the "Romance de la Guardia Civil española" was sufficient justification for the poet's murder in those turbulent moments before the onset of the war. When García Valdecasas replied that García Lorca had also penned the lines "Ay Federico García / llama a la Guardia Civil," as a symbol of justice, legitimacy, law and order, the governor "went pale; and at that instant I knew Federico had been shot." (José Manuel Cuenca Toribio, "García Lorca y su muerte: Un testimonio singular," *El Imparcial,* 25 June 2014, 4)

75. García Valdecasas spoke only of one manifesto that was not made public, not two, and that José Antonio used part of the text in his speech at La Comedia. Alfonso García Valdecasas, "Mi recuerdo del 29 de Octubre," in *Dolor y memoria,* 257–259.
76. Eugenio Montes, *Arriba*, 2 October 1957, cited in Gil Pecharromán, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera,* 196.
77. Ximénez de Sandoval, *Biografía*, 149
78. According to García Valdecasas in 1938, the theater was full:

> We knew that an attempt would be made to stop us going ahead . . . But even so the theater was packed, and there was no shortage of courageous Spanish women there, whose beliefs could not be shaken. The audience was quite mixed. There were mature men and very young men; famous names and more humble people. The young general who had twice been decorated for valor was there in plain clothes [a reference to Varela who, in fact, was not a general at the time]. The boys from the [Carlist] AET [Agrupación Escolar Tradicionalista—Traditionalist School Group] were there, as were the first groups of *falangistas*, many of whom had traveled in from the provinces. There were the Spanish legionnaires [from the PNE] and the lads from the JONS. Their leader, Ledesma Ramos, was sitting up on the stage with a few of them. (García Valdecasas, "Mi recuerdo," 257–259)

We also know young men with sticks occupied “defense seats.” Interview with Enrique García-Ramal Cellalbo, Madrid, June 1987.

79. According to García Valdecasas, afterward:

> I left very quickly because I had to go to one o’clock Mass. When I told José Antonio that morning I would have to leave early, he said, “I heard Mass first thing this morning in a nuns’ convent where they all prayed for God to enlighten us.” Groups of people started to leave. Some were still clapping. They were saluting with their arm held high. I went to the Church of the Augustines on the Calle Alcalá. When I was leaving, a stranger came up to me and said, “Are you Mr. Valdecasas?” “Yes. And you are . . .?” “I have just been to the meeting in La Comedia,” he said. “I was very happy to see you kneeling before the Lord.” We shook hands. I don’t know who he was, and I have never seen him again. When I was walking through the Plaza de la Independencia, I witnessed an incident. Three individuals had attacked someone who had been to La Comedia from behind. The life of the Falange was beginning. (García Valdecasas, “Mi recuerdo,” 258)

80. Ramiro Ledesma, *¿Fascismo en España?*, 261.
81. Vegas Latapié, *Memorias políticas,* 187.
82. *La Nación,* 30 October 1933.
83. Ibid.
84. Vegas Latapié, *Memorias políticas,* 187.
85. Ximénez de Sandoval, *Biografía*, 154.
86. Payne, *Franco y José Antonio*, 180.
87. See “Acta de constitución de la Falange Española,” *Informaciones,* 2 November 1939, cited in OCJA, http://www.rumbos.net/ocja/apendice.html.
88. “Barely a fortnight later, Valdecasas, for reasons unknown, disappeared from the Falange without a trace. Apparently he married into money (a marchioness no less), and he put his aspirations of saving the nation to one side and went abroad for a six-month honeymoon.” Ledesma Ramos, *¿Fascismo en España?,* 261. In fact, he married the daughter of a marquess (José Luis de Andrada-Vanderwilde y Pérez de Herrasti), María Andrada-Vanderwilde y Bachoué de Barraute.

89. Juan Antonio Ansaldo, *¿Para qué . . .? De Alfonso XIII a Juan III* (Buenos Aires, 1951), 79.

90. Ximénez de Sandoval, *Biografía*, 161.

Chapter 3

Saving Spain

José Antonio and the First Year of the Falange: The Path to Total Power

The Falange was organized in the Fascist way, along paramilitary and militia lines. Alongside José Antonio and Julio Ruiz de Alda, Rafael Sánchez Mazas (whom Ramiro Ledesma Ramos referred to as “the theorist who supplied the rhetoric . . . flitting from one place to the other in his role as adviser” to the two leaders),[1] and a few military chiefs soon occupied important positions. Most of them had been staunch Primo de Rivera supporters such as the lieutenant colonels Emilio Rodríguez Tarduchy and Arredondo.[2] Other, more independent military personnel who were attracted by the organization’s radical anti-Republicanism, such as the lieutenant colonels Ricardo Rada (the Falange militia leader who would go on to join the Carlists, where he led their Requeté forces) and Emilio Alvargonzález, joined them. In general, the Falange was attracting former dictatorship supporters and young men, mainly students, in Madrid and such provinces as Seville (where José Antonio’s “cousin” Sancho Dávila was in charge), Toledo (José Sáinz Nothnagel), Zaragoza (Jesús Muro), and Barcelona (Roberto Bassas Figa and Luis Gutiérrez Santamarina, who was from Santander but lived in Barcelona and wrote under the pseudonym Luys Santa Marina). It was also on the rise in regions like Galicia, Extremadura, Asturias, Cantabria, Majorca, and Murcia. The militia was organized in *escuadras* (of eleven men), phalanxes (of thirty-three), centuries (of one hundred), regiments, and legions. Of these, the first three units were the most common because of the relatively few men available. As of 21 November 1933, the Falange also had at its disposal the Sindicato Español Universitario,[3] which had been founded as an outlet for students and

essentially designed to act against the FUE. The following were involved from the very beginning: Ruiz de Alda, Manuel Valdés Larrañaga, Juan Manuel Fanjul, Luis Zaragoza, Miguel Guitarte, Matías Montero y Rodríguez de Trujillo (a former JONS member and the first Falange member to be killed), and Alejandro Salazar.

Almost immediately, the weekly newspaper *FE* went on sale; the first issue was published on 7 December 1933. Produced by Sánchez Mazas (who wrote the editorials), José Antonio, José María Alfaro, Jacinto Miquelarena, Ernesto Giménez Caballero, Samuel Ros, Víctor d'Ors, and Ruiz de Alda, among others, it synthesized the political and literary pretensions of Primo, Sánchez Mazas, and the other men of letters in the Falange's incipient intellectual group. In José Antonio's case, this was not merely an exercise to amend for his father's disorganized, confusing, and uncontrollable verbal incontinence and to act as a mouthpiece against "the intellectuals" who had reviled him. He aimed to set up a political-literary instrument to represent a party that was much more than an extreme right-wing group of agitators. In his speech at the Teatro de la Comedia, he had mentioned the need to bring "poetry" (i.e., ideals, values, and noble sentiments) to his political project, and he hoped *FE* would be the platform from which this poetry, the ideology, and the movement's program would be disseminated.

Hence, the first issue printed the party's first program, its "Initial Points" (there were nine). As well as defining Spain as a "unit of destiny," these points described three rifts within the country: local separatisms, party conflicts, and class divisions. But the Falange had the solution in its hands: "If we owe the conflict and the decadence to the fact that we have lost sight of Spain's immutable nature, then the remedy must lie in reviving this concept. We must think once more of Spain as a reality in its own parties and the class struggle. Whoever does not lose sight of this assertion of Spain's superior reality will see all political problems with the utmost clarity." José Antonio believed the solution to all Spain's problems was the construction of a new state: "The Falange wants a state that believes in the superior reality and mission of Spain. A state that will, for the sake of this idea, assign to each man, to each class, and to each group their tasks, their rights, and their sacrifices. A state for ALL, which means ONE state for ALL, which will be moved exclusively by the thought of this idea of Spain's permanence, and never by allegiance to any one class or party." In

this new state, parties would be banned and representation would be in the hands of “natural entities” (i.e., the family, the municipality, and the syndicate):

> We are all born into a FAMILY. We all live in a MUNICIPALITY. We all have a TRADE or a PROFESSION. But nobody is born into a political party or lives in it. A political party is an ARTIFICIAL connection with people in other municipalities and other trades, with whom we have little in common. It separates us from our neighbors and workmates, who are the ones we really live with. A genuine state, like the one the Falange aspires to, will not be based on the lies of political parties or on the parliament they form. It will be based on the realities of life: the family, the municipality, and the guild or trade union. The new state will have to recognize the family as a social unit; the autonomy of the municipality as a territorial unit; and the trade union, the guild, the corporation, as the real foundations of the whole state structure.

The “Initial Points” made no mention of the future role of José Antonio’s party, the Falange, which was to be the force behind this new state. Why? Did José Antonio really plan to dissolve the party once it had taken power? No mention was made because the very existence of the Falange was not consistent with its rejection of political parties and its ambition to eliminate them all when it took power. So, the leaders were concealing something that, whatever form it might eventually take, would inevitably happen: after rising to power, the Falange would establish itself as the single party or movement and remain in control, just as was happening in the regimes that José Antonio and the Falange leaders were taking as their model (Italy and Germany with their respective PNF and Nazi Party). The points explained:

> The new state will not cruelly distance itself from men’s daily struggle. It will not leave it in the hands of each class to free itself from the tyranny of the other or find ways to subject it. The new state will belong to us all, regard the goals of each component part as its own, and take care of everyone’s interests as it takes care of its own . . . Capital gains—often unjust—and the work to be done will be determined not by the interest or the power of the dominant class but by the common interest of national production and the power of the state. The classes will not need to defend themselves as if they were at war, because they are guaranteed that the state will have their fair and proper interests at heart.

The state would also be Catholic, although the powers of the state and the Church would be clearly separated. On this point, the Falange was quite different from Popular Action, the CEDA, and the rest of the extreme right wing:

> The Catholic interpretation of life is, first of all, the truth, but it is also, historically, Spanish. Spain's sense of CATHOLICISM, of UNIVERSALISM won unknown continents from the sea and barbarism. Spain conquered them as part of a universal commitment to salvation. So, any reconstruction of Spain must have Catholic significance. This does not mean those who are not Catholics will be persecuted. Those days are past. Neither does it mean the state will be responsible for the Church's religious functions or tolerate any interference by the Church that might endanger the dignity of the state or national integrity. It means the new state will be inspired by the traditional religious spirit of Spain and enter agreements with the Church so that it will receive all the care and protection it is due.

To achieve all these aims, the Falange would embark on a new crusade that would not shun the use of violence, although the fundamental objective was to reunite and reunify all the Spanish people:

> We shall use violence to defend what is right and just, and to defend our Fatherland against any violent or insidious attack. But the Falange will never use violence as an instrument of oppression. Those who tell the workers, for example, we are on the verge of a Fascist tyranny are lying. At all times the Falange represents union, cheerful, and fraternal cooperation, love. The Falange, burning with love, secure in its faith, will conquer Spain for Spain in a militia atmosphere.[4]

Many who had been expecting a more belligerently Fascist pamphlet regarded the tone of these points and of the newspaper in general as inappropriate. A year and a half later, Ledesma criticized the points:

> When much of Spain was expecting the Falange's newspaper to provide them with political guidance, with clear and effective instructions, what they actually found was a posh, rhetorical magazine, the aim of which was to produce polished academic syntax and appeal to an audience of a certain intellect . . . It was a tremendous mistake to produce a magazine of such literary meticulousness, which spoke of Rome and Plato and was suited to the mentality, style, and rhetoric of arts lovers. It was controlled by [José Antonio] in person, who imposed this style on it largely because under no circumstances did he want to be considered the leader of a movement that had no doctrine and that was not serious and meticulous. He did not want anyone to think for a moment that he would be responsible for a repeat of [PNE leader José María] Albiñana's oafish attempt. But what most weighed on José Antonio, what was a constant concern for him and the cornerstone of his opinion of his father's dictatorship, was his eagerness to be able to count on the support of the intellectuals. (He was mistaken in this concern, because the true political creator—Napoleon is an example from the past, Mussolini an example from the present—always manages to find a group of intellectuals whose mission lies not in the vanguard but in the rearguard, and who justify the deeds of the politician with rhetoric and concepts.) . . . Like any revolutionary movement, rather than an educational journal for training and learning, the Falange needed a belligerent newspaper to stir up unrest. [José Antonio] was frightened by this because he believed agitation and belligerence necessarily involved embarking on violent, personal, and slanderous campaigns against particular politicians. And this annoyed him.

The Falange's newspaper might have adopted this "highfalutin" tone in an attempt to avoid problems with the censors, but it did not work, because it had problems galore from the very first issue. Just getting it into the street was a heroic feat because the printers affiliated with left-wing syndicates boycotted it (and getting newsagents to sell it came up against the same difficulty). The only option was to have young SEU members hawk it directly in the streets. And in an attempt to gain a Fascist foothold among the left-wing masses, they took the *FE* to the working-class districts. Juan Antonio Ansaldo, the head of the most belligerent sector of the militias, graphically described this period after he had become a dissident and left the party: "What a stir we raised when we started hawking *FE* in the vicinity of the Casa del Pueblo and the communist districts of Cuatro Caminos and Vallecas!"[5] The sale of the first issue sparked off riots in these areas and the city center streets, and although there were no fatalities, the situation was serious enough for the minister of the interior to use it as an excuse to ban the paper for a month. When the second issue came out in January, there were further incidents in which even José Antonio, Ruiz de Alda, and other leaders helped defend the young Falange members who were selling the paper. During one of the many scuffles, in which both sides used cudgels and knives, José Antonio actually drew a pistol while Ruiz de Alda beat off the leftists with a stick.[6] The most serious incident was the death of a student from Majorca, Francisco de Paula Sampol. He had been walking down Calle de Alcalá and had bought a copy of *FE*, even though he was not a party member, when a group of young Socialists shot him down. The Falange claimed him as the first of "their fallen."

But things did not stop there. Party members and supporters were injured in cities around the country. In Madrid itself, one victim—the foreman of the workers selling *La Nación* and *FE*—died. Serious riots took place, in universities in particular, when the few SEU members (often with the support of Catholic students or the AET Carlists) confronted the FUE. They stormed its headquarters, guns at the ready, and on 7 February 1934 unfurled an enormous banner at the Socialist Casa del Pueblo in Madrid that read "FE: Long live the Fascio." In the same afternoon, Matías Montero, an SEU founder and a medical student, was shot in the back and died. He may have been shot in reprisal for an incident on 25 January in which he and Agustín Aznar Gerner—who would later be responsible for the party's militias—had led fellow Falangistas in storming the FUE's

premises at his Central University of Madrid faculty. Montero became the SEU's martyr par excellence.[7]

The death of the first Falange leader drew criticisms from other right-wing groups and within the organization itself. The Falange was accused of being too passive in the face of the attacks it had received from the Left. Particularly vociferous in their criticism were the authoritarian Alfonsists. José Antonio's long-standing sidekick Álvaro Alcalá-Galiano, a journalist for the *ABC,* took the opportunity to publish an article in which he railed against the Falange's lack of violence. At that time, José Antonio's tactic was to portray the Falange as a party that was not just a group of agitators (like many other right-wing groups), and to this end, he focused on transmitting the Falange's message to the people, including the left-wing sectors, through the weekly newspaper and his speeches in the parliament. In this way, he hoped to prevent the government from increasing pressure on the Falange, which was threatening to totally suffocate the party so shortly after it had been founded. José Antonio's attitude had prevailed up to that moment in the party's upper echelons, but as soon as the Falange started counting its victims and no reprisals were ordered, this attitude became increasingly difficult to justify. A strange situation was emerging: some people were joining the Falange because of the Fascists ideals it represented (or so they thought) and were then reluctant to use violence, preferring flowery, rhetorical, and elaborate speeches and articles. José Antonio believed

> the martyrdom of our own is, in those cases that we must look on in silence, a school of suffering and sacrifice. In other cases, it prompts rage and a quest for justice. But what our martyrs can never be is the object of "protest" in the Liberal sense. We do not complain. It is not our style. We do not profane the remains of our dead by dragging them through sniveling editorials or exploiting them for some political gain among the faded velvet of the parliament's seats.[8]

At Montero's funeral, he said:

> He is a magnificent example of silence. From the comfort of their own homes, others will tell you to take revenge more enthusiastically, more belligerently, more ruthlessly. But giving advice is easy. Matías Montero did not advise or speak out of turn: he simply did his duty, even though he knew death was probably lying in wait for him in the street. He knew because he had been told. Just before he died, he said, "I know I have been threatened with death, but if it

> is for Spain and the cause, I don't mind." Shortly afterward, he was shot in the heart, a heart full of the purity of his love for Spain and for the Falange.[9]

This attitude was difficult to defend, particularly from the perspective of thinking and acting "in the Fascist way." The whole concept of *squadrismo* required not just meting out vengeance for any attacks they may have been victims of but also taking a more proactive aggressive approach.

José Antonio's initial reluctance to use violence—in particular, violence that would lead to deaths—shows how naive he was when he founded the Falange. Apparently, he had not been expecting the violent reaction from the Left, mainly the Socialists, against the party in general and its youth section in particular. He even thought he might have made a mistake by founding the Falange around the time of the Teatro de la Comedia rally and that he should have put it off, focusing instead on organizing a propaganda campaign. Ruiz de Alda disagreed and argued that if the party had not been founded when it had been, membership would not have increased by so much after the rally.[10] In short, José Antonio seemed to be more engaged with his role as a first-time member of the parliament and director of *FE* than as the joint leader of a party that was being overwhelmed by violence and put in the public eye not because of José Antonio's political-cum-pedagogical mission but because of street brawls and violence. This, of course, was only to be expected from a political party that was like all Fascist parties: they were well known for their combative approach to the political struggle.

José Antonio said he attended parliamentary sessions "without faith or respect," although his friend and CEDA parliamentary representative Ramón Serrano Suñer said he had taken the "parliament seriously . . . and to some extent allowed himself to be won over by it."[11] From the very beginning, he was proud of his political independence and refused to join any right-wing "minorities" (parliamentary groups), which meant he became somewhat isolated and could only take active part in the plenary sessions.[12] One other way in which he managed to make himself heard was to interrupt other members' speeches, a tactic that, unlike now, was not in contravention of parliamentary rules. When he spoke, he used his characteristic political-literary rhetoric. On one occasion, José María Gil-Robles, who he had just interrupted, spat, "Is that why your Honor needed to write a literary essay?" and Serrano Suñer, sometime afterward,

described that particular intervention as “embarrassing,” full of “immaculate words that were too academic and lacking in vigor.” José Antonio also played to the gallery with his gestures. For example, he made a great show of waving his slip of paper in the air when he voted in favor of one of his father’s enemies, Santiago Alba, as president of the lower house, making it quite clear that he wanted nothing to do with the general right-wing abstention.

He was quick to learn and once again showed he was quite prepared to use his fists to redress any (alleged) insults proffered to his father. He was involved in an incident with former Minister of Finance Indalecio Prieto, one of the Socialist leaders whom he most respected, when Prieto was extremely critical of the dictatorship’s contract with ITT and the CTNE. When he publicly described it as “theft,” José Antonio first attempted to assault him but then accepted that an inquiry be set up. Various right-wing members of the parliament and even some PRR members congratulated him on this. Quite satisfied and feeling surer of himself, he ended up announcing he would not put up with any more slanderous allegations.[13] He aimed for his speeches to have an impact both inside and outside the parliament, and he was (naively) very attentive to the reactions of the leaders he respected, including Prieto, Gil-Robles (at least at first), and former Prime Minister Manuel Azaña. According to Ansaldo, the Marquess of Eliseda had told him that José Antonio, after one of his speeches, had asked him: “Did you notice if Azaña liked it?”[14] This was in stark contrast with Azaña’s opinion of him: a year earlier, he had been shocked when a mutual lady friend, Princess Bibesco, who was or had been romantically involved with José Antonio, tried to introduce them.[15] What attracted José Antonio to Azaña can be deduced from what he wrote about him: “Azaña was not popular: he was one of an intellectual minority; a select and disdainful writer, an exacting, cold, precise, original dialectician. From the very first time he appeared in the public spotlight, he had proved to be impervious to praise.”[16] These features were precisely what he was attempting to develop. Despite all his contrary rhetoric, José Antonio was delighted to be a member of the parliament and to have the opportunity to rub shoulders with state and party leaders in his attempt to make room for the Falange and find a position in the limelight for himself.

While all this was going on, he continued with his habitual life of leisure and recreation; when the Falange foreman and Montero were killed, he had

been a ball in the exclusive Real Club de la Puerta de Hierro and on a hunting expedition, respectively. In fact, Montero's funeral had to be postponed several times because he did not get back from the hunting expedition on time, which shows how important he had become within the party by February 1934 but also earned him a great deal of criticism, much of which he would never forgive. Eugenio Vegas Latapié expressed his disapproval of José Antonio's late arrival and had to suffer the consequences. In his memoirs, he wrote an eloquent passage on the enmity he felt for José Antonio from that day forth:

> I quietly expressed my disapproval of José Antonio's behavior to the three or four friends I was with. There he was enjoying himself at parties and going on hunting expeditions while his followers were being shot at by the Marxists. My criticism was limited to the small group I was with. It could have been heard only by them, one of whom was Rafael Sánchez Mazas, and I had the utmost faith in all of them. After a lengthy wait, José Antonio eventually arrived. He immediately went to view the body. When he walked past me, I can assure you I was frowning and surly, but I did not exchange a single word with him. But one of the friends I was with [Sánchez Mazas?] must have told him what I had said. From that moment on, he refused to recognize my presence and never spoke to me on the few occasions we attended the same meetings.[17]

But the fact that José Antonio refused to speak to him does not mean he was not affected by what had happened. If we can believe his biographer Felipe Ximénez de Sandoval, José Antonio said on the day of the funeral, "Today's outing in the country is the last time in my life that I shall accept an invitation to a frivolous event of any sort."[18] Of course, this was a great exaggeration and a promise that would not be kept,[19] but it shows the effect this whole situation had on him. José Antonio responded to all the published criticism in *FE* and *La Nación*.

However, under the pressure of the violent deaths and, like Ruiz de Alda, disappointed because the Falange had not attracted more new members, José Antonio was delighted by Ledesma, Onésimo Redondo Ortega, and Juan Aparicio's decision to accept his offer of merging with the JONS. Although some JONS members disagreed and actually left the party (e.g., Santiago Montero Díaz, the leader in Galicia), the merger finally went ahead on 13 February 1934.[20] The Falange's interest in the merger was largely practical. As José Antonio would explain during the trial that ended in his death sentence:

> There was a small group called the Councils of the National Syndicalist Offensive. It had been founded by a young lad, Ramiro Ledesma, who had always had a burning revolutionary spirit. It didn't have a youth section, because they were just a dozen friends. The thing was that they were flying the National Syndicalist flag, which coincided in many theoretical points with the flag that we were flying, so there were two similar organizations, and this led to confusion. Anybody who has ever been involved in setting up a political party knows how difficult it is to attract members. The fact that there were two associations with similar ideologies complicated things and was such an obstacle that we had little option but to join forces.[21]

José Antonio was not particularly enthusiastic about Ledesma, whom he felt might be an obstacle to his leadership aspirations and to the design of party tactics. And he was proved right in these misgivings.

After the reluctant JONS had analyzed the reality of the situation, it was brought around to the idea of the merger. The party's leaders could see that the Fascist area of the political spectrum was being monopolized by the Falange, which had more members; received more Alfonsist subsidies; had its own weekly newspaper, which had a bigger circulation than their *JONS*; had two members of the parliament; and was relatively well known in the streets and the media. In all these aspects, the Falange was doing better than the JONS. The JONS contributed to the new joint party the Catholic kings' emblem of the yoke and the arrows as the party's symbol; the red-and-black-striped flag, inspired by the colors of Spanish Anarcho-syndicalism (the CNT); the mottos "Una, grande y libre" (One, great, and free), "¡Arriba España!" (Onward Spain), and "Por la patria, el pan y la justicia" (For the Fatherland, bread, and justice); and a more elaborate and radical Fascist discourse. As Ledesma would explain:

> The JONS had raised and created a flag for National Syndicalism. They had discovered and adopted the historical symbols of the yoke and the arrows, and they used an anti-bourgeois vocabulary, a sort of social patriotism. [The Falange], on the other hand, was not so sure about its objectives, largely because of the reactionary political tradition of most of its members and the surname of its most important leader, Primo de Rivera, who naturally automatically linked the organization to the period of the dictatorship.

Even so, Ledesma believed José Antonio "was steadily evolving toward a revolutionary interpretation of Fascism that facilitated understanding with the JONS."[22] As well as contributing the slogans and symbols, the JONS were more in touch with the working class. As things turned out, the former Falange leaders finally took over the joint party and expelled Ledesma, but these events were still a year away.

Against José Antonio's criterion, the new organization's name was the extremely long Falange Española de la Juntas de Ofensiva Nacional-Sindicalista. As he said at his trial: "Ledesma is cautious and knew how to exploit his strengths and, in particular, the instrument of potential political speculation that he was in charge of. He demanded we add JONS to the short and quite attractive name Falange Española. We could not persuade him otherwise, and of course, we would not let this minor point scotch the agreement. We agreed and had to write some new articles of association in October 1934. The previous ones were from 1933."[23] The new articles defined the party as a "political association," even though it still regarded itself as an "anti-party." José Antonio also said, "As we are of a totalitarian tendency, like the Socialists, we decided to avoid the word 'party' and used National Movement instead."[24] To prevent any rivalry for the future control of the party, a joint leadership committee consisted of a central executive triumvirate (José Antonio, Ruiz de Alda, and Ledesma) and a managing board of the same three men plus Sánchez Mazas, Redondo, and General Secretary Raimundo Fernández-Cuesta (whose post involved no real power at all). This solution, however, did not end the debate about the single leader, which was the Fascist model in other countries.

The JONS members were relatively satisfied because they had managed to radicalize the "Initial Points" and curb what they regarded as the Falange's excessive dependence on extreme right-wing ideology. It had been agreed that "the new movement would forge a political personality that could not be mistaken for that of a right-wing group . . . make a National Syndicalist statement in the form of direct revolutionary action, and draw up a specific National Syndicalist program that defended and justified the fundamental ideas of the new movement: unity, direct action, anti-Marxism, and a revolutionary economic policy that will ensure the redemption of the working class, the peasants, and the small industrialists." Although the program took several months to complete, the party almost immediately set up its syndicates: the Confederación de Obreros Nacional-Sindicalistas (Confederation of National Syndicalist Workers—CONS) and the Confederación de Empresarios Nacional-Sindicalistas (Confederation of National Syndicalist Entrepreneurs—CENS). Once in power, the aim was for these two syndicates to be the basis of a vertical Syndicalist system in which both employees and workers would be at the service of the national economy. At this point, José Antonio officially proposed that members

internally speak to one another informally in their internal dealings to accentuate the party's classless nature and its leanings toward the workingman (in imitation of what Mussolini had done in Italy).[25]

Another immediate consequence of the merger was the reorganization of the militias (the so-called Primera Línea), which took advantage of the experience the JONS had acquired. Under the command of Ruiz de Alda, they incorporated leaders such as Arredondo, a former UPE member; Ansaldo, a military aviator, a friend and business colleague of Ruiz de Alda's, and a man of action who came from not the JONS but radical Alfonsist monarchism; Rada, also a former UPE member; and, in 1935, Aznar Gerner, one of the sociology professor Severino Aznar Embid's three sons (all Falange members) and the fiancé to one of José Antonio's cousins and goddaughter, Lola Primo de Rivera. The nonmilitant Segunda Línea was also set up for older men. Members were classified as "activists" and "associates," or contributors. The Women's Section was also created. Mainly devoted to tasks of assisting the party's male prisoners, it was led by Pilar Primo (politically speaking, José Antonio's closest sister) and her second-in-command, Dora Maqueda, from Albiñana's old PNE, a real Alfonsist party of agitators that had joined forces with Spanish Renewal.

From that point on, violence (and not just as a form of reprisal) became the order of the day. In fact, at the rally in Valladolid to announce the merger of the two parties, a Falange member was killed, and there was another death in March (Jesús Hernández, just fifteen years old). José Antonio survived an assassination attempt when he was driving under escort and with a clerk from his office in April 1934. In response, he jumped out of his car and chased the gunmen through the streets.[26] The militias were now better organized and held their first clandestine mass meeting—attended by 150 to several hundred militiamen[27]—in early June 1934 at the Estremera private airfield near Madrid, in Carabanchel. The authorities discovered what was going on and fined the organizers. The meeting was observed by monarchist Army leaders responsible for distributing Alfonsist funds, three of whom would play a major role in the Franco dictatorship: Valentín Galarza, Jorge Vigón, and Pablo Martín Alonso.[28]

The situation took a turn for the worse on 10 June, a Sunday, when groups of Falange *escuadristas* took on some young Madrid Socialists—nicknamed *chíribis*, after one of their songs—who used to march out into

the country on festival days. On that particular day, they were on a training exercise in El Pardo. During a confrontation, the Falange member Juan Cuéllar was killed, and his corpse abused. Ansaldo ordered a retaliatory attack without, it seems, informing his superiors. He drove a group of *escuadristas* in search of a young *chíribi* woman, a dressmaker called Juanita Rico, who was said to have abused the body. They saw her getting off a bus on her way back to Madrid and gunned down her and all the people she was with, including two of her brothers. She was critically injured and died a few days later. From that moment on, the JSE honored her as a victim of Fascism. The press accused Aznar Gerner, Alberto Ruiz Gallardón (*El Cejas*), Pilar Primo, and Alfonso Merry del Val of the shooting. The last of these four was arrested but absolved by a citizens' jury after he claimed his car (the one the *escuadristas* used to do the deed) had been robbed on the day of the events.[29]

The escalation of violence was relentless, and José Antonio had to put his foot down to stop some Falange members from assassinating Prieto, and Manuel Groizard Montero from blowing up the Socialists' Casa del Pueblo in Madrid.[30] Groizard was Ansaldo's lieutenant and, like Ansaldo and Ruiz de Alda, a retired soldier.[31] Some considered him the man behind Rico's murder, and he and his wife had survived an assassination attempt.[32] Ansaldo was not actually in command of what came to be known as the Phalanx of Blood (that was Ruiz de Alda), but his brave and violent character made him a natural leader,[33] and he functioned as such until he was expelled.

In an attempt to halt the escalation of violence, the government searched the Falange's headquarters in Calle del Marqués de Riscal, where José Antonio, Eliseda, and sixty-five "comrades" were arrested. Because they were members of the parliament, José Antonio and Eliseda had to be released the same day. Other Falange centers around the country were also closed, the party's two publications (*FE*[34] and *JONS*) were suspended, and they were not allowed to hold public events of any sort. However, the Falange was not made illegal,[35] despite some editorials in the press that questioned the increasing violence: "No longer should we have to put up with the existence of legal political organizations that are proud of their military ideals and tactics, and plan to subvert the structure of the state by some sort of terrible, sudden attack. Whether they call themselves Socialists or Fascists, these undesirables have no right to organize military parades

and disturb law and order."[36] Nevertheless, several general measures were taken to reduce the number of firearms in circulation (in raids carried out in the old part of Madrid and spot checks on pedestrians, three hundred pistols were confiscated),[37] and in response to the complaints of many parents whose children had been arrested, minors were legally banned from becoming members of political parties.

José Antonio was, relatively speaking, more reserved in his attitude toward violence than were Ruiz de Alda and Ansaldo. Ansaldo mentioned this in his memoirs when he narrated the events of the period immediately before Rico's death in May 1934 and, in particular, José Antonio's return from a trip to Germany:

> He was welcomed at the North Station by the party leaders, and when he got off the train, he asked Julio Ruiz de Alda, "How are things here?" Ruiz de Alda is more a man of action than a diplomat, and he replied, politely and honestly, but rather unfortunately, "Since you have been away, things have been just perfect. No attack has gone without its corresponding retaliation, and we have been taking the initiative on all fronts. I'm delighted that Juan Antonio is now in charge of achieving our objectives, because he is performing just wonderfully." Julio himself said later that he realized he had "really put his foot in it" as soon as he had finished speaking. José Antonio's face was a poem . . . Always jealous of his initiative and position, the comments made by his colleague in the party's triumvirate, whom he really did not get on with, dampened his enthusiasm and affected his immediate plans.[38]

This is how he felt before Cuéllar's death. Afterward, José Antonio apparently overcame his reluctance. So, the intermittent sequence of deaths on both sides went on. In August, the PCE leader Joaquín de Grado was killed in a confrontation with *falangistas*; two weeks later, the Falange leader in San Sebastián was shot down, and in retaliation, the Falange killed former Director General of Security Manuel Andrés Casaus.

José Antonio had traveled to Germany on his own initiative but also at the suggestion of the German ambassador in Madrid. During the final trial, when the citizens' jury asked him about it, he tried to play down the importance of his interview with Hitler, which could have decisively influenced the court's decision. He recognized that he had been in Germany

> on 1 May 1934, for the first time, and returned on the seventh of the same month. I spoke to Hitler for a few minutes, but the only language he speaks is German, which I cannot understand. I had to rely on an interpreter, and in the five minutes we spoke, he said he felt great affection for the memory of my father. I thanked him, and because of the distance

> separating us, that is where the interview ended. I have not set foot in Germany other than on this occasion, neither before nor since.[39]

According to José Antonio, then, the encounter had been nothing like his interview with Mussolini. However, this version was not quite accurate. The Nazis had invited him and other right-wing leaders (including Gil-Robles and Antonio de Goicoechea) to visit Germany,[40] and while he was there, he took part in many activities with leading party members. Now, thanks to the discovery of a main Nazi ideologist's diaries, we know he and Alfred Rosenberg had met in Berlin, although the date is not specified. (It also seems quite feasible that José Antonio met other Nazi leaders.) Rosenberg wrote about the meeting in his diary on 23 August 1936, and he clearly made a mistake about the dates: "A year ago, young [José Antonio] came to see me. He was a clear, intelligent young man; Catholic (but not clerical); a Nationalist (but not dynastic). He offered no opinion on the Jewish question."[41] On the subject of Catholicism, Rosenberg told Hitler on 16 September 1940 that he and José Antonio "had gotten on very well." Rosenberg told José Antonio that Germany had no intention of intervening in the fact that Spain was Catholic. José Antonio replied that the Pope was like a Masonic leader and that Spain would elect its own Pope in Toledo.[42] On 29 July 1943, Rosenberg recalled the conversation: "In all other respects, it should be absolutely clear to Franco that *with* the Church, the Falangist revolution will never be successful. Having a Spanish Pope in Toledo, as [José Antonio] said, is the only possible way to gradually remove the disastrous interference of the entity that constantly stops all organic growth [the Pope]."[43] This was the situation in a nutshell. According to Rosenberg, José Antonio, a Catholic Fascist, would not have been prepared to exempt the Spanish Church from being under the control of the new state that he was aiming to construct.

Returning to the issue of violence, the excessive de facto independence of Ansaldo (who was more of an extreme right-wing Alfonsist monarchist than a Fascist) led to the Falange's first internal crisis. Apparently, he planned to force José Antonio into adopting a harder, more violent policy[44] and ending his alleged "flirting" with Prieto in the parliament. If José Antonio did not bow to these wishes, he would have to leave the organization in the hands of Ruiz de Alda and Ledesma. Ansaldo and the other militia leaders were incensed not only by the limits José Antonio was

putting on their activities but also by incidents he was involved in at two different parliamentary sessions in July 1934. The first was his speech on why it was necessary for the Socialists to abandon their “anti-national” Marxist standpoint and adopt revolutionary social and national policies, which the right-wing members of the parliament greeted with contempt and outrage. And the second was the petition to waive his parliamentary immunity because weapons had been found at the Falange’s headquarters. It so happened that a proposal Prieto had presented in defense of a Socialist member of the parliament had passed, despite the opposition of the CEDA and the radicals, and it saved both of them from being put on trial until the end of the legislature. José Antonio had thanked Prieto effusively and railed against all the right-wingers who had wanted to see him in court. This attitude outraged not only Ansaldo and his lieutenants but also the members of the parliament who had voted against him, including his friends and relations José María Pemán and José Pemartín Sanjuán. According to Ledesma:

> When Prieto finished his speech, [José Antonio] congratulated him effusively and shook his hand. That may have been a logical reaction in accord with parliamentary etiquette. But at that time, violent confrontations were the order of the day and the Falange members killed by the Socalists were still fresh in the memory, so his attitude shocked and angered us all. Apparently, the [JSE] was also outraged with Prieto, but he did not react in any way, merely not refusing to acknowledge a greeting.[45]

Outside the parliament building, the situation was reaching boiling point, and the young Socialists made a fresh attack on the Falange supporters.[46] José Antonio managed to get out of the internal conspiracy unscathed and in the same month forced Ansaldo out of the party. Ruiz de Alda and Ledesma had been in favor of him staying. Ledesma’s strategy was to bring together a group of right-wing forces, Fascitize them,[47] and become their leaders. This plan was certainly consistent with the fact that the Alfonsists were funding the new joint party, just as they had been when it was separate groups. And it was consistent with Ledesma’s new project after he had been ousted from the FE de las JONS.[48] Meanwhile, José Antonio had consolidated his position of strength and took advantage of the situation to get closer to the goal he had had ever since the party’s founding: to become the one and only leader.

Very soon, however, he had to get around another obstacle: an extreme right-wing heavyweight's request to join the party. José Calvo Sotelo had been a minister under the dictatorship and, after several years of exile in France, had returned to Spain thanks to the amnesty decreed by the government, to which he had been elected as a member of the parliament in the general elections of November 1933. In this case, also against Ruiz de Alda's criterion, José Antonio once again got his way and prevented Calvo from joining.[49] He could not forgive him for fleeing into exile to avoid his responsibility as a minister of the dictatorship precisely when accountability was being demanded.[50] He was also irritated by his attitude toward the General, (rightly) wary of his sudden conversion to Fascism, and very aware of the threat he posed to his own leadership ambitions. All this was still compatible with the party's continued funding by the Alfonsists (of whom Calvo was one); in fact, the economic agreement between the Falange and the Alfonsists was renewed around this time. With Goicoechea, José Antonio signed the extension of the El Escorial Agreement by which the party would continue to receive funds for its militias and workers' syndicates, which were largely in the hands of former JONS members like Nicasio Álvarez de Sotomayor and the former Communist Manuel Mateo.

The Wish Granted: José Antonio, National Leader

These tensions reinforced José Antonio's conviction (and that of the inner circle, which included Sánchez Mazas and Fernández-Cuesta) that he should take control of the party. The time had come. One of his wishes was about to come true. A year or so earlier, he had assured Juan Ignacio Luca de Tena that his vocation as a student was completely unsuited to the role of leader. But the situation now was quite different. For some time, José Antonio had been annoyed that he was criticized for being an atypical Fascist leader, for being regarded more as an essayist or a man of letters, and for not being of humble origins "like Mussolini or Hitler."[51] But he was quite set on the idea of being the National Leader. To this end, he called the party's first National Council, held 5–7 October 1934. His only possible rival was Ledesma, and at this stage, their differences were considerable.

José Antonio was in favor of gradually accumulating forces from within the party itself or by means of agreements with other sectors of the extreme right wing, while Ledesma advocated that the party should go it alone. They also disagreed over tactics. Ledesma favored rallies in large cities (as in Valladolid in the previous March) and policies that would recruit huge numbers of people to the party because of their impact on public opinion. José Antonio, on the other hand, wanted to continue holding rallies in the country or in small towns, because he felt they would connect with the grassroots support in these places.

One of the main issues that divided the two men (but was not discussed openly) was the question of party leadership. Despite the discrepancies there had been among the joint leaders, Ledesma felt the leadership should remain in the hands of the triumvirate, almost certainly because he realized he could not aspire to being the single leader: he lacked charisma, parliamentary membership, and majority support within the party—clear disadvantages. However, his ideas went against the very essence of Fascist parties, which were marked by having single, strong, charismatic leaders who generated doctrine and aspired to creating laws. And to all these discrepancies between the two men, another was soon added: the Revolution of October 1934.

The leadership structure was decided at the end of the first National Council by a single vote.[52] (José Antonio, who chaired the meeting, did not vote.) There would be a single leader. And José Antonio was elected. Ledesma was president of the Junta Política (Political Board), which merely advised the leader, and, on José Antonio's insistence, was made the organization's member number one. At the same meeting, a committee was appointed to draft the party's definitive program, and, to highlight the party's working-class nature, the blue nankeen shirt was voted as the official uniform because of its similarity to the shirt worn by industrial workers. Ruiz de Alda and Gutiérrez Santamarina defended the proposal.[53]

The National Council coincided with the Asturian miners' strike and the rebellion of the Generalitat (Government) of Catalonia—the only part of Spain to which some power had been devolved, which was in the hands of an ERC leader, Catalan President Lluís Companys—which started on 4 October and 6 October 1934, respectively. These two events were a response to the CEDA's entry into Prime Minister Alejandro Lerroux's Council of Ministers. Companys saw this change in cabinet composition as

the beginning of the end of the Republic and the arrival of “Fascism,” and he reacted by proclaiming the Catalan State within the (new) Spanish Republic, as a bastion of Democratic and reforming Republicanism.[54] For their part, the Socialist and Communist workers’ alliances throughout the country were also convinced Gil-Robles would be introducing “Fascism” into the government. Well aware of what had happened in Austria just a few months before, when a Catholic party like Popular Action had taken power and triggered a brutal repression of all the left-wing forces, they called a general strike, which failed in most of the country but became a real revolution in the Asturian mining regions.

Like many others, José Antonio knew the Left was preparing something big. He was convinced (but mistaken) it was a Socialist uprising inspired, or even led, by no less than Leon Trotsky. In fact, he felt Trotsky was possibly already in Spain to bring about a (Communist) revolution and the secession of Catalonia. He arranged to see Minister of the Interior Salazar Alonso to offer the Falange’s help in defending Spain, in exchange for which he asked to be supplied with long guns (which he promised to return as soon as the revolution had been quashed). However, the minister clearly did not attach the same importance to the situation as José Antonio did, and he was sure the forces of law and order would be more than capable of coping.[55] Disappointed and extremely concerned, José Antonio decided to write to General Franco to explain how worried he was.[56] Franco was the military commander of the Balearic Islands and was in León to attend some maneuvers at the invitation of Minister of War Ignacio Hidalgo de Cisneros. José Antonio had met Franco several years earlier, in October 1931, at the wedding of his friend Serrano Suñer to Ramona Polo Martínez-Valdés (the sister of Franco’s wife), and wanted to warn him about what he believed was in the offing. He was also afraid Franco would immediately and diplomatically recognize the new independent Catalan State. Apparently, Franco replied that he should wait and see how the situation developed, and if the revolution were to break out, the Falange could join forces with the Army. As it happened, Franco, as Hidalgo de Cisneros’s adviser, coordinated the repression of the Asturian miners’ strike from Madrid, taking over from the officer in the field, General Eduardo López Ochoa. José Antonio, then, had apparently been on the right track when he wrote to Franco and may have had some information about the minister’s intention to use him. Franco certainly made his mark in Asturias with the extreme

repression he imposed there and the methods used by the troops from Africa, which, on his advice, were drafted in to subdue the revolution. In turn, this revolution was also characterized by extreme violence: members of religious orders, the Army, and the public were killed, and churches and property were destroyed. The methods used by Franco and the troops from Africa won the day over the more benevolent treatment that López Ochoa wanted to give the revolutionaries and prisoners.

In response to the events in Asturias and Catalonia, and at Ruiz de Alda's suggestion, the Falange organized a protest march in Madrid on 7 October led by José Antonio, Ruiz de Alda, and all the national representatives, who were on the third day of their first National Council. They marched in support of the government and managed to gather a crowd of several thousand behind a national (Republican) flag and a banner held by the Catalan Falange leader Bassas that proclaimed, "Long live the unity of Spain." It was the most multitudinous gathering of the Falange before the outbreak of the Civil War, although the march was more patriotic than *falangista*. In his capacity as the new National Leader, José Antonio took advantage of the occasion to go to the Ministry of the Interior and interview Lerroux. He gave him his thanks and support for "saving Spain," for being in the process of successfully repressing the Asturian uprising, and for subduing the Catalans. Back in the street, in the Puerta del Sol, he gave a speech to all the protestors. Lerroux and his assistants listened to him from the balcony. During their interview, José Antonio had attempted to persuade the prime minister to supply him with handguns so that the Falange could take on the city's leftist snipers. He had not succeeded.

Meanwhile, in Asturias, the few local Falange members took note of what Franco had told José Antonio and joined forces with the Army. The events in Asturias were in stark contrast with the quick, pacific, and almost bloodless surrender of Companys in Catalonia to General Domènec Batet, head of the IV Organic Division, the former captaincy general. The day after the happenings in Barcelona, José Antonio and Fernández-Cuesta ran into the "eternal student" Antoni María Sbert—at the time a member of the Court of Constitutional Guarantees elected by the Catalan government—who was having dinner with a married couple in the Savoy in Madrid. José Antonio immediately approached their table and ordered his former rival and his father's adversary to leave the premises because "it was disgusting to see the man in such a place. Not only had he been a participant in an

attempted revolutionary uprising just a few hours previously, but also, from the point of view off his political position, he was the colleague of those who were said to be running the greatest risks at that time" (the papers were all talking about the severe punishments that would be meted out to those responsible in Asturias and the arrest of the members of the Catalan government).[57] To the great satisfaction of José Antonio, who had several debts to settle with him, Sbert did as he was told and left the restaurant.

José Antonio's rise to the leadership did not mean his disagreements with Ledesma had finished. Quite the contrary. The next conflict was how to react to the events of early October. Ledesma believed that, after the failure of the two revolutionary movements, the FE de las JONS should exploit the situation and attempt to seize power by launching a revolution all their own with the support of some sections of the Army. He had been in favor of the protest march in support of the government "assaulted by the Marxist uprising" but believed the Falange should have immediately attempted to seize power. José Antonio refused to entertain such a notion. Although he rightly believed it was not the right moment to seize power and that the party was too weak, he did approach those sectors of the Army he felt would offer them support (the corps of officers and, in particular, the captains). In November 1934, he sent them a letter in which he asked them to help the Falange in two respects. First, if the Falange rose up to conquer the state, they would do nothing to quash the rebellion. And second, if the military were to lead a coup, they should entrust the management of the ensuing political situation to the Falange because it had an important political program that the officers who could lead the revolt did not have (just as his father had not had one in 1923). In the letter, José Antonio used the sort of language he liked, not exactly clear and direct:

> If providence once again places the destiny of our country in your hands, officers, remember that it would be unforgiveable to take the same path [as Primo de Rivera, lacking in historical vision]. Do not forget that anyone who interrupts the normal running of a state is obliged to set up a new state, and not merely restore a show of order. And that constructing a new state requires a mature and resolute understanding of history and politics, and not a rash confidence in one's own ability to improvise. Not only will the Army expiate its sin of formal indiscipline, but it shall cover itself in long-lasting glory if, when the time is ripe, it knows how to respond to the period that is beginning . . . The Army must place its trust in those who most resemble the Army itself. That is to say, in those in whom it finds not only a military sense of life but also complete devotion to two essential principles: the Fatherland, as an ambitious and magnificent undertaking, and an unreserved belief in social justice, as the only basis for the Spanish people to live in peaceful coexistence.[58]

The discrepancies with José Antonio and his rise to the leadership were just the beginning for Ledesma. There was more to come. As soon as the party's new program had been drawn up to replace the "Initial Points"—this time under the title of the "Twenty-Seven Points" in imitation of the Nazis' "Twenty-Five Points"—José Antonio decided to modify them to "make the expressions more abstract and to soften, deradicalize, some of the points."[59] The new "Twenty-Seven Points" were also more specific and detailed than the previous ones. Particularly interesting was the definition of the Falange state as "a totalitarian instrument at the service of the Fatherland's integrity," and the reaffirmation of the general principles: "unit of destiny"; regional anti-separatism; the abolition of political parties with suffrage in the hands of families, municipalities, and vertical syndicates ("All Spaniards will take part as members of families, municipalities, and syndicates. Nobody shall take part as a political party member. The party system will be ruthlessly abolished, with all the consequences this may have: inorganic suffrage, representation by opposing sides and the parliament as we know it."); and the rejection of class struggle and the corporate organization of economic life:

> From the economic point of view, we conceive of Spain as a huge syndicate of producers. We shall organize Spanish society corporately as a system of vertical syndicates for the various areas of production at the service of national economic unity . . . We reject the capitalist system, which takes no notice of people's needs, dehumanizes private property, and gathers workers together in shapeless masses, with a tendency for misery and desperation . . . Our spiritual and national sense also rejects Marxism. We shall direct the energy of the working classes, who have been led astray by Marxism, so that they will take active part in the great task of the national state.

The new points said private property would be "protected from large-scale financial capital, speculators, and moneylenders" and that the banking service and great public utilities would be nationalized. Priority would be given to the problems of the countryside and agriculture, not to industry. The agrarian sector required "economic and social reform," and there were references to family property, the syndicalization of farm laborers, and the redemption "from misery of the human masses who today wear themselves out by scratching a living from sterile soil but who will be moved to new, more cultivable land." The issue of Spain's role in world affairs was dealt with more directly (and aggressively): "Our aim is to have an empire. An empire that will fulfill Spain's historical destiny. We will fight for Spain to

play a leading role in Europe. We shall not tolerate international isolation or foreign interference. As far as the Hispanic American countries are concerned, we shall strive for the unification of their culture, economic interests, and power. Spain remains the spiritual axis of the Hispanic world and therefore deserves preeminence in world affairs." This leading role in world affairs required powerful armed forces:

> Our armed forces—on land, at sea, and in the air—must be as capable and as numerous as necessary to ensure that Spain is totally independent and occupies its rightful place in the world's hierarchy. We shall give back to the land, sea, and air forces all the public dignity they deserve, and we shall strive to give a military significance at all aspects of life in Spain . . . Spain will once again seek glory and wealth at sea. Spain must aspire to become a great seafaring power, for times of danger and for trade. For our Fatherland, we demand the equality of the navies and the air routes.[60]

Great importance was given to education: young men would be given premilitary training, grants would be awarded, and higher education would be encouraged. The Church and the state would be separate entities, although the necessary "national reconstruction" would be permeated with Catholic meaning.

Overall, José Antonio was proclaiming a "National Syndicalist revolution" to create a "new order," which necessarily involved the abolition of the Constitution of 1931 and the 1932 Statute of Autonomy of Catalonia. His aim was to create a country that was internally reunited and led by the state, but, as in the "Initial Points," he never mentioned the role the Falange would play but not for the same reason as before: assigning a role to his party was a direct contradiction of his refusal to accept parties in general and of the need to abolish them. This was a fundamental part of his program and showed his desire to end democracy. However, it is difficult to believe he was not planning for the Falange to be the only party in the country as soon as it took power. According to the "Twenty-Seven Points," the new Falange state would bring back the glorious ages before the emergence of Liberalism, the class struggle, and leftist, internationalist, and sectarian ideas, which had only been made possible because the masses lived in conditions of great hardship. This, the Falange would now redress.

It was a Fascist program, not typically Conservative, and the references to "revolution," nationalizations, and "social justice" irritated the other right-wing groups, even though most of them also mentioned corporatism in

their own programs. Also irritating was the issue of the separation of the Church and the state, and the emphasis placed on the role of the latter was particularly upsetting to Catholics, who felt it was being idolatrized. These two points most differentiated the Fascist program from the other right-wing options. It is in this light we must understand José Antonio's attempts to curry favor with Prieto (a bit pathetic, it must be said), which may have irritated the right-wing groups and some sectors of the Falange. He wanted to be in the good books of someone who once thought like the new Mussolini, given the Socialist origins of the Italian, but only as long as he was prepared to drop his Marxist and internationalist principles. This apparently was not to the liking of Ledesma, José María de Areilza (one of the national councilors), or the other Falange member of the parliament, Eliseda, who shortly afterward would use his discrepancy with the program's insistence on the separation of the Church and the state as a public excuse to leave the party. Apparently, he was more attracted by the Bloque Nacional (National Block), which would trigger another internal crisis and lead to José Antonio's discrepancies with Ledesma and Eliseda.

The alliance of extreme right-wing groups that caused this internal crisis was instigated by Calvo and designed to function both inside and outside the parliament. It aimed to bring together the Alfonsists, the Carlists, some sectors of Popular Action disillusioned with the party's "random" tactics, and the Falange. Its program called for "the conquest of the state," which would be "new, integrative," and corporate. Calvo himself was its leading figure, and the new platform would launch him as the great leader of the anti-Republican sectors. José Antonio refused to be part of it. He jealously protected the Falange's independence, defended its Fascist policies, and feared Calvo not only would occupy the political space he was struggling to create but also (and quite rightly) planned to become the major player. So, he immediately emphasized the differences between the Falange's program and the National Block's by ironically pointing out that his party congratulated itself on the fact that "Conservative groups now tend to fill their programs with national policies instead of defending class interests."[61]

Eliseda, Areilza, and Ledesma, however, did not share José Antonio's opinion. Thus, Eliseda eventually left the party, and because he did not agree with the Falange's insistence on the separation between the Church and the state.[62] Whether the issue of separation was really of any great importance is debatable, because it had been one of the "Initial Points" in

1933 and he had said nothing about it then.[63] When he left, he took with him the considerable funds he had contributed over time. Like Areilza, he immediately joined the National Block, where Ansaldo was already the leader of the militias, known as "guerrillas." But this was not all. Irritated by the "Twenty-Seven Points" and José Antonio's constant attacks on their new initiative, the Alfonsists decided to cease funding the Falange and send the money to the National Block instead.[64] This decision had such an effect on the Falange that it had to give up its headquarters because it could not afford the rent. Its headquarters was quite luxurious—a chalet in Calle del Marqués de Riscal, 16, close to the Paseo de la Castellana—and the electricity had been cut off for nonpayment at least once. At the same time, other Falange members such as Rada—then leader of the militias—swapped allegiances to the Carlists' Traditionalist Communion, and Alcalá-Galiano accused José Antonio of splitting from the monarchists "to attract the sympathy of the revolutionaries."[65]

José Antonio's main adversary on this issue, however, was Ledesma (although Ledesma himself made light of it in his book *¿Fascismo en España?*). The loss of Alfonsist funding had dealt a crushing blow to the CONS and, from the strategic point of view, to all hopes of gathering support (just when the creation of the National Block was providing the extreme right wing with the perfect opportunity to join forces). As a result, Ledesma decided to leave the Falange, as did some of the most important of his JONS colleagues such as Redondo, Álvarez de Sotomayor,[66] Aparicio, Mateo, and Javier Martínez de Bedoya and other members such as Groizard.[67] His aim was to relaunch the JONS, win back the funds he needed for the CONS, and then merge the two organizations. Other issues had also affected his decision. He was upset and hurt he had not been able to galvanize the organization into insurrection, seize power, and set up a National Syndicalist state after the events of October. And he was not happy with José Antonio's performance as National Leader (he felt he was responsible for the CONS's lack of success) or that he had merely been promoted. Ledesma had always regarded José Antonio as unmanageable, and the grudge he bore him was almost unbearable. Several former JONS members felt the same way. This was hardly surprising, because ever since José Antonio had been proclaimed National Leader, his cult status within the party had been increasing, and he was now surrounded by a large group of admirers. This admiration was almost certainly much to José Antonio's

liking, given his passion and conviction that the Fatherland needed to be saved and that he was just the man for the job, but he also must have felt it was an inherent and fundamental part of being a Fascist leader. Nevertheless, after Ledesma left, the most common criticisms leveled at José Antonio were that he was ambitious and a rich, young man of leisure, and this has helped cloud the issue of the main causes for the split.

Of course, José Antonio's personal ambition had been very real up to this point and would be even more real afterward. This ambition had been fueled by the fact that he was elected party leader. He had fully adapted to the role, as was required of a Fascist "conductor," even though this was sometimes not easy for him and forced him to a certain degree of pretense. His characteristic shyness undoubtedly did little to help. Francisco Bravo, his colleague from Salamanca, wrote to him shortly after his appointment as National Leader:

> You are a straightforward, good, and likeable man . . . Strengthened by the supreme authority you have been awarded by the [National] Council, you must distance yourself from others. Do not take everybody on, as you do now, behaving with this aristocratic Andalusian bonhomie that does not suit the unbending leader of a steely movement such as ours. Do not be so approachable: some pretense is required. Only allow into your office those people whom you call, and you must always be seen to be above the masses and the other members of the chain of command. Be authoritarian, absolutely authoritarian. If anyone does not understand this, then they are not Fascist and do not deserve to be one. And reject all Liberal thoughts; neither Unamuno nor [Redondo] Ortega (nor, of course, all our intellectuals) is worth a twenty-year-old youngster fired up with Spanish passion.[68]

José Antonio followed his advice.

Personal ambition, however, was part of his very being, of his personality, forged within him from a very young age as the idea of "command" and the desire to follow in his father's footsteps and go one better. This idea had become more than a mere wish. He had forged his own "character" by rigorous, hard work and a strong personality that was extraordinarily attractive—even magnetic—for many of his subordinates and, in particular, for the intellectual circle that had begun to form around him as soon as the Falange had been founded and had grown as new members joined. In this circle, among several others, were Sánchez Mazas, who had taken part from the very beginning; Giménez Caballero, more nonconformist and more cunning in his dealings with José Antonio; Alfaro; Ros; Gutiérrez Santamarina; Miquelarena; Agustín de Foxá; Eugenio

Montes; Pedro Mourlane Michelena; Dionisio Ridruejo; and Víctor de la Serna. This created a paradox. José Antonio had serious literary concerns but was incapable of writing anything more than outlines of novels, plays, and some poems. This must have made him quite frustrated. Even so, he managed to gather around him a group of men of letters who had a great capacity for writing literature, all of whom admired and appreciated him (possibly because of his strong personality and his ability to lead). These men of letters may have been more interested in politics and ideology, unlike others who entered politics because of their interest in literature.[69] For them, José Antonio was not "a" but "their" point of political reference and was even a personal inspiration in some cases. This says a great deal about his ability to charm, which would have been impossible had he not shared an interest in literature and been a man of culture.

Some of the intellectuals involved have written their thoughts down. Most of what they say was complimentary—because they were writing in 1938, when they were still affected by the fascination they had felt for José Antonio at the time and would feel for the rest of their lives—although some were highly critical (e.g., a former JONS member). One admirer, Alfaro, described how obsessed José Antonio was with being accepted as part of this highly charged intellectual environment. In an interview with Ian Gibson, he described a conversation he had had in the Bakanik with Sánchez Mazas, which was interrupted by José Antonio's arrival:

> We were talking—Rafael Sánchez Mazas was really fond of giving his opinion about great historical events—and Rafael was explaining that the Catilinarian conspiracy was a plot of well-to-do young Romans and all that. José Antonio arrived and said, "Please carry on. I am very interested in what you are discussing." But then some others turned up and we changed the subject. Then José Antonio said he wanted to speak to me on the following day—probably nothing political, just something about an excursion or a lunch, I can't remember exactly—and asked me to go to his office in the Calle [de] Alcalá Galiano the next morning. I arrived at about eleven or half past and went in. His secretary, Andrés de la Cuerda, a rather severe guardian, said, "You can't go in." I said, "But I have an appointment. José Antonio asked me to come, he asked me himself." Then Cuerda said, "Look, this morning, when he arrived at half past nine, José Antonio sent me out to buy some books, and he's shut himself away with them in there and told us to leave him in peace because he had work to do." I said, "What books did he ask you to buy?" And Cuerda replied, "A Latin edition of *The Catilinarian Conspiracy* and a vocabulary in Latin."[70]

José Antonio had made the appointment with Alfaro so that he could take part in the previous day's conversation, and he was making sure he was

suitably prepared. Another member of the group, Mourlane, said:

> For me, José Antonio, is like a prince of intelligence, good taste, and, especially, behavior. He spoke as he wrote, with absolute clarity and convinced that he was asking his people to engage in noble struggles and a great mission. I always say he changed the air around him, something that only a few privileged beings can do . . . We all wondered how someone so young could have so much talent and be so mature . . . The numerous days and hours that I spent by his side are the best of my life and make more sense to me as time passes.[71]

Foxá wrote:

> José Antonio was a magnificent friend, full of humor, imagination, irony, and anecdotes. He could take a common or garden conversation and raise it, without the slightest pedantry, up to the clouds. At times, he was somewhat arbitrary and a little cruel, but he would react at once with boundless generosity . . . All I know is that the concepts that I hold most dear—about the Fatherland, religion, love, literature, and marriage—I owe to him. He improved my spirit, he matured it, and he saved me from the constant threat of defeatist, Sovietizing conversations. For all this, I am extremely grateful. Without meaning to, José Antonio converted his friends into his disciples. Before I was a Falange member, I was José Antonio's friend. I realize that for pure theorists, for those who place reason and doctrine above all else, this would be a cause for reproach.[72]

In De la Serna's opinion, José Antonio had the gifts of an "angel":

> One of José Antonio's spiritual sports consisted of the almost godlike sport of conversation. That voice of his . . . delighted us with chats that were full of humor, the pure refined humor of an Andalusian gentleman. He detested jokes and hated British humor. He had what in the land of his birth is known as "angel." The heavenly gift of enchanting with his voice and his speech, full of the expressive force that makes conversation the most difficult and most beautiful art that men can engage in. José Antonio often spoke of art, literature, and philosophy but not of politics, at least with his circle of close friends. We used to get together in a basement club that was called "La ballena que ríe" [The laughing whale].[73]

And Miquelarena said:

> José Antonio would tell us about a novel he was writing that he couldn't finish, what he had just read, Rome, and life in general. He used to sit side on, with his left leg bent and resting against the couch. He would often chew on a broken fingernail, the only nervous tic of an otherwise perfectly serene man. His gaze seemed to be perpetually fixed on the horizon. I know no one else more physically and spiritually prepared to enjoy the world. Travel! He wanted to go on all sorts of journeys, and he was beginning to learn by heart the whole of *Marco Polo*. When people spoke of other lands and far-off seas in his presence, he would begin to feel the call. But he did not respond. I know no one who has forsaken as much as he has, no one who has given so generously to his country. Because José Antonio knew that life is

> good and joyful. That there are miraculous dishes the world over. That the first cocktail was made two thousand years ago in Cyprus and Falerno. That nights can be joyful and irretrievable. No one like him has managed to tame himself: "Being Spanish is one of the most serious things that one can be in this world," "Death is an act of service," "Our current situation is the only one worth living. Long live Spain!"[74]

In stark contrast is the account by Martínez de Bedoya, a member of Ledesma's splinter group, in which he recalled the adulation surrounding José Antonio (and which also reinforces the argument about why Ledesma split from the party). According to this account, as head of the party's publications, he had been given

> a table in a room [at the address in Calle del Marqués de Riscal] where there were also three other tables for Ernesto Giménez Caballero, José María Alfaro, and Rafael Sánchez Mazas, who were also working on issues of propaganda, the press, and the management of the weekly paper *FE* . . . Whenever the three of them happened to coincide, the whole place became a battle of wits. I remember one discussion between Giménez Caballero and Sánchez Mazas, with plenty of sharp arguments, in which Rafael maintained that José Antonio Primo de Rivera would go down in history for playing a role similar to that of Caesar, whereas Ernesto was convinced that in terms of his personality and historical function he was more like Augustus.[75] Anyone who managed to get to speak to José Antonio by himself really felt quite privileged because he generally dealt with three or four people at once. Then, when he was getting ready to leave, he would stop for a while in the foyer with all the others who were there waiting for the moment. The few times I witnessed this, it was quite embarrassing to see so much admiration and obsequiousness squeezed into such a small place. They were in such awe that they would constantly compliment him on his suit, his tie, the sound of his voice, etc. José Antonio seemed to take all this in his stride. He had gotten quite used to men belittling themselves before him, which said nothing for him at all. And when he decided to go down the stairs, he knew the crowd from the foyer would swarm around him and follow him out into the street and even as far as his car. And at this point there would be another delicate moment because José Antonio would often invite a couple of the hangers-on to get in the car with him and go off for lunch. Or he would select four or five, leave the car behind, and go for a stroll along the Castellana.[76]

Martínez de Bedoya had explained elsewhere that José Antonio had surrounded himself at the headquarters with "'young men of leisure' with positions of responsibility, all of whom jealously guarded their responsibilities and had even awarded themselves salaries. It was run . . . like a 'small government' and 'the atmosphere of privileged young men made me sick.'"[77]

The splinter group announced its separation from the Falange in the *Heraldo de Madrid*, a Republican newspaper. They sent a letter to the editor

that was published on 14 January 1935 and signed by Ledesma, Álvarez de Sotomayor, and Redondo:

> At a meeting . . . of the former leaders of the Councils of the National Syndicalist Offensive, we have unanimously agreed that the JONS needs to be reorganized from beyond the confines of the Falange and the discipline of its leader, José A. Primo de Rivera. We have taken this most serious and fundamental decision after making a minute examination of the political situation and the perspectives open to our doctrinal and tactical convictions on the hesitant and misguided path taken by the party and its leader. With this decision, we hope to: (1) consolidate the National Syndicalist revolutionary nature that has always characterized us and that we brought to the Falange when we entered into the merger, the breakup of which we are announcing today; (2) unambiguously state the position we are adopting in the prevailing political situation; (3) positively channel the discontent and protest that has been evident in nearly all former JONS members in response to the spirit and the men that have lately taken hold of the Falange; and (4) efficiently and vigorously spread the National Syndicalist ideals among the most humble of the Spanish people.[78]

They made no mention of the deep causes for the breakup and described themselves as the authentic champions of Fascism, suggesting the Falange was little more than a Conservative organization. This was highly cynical on their part, because a main reason for the split was that they wanted to continue receiving funds from the Alfonsist authoritarian Conservatives. In the first few days after the split, Ledesma believed the FE de las JONS would end up being dismantled. He said as much in an interview in the *Heraldo*: "The split with the JONS means they [the Falange] have lost, on the one hand, the intellectuals and theorists who created the doctrine—for example, Jiménez [*sic*] Caballero, Juan Aparicio, [Martínez de] Bedoya, etc.—and, on the other, the group of organizers and agitators—Ledesma Ramos, Redondo Ortega, and Álvarez de Sotomayor: that is to say, the intellectuals and the whole traditional, revolutionary, and working-class base of the party." He accused José Antonio of using "demagogic language," being "in cahoots with high finance and the important Andalusian landowners," and having "a feudal mentality, operating in politics with a few dozen mercenaries and a small group of badly chosen, though sincere, friends whose praetorian spirit is quite incompatible with our deep sense of human dignity." He and his fellows, on the other hand, were

> Nationalists concerned for the destiny of Spain. And we believe it is down to the working people to defend and exalt Spain, not oligarchic groups of the privileged who have inherited

> fortunes . . . We are anti-Marxists and revolutionaries, and we believe Marxism has failed and is harming the Spanish national revolution . . . We want to nationalize the banks and all the other means of exchange. We accept, however, private property and personal economies, although these will be subject to the restrictions placed on them by the public organizations of the corporations and syndicates. We have faith in the people. And it is the people whom the JONS will call on, preaching distrust in the parliamentary system and in the liberties of the bourgeois democracy, which favors only the rich.

To this, Álvarez de Sotomayor, also present at the interview, added: “And we shall tell the workers that their enemies are not always the employers and that the true beneficiaries of the current economy are the speculators and major moneylenders, the real enemies of both employers and workers. Our National Syndicalist syndicates, organized by me, former leader of the CNT, today have some 1,500 active workers and about 2,000 unemployed.” Ledesma finished the interview by confirming they would be candidates at the next elections and pointed out: “We are enemies of the parliamentary system, but our voice must be heard in the chamber. We are young, and in the face of the timidity of the Left and the manifest impotence of the Right, we are the hope of the Spanish people.”[79]

Nothing worked out as they had planned. They did not take control of the party, increase support for the CONS, become the principal representatives of Fascism, or accumulate forces. They did, however, manage to get some funding from the Alfonsists and brought out a weekly periodical, *La Patria Libre*, which spent a great deal of energy disparaging José Antonio and the Falange. The Falange members took this very badly, and there were several confrontations. According to one member, José Antonio once had to stop “one of ours, quite irate about the unjust attacks by the JONS founder, from taking a potshot at him.”[80] Eventually, toward the end of 1935, the splinter group tried found a Spanish National Syndicalist party in Barcelona with some local JONS members, but it would have no impact at all in Catalonia or Spain.[81]

The real winner of the split was José Antonio. He not only kept control of the party but also managed to divide the breakaway group by hanging onto some of their leading figures and even most of the CONS, with Mateo in the lead. After a tumultuous meeting, during which someone even tried to attack José Antonio, he convinced them not to leave the Falange. He also managed to get Redondo to stay in the party, along with many of the rank and file in Valladolid, after a few days in which Redondo had been debating what to do.[82] Between the publication of the letter to the editor and the

interview, José Antonio expelled Ledesma and Álvarez de Sotomayor from the party. During his trial, he frankly described how he had lived through the experience with Ledesma and the JONS: "They formed the JONS and got in our way. They joined the Movement and merged. And then they were disloyal."[83]

Despite Ledesma's affirmations to the contrary, nothing suggests Giménez Caballero, another leading former JONS member, also decided to leave with him. In fact, he tried to remain on good terms with Ledesma and José Antonio.[84] Nevertheless, his relationship with José Antonio went downhill from that point on. According to an expert on Giménez Caballero (aka Gecé), José Antonio had always lived in fear of his

> emotional outbursts that bordered on delirium . . . , the absolute irrationality of his rhetoric and his instability; this is why he never allowed him to speak at Falange rallies. He did admire his "literary genius," however, and, as one of the founding members, he gave him card number 5, although, significantly, he gave number 4 to Sánchez Mazas, an intellectual who was less committed to Fascism as a whole, who had a more classical training, who was obsessed with style, and "whose courtly baroque language pleased him."[85]

We have seen that José Antonio relied heavily on Sánchez Mazas, whereas Gecé's attitude and affectations bothered him so much that he told Ridruejo, another of the committed Falange intellectuals: "Have you not noticed he tries to come across as a Führer? It's a bit ridiculous when you actually get to know him."[86] The fact is that the rivalry between the two men to be the Falange's top intellectual had always gone Sánchez Mazas's way. Gecé's noncommittal attitude after the split was not to José Antonio's liking, but things suddenly took a turn for the worse in February 1935. After Gecé had earned the position of professor of language and literature at the Instituto Cardenal Cisneros in Madrid, José Antonio did not attend the celebration meal provided by Spanish Action. Ramiro de Maeztu, Víctor Pradera, Pedro Sainz Rodríguez, Calvo, Vegas Latapié, Lequerica, the German Count Hermann Keyserling, and Ledesma did attend, but José Antonio's absence upset Giménez Caballero enormously.

Giménez Caballero wrote an inflammatory article in *Informaciones* that referenced José Antonio: "It is the farce of the privileged young man who pretends he is a member of the proletariat . . . It is the farce of the Liberal who cannot find his way and suddenly, on a whim, dresses up like a Fascist and puts on a shirt that hardly covers the tails of his parliamentary frock

coat." And he went on to say a Fascist should have "the impetus of sincerity, of truth, and of direct action" and refuse to speak or write "about flowers, marmalades, and Venetian delicacies."[87] It was quite a portrayal of José Antonio and the influence that Sánchez Mazas had had on him, and José Antonio did not deign to reply. He may not have taken it as an allusion to his person, or he may have intended to make a total and public break from him at this point. Even before this incident, the situation between the men was tense, and Giménez Caballero was almost certainly not taking an active role in party affairs. He defined his situation as "part of the [Falange] orthodoxy, albeit on the margin." The fact was that they were fundamentally divided over tactics and strategy, which would lead to confrontation. This division can be seen in José Antonio's reply to Bravo, who was also a former JONS member but had remained faithful to the Falange, when he had asked for permission to organize an event in Salamanca:

> I have nothing against your screening the film *Camisas Negras* there with the lecture by Giménez Caballero. I feel sure a conversation with you will convince him there is no need for any extravagance and show him the advisability of toeing the party line. By the way, you didn't revise the publicity for the lecture written by the [SEU] very well. What's all this about Giménez Caballero being the "leader of Spanish youth"? And what is the meaning of the quote from the German text, written by Ernesto himself, comparing his influence on young people with that of [José] Ortega y Gasset? Have you forgotten the unfortunate incident of his articles about the employers?[88]

The issue of their relationship with employers would later be another point of disagreement.

José Antonio responded with utmost severity to Ledesma's criticisms in the *Heraldo* interview. First, he accused those who had left the Falange of being behind some of the incidents with the *escuadras* that "were examples of the most vulgar delinquency." And he went: "This would not happen again because in the last purge we got rid of all those undesirables who were trying to drag our aesthetic, poetic, and military movement into delinquency and the underworld."[89] He also mocked Ledesma's deafness and inability to pronounce the letter *r*[90] and accused him of being the one who was funded by "millionaires":

> Should you ever come across a fierce revolutionary—or gevolutionary, as those who pronounce a guttural *r* say—one of those revolutionaries who are so fierce that they regard all

> other revolutionaries not to be revolutionaries at all, you should ask yourself the following question: how does this individual make his living? Because there are some tremendous revolutionaries who earn, say, 450 pesetas a month in a public office and who spend two or three thousand on trips, private accommodation, dinner invitations, and the wage of three hired guns to ride in their car and protect their precious lives.[91]

These cutting remarks were made after a resounding internal victory. And although the comments about them in their newspapers made by the group that had left the movement still incensed the Falange members, they never posed any real threat.

Returning to the issue of the National Block, one collateral effect of José Antonio's distancing himself from it and the end of the Alfonsist funding was, a few months later, his making the clearest statement to date on the issue of the monarchy. This issue, which was central to the extreme right-wing parties and their coalitions, and a little more peripheral for Popular Action and the CEDA, was one of the most defining features of Republic opponents in 1931. Now that he was not restricted by any sense of loyalty to his paymasters, and still influenced by his father's experience with Alfonso XIII, José Antonio gave a speech in the Cine Madrid (an old *frontón* of considerable capacity) in May 1935.[92] He said:

> It should not be forgotten that the Spanish monarchy was not brought down on 14 April 1931. The Spanish monarchy had been the tool of one of the greatest projects in the history of the universe. It had founded and sustained an empire, largely thanks to its fundamental virtue: it was a single authority. A single authority is essential if things are to get done. The monarchy, however, ceased to be a single authority some time ago . . . So, as I have said from the very beginning, and without the slightest sign of disrespect, rancor, or dislike—many of us even have a thousand reasons for affection—we believe the Spanish monarchy had fulfilled its cycle, had been left without substance, and was toppled like an empty husk on 14 April 1931.[93]

An Increasingly Fascist National Leader

After the internal crisis caused by Ledesma, José Antonio's position and role in the party became unassailable. But, unlike what would happen in the spring of 1936, this did not lead to any significant increase in the number of members for more than a year. If we are to believe the National Leader himself, the provinces in which the Falange was strongest in 1935 were Asturias, Santander, León, Palencia, Zamora, Salamanca, Valladolid,

Cáceres, Badajoz, Madrid, Toledo, Cuenca, Ciudad Real, Córdoba, Jaén, and Seville[94]—that is, the provinces in the two Castiles, plus Madrid (capital), Extremadura, and part of Andalusia and Asturias. Although Ledesma and his followers had ceased to be a problem, there were other, much more powerful competitors such as the National Block and, in particular, Popular Action and the CEDA, which in March 1936 forced a new governmental crisis and managed to get not just three but five ministries out of the ensuing mess. The Ministry of War was one of them, which was given to their leader, Gil-Robles. He continued to implement the softly-softly approach by which he hoped to force his way into power, set up a "rectification" program for the Republic, and install a Catholic corporate regime that would occupy much of the political space the Falange had wanted to dominate.

Such powerful options in the right wing limited José Antonio quite considerably. If he was to keep the Falange flag flying independently and play a central role in the country's destiny, he had only a few options left. He could criticize his right-wing competitors to differentiate them from his own ideology; continue with the campaign of rallies in towns and cities (he was now more convinced he should also focus on cities); keep up with the "direct action" of the *escuadras* against leftists, left-wing Republicans, and "separatists"; step up propaganda production; or prepare for seizing power in the future (essential if the imminent left-wing revolution was to be thwarted). In José Antonio's mind, this seizure of power involved some sort of military assistance subordinate to the Falange, which, as we shall see, was more fantasy than reality.

For all this, however, funding was crucial. Since the Alfonsists had now cut the Falange off, José Antonio decided to approach the Italian Fascists, although whether he did so in response to a specific offer made by Il Duce in the course of their meeting in 1933 (or by the Italian ambassador in Madrid) or on his own initiative is unclear. He traveled to Rome with Sánchez Mazas in early May 1935 to make his request in person to Mussolini. Once there, however, the date set for the meeting was not at all convenient—he had to be in Madrid on the day in question—so he was unable to see Il Duce. Even so, the Italian leader decided to award him a considerable subsidy of fifty thousand liras a month that he would collect with the assistance of the Italian embassy in Paris. The payments began the next month (June 1935) and were made until January 1936, when the

amount was decreased, not because the Italians had lost interest in the arrangement but because of the decrease in gold reserves deposited at the Bank of Italy.[95] Just over a year earlier, Mussolini had also offered financial and military aid to Spanish Renewal and Traditionalist Communion to prepare an anti-Republican insurrection in Spain. On this occasion, he had offered 1.5 million pesetas, thousands of weapons, other equipment, and training in Libya. Before this agreement was suspended a year later for reasons of Italian international policy, only part of the money had exchanged hands, and this, paradoxically and indirectly, in compliance with the El Escorial Agreement, was probably used as part of the Alfonsist funds passed on to the Falange.[96] Mussolini's direct funding to José Antonio and his Falange was of a different nature, more prompted by ideological affinity than anything else, although Mussolini was also thinking of future international relations with a Fascist Spain.[97]

The new source of funds helped defray the expenses of *Arriba*, a weekly publication launched in late March 1935 after all attempts to continue with the legal struggle to lift the governmental ban on *FE* and *JONS* had been abandoned. Also launched was SEU's weekly *Haz*, which was an important publication for the Falange because at least half its members belonged to the student union. Until these two new publications, the Falange's press had hit rock bottom, because even the "friendly" newspaper *La Nación* had moved over to the National Block without José Antonio being able to do anything about it.[98] By this time, José Antonio had managed to visit one of the intellectuals he had once reviled: Miguel de Unamuno. He was greatly interested in meeting Unamuno personally because he wanted him to know his anti-separatism had inspired his own thought and, consciously or not, to show him the differences between him and his father, the writer's former enemy. José Antonio must have felt grateful, because Unamuno had written favorably about his position against the Statute of Autonomy of Catalonia, which he also hated.[99] This had made possible a reconciliation with someone who had had a decisive influence on the formation of his ideas and for whom, deep down, he felt great respect. In fact, Unamuno had changed and no longer viewed the dictatorship as he used to.[100] And, initially at least, he was not against the 18 July rising.

The meeting took place on 10 February 1935, the day of the first FE de las JONS rally in the Teatro Bretón in Salamanca. After traveling to the city, José Antonio went to the writer's home with Bravo and Sánchez

Mazas, who were all going to address the rally that day. (Evidently, Sánchez Mazas and Unamuno were distantly related through the former's grandmother, the poet Matilde Orbegozo, while Bravo was a friend of Unamuno's son Fernando.)[101] If we are to believe Bravo's version of what happened, José Antonio addressed Unamuno: "I wanted to meet you, Don Miguel, because I admire your literary work and, above all, your very Spanish passion for your country, which you have not forgotten even with all the political work you are doing at the constituent assembly. Your defense of the unity of the Fatherland against all sorts of separatism inspires the men of our generation." In his response, Unamuno indirectly referenced the dictatorship, and José Antonio immediately tensed up. Bravo defused the situation: "Well, Don Miguel. All that about José Antonio's father is old history. Tell us when you want us to sign you up for the Falange." Unamuno replied: "You're right. It's all history now. And you're busy writing history now . . . I'm not very sure what this Fascism is, and I'm not sure Mussolini knows either. I trust you will respect the dignity of men, if nothing else. Men are what matters; then everything else, society, the state . . . I trust you will not go to those extremes against culture that are common in other places."[102]

Immediately afterward, and out of respect for their guests, Unamuno and his son accompanied the three Falange members to the rally and attended the subsequent dinner, during which Unamuno continued to converse with José Antonio and the other Falange members. Their stroll through the streets of Salamanca was broadcast throughout Spain and was the subject of a bitter article in the *Heraldo de Madrid* by the Azañista Roberto Castrovido, a friend of Unamuno's. On his return to Madrid, José Antonio must have felt quite moved. Apparently, he had not been his usual, lucid self during the rally because he had felt overawed by Unamuno's presence. Bravo said he knew what Unamuno was like and that he would not be at all surprised if he were to change his tune and start criticizing the Falange and its leader. In light of what actually happened, however, this may be a justification ex post facto. Indeed, whether prompted by Castrovido's article or for some other reason entirely, Unamuno shortly afterward published an article in *Ahora* in which he showed his great perception and described José Antonio as "a young lad who is out of his depth. He is too refined, too much the privileged young man, and, deep down, too shy to be a leader and, even less, a dictator." And he added that a Fascist leader needed to be

"epileptic."[103] *Arriba* responded immediately with an unsigned article that had apparently been written by Bravo and rather aggressively referred to Unamuno as "that old Scrooge" and "that grotesque exhibitionist." However, rather than these insults, surely what Unamuno would remember was the mistake he made by attending the Fascist rally, which may have influenced the decision not to award him the Nobel Prize for which various Spanish and Hispanic American institutions had nominated him in 1935.[104] In fact, he described Fascism—together with Bolshevism—as "a mental disease" in his brief address in Salamanca on the 1936 Day of the Race (Columbus Day) when he responded to the criticisms of intelligence General José Millán-Astray had made in his presence.[105]

Another meeting, in late 1935 or early 1936, between José Antonio and one of the country's leading intellectuals who had also been critical of his father's dictatorship, would have a better outcome. In this case, the fact that José Antonio's younger brother Miguel knew Gregorio Marañon, the intellectual in question, and, possibly, that one of his sons had taken an interest in the Falange made things easier. Whatever the case, José Antonio was surer of himself, even though he also expressed his desire to "be understood" by Marañon, for whom he had a deep respect. The encounter took place in Jerez de la Frontera, and Marañon later said: "The first time I spoke to him . . . was like two old friends greeting each other. Hardly had we started our conversation than José Antonio said: 'Neither you nor I are what people think we are.' To this I replied: 'You and I are what we are; the thing is that we are both capable of respecting each other despite the circumstances, and the biggest circumstance of them all is politics.'" Despite the friendship that emerged from this interview, and which I think I can describe as enthusiastic, they did not enjoy another personal encounter, because José Antonio was arrested and taken to Alicante a few months later. Once imprisoned in Alicante, José Antonio began to write to Marañón about his book *El Conde-duque de Olivares*, which "someone had sent him, suggesting it was a satire of his father's dictatorship, which he denied with more compassion for the unofficial informant than indignation." There were two other letters, which Marañon described as "admirable, full of serenity, intelligence, generosity in the face of the tremendous ordeal he was going through, and a valuable and penetrating vision of the future." Moreover, before he died, José Antonio asked Miguel to see Marañón and embrace him in his name.[106] This he did after he was exchanged for another prisoner

in early 1939 and went to Paris, where Marañón had been since the beginning of the Civil War.

His efforts to grow the party in 1935 led him to organize rallies like the one held in Salamanca in other towns and cities (e.g., Zaragoza, Toledo, Valladolid, Madrid, Zamora, Puebla de Sanabria, Toro, Don Benito, Málaga, Córdoba, Oviedo, Mota del Cuervo, Campo de Criptana, Barcelona, Madridejos, Puertollano, Santander, and Tauste). At these events, the Falange speakers discussed the organization's doctrine and did their best to explain that their policies belonged to neither the Left nor the Right. In this way, they managed to warn against the former's threat of revolution and the latter's Conservatism and blindness, and to criticize the passivity of the radical CEDA government. José Antonio played a leading role at all the rallies, and he frequently and ironically referenced the CEDA and the National Block to contrast them with the "true" doctrine "of salvation." He felt obliged to do this because all the right-wing parties, instead of limiting themselves to the terrain of hard-line Conservatism, had incorporated corporations into their programs and announcements (to end the class struggle) and the need for social justice. They even had good words to say about the Italian and German Fascist regimes (the CEDA with some reservations and the National Block with greater enthusiasm). There was, then, an element of ideological competition.

Moreover, as it had done throughout Europe, the Fascist way had impregnated the whole of the political right wing; training youth sections, salutes, uniforms, anthems, and so on were the order of the day to one extent or another. Both Popular Action and the National Block had their youth sections, and the latter even had "guerillas." The Juventudes de Acción Popular (Youth of Popular Action—JAP) were quite radical and much more numerous than those of the Falange. All this made it necessary, if not essential, for José Antonio and the other Falange members to define and clarify their ideology constantly and show how it was different from that of the other "Fascist" parties. They believed they were the real founders and representatives of Spanish Fascism the only ones who belonged to neither the Left nor the Right and were genuinely struggling for a national and social revolution. In their eyes, the Fascitized right-wing parties were simply representatives of a Conservatism that had acquired a superficial rhetoric and Fascist symbols.

Partly because of this situation, but also because of his own theoretical and political development, in 1935 José Antonio started to delve deeper into his Fascism's "anti-capitalism" (against financial and speculative capital but by no means against private property), which meant he had to find increasingly larger auditoriums for his speeches. At this point, he adopted a more radical stance on those issues of Fascism that differentiated the Falange from other right-wing ideologies. That is, paradoxically, he became more Fascist. In a lecture he gave to a large audience in the Círculo Mercantil in Madrid on 9 April, he explained his conception of capitalism:

> Once and for all, I would like us to understand the words we use. When we say capitalism, we do not mean private property; these two things are so unlike each other that you could say they are opposites. In fact, one of the effects of capitalism was that it almost entirely destroyed the traditional forms of private property . . . This is quite clear to everybody, but, even so, perhaps a few words of explanation are in order. Capitalism efficiently transforms the direct link between a man and his goods into an instrument of power.

The audience he was addressing (he must have thought) was ripe for the taking, because his argument was that the Falange was prepared to take drastic measures (nationalize banks, etc.) against this financial capitalism that was oppressing the small and medium-sized companies. Moreover, after recognizing Marx's merit for analayzing the system and predicting proletarianization, the concentration of capital, and crises—which must have shocked more than one audience member—he went on to say:

> This Spain has never been one of the great industrial nations and is not overpopulated. It has not been through times of warfare; artisanship is still alive; small-scale producers and merchants are tough, closely knit, disciplined, and uncomplaining; and our spiritual values are intact. In a country such as ours, then, what are we waiting for to take our chance and to become once more, in a few years' time, a leader of Europe? Although this may sound ambitious, it is a possibility. Well, we are waiting for the political parties to stop their petty quarrels both inside and outside the parliament.

The division between the Left and the Right, however, could only be overcome with the unifying force of the FE de las JONS: "The left-wing parties regard man as rootless. They have constantly taken an interest in the lot of the individual in contrast to all political architecture as if these were contradictory terms. So leftism is destructive . . . Rightism wants to preserve the Fatherland, to conserve unity and authority; but it ignores the anguish of the man, the individual, the person just like you who has nothing

to eat." He also took the opportunity to criticize the right-wing corporate project, quite different from National Syndicalism:

> How often have we heard the right wing say: "This is a new age, we need a strong state, to harmonize capital and labor, we must find a corporate form of existence"? I assure you this all means absolutely nothing . . . Another of their sentences is that capital must be harmonized with labor. When they say this, they believe they have adopted an extremely intelligent, highly human attitude to a social problem . . . And what about the corporate state? That's something else. Now everybody is in favor of the corporate state. If they were not, they think they would be criticized for not having shaved that morning. All this about the corporate state is just more hot air.[107]

For José Antonio, corporations were simply the means to create a situation in which "labor will not be treated as merchandise. Neither will it continue to have a bilateral relationship. And all those who are involved in labor, all those who are part of the national economy, will be structured in vertical syndicates." There was the possibility, then, that the "social question" could be solved by totally changing how the economy is organized. In this respect, he was largely taking his lead from Mussolini. The future lay in the "Syndical state," not in corporatism, which was simply the starting point. Shortly afterward, in May, he said in Barcelona: "We want to replace the capitalist order with the Syndical order . . . The production of capital must be released. The alternative is left-wing revolution."[108] In the same month, he insisted there was nothing wrong with private property but that rural, financial, and industrial capitalism should be halted because "capitalism has gradually destroyed artisanship, small industry, and small-scale agriculture; it has gradually passed everything—and is continuing to do so—into the hands of the big trusts, of the big banking concerns."

At the public closing ceremony of the second National Council at the Cine Madrid in November, he reiterated his aim to "dismantle rural capitalism, banking capitalism, and industrial capitalism." Ending rural capitalism involved not only not allowing anyone to live off the income generated by others who worked their land but also undertaking a full-scale technical and social reform of the land. This reform might or might not require the expropriated owners to be paid compensation. Financial capitalism would be "dismantled" by "nationalizing the credit service." For its part, industrial capitalism would be the most difficult to dismantle, "because industry does not rely on capital for purposes of credit; the capitalist system has infiltrated its structure and become a part of it," and

eliminating it too suddenly could lead to economic collapse. However: “Since God is on our side, it so happens that hardly any industrial capitalism needs to be dismantled in Spain, because there is very little here. And considering how little there is, if we were to reduce the burden on the nation caused by extravagant boards of directors, the needless multiplicity of firms all providing similar services and the unjustifiable award of free shares, our modest industry would recover its vitality and manage a period of transition relatively well.” So, “the nationalization of credit and agrarian reform will be put into immediate effect. This is why Spain, which is almost all agrarian, rural, is in the best possible situation to decapitalize without causing a catastrophe in this period in which the capitalist order will be liquidated.”[109]

A year and a half later, at the trial that would end with his death sentence, he condensed his anti-capitalism and his thought on economic and social issues in a response to the prosecutor, who asked, “Was the purpose of this new political group to replace the Democratic state with the authoritarian and imperialistic state that you advocated in your political ideology?”

> Of course, the purpose was to replace the constitutional parliamentary system and all that, yes. Why should I conceal that? But it was to be replaced not by a system but by a Syndicalist state. Everybody knows what this means. The people who believe the capitalist regime has failed understand it must make way for either the Socialist or the Syndicalist solution. In general terms, Socialists give the capital gain—that is to say, the increase in the value of human work—to the collective state organization. On the other hand, the Syndicalist system gives this capital gain to the worker’s organic unit. They are both different from the capitalist system, which gives the capital gain to the employer, the person who commissions the work. Well, the Falange has believed from the very beginning that the capitalist system is in its death throes . . . This is precisely what is causing the problems of the present, so it chose the Syndicalist option, because I believe it provides, to some extent, the organic unit of the worker with motivation and happiness. The Socialist option seems to bureaucratize the total life of the state. But this, as can be seen, is quite a reasonable attitude to take.[110]

And he confirmed what he said after being asked by a member of the citizens’ jury why he spoke so much about Syndicalism, because both the PSOE and the CNT “truly condensed and wholly defended the interests of the working class,” so what exactly was the difference between the Falange and these parties? José Antonio replied: “The difference lies in our national feeling. We have the historical asset of our nation, a national and religious

content that needs to be preserved. That is why we are National Syndicalists and not just Syndicalists."[111]

In mid-1935, he spoke in the parliament to defend his ideas on agrarian reform. He spoke out against the law of 1932, which the PRR and CEDA government were refusing to put in practice, and the legislative reform that they were trying to put in its place. But at the same time, he confirmed the need for technical reform described in the "Twenty-Seven Points," and he denounced the mistreatment to which the workers were, and had been for time immemorial, subjected by the large landowners. He also made it clear that he was opposed to landowners who were parasites but not to the existence of large properties, which he claimed needed to be worked by the community. Of course, none of this was to the liking of the country's agrarian elites or of the parties that represented them (Popular Action and the Agrarian Party).

> I believe everything we are discussing here can be summed up by asking one question: Does Spain need an agrarian reform or not? If it does not, if any of you believe it does not, please have the courage to submit a bill, as Mr. del Río was saying, repealing the law of 15 September 1932. But is there really anyone here among you, on any of the benches, who has actually been into the Spanish countryside and believes there is no need for agrarian reform? Because we do not have to resort to demagogy: Spanish rural life is utterly intolerable.

He took advantage of the speech to describe the Falange's concept of agrarian reform and, in particular, the fact that it questioned the right to own agrarian land:

> Spanish agrarian reform must consist of two stages; otherwise, it will only provide a partial solution and probably make things worse than before. In the first place, the land in Spain must be reorganized from the economic point of view . . . The second stage, after the habitable and cultivable areas of Spain have been determined, consists of deciding what the economic units of cultivation should be within these areas. And once the habitable and cultivable areas and the economic units of cultivation have been established, the Spanish population should be resolutely settled in these areas . . . You are probably wondering why we are focusing on land ownership and not on bank ownership—which is the next thing on the agenda; why not urban ownership or industrial ownership. I don't make the world go around. Just at the moment, the world is aware that land ownership is being legally underestimated, and when this happens, whether we like it or not, whenever this underestimated legal title is used, any change in ownership involves economic amputation. This has constantly occurred throughout history . . . But the fact is that, as well as the essential legal need to undertake a revolutionary agrarian reform, there is also an underlying economic need, and we would be hypocritical if we were to try to conceal it.[112]

At the end of his speech, and while he was correcting the shorthand copies of what he had said, Claudio Sánchez Albornoz, a member of the parliament for Republican Action (Azaña's party) told him, "If you carry on along the same lines as this afternoon, you are going to disappoint the Spanish right-wingers who are following you." José Antonio replied, "It has been made abundantly clear to me. Ever since I veered to the Left, the subsidy I used to get for my campaigns has been taken away."[113]

So, the Falange's program was by no means Conservative, corporate Catholic, or Fascitized. It was Fascist for all intents and purposes. For José Antonio, preventing the social revolution Marx had predicted involved embarking on a "National Syndicalist revolution" to combat the Communist-Marxist or anarchist revolution, but, at the end of the day, it was still a revolution, one that was designed to "dismantle the cumbersome [capitalist] system" and construct a new order based on the individual. A man cannot "be free if he does not live like a man, and he cannot live like a man if the economy is not structured in such a way that millions and millions of men can enjoy life. And the economy cannot be structured without a strong, organizing state, and there cannot be a strong, organizing state that is not at the service of the great unit of destiny that is the fatherland."[114] Or, as he said in another speech:

> As Westerners, Spaniards, and Christians, we must begin with man, with the individual, if we are to construct a new order; we must begin with man and go up through man's organic units. Thus, we move from man to the family, and from the family to the municipality, then on to the syndicate, and finally the state, which is the harmony of them all. This political, historical, and moral vision that we have of the world provides the implicit economic solution: we shall dismantle the economic machine of capitalist ownership that absorbs all the profits, and we shall replace it by individual ownership, family ownership, communal ownership, and syndical ownership.

And that was not all. As well as "reconstructing our people's existence on a base of human material," people had to be given "a collective faith and returned to the supremacy of all that is spiritual. For us, the Fatherland is . . . a unit of destiny." This Fatherland

> is not our spiritual center merely because it is ours, physically ours, but because we have had the incomparable good luck to be born in a Fatherland going by the name of Spain, which has played a major role in universal destiny and can continue to do so. This is why we feel forever united to Spain . . . It does not mean we are Nationalists, for Nationalists have no common sense; it means we attach the deepest spiritual significance to a physical fact, a physical

> circumstance. We are . . . Spaniards, one of the most serious things it is possible to be in this world.[115]

And during his trial, shortly before he was shot, he once again insisted the Falange was not a Nationalist group:

> One of our points . . . states that we regard Spain's historical fulfillment to be the empire. But as Rafael Sánchez Mazas, the leading intellectual of our group, explained in one of his talks,[116] by empire we do not mean an enormous expanse of country. We are not Nationalists. We do not believe a nation is the most important thing in the world simply because it is a unit of territory and certain men and women are born there. We believe a nation is important insofar as it embodies a universal history. So, we see universal values in the destiny expressed by Italy and Germany, as we do in Russia. These are nations. The nations that no longer represent a historical value in universal terms are of no interest to us at all. We do not believe they should be of interest simply because they exist and occupy an area of land. We believe they should have a universal function. Empires are transcendental; they go beyond their borders, their land, their stones, beyond their natural elements.'[117]

In contrast to these ideas was the imminent danger of a left-wing revolution in Spain, which meant the Falange's undertaking was urgent.

Consequently, he proposed a twofold strategy: on the one hand, an uprising or a coup by the Falange to take power; and on the other, a major alliance with all the other right-wing forces at the next general elections in which the FE de las JONS would be guaranteed its autonomy and a sufficient number of candidates. But both strategies were based on a false premise: the Falange was not the force he thought it was. As far as the plans for insurrection were concerned, the Political Board had discussed his first proposal in June 1935 at the Parador Nacional in Gredos.[118] José Antonio had been offered several thousand weapons, and a general—probably José Sanjurjo—was prepared to direct an armed movement based on Falange members and sympathetic military personnel. It was supposed to start in a village in Salamanca—apparently, Fuentes de Oñoro[119]—near the frontier with Portugal, where the general was living in exile, and be the fuse that would spark a Falange- and military-based uprising on a larger scale. All this, however, required the participation of the Civil Guard and the anti-Republican sectors of the Army, so José Antonio got in touch with the Unión Militar Española (Spanish Military Union—UME), the clandestine organization of officers who opposed the regime. They refused to take part

because they regarded the whole enterprise as inviable, and some members were reluctant to get involved if it the Falange was to lead it.

One Political Board member—Alejandro Salazar, national head of the SEU—wrote about the frustration he felt at the time in his diary:

> We came back from Gredos full of an enthusiasm that subsequently turned to disappointment when we found out we had been wasting our time . . . The political situation was clear, as was our attitude. But we didn't manage to get what we wanted. There is always a sense of expectation when you are playing for high stakes. I can understand Rafael [Sánchez Mazas] and José María [Alfaro] waiting expectantly; they are men of letters, quite accustomed to political writing and literary controversies. But I cannot understand José Antonio doing the same. He is an energetic man, a fighter, as young and as spirited as any of the members of our militia.[120]

He mistakenly blamed José Antonio for the failure because he had refused to give up his plan. In fact, in a report he wrote for the Italian Fascists who were funding the Falange, José Antonio referenced the plan (clearly exaggerating the extent of the Falange's forces). He said "the Falange could soon try to take power, however unlikely that may sound just now" because the Left would initiate a revolution after the dissolution of the parliament and the subsequent victory of the Left or because the parliament and the center-right government had to be stopped:

> If the Socialists rise up against the government, the Falange and the Civil Guard could take some towns, maybe even a province, and proclaim the national revolution against an impotent state that has been unable to prevent several revolutions in the country in a year. The government is being made to feel rather awkward by the Socialists and will find it difficult to send the troops against Fascism. And if we have managed to gain the support of the Civil Guard and the military in the occupied territory, then the expeditionary forces will surely sign up to the cause. This plan could easily have been put into practice in October 1934 if the Falange had been as strong as it is now. However Socialist the left-wing government voted into power may be, the whole Army will throw itself into the national rebellion if it is commanded to do so. All the right-wing parties will have their doubts, and the Army won't take the initiative by itself. But the Falange might.[121]

He was quite wrong, as would be seen a few months later when the Army revolted. However, by that time, the commanders whom Minister of War Gil-Robles had appointed no longer wielded any power, and this would go against José Antonio and lead to the Civil War. Even so, José Antonio was not discouraged from planning insurrection and, well aware of his own shortcomings, was constantly seeking the complicity of the armed forces.

For its part, the Army, or at least its most right-wing members, as of the spring of 1936 had no need for any “order for national rebellion.” And when they finally rebelled, it was in response not to instructions given by José Antonio and his party but to José Antonio and his party as their subordinates.

President of the Republic Niceto Alcalá-Zamora was under pressure because, toward the end of 1935, Prime Minister Lerroux, president of the PRR, had been accused of corruption, and Gil-Robles was demanding to be allowed to take over as prime minister. In response to this situation, he asked an independent member of the parliament, Manuel Portela Valladares, to call new elections. The date was set for 16 February 1936. However, before the announcement, and because of the Left’s more-than-likely victory, José Antonio proposed to the Political Board another plan for a Falange uprising just before the elections. In the words of Salazar: “Alcalá-Zamora appoints a new government with Portela as its leader. The Movement engages in new political maneuvering. The issues discussed at Gredos are once again on the table, which raises new hope. Visits, journeys, studies, and the [Political] Board in permanent session.”[122] The plan was for the Falange militias from Madrid and Toledo to gather in Toledo, home to the Infantry Academy headquarters, and from there, with the support of many instructors and cadets from the capital, launch a movement that would immediately be backed by the rest of the party and (it was hoped) by a good part of the Army. But, once again, the plan had to be rejected because the military did not approve it. It had been proposed to acting Colonel José Moscardó, who had passed it on to Chief of the General Staff Franco. Franco rejected it.[123] This time, Salazar’s diary faithfully reflected events and José Antonio’s role in them: “It has all come to nothing! On this occasion, I cannot blame José Antonio. I am sure he was as excited as I was about what could have been the death of us. Julio [Ruiz de Alda], however, did not seem quite so keen. We may have been a little negligent, but we did everything we possibly could.”[124]

At the same time, the party’s *escuadras* had continued their activity, usually consisting of defensive skirmishes that often took place before, after, or during the Falange’s meetings, the sale of press and propaganda, or provocations of their left-wing or separatist adversaries. In April 1935, a Falange member and two Socialists were killed, and on 29 April, there was trouble in the mining town of Aznalcóllar (Seville province), which led to

one death and several injured among the Falange's rank and file and a similar tally among their left-wing opponents. Four Falange members had turned up in Aznalcóllar to sell *Arriba* and had been thrown out by a large group of townspeople. In response, Sancho Dávila, the Falange leader in Seville, had ordered two *escuadras* armed with pistols and cudgels to return, and the ensuing confrontation led to the casualties. José Antonio awarded medals to the participants and, as he was wont to do, personally took charge of the defense of those arrested and charged. Later, in November, two more Seville Falange members were murdered while putting up posters, which prompted José Antonio to say in the parliament that his party had never initiated an aggression:

> For more than a year now, in the streets of Seville, disputes between political groups have been settled with violence. The Falange is proud of the fact that on no occasion has it initiated an attack. We can say we have not been found guilty of a single attack. One day, a workingman, a Falange member, is killed; the whole city knows the Communist Party [of Spain] is responsible; but not a single Communist headquarters is closed down, not one known Communist is punished. Nothing is done.[125]

Although José Antonio alleged that the Falange had never initiated any violence, this did not mean it had not been responsible for acts of revenge or that the "enemy" attacks had not been quite as gratuitous as had been made out. Whatever the case, in this instance the civil governor ended up resigning.[126] Also during this summer, José Antonio may have been the target of an assassination attempt when Communists opened fire on a car that was just like his belonging to a Dr. Luque (who ended up with a minor foot injury) when he was leaving a property belonging to the Marquess of Valdeiglesias in the outskirts of Madrid. The marquess had just hosted one of his regular cocktail parties attended by right-wing figures and leaders—most of whom were from Spanish Action—as well as José Antonio, Sánchez Mazas, and other Falange members.[127] By that time, forty-five Falange members had been "killed in action," and many of their "enemies" had fallen. However, as we shall see, the Falange and anti-Falange violence would not reach its climax until the first half of 1936.

José Antonio's second strategic objective was the launch of a great electoral alliance under the name of the Spanish National Front (Frente Nacional). It was an attempt to rise to the challenge he defined in the following way: "The coming struggle, which may not be electoral but may

be more dramatic than any electoral struggle, will not be a confrontation between the outdated values that we refer to as Left and Right. It will be a confrontation between the grim, threatening Asian front of the Russian Revolution in its Spanish version, and the national front of the generation ready for battle."[128] The alliance was approved during the party's second National Council, held 15–16 November, and announced at the public closing ceremony in the Cine Madrid. He proposed:

> The Bolshevik threat is becoming increasingly real because the Socialist masses are shifting to more extreme positions. To combat this, we must set up not the anti-revolutionary front—because Spain needs a revolution—but the National Front with the following exclusions and demands:
>
> Exclusions. Our generation, which has the responsibility of finding a solution to the present world crisis, can feel no solidarity:
>
> *a)* for historical reasons, with those who use the national flag to harbor reactionary nostalgias for decadent institutions or unjust economic-social systems,
>
> *b)* for ethical reasons, with those who have become accustomed to living their political lives in a corrupt climate.
>
> Demands. The National Front must propose to:
>
> *a)* restore the Spanish people's faith in their unit of destiny and their resolute will to rise again,
>
> *b)* increase in human terms the standard of living of the Spanish people.
>
> The former requires a revival of spiritual values, for so long systematically ignored or deformed, and, above all, an insistence on the concept of Spain as the expression of a community of people with their own destiny, which is not that of every individual, class, or group, but greater than all of them. This economic reconstruction of the life of the people, so necessary for two reasons in these times in which the capitalist order is being wound down, urgently requires:
>
> *a)* a credit reform that may even include the nationalization of the credit service to benefit the economy as a whole, and
>
> *b)* an agrarian reform that defines the arable areas in Spain (in the present and those that may be converted into arable lands in the future after technical intervention). The reform must also allow all land that is unfit for crops to revert to woodland or pasture, and revolutionarily settle (that is to say, with or without compensation) the farming population of Spain in these areas, either in family smallholdings or large, syndicate-managed farms, according to the necessities of our lands.
>
> Anything less than a sincere and austere acceptance of a program of this sort, with all the sacrifice that it involves, will not be a true stand against Bolshevism, which is largely a materialistic interpretation of the world. Rather, it will be a useless, materialist attempt to conserve a social, economic, and historical order that is in its death throes.[129]

The proposal was merely an expression of the party's points of view, so it had little (or no) chance of being accepted by the other right-wing forces. It aimed to distance the CEDA from the Democratic, center-right PRR with

which it had been governing up to then and create a new right-wing group to take on the left-wing Republicans and other left-wing forces that were going to fight the coming elections together in a coalition known as the Popular Front. José Antonio mistakenly understood this joint electoral campaign as the prelude to the Communist revolution. However, his attempt to unite all the right-wing groups with a partly anti-Conservative program was completely utopian (as was his hope of playing a leading role in the venture), so his proposal was ignored.

The right-wing forces were also having considerable difficulties in presenting the joint candidacy—known as the National Front but officially described as "anti-revolutionary" or "counterrevolutionary" (Frente Nacional Anti-revolucionario—FNA)—that Gil-Robles, leader of the coalition's most powerful group, had proposed after the elections had been announced for 16 February 1936. His proposal was a response to the same strategic need as José Antonio's—to unite the right wing and counter the left wing's joint candidacy (an obvious proposal considering the prevailing majority electoral system). Nevertheless, he was unable to agree on a program because of Calvo's demands, one of which was to declare the new parliament a constituent assembly and replace Alcalá-Zamora with a general.[130] Finally, the FNA fought the elections only under the joint slogan "Against the revolution and its accomplices" and without agreeing on all the candidates. They were up against a left wing that, after the repression of the Revolution of October in Asturias and Catalonia, did actually present a united front in the elections under the name Popular Front, of which the ERC became a part. The program was wide ranging and sought not only to revive the reforms that had been interrupted in the two-year period known as the "black biennium" (or second biennium; November 1933–February 1936) but also to extend them. And some extreme sectors of the Left were proposing to raise the stakes and initiate a Socialist revolution. This is what José Antonio saw as the most immediate threat: the rise to power and the revolution of the Communists. As he said in his closing speech of the second National Council:

> And don't think that I am exaggerating. Censorship and other institutions mean we live as if we were wearing rose-tinted glasses, but in some Spanish provinces, there is no censorship, and even where there is, Socialist rallies are held every Sunday. Go to them! And you will see how soft and tolerant the Socialist masses are: they hold their fists high, they acclaim [Francisco] Largo Caballero and [Ramón] González Peña, they glorify the tragedy in Asturias

> and even go so far as to say there was a conspiracy with the separatists. You can see this every Sunday, in all the Communist and Socialist newspapers that are published in Spain. Take a look at this book: *Octubre*. It's an official document signed by the [JSE] president and sets forth the organization's political conclusions. These conclusions require no comment from me. They simply say: "For the bolshevization of the Socialist Party," "for a more centralist party structure with an illegal wing," "for anti-military propaganda," "for the defeat of the bourgeoisie and the victory of the revolution in the form of a proletarian dictatorship" . . . This is the official tone of the young Socialists who are gradually gaining influence because of the party's current state of disarray. This is what awaits the Spanish middle classes and the Spanish workers if the revolution of our Marxists should triumph in one guise or another. And it comes with the Asian, Russian, threat that contradicts the Western, the Christian, and the Spanish way of understanding existence.[131]

In view of Gil-Robles's proposal, José Antonio's came to nothing, although, if truth be told, it would never have stood a chance in any circumstances because of the Falange's insignificance within the right wing. As we can see, however, his fantasy was to hegemonize *his* National Front and organize it around *his* party's program. In the face of this reality, he made harsh criticisms in his press of the other proposal, describing it as a repeat of a right-wing coalition conceived as a "syndicate of vested interests." Even so, despite not being invited to take part, he was prepared for the FE de las JONS to join the FNA, although he would have to make certain (public) conditions. For his part, Gil-Robles was happy to accept some Falange members—José Antonio in particular—but it was clear to him that the Falange's real involvement in the election would be minimal. He also thought, since the Falange was an anti-parliamentarian, combat party, the members would only be interested in having a testimonial presence in the parliament to make themselves heard.

José Antonio made a pompous statement on the issue in which he claimed the Falange played a role in the National Front "full of dignity and with full understanding of its quality as a total movement, imbued from top to bottom with its very own doctrine, structure, and discipline."[132] This was a clear exaggeration, in stark contrast to the possibility of his agreeing to subordinate the Falange to those who had formulated the proposal. His other option was to ignore Gil-Robles's FNA and for the Falange to fight the elections on its own, even though he was fully aware this would be a complete failure and that he would lose his parliamentary seat and the parliamentary immunity it entailed. And he was well aware of the court case that had been hanging over his head since the year before. When José Antonio ordered the Political Board to debate the issue of participating in

the FNA, he stipulated that the Falange's participation depended on having twenty-five to thirty candidates on the joint lists. If this could not be guaranteed, the Falange would fight the elections on its own. The only member to be initially critical of participating in the FNA was Salazar, and, in response, José Antonio attacked him with such fury that he presented his resignation then and there (although Political Board President Ruiz de Alda did not accept it).[133] Before this, they had discussed the questionnaire José Antonio had submitted for debate. It was expressly designed to prompt the affirmative response he hoped to obtain about participation in the alliance, as can be seen simply by reading the questions, the answers to which were a foregone conclusion. For example:

> Is it in the Falange's interests to undergo complete electoral inhibition or to adopt an attitude of absolute independence that will lead to a total absence of representatives in our parliament? Will the lack of a single parliamentary seat mean the Falange will lose a huge amount of influence in Spanish political life, given that public opinion is used to judging the importance of parties by their quantitative or qualitative representation in the parliament?

Or: "Will a possible victory of the Marxist parties allied to the parties of the middle-class Left involve the Falange returning to a period of such severe hardship that it may be in danger of extinction or, at the very least, have its chances of political victory put back many years? Should this factor be borne in mind to put aside, for the moment, our repulsion at the thought of an electoral pact?" And:

> What does the Political Board think of the examples of other parties like our own that, in various countries around Europe, momentarily accepted alliances to combat the threat of Marxism to Nationalistic principles and parties? And does the Political Board believe the Falange circumstantially joining a Nationalist, anti-Marxist coalition, with all the necessary reserves and provisos, would do it lasting harm in public opinion? What do you believe is more serious: this circumstantial setback or the risk that the lack of parliamentary representation would lead to the loss of public faith?

Eventually, they agreed to take part in the great right-wing coalition, and even a repentant Salazar voted in favor. However, they insisted on a high number of candidates on the joint lists, and had José Antonio been more realistic, he would have realized this would cause a problem. In fact, it led to the FNA rejecting the Falange's request to participate. More specifically, according to José Antonio, Gil-Robles offered him three places on the

lists.[134] One was for himself as the candidate for Salamanca, “a safe bet” (i.e., he was sure to be elected), and two others were for Ruiz de Alda in Madrid (with no chance of being elected, because he was the last on the list) and Fernando Primo in Andalusia. José Antonio regarded the offer as unacceptable and was offended they had not found a place for him on the list for Madrid.[135] However, Gil-Robles’s version of his dealings with José Antonio is different and much more credible. He said that, at a first meeting on 14 January 1936, José Antonio had expressed

> the desire for a number of candidates that was clearly not in consonance with the effective force of his party in the country. I was absolutely frank with him about this. Arguing that an anti-parliamentarian group should be able make do with just a few members of the parliament to make their ideas known there and carry out their propaganda, I offered him three seats I thought he would be sure to win and another three I regarded as doubtful. To further improve his chances of being elected, I agreed to accept him as a member of my candidacy for Salamanca [which coincides with José Antonio’s version]. At first he accepted this proposal, but the next day he came to see me at home at eleven o’clock at night and said with great regret that he would have to decline the offer because he needed more places on the lists for the Falange leaders, some of whom were under arrest by court orders. Very delicately, he suggested his colleagues had forced him to reject the proposal with the implicit reproach that he was attempting to guarantee parliamentary immunity for himself and leave them “in the lurch.” “I am sure you will understand,” he said “that I cannot ask you what my friends want me to.”[136]

It seems, then, he was sensitive to the recriminations, or insinuations, of his “comrades.”

Evidently, the Political Board would only accept a minimum of eighteen places. It is particularly striking that José Antonio was prepared to follow the orders of the Political Board, whose function was purely advisory. This subordinate attitude may have been because this issue affected him personally and he did not want to appear to have any privileges, even though he could have imposed his own criteria as National Leader. In fact, the offer of three safe seats, if we believe Gil-Robles, or one or two, if we believe Ximénez de Sandoval, was generous if we consider the Falange’s real influence within the right wing as a whole. This would become quite clear after the elections were held and the votes obtained by the candidates for the FE de las JONS were counted. The election results put the Falange in its place.

Some infighting also occurred during the negotiations. For example, Luca de Tena attempted to replace Giménez Caballero with Ruiz de Alda on

the FNA list,[137] because for much of the year, and against José Antonio's point of view, Gecé had been arguing for the need to politically mobilize employers and employers' organizations, which had earned him considerable popularity in Madrid. Sometime later, Gecé helped set up a political party for entrepreneurs, the Partido Económico de los Patronos Español (Economic Party of Spanish Employers), of which he became a leader, and therefore decided to leave the Falange (although there is some debate about whether José Antonio ousted him). To understand these events, we should bear in mind that, above anything else, Gecé was a businessman in the graphic arts sector and may well have been in financial difficulties. However, instead of attempting to initiate a mobilization of entrepreneurs from within the Falange's CENS, he used his contacts with Calvo's National Block and the financier Juan March, thus obliging Gil-Robles to accept him as a member of the Madrid candidacy of the FNA. This is why the attempts to swap him for Ruiz de Alda on the electoral list failed. According to Luca de Tena, Gecé had criticized "José Antonio's stubbornness and said he was more passionate about the Falange than José Antonio was! No, absolutely not!"

This all meant the always-complicated relations between Gecé and the National Leader had reached their nadir. As Luca de Tena would say to Gecé: "[José Antonio] despised you . . . so much that one day he threw you out of the party, after grabbing you by the lapels and calling you a traitor in the Cafe Universal."[138] Whatever the case, Giménez Caballero was not elected to the parliament, but some months later, he visited the imprisoned José Antonio, who reproached him for his attitude but then readmitted him to the party.[139] Gecé often wrote to him in Alicante, and in 1939, in an attempt to defend himself from the hostility many "comrades" felt for him and to clear his name, he sent Ximénez de Sandoval, who was drafting José Antonio's biography at the time, one of José Antonio's replies. Before that, however, during the first months of the Civil War, he would again have problems with the Falange, led by Manuel Hedilla, until Spain's unification and Franco's single party, in which Gecé would play an important role, and show his heterodoxy and personal idiosyncrasy.

Returning to our discussion of the negotiations, José Antonio and Gil-Robles made a final attempt at an agreement on 7 February 1936, after the latter had refused to give the Falange the number of candidates it wanted on the list and the party had decided to fight the elections on its own. On this

occasion, José Antonio offered to withdraw some of the Falange's candidates so as not to disperse the vote for the Right, as long as the FNA did the same in benefit of the Falange. But, yet again, the agreement was thwarted by the reluctance of other Falange leaders, who flatly refused to accept the deal. To sum up, there was no electoral agreement, and the Falange set its solitary course for failure and its National Leader's loss of immunity.

José Antonio must have been well aware of what was in store for the Falange, because, on day before the elections, he was extremely irritated and was involved in an incident on the telephone with the secretary of the civil governor of Madrid. He had been informed that one of the Falange's *escuadras* had been arrested after entering a branch of the Izquierda Republicana (Republican Left) in search of someone who had been shooting at them. The civil governor was unavailable at that time, and José Antonio had the following dialogue with the secretary:

> This is José Antonio Primo de Rivera . . . Have you got paper and pencil? Well, write this down. José Antonio Primo de Rivera has rung to tell the [bastard of a] governor . . . Yes, yes . . . Write it all down, it's a message from Primo de Rivera . . . No? . . . Well, I haven't finished there . . . What? You're not going to put up with it? . . . I haven't even started yet! . . . Keep writing . . . Please tell the governor from me that he is a . . . [bastard] and if he doesn't immediately release some young lads who have just been arrested, I'll go and do it myself . . . What did you say about impertinence? I can assure you I am not being impertinent; I am being a man! The only impertinent people in Spain these days are still the private secretaries of Portela Valladares's civil governors . . . *Arriba España*!

After he hung up, José Antonio told his comrades: "I don't think I went quite far enough! I still need to get this out of my system. Let's go out onto the streets!"[140] Shortly before, when an *escuadrista*, having rushed from the scene to the Falange headquarters, had told him about the arrest, José Antonio had asked him why he had not been arrested along with the others: "Everyone's been arrested, you say? . . . Not everyone, because you have left the others to their fate and you are here now!" The young man replied: "Well, someone had to come and tell you!" This seemed to please José Antonio, because he responded: "Well, you have just told me. What are you going to do now?" To which the young man said: "I'm going back to where my comrades are. Unless you give me other orders." And when he left, José Antonio said, "I wouldn't give tuppence for the chances of the first Marxist who crosses that lad!"[141]

The electoral campaign was a modest affair during which the party's anthem "Cara al Sol" ("Facing the Sun")—subtitled "The Falange's Song of War and Love"—was used for the first time at a rally at the Cinema Europa in Madrid on 2 February 1936. Juan Tellería Arrizabalaga, a Basque Falange member living in Madrid, had composed the music in 1934 with a different title and no lyrics.[142] On 3 December 1935, José Antonio called a meeting with the musician, who had penned other anthems, operettas, and popular songs, and the party's leading men of letters (i.e., Sánchez Mazas, Alfaro, Foxá, Mourlane, and Ridruejo) at the restaurant Cueva de Orkompon, where they composed most of the lyrics (José Antonio had actually composed his two lines beforehand).[143] To these lyrics, the rest were added, beginning with what would be the first verse, jointly composed by Foxá, José Antonio, and Alfaro ("Facing the sun in my new shirt / that you embroidered in red yesterday / That's how death will find me if it takes me / and I won't see you again"). Foxá composed the second in its entirety ("I'll take my place / alongside my companions / who stand on guard in the heavens / with a hard countenance / they are alive in our effort"), as well as the link with the next verse ("If they tell you that I fell, know that I have gone to my post up above"). The third verse consisted of two lines by Ridruejo ("Victorious flags will return / at the cheerful step of peace") and the two that José Antonio had provided ("and they will bring five roses / the arrows of my quiver"). The fourth and last verses were the work of Alfaro, who contributed the first, third, and fourth lines ("Spring will laugh again / . . . Onward, squadrons, to victory / a new day dawns on Spain!"), and Mourlane, who contributed the second ("which we await by air, land, and sea"). From this point on, the anthem was always sung at Falange events, including funerals for the "fallen," the numbers of which would steadily grow over the following months.[144]

The party held dozens of electoral rallies throughout the country, although its results were by no means proportional to the effort made. And, as expected, not a single Falange member was elected. The party as a whole obtained 46,466 votes, which was 0.4 percent of all the votes cast in Spain. José Antonio got the most votes at 7,499 (4.6 percent) in Cadiz, while he got 4,995 (1.2 percent) in Madrid. Ruiz de Alda got 2,930 (1.9 percent) in Santander; Redondo, 5,435 (4.5 percent) in Valladolid; and Fernández-Cuesta, 6,136 (2.2 percent) in Jaén.[145] If we compare these votes with the total number of members in all party sections (about twenty-five thousand

throughout the country, many of whom were too young to vote) and of the activists (of whom there may have been about eight thousand), we can seen the FE de las JONS had been incapable of going beyond the confines of the party itself and reaching significant sectors of public opinion.[146] The FNA obtained 124 seats, but the real victor was the Popular Front, which obtained 278 seats.[147]

José Antonio was extremely hurt by the electoral defeat and the bad result for the party. And he was very upset with the other right-wing parties for having been unable to agree to a pact with the Falange. He was particularly upset with the Alfonsists because, just two days before the elections and after lamenting the Falange's exclusion from the candidacy of the FNA for Madrid, *ABC* had asked the Falange leaders to withdraw all their candidates to reinforce the FNA's chances of success. They made this request "in all cordiality and in the highest patriotic spirit": "We appeal to the noble sentiments of the Falange to generously renounce the interests of their party, however legitimate and just these may be—precisely for this reason, it must be seen as a new service to Spain—and leave the field free for the anti-revolutionary front. Their valuable contribution and their quota of the votes will be a magnificent addition to a right-wing majority but will not in itself be sufficient to defeat the revolution."[148] The request had not been accompanied by any offer of compensation.

José Antonio was also upset with the Catholic Right. On 17 February 1936, he said to *La Voz*: "I was sorry the huge poster of Gil-Robles in the Puerta del Sol was taken down so soon. It should have been left there for another three days so that Spain could have learned its lesson and been reminded of its shame. It would have been burned by the mob."[149] From this moment on, he devoted himself to making the decision to fight the elections alone seem like a feather in the Falange's cap and not just a failed attempt to enter into a pact. Thus, one week after the elections, he wrote in *Arriba*:

> Our attitude in the electoral struggle gives us cause to congratulate ourselves a thousand and one times. We have saved ourselves from the collapse of the right wing. We went into battle on our own . . . The Right almost threatened those who voted for us with excommunication . . . , they resorted to the dirtiest tricks: they did not stop asking us to withdraw until the very last minute; they took votes off us when the count was not overseen by one of our auditors.[150]

But it had been Salazar, not José Antonio, who had proposed that the Falange fight the elections on its own, although this was not common

knowledge outside the party.

Around this time, José Antonio revived an argument he had developed in October 1935 and was especially bothersome to the right wing in general and the extreme right wing in particular: Azaña's "second chance." With this argument, he reinforced his independent position, which he believed would be useful for him in the coming months, but, above all, after Azaña's first speech as the new prime minister (on 20 February 1936), it gave him a certain margin for maneuver. Deep down, José Antonio admired Azaña as a political figure. Although, in the previous October, he had criticized the 1931–1933 administration and predicted (as others did) that Azaña would return to power, he was much more hopeful (albeit only briefly) after the elections when the prime minister announced his objectives for this new period. José Antonio had written in *Arriba* the previous autumn:

> If after their victory in 1933 the right wing had communicated any real message to Spain, the failed Caesar [Azaña] of the April revolution [1931] would never again have raised his head. But it makes no sense to seek precedents for greater clumsiness than that of the Spanish Right. Instead of wiping out the memory of the enemy with deeds and deep and long-lasting results for all to see, all they have done is keep the memory of the enemy alive with a constant campaign of crude and vicious slander [a reference to the attempts to implicate him in the events of October 1934] and lie in a stupor of inactivity that is unforgivable at times of revolution like the present. The policy of the second biennium (the Stupid Biennium, as it has been referred to in these columns) has been to uselessly conserve everything that might bring joy to our futures. The policy is a hybrid one. It is not completely secular, so as not to offend the Catholics, but it is not based on religious feeling, so as not to upset the radical priest haters. It is not generous in social issues, so as not to alienate the self-interest of the well-entrenched country leaders, but it is not totally free of the occasional Christian-Democrat Platonic declaration, by that restless canonist Mr. Jiménez [*sic*] [Fernández]. And, of course, in contrast to all this, we have the figure of Azaña, of the great occasion missed, who was beginning to look his age . . . So, quite exceptionally, Azaña is going to have two decisive opportunities in his life: the first was the first biennium; the next will be in 1936.

José Antonio said this failed "Caesar of the October Revolution," the man responsible for "a monstrous policy" that, "for those who could not appreciate the aesthetic complexity it enshrouded was a sort of diabolical, unintelligible torture," was to blame for making Spain pass through the hands of a "dictator as if through those of an Asian masseur, at once both fascinated and tormented." On the day he left office, he said, the country felt the relief of someone who can rest once again. He had also predicted that when Azaña returned to power, "despite the protests of the masses, he would once again have the Caesarian opportunity to fulfill the revolutionary

destiny that has elected him on two occasions. So, yet again, broad and virginal Spain, full of fear and hope, will entrust him with discovering her secret." Only if he found this secret "would his message be loud enough to be heard above the roaring of the red mob who had raised him to the heights." Nevertheless, he was convinced Azaña would not hit upon this "secret" and would either hand himself over "to the mob, who would treat him like a servile wretch," or "oppose it without having the authority for such a task, and both he and Spain would be overwhelmed."[151] This had been José Antonio's verdict in October, but, after Azaña's electoral victory, he saw him as the last remaining hope of a Nationalist/anti-separatist/anti-Marxist revolution (even above his own, Fascist option). He showered him no longer with insults but with praise.

In his first speech as prime minister, Azaña had announced that, "with the participation of the parliament, we shall implement the great task of national restoration, in defense of work and production and focusing on the problem of unemployment." He also ensured that "he felt no desire for persecution or revenge" and added: "The responsibility of power bears no grudges. The government will undertake no persecution as long as everybody stays within the law."[152] In response to these statements, José Antonio wrote:

> Azaña has been given a second chance. He is not quite as fresh as 14 April, but he is surrounded by considerable popular hope. However, he is confronted by two terrible dangers: separatism and Marxism. The infinitely delicate operation Azaña must carry out is this: gain a broad national base that is neither separatist nor Marxist, which will allow him to be free of those who give him their support in return for some influence over him. That is to say, he must change from being the leader of a faction—unjust like all factions—and become the head of the Government of Spain. This does not mean—God forbid!— he should become a Conservative governor: Spain's revolution is still pending, and he must bring it about. But he must bring it about—and this is the crucial point—with his heart and soul at the service of the destiny of Spain, not of the grudges of any particular group. If Azaña is skillful enough—and on many previous occasions we have spoken of his exceptional talents—and he can design a government that is up to the task before him, he may occupy an enviable place in the history of our times . . . Spain can no longer put off her national revolution. Will Azaña bring it about? Ah, if only! But if he does not, if he is toppled by the Marxist hordes or if he should relapse into right-wing sterility, then there will be only one solution: ours. The time will be perfectly, gloriously ripe for the National Syndicalist Falange.[153]

These opinions astonished many of his fellow party members. Salazar, who was quite able to express opinions of his own, discussed the change in José Antonio in his diary:

> José Antonio is unrecognizable. He has told us he has blind faith in Azaña. He believes his task is to bring about national revolution. Of course, I much prefer Azaña's government to the previous one because at least it has real talent, not lack of confidence and half-heartedness. The problem is that he has never had real faith in his work. He cannot go it alone. If he seeks the support of the Right, within the year he will have become just another Lerroux and will betray the Republican cause. If he carries on as he is doing, he will have to do what he is told by the Marxists. I noticed a great deal of coldness in the [Political] Board today. I'm not very sure what it was due to. I was not expecting it. Everything that has been happening these days has given me too much food for thought. And I have even gone so far as to think about giving up politics. And despite what José Antonio thinks, I feel certain we are now about to embark on a period of real persecution. Several of our men have been killed in the last few days, and José Antonio has not reacted like he used to. I think the elections have been a bitter blow for him. He was expecting to get at least thirty-five thousand votes in Madrid, and we only managed five thousand. And we didn't get a single seat in the parliament. I can see he is down, perhaps because he is worried, but I cannot even begin to understand what is happening to us at this time. Never for one moment did I believe the Falange would be rejected.[154]

However, the National Leader's opinion of Azaña and the hopes he had deposited in him would soon change. Just two weeks after the elections, he started to question the policy of the new government and, bearing in mind the steady advance of the left-wing groups toward revolution, wondered whether the prime minister had the same "vocation as Kerensky."[155] In his heart, however, his beliefs and expectations persisted, and shortly before he was sentenced and shot, the script he wrote for his defense recalled his "attitude after the elections: 'What had to happen happened.' Afterward, there was hopeful expectation and the keen desire to make the right decisions."[156] In the period immediately after the elections, he may have used the mediation of Juan Negrín, the Socialist professor of physiology at the Central University of Madrid who would eventually be prime minister during the Civil War, to approach Prieto. He suggested the Falange merge with the (alleged) "national" wing of the PSOE and that Indalecio himself be the leader of the resulting movement. His efforts were to no avail.[157] Whatever the case, José Antonio's admiration for Azaña did not wane, and in late May 1936 José Antonio published an article in the underground Falange newspaper *Aquí Estamos* about the (again alleged) coincidences between one of Azaña's speeches and the Falange ideology. The article was somewhat hopefully entitled "Prieto Draws Closer to the Falange."[158]

At this time, the main dangers threatening the FE de las JONS were the imminent trial of its leader and, above all, the fierce repression to which it was subjected. The first of these dangers was soon overcome: the Popular Front government immediately announced an amnesty, which included José

Antonio, so he was spared from being hauled before a court. He attempted to avoid the second danger by ordering the party's militia to limit the activities of their squadrons so that they could continue to function without having to go underground. But these dangers aside, and after the very short period of hope generated by Azaña's policies, he continued work on preparing a Falange uprising. However, the limitation he imposed on direct terrorist action was extremely short lived and absolutely useless, because the far right wing had already been responsible for various incidents. The Ministry of the Interior soon started to take defensive-repressive measures, particularly against the Falange. On 27 February 1936, just eleven days after the elections, the Falange was accused of illegal possession of arms and had its headquarters in Madrid closed. Shortly afterward, on 5 March, the police confiscated the weekly newspaper *Arriba* at its points of sale. It would never again be published.

In conjunction with Carlists, Alfonsists, and other far right-wing groups, the Falange launched a full-scale wave of clashes with young Socialists and Communists, raising the tension in the streets of cities and towns all over the country to unprecedented heights. The Falange played a leading role in the troubles, although other left- and right-wing groups also took direct action. According to Eduardo González Calleja, "Although it is true that the first Falange members were killed before they got involved in the homicidal violence of a terrorist nature, it is also true that the first of the 'fallen' after the elections were killed in an increasing escalation of provocations" (by Falange members).[159] Various incidents aroused the left wing's wrath and sparked attacks on right-wing headquarters and church arson. Before José Antonio gave the order to take reprisals, the FE de las JONS squadrons suffered five fatal casualties in Seville and four between Puebla de Almoradiel (Toledo province), Yecla, and Murcia in March. Of course, the Falange also killed various leftists. On 6 March, the Falange suffered two more deaths in Madrid. In reprisal, they killed a Socialist. Five days afterward, also in the capital, the Falange member Juan José Olano—an SEU leader at the Faculty of Law—was killed, and a Carlist was seriously injured. The next day, in response, a murder took place that would rock the party. On 12 March, the SEU attempted to kill a Socialist professor from the same faculty as Olano, Luis Jiménez de Asúa, an old acquaintance and teacher of José Antonio's, and an opponent of the dictatorship. Guillermo Aznar (brother of Agustín), Alberto Ortega (who was sentenced to a long

stretch in prison), and two other SEU members[160] opened fire with a machine gun on the professor and his escort. Jiménez de Asúa got out of it unscathed, but his police escort Jesús Gisbert died. This incident had enormous repercussions in the capital. Almost one hundred thousand people attended Gisbert's funeral, during which shots were fired, and the premises of *La Nación* and two churches were burned down.[161] The French authorities arrested and repatriated the assassins after Ansaldo had flown them out of the country at the request of José Antonio's brother, Miguel Primo.[162] Two days later, on 14 March 1936, José Antonio was arrested, as were other Political Board members such as Ruiz de Alda and Fernández-Cuesta, accused of breaking the police tape at the party's headquarters. He would never set foot in the street again.

He and his colleagues were taken to the cells in the Directorate General of Security, where the members of the parliament the Count of Vallellano, Serrano Suñer, and Goicoechea visited him. As a joke, José Antonio told Goicoechea he had not broken the police tape but that it had been Director of Security José Alonso Mallol "with his horns."[163] The guard overheard and reported it, which led to one of the many lawsuits that would be filed against José Antonio in the coming months. In a manifesto he drafted, apparently in these very cells, which were "horrific, comparable to the prisons in the Middle Ages," he gave a portrayal of a political situation in which the Communists controlled the government and the country:

> Russia has won the elections. It has only fifteen members of the parliament, but the cries, the salutes, the street protests, the colors, and the emblems are typically Communist. And Communism rules the streets. These last few days, the Communist combat groups have set on fire hundreds of houses, factories, and churches; they have committed cowardly murders, they have dismissed and appointed authorities. And the poor members of the middle classes, who like to think they are ministers, have done little more than conceal these outrages using the censorship of the press.[164]

From the cells, he was taken with all the others to the magistrates' court in Las Salesas, where Goicoechea again visited him. There, he was accused of being the leader of a party that, according to its program, was a threat to the constitutional system, and he and his Falange colleagues were charged with illicit association and taken to La Modelo prison. He was given a room (not a cell) in the prison gallery for politicians that had previously been occupied by the PSOE leader Francisco Largo Caballero after the events of October

1934.[165] The government had especially refurbished the gallery to accommodate Largo and other leading politicians, and the rooms had many more comforts than the cells did.[166] But things did not stop here. After new Falange-related incidents had taken place in Logroño and Albacete, a judge provisionally suspended the activities of the FE de las JONS and ordered all its headquarters to be closed. José Antonio's response was to order the Falange to go underground and for the squadrons to renew their activity, the result of which in the following weeks and months was the prisons of Spain filling up with more party activists, from the Primera Línea in particular, the most active members of the militias. Paradoxically, it was precisely at this time that the number of members started to grow significantly.

The spiral of Falange terrorism continued, and there was a failed assassination attempt on Largo (which had apparently gone ahead, despite José Antonio's opposition)[167] in which gunmen had opened fire on his house, as they also did with Eduardo Ortega y Gasset. On 13 April, they assassinated the magistrate of the Provincial Court of Madrid, Manuel Pedregal, who had just ordered the sentence that condemned Alberto Ortega, one of the squadron members.[168] Three days later, the Falange members who were bearing the coffin of a guard who had been killed by left-wing groups were attacked; six men were killed and thirty-two injured, and one of the victims was José Antonio's first cousin. In early May, the murder of another Falange member in Carrión de los Condes ended up with the president of the Casa del Pueblo (the local Socialist headquarters) and several other Socialists being lynched. In Madrid, Captain Carlos Faraudo, who trained the JSE in his free time, was murdered. Gangs looking for Socialists assaulted taverns with knives and pistols. And there was a wide range of other incidents, all initiated by the Falange or in reprisal for attacks against it, in an escalation of violence that it hoped would destabilize the government and the Republican regime.

Minister of the Interior Santiago Casares Quiroga had already announced in the parliament that the Falange was the government's worst enemy. And he reaffirmed it—this time without mentioning the Falange by name—on the next 19 May when he was appointed prime minister:

> There is no more time for niceties with the enemies of the Republic, whether they be out in the open or hiding in the shadows . . . Some time ago now I said I was not prepared to tolerate a civil war. When a Fascist movement—and I say Fascist without mentioning exactly which group I am referring to because we all know what Fascism is and what the Fascist

> organizations are—attempts to attack the Democratic Republic and all the things we have achieved alongside the proletariat . . . well, enough is enough! I cannot remain on the margin of these struggles and I tell you, gentlemen of the Popular Front, the government will be belligerent against Fascism.[169]

And he kept his word. He did not ignore the other right-wing forces, but he was particularly belligerent with the Falange. It was the only party to have all its headquarters closed and all its publications banned.

But there was no stopping the Falange now. As the violence continued to escalate, the right-wing group caused most deaths, particularly among Socialists and Communists,[170] who were most committed to combating Fascism. Although José Antonio claimed some months later in his trial that, between the time the Falange was founded and the end of the period just before the outbreak of the Civil War, the party had suffered seventy-five casualties,[171] a recent calculation has provided a much higher figure: sixty-seven deaths during the period of the Popular Front and forty-one during the previous biennium. In turn, the Falange was responsible for the death of sixty-four members of left-wing groups, mainly Socialists and Communists.[172] The government believed dismantling the Falange would end much of the violence. In this respect, it was being naive on three counts: first, because the FE de las JONS was growing and would continue the struggle as an underground movement; second, because far right-wing violence was not limited to the Falange; and last but by no means least, because the violence perpetrated by some sections of the Left was not a mere response to Falange provocation but had its very own raison d’être. The right-wing sectors believed (and to some extent, they may have been right) the repressive policies were more indulgent with the actions perpetrated by the left-wing organizations of the Popular Front than with those of the right wing, although the CNT was a case apart. But the Falange was clearly the government’s real bête noire. The government was constantly acting under the pressure of knowing that a right-wing military coup was being prepared, and was taking a great deal of time and trouble (fruitlessly as it turned out) to stop it.

To sum up, the Falange was making a considerable contribution to the deterioration of law and order in an attempt to create political instability, in a political context that in itself was one of extreme conflict. The party was convinced a Communist revolution was imminent and that a coup was the only way to prevent it. But, exactly what was the nature of this conflict?

And was Spain really on the threshold of a revolution that could only be stopped by a "Spain-saving" coup? As far as the first question is concerned, between the victory of the Popular Front in February and the coup in July—the failure of which led to the outbreak of the Civil War—law and order deteriorated considerably throughout the country. The violence did not reach the heights of October 1934, but, even so, it was of great virulence. As González Calleja has explained, the instability was used for propaganda purposes: "The right-wing groups were constantly using the alleged chaos in which the country was immersed to justify their own radicalization and, when it came down to it, the need for the armed forces to intervene and save the situation."[173] At this point, the masses of the Popular Front were impatient to bring back and extend the first biennium's agrarian and labor reforms, and some sectors wanted to push ahead with the revolution. In counter position, the right wing was set on destroying the Republic through provocative action, while some sectors of the Army were conspiring to the same end.

This social and political conflict took various forms[174] and included changes in municipal corporations that were not always peaceful: "Prisons and political headquarters were stormed, buildings were burned down, and there were fires, skirmishes, and riots. The revenge of those who had suffered reprisals in October was expressed in the form of disorderly protests and rebellions."[175] There were attacks on right-wing party headquarters and newspapers, groups of property owners, Conservatives, and/or Catholics, and churches and convents were burned and ransacked. Apparently, some of these anticlerical actions were a reaction to provocation by the Falange, and in the country as a whole, 153 religious buildings were damaged or destroyed.[176] Although no priests or members of religious orders were actually murdered, some were harassed or expelled from their places of worship, which has been interpreted as the counterpoint to the closure of the Socialist Casas del Pueblo during the previous biennium.[177] All forms of religious expression outside established places of worship were prohibited.

Another source of conflict with employers, owners, and current workers were the measures taken to readmit workers who had been sacked for political reasons in the previous biennium (because the workers who had lost their jobs demanded that the workers who had replaced them be dismissed). The soldiers who had been expelled from the Army were

causing a similar controversy with the rest of the Army.[178] Rural Spain was undergoing a new wave of conflict. Without waiting for the agricultural reform promised by the Popular Front, agricultural workers invaded farms and demanded that their employers guarantee them a wage. If they were refused, they just took them over. The reform finally arrived, and, between the electoral victory and the outbreak of war, seven times more land was distributed than in the whole of the Republican period up to that point. Even so, given the magnitude of the problem of the landless peasants, the measures were still insufficient. The local Casas del Pueblo also started to regulate the duration of the workday, the number of day laborers who could work, and wages, all independently of what the farm owners might think, which prompted many of them to flee and abandon their properties. As Edward Malefakis once said, "The victory of the Popular Front authorized the workers, on many occasions, to impose their will with complete impunity."[179] And although the government did what it could to ensure the law was obeyed, it was often not successful. Among other measures, regulations were introduced on the collection of unlicensed weapons, but the results were highly variable because of the enormous numbers of weapons in circulation.

The government also made up for the relatively small numbers of police by enrolling activists from the parties of the Popular Front as auxiliary forces (just as the right-wing parties had done in the previous biennium). They often acted in a highly sectarian way. In the words of González Calleja: "It is true that the Popular Front executives gave too much autonomy to certain governmental authorities, police chiefs, and local authorities to carry out selective repressive actions, and this soon had to be stopped when the inevitable abuses were detected." However, González Calleja also believes (and I agree) fewer restrictions were placed on individual freedom in this period than after October 1934 in terms of arrests and the closing of party headquarters and newspapers, with the exception of the treatment that was dished out to José Antonio's FE de la JONS.[180]

Lawlessness was the order of the day. In late May and early June, proposals were made—by Felipe Sánchez Román[181] and Miguel Maura[182]—to set up a national unity government that would legislate by decree to eliminate the armed militias of all parties and therefore end this untenable situation. As we shall see, one of these may have been the inspiration behind José Antonio's own proposal shortly after the outbreak of the Civil

War. In any case, the escalation of violence reached its peak in July. The final straw was the murder, allegedly by a left-wing group member, of Civil Guard Second Lieutenant Anastasio de los Reyes when he was on duty near the presidential stand during the commemorative parade on 14 April. His funeral was attended by all sorts of members of the Right—and sparked off a series of severe incidents involving several deaths in the streets and an attempt to storm the parliament building. In these incidents, José del Castillo played a leading role. He was an Assault Guard lieutenant, a PSOE member, and a JSE trainer who had been expelled from the Army for refusing to take part in the Asturian repression two years before. On 12 July, he was murdered, apparently by a group of Carlists.[183] And on the next day, in reprisal, Calvo was killed by several assault guards commanded by a Civil Guard officer, Captain Fernando Condés of the PSOE.[184] They killed Calvo merely because they had been unable to find Gil-Robles and because José Antonio's younger brother Fernando had been arrested by a colleague of his from the cavalry on secondment to the Assault Guard and locked up in La Modelo for his own protection.[185]

Calvo's was a turning point in the country's increasing lawlessness. It proved to be a catalyst for the coup the Army had been preparing for several months, because it was the event that finally determined which generals and officers (Franco, for example) would take part and made a decisive contribution to the climate of exasperation in some Conservative, Catholic, and right-wing sectors of the country. Among these were the rural middle classes and the urban middle-lower classes, as well as the Catholic workers who had become increasingly convinced the government was not protecting the rights of all citizens alike but was acting with a bias toward the Left. Calvo's murder was the last straw. It was definitive proof for some of the need for a coup to bring down the Popular Front government and even the Republic itself because the involvement of members of the forces of law and order in the murder did much to delegitimize the government. And the government's lack of a firm response only increased this feeling. Condés, for example, was never arrested, despite Calvo's widow recognizing him as the leader of the group that had taken her husband from his home.

One example of the climate prevailing in these sectors and the advance of Fascism is the following text by the Conservative Catalan journalist Agustí Calvet Pascual (aka Gaziel):

> How many votes did the Fascists get at the last Spanish elections? Hardly any: a ridiculous number. But today, travelers coming from Spanish lands are saying, “Everybody’s turning Fascist there.” What sort of change is this? What’s happening is quite simple: they cannot live there; there is no government . . . And in this situation, they are instinctively looking for a way out . . . What is the political form that will radically end these unbearable excesses? Dictatorship, Fascism. This is why people are beginning to “feel” Fascist without really wanting to, without realizing it. Of course, they know nothing of the drawbacks of dictatorship. Although they soon found out when they had to put up with one. In both Spain and France, Fascism is the deadly shadow that democracy itself casts across the country when its internal decomposition converts it into anarchy. The greater the corruption is, the longer the shadow becomes. And the bewildering preoccupation that the victorious Popular Front feels for the Fascism that has been conquered is little more, therefore, than the fear of that shadow.[186]

And what about the question of whether Spain was really on the brink of Communist revolution? Well, it does not seem that it was. Even so, the Left—in particular, the sector of the PSOE that was close to Largo and opposed the more moderate Prieto and Julián Besteiro—and the leaders of the Juventudes Socialistas Unificadas (Unified Socialist Youth) were constantly appealing to the “revolution” or the “dictatorship of the proletariat.” They did not limit themselves to appeals, however; they also called for action, which proved to be of considerable violence and alarmed the right-wing, Conservative, and Catholic groups. Apparently, Largo’s group was expecting a right-wing coup, after which he believed in the possibility of a brief civil war and subsequently a Socialist Republic. However, he had made no specific revolutionary plans for his party’s forces while attempting to merge with the Communists. Prieto opposed these ideas and was in control of some of the party apparatus. According to Fernando del Rey:

> The failure and the repression of October fueled a spirit of revenge that radicalized the political activity of the workers’ Left like never before. [Largo] Caballero’s group took up its position in the vanguard of this radicalization and were was responsible for hundreds of episodes that were as violently revolutionary and fragmented as they were sterile, but deeply damaging to the Republican regime. Clearly, he did not convert his revolutionary discourse into a real project between February and July 1936. But since they often went against the law, this discourse and its practical aspects generated fear in considerable sectors of the population, weakened the government, and, for many of his contemporaries, legitimated the plots of the extreme right and the military agitators.[187]

For his part, Prieto did not believe Spain was on the brink of revolution, and at a rally held in March, he said: “At this time, there is no more revolutionary spirit than in 1934, although perhaps there is a little more

show. And the fact that our core organizations are constantly swelling in numbers does not mean our revolutionary capacity has increased, because that requires a political education that cannot be improvised."[188] He showed he was open to reinforcing Republican structures and had agreed to be Azaña's substitute after he had moved on to the presidency of the Republic, although Largo had frustrated this attempt at governmental collaboration between the Republican Left and the PSOE during the regime's first biennium.

The CNT Anarcho-syndicalists, who had launched two revolutionary movements between 1931 and 1933 and taken a leading role in Asturias, were not preparing their revolution at this time either.[189] They had played a major part in the strikes that had been called and in the occupation of farms, but they never forgot their ultimate aim was their libertarian revolution, which was diametrically opposed to the proletariat dictatorship that was the aim of Largo's group and the Communists. The leading representatives of Communism in the country, the PCE, were focused more on anti-Fascist pacts than on the proletarian revolution, although, of course, they did not give up on it completely and believed the Popular Front's time in power would simply be a transitional period in this direction.[190] Since 1935, they had had to adopt the Popular Front policy of the seventh World Congress of the Communist International, which gave priority to alliances with other left-wing groups (even the middle-class ones) in these anti-Fascist alliances. To sum up, then, the Communist revolution was not imminent in Spain, but the political and social situation had deteriorated considerably, and radical left-wing speeches delivered in revolutionary terms were the order of the day. However, the fact that it was not being prepared does not mean the revolution was not a central part of the strategies of the most radical sector of the PSOE, the CNT, and the PCE or that many of their Conservative, Catholic, and right-wing opponents did not really believe it was imminent. José Antonio was one of those who believed it was, and in some speeches, he reproduced paragraphs from left-wing articles to prove his point. However, paradoxically, the failure of the coup on 18 July did actually trigger a revolution.

Returning to José Antonio, he directed—or, in some specific cases, held back—the Falange's escalation of violence from prison in Madrid and attempted to plan his own uprising. Just after he had been arrested in March, he had attempted to arrange an interview in Rome between his

brother Miguel and Mussolini through the mediation of a friend, the aeronautical military attaché at the Italian embassy in Madrid. However, he was unsuccessful because of the opposition of the ambassador, Orazio Pedrazzi, who did not believe the encounter would be useful.[191] Despite this, now there was no holding back José Antonio and the rest of the party, and it seemed they had gone beyond the point of no return. His "number two," and prison mate, Political Board President Ruiz de Alda wrote in *No Importa* in early June:

> It is indecent to try to drug a whole nation with the lure of peaceful solutions. THERE ARE NO PEACEFUL SOLUTIONS ANY LONGER. War has been declared, and it is the government that took the first belligerent steps. This is not the triumph of just another party in the peaceful terrain of democracy; it is the triumph of the October revolution, the separatist revolution in Barcelona and the Communist revolution in Asturias, the murder of Captain Suárez by the traitor [Enrique] Pérez Farrás, and the burning down of the University of Oviedo.[192]

Before the elections, José Antonio had asked the Political Board if the risk of a "victory of the Marxist parties allied to the parties of the middle-class Left" would mean "the Falange returning to a period of such severe hardship that it may be in danger of extinction or, at the very least, have its chances of political victory put back many years." This prediction had only partly come true. Although the party was subject to considerable repression and many of its leaders (including him) had been imprisoned, what the Falange had always been seeking was beginning to take place. The number of grassroots members was increasing in leaps and bounds because people were starting to see the Fascist party, as well as the use of violence, as the only chance of getting the Left out of power and ending the increasing radicalization of the leftist groups. The new members were certainly joining to fight "against" rather than because they were familiar with the Falange-Fascist ideology, but, even so, the party now had considerably more members than ever before.

As far as we know, the new members either had no previous political affiliation or came from the CEDA, which had failed in its "gradual" strategy. As Alfonso Lazo and José Antonio Parejo Fernández have shown in various areas of the province of Seville, most members who joined the underground Falange had no previous history of political activity and came from different (but mainly working) classes[193] They were joining because

they perceived the Falange as the most likely option for bringing down the Popular Front government or the Republican regime itself. Likewise, other areas of the country had plenty of proof that young people belonging to organizations such as the JAP were becoming disenchanted with the failure of Gil-Robles to take power and were changing their allegiance to the Falange.[194] To a lesser extent, they were also changing to the Traditionalist Communion, although the size and distribution of this shift has yet to be studied.[195] The paradox about this significant growth in party membership was that it was taking place in completely irregular circumstances: none of its headquarters were open, it had no authorized press, and most of its leaders were in prison.

The difficulties José Antonio and his imprisoned colleagues had in running the party were somewhat offset by the permissiveness of the legislation and the Republican penitentiary practices, which gave prisoners considerable freedom in terms of visits, correspondence, receipt of mail, and so on. Even so, José Antonio needed a lieutenant on the outside who he could trust completely. He found one (significantly, because perhaps it meant he had no other options) in the person of his little brother Fernando, who became the true "number two" of the organization. And like that of José Antonio, his involvement would cost him his life. José Antonio was encouraged by the party growth, but he also must have been aware that the immense majority of the recent arrivals had little or no understanding of the Falange doctrine. They were joining the most belligerent of the anti-Left militias, certainly, but they had no knowledge of the ins and outs of the Fascist program they were defending. The Falange was beginning to acquire critical mass and therefore was surely aware of the extreme difficulty of launching a coup that would bring down the Popular Front government, halt the allegedly imminent Communist revolution, and set up a Falange regime. The Army (or at least part of it) did have this capacity. So, he got in touch with the Army in writing, convinced that Spain needed a coup, and with the secret intention that he and the Falange could take power through this route. He wrote the clandestine "Letter to the Soldiers of Spain" in La Modelo on 4 May 1936 and sent it to the guardrooms of military barracks, although it is not clear exactly how effective the system of distribution was.

In the letter, he appealed for officers to collaborate in a coup and compared the Republic's alleged treatment of the Army with the

persecution of the Falange. He did not specify his final aim (the taking of power) but stressed the need to work together to “save Spain”:

> When you hand down the uniforms you wear to your sons, you will also pass on to them the shame of saying, “When my father wore this uniform, Spain as we knew it ceased to exist,” or the pride of recalling that “Spain did not disintegrate because my father and his brothers in arms saved her at the decisive moment.” If you respond to my call, as the ancient oath says, may God reward you, and if you do not, may God call you to account. *ARRIBA ESPAÑA*![196]

Although the FE de las JONS had gained in stature, it was still incapable of organizing an uprising and leading an insurrectional movement. In fact, the next step, much against José Antonio’s wishes, was to agree to join the military coup that had been in the preparation stage since March under generals such as Sanjurjo (who was set to become the supreme leader), Franco, Luis Orgaz Yoldi, Manuel Goded, and Emilio Mola (the real organizer, who was known by his fellow conspirers as “the director”). Many of those involved were Alfonsist monarchists who were open to the idea of incorporating civilians as subordinate auxiliary troops. Even so, one demand that José Antonio made to Mola was that power be handed over to the Falange after they were victorious. Mola, of course, refused. This attempt, however, was further proof of his error of judgment, which was based more on his passion than on a realistic notion of the party’s strength and effective influence, even though it was not as meager as it had used to be.

In the negotiations with the military, José Antonio also used people from outside the party, such as Goicoechea, a friend and Spanish Renewal leader, who acted in his name to speak to the coup leaders who could not visit him in prison. On behalf of his own party and José Antonio, and as an active member of the military plot, he attempted to get Mussolini to donate at least a million pesetas to convince those members of the military high command who feared for their own future and that of their families in the event the coup should fail. Mussolini refused. José Antonio had written to Goicoechea—when he had asked him to be his representative—that, he, like him, was aware of “Spain’s tragic situation”:

> I believe it is now urgent for extraordinary solutions to be found. The fact that I am imprisoned prevents me from doing many things, although leading the Movement [the Falange] is not one of them. It is growing by the day, quite efficiently. If you could act on my behalf in my

> dealings with those who cannot come and visit me, I would be most grateful because I have all the proof I need of your loyalty as a friend.[197]

The report he wrote on 14 June to ask Mussolini for economic help contained significant snippets about the Falange and, in general, his intentions and the difficulties encountered by the civilian conspirers:

> The victory of the Popular Front means the failure of the populist policies of Mr. Gil-Robles, and his accessionist and legal tactics. This is clearly shown at all times by the clear condemnation of public opinion. So, because the legal authority is in the hands of the Revolution and the country is in vital need of extricating itself from this anarchic situation, there is no option other than that of brute force or violent insurrection . . . Spain finds itself in the real situation of an inorganic and sporadic civil war presided over by a government whose last remaining reserves of strength are being used to facilitate the task of the revolution by weakening the state's defensive bodies and persecuting the very social classes the Revolution aims to destroy . . . The atmosphere of violence and the inevitable need to organize it has given rise to small groups of direct action within the national parties that have carried out attacks on people and buildings in order to combat the Revolution. Many of these groups are referred to as "Fascist," and it is well known that the number of young people who have registered with the organizations of the Falange has increased considerably. This text has been written with the agreement and the authorization of the leaders of the Falange and the parties similar to the National Front.

Nevertheless:

> For the moment, all this effort has not succeeded in mobilizing great masses of civilian troops because there is a lack of human resources, and, unlike other European countries, there are no veterans associations. So, in Spain, as in the last century, it is up to the Army to push ahead with the movement of national recovery with the violence that the whole of Spanish society who is against or on the margin of the Popular Front is willing it to use. There is an enormous patriotic and Nationalist organization within the Army that has been set up, given anti-Democratic political guidelines, and funded by us during recent years. If we are to carry out an urgent military coup with maximum guarantees of success, we need to be provided with at least one million pesetas.

The coup was being organized by "the military organization within the Army . . . in agreement with civil members, and General Sanjurjo will become the president of the state."

They were counting on the garrisons in Morocco and the north of the country (in particular, they mentioned Valladolid, Burgos, Logroño, Zaragoza, Barcelona, Pamplona, Vitoria, San Sebastián, Santander, Asturias, and Galicia) but not on others (e.g., Madrid, which "had required special attention . . . because of . . . the number of officials totally lacking in

national and patriotic spirit”). Some were also “prepared to do their duty within the regulations, risking their lives as they have done in the wars in Morocco. Nevertheless, they lack the decision, doctrine, and spirit to break the letter of the law and risk the social and economic status of their family. To these we have promised financial help so that their families run no economic risk. They are not moved by money, but they will not take action if they are not covered economically.”[198] However, Il Duce had not agreed to the request, so the rest of the money had to come from sources within Spain. But why did he not agree? Essentially, because he was more interested in consolidating his Abyssinian adventure and had no desire to open up another front of conflict with the Democratic powers. Or he may also have thought it would end up like Sanjurjo’s attempted coup of 1932, which the Republican government had allowed them to prepare and then quashed.[199] So, there was no direct Italian participation in setting up and funding the military coup. Italy’s involvement after 18 July, however, was quite another thing.

While all this was going on, court cases started to rain down on José Antonio. First, he was tried and found guilty of writing the manifesto in the cells of the Directorate General of Security and for insulting Alonso Mallol (the reference to his “horns”). In both cases, he was sentenced to two months in prison. The Supreme Court absolved him of the first charge but not of the second. Meanwhile, on 30 April, he was absolved in another trial —for illegal association—because the party’s statutes revealed that the FE de las JONS had no subversive intent. This meant the Falange members who had been arrested without specific charges (if they were charged, it tended to be for illegal possession of firearms) were released. However, the Directorate General of Security immediately ordered a new wave of arrests, this time of all local party leaders. José Antonio was not only not released but also very soon sentenced to five months for the possession of arms. The police had found several pistols at his home during a search, and the sentence was announced on 28 May 1936. When he heard the decision and realized it meant he would not be able to leave prison in the short term, José Antonio flew into a rage and caused a violent incident in the prison’s visiting room. He insulted the magistrates and assaulted the legal officer who had brought him the communication of the sentence (who, it should also be said, did not take things lying down and gave as good as he got). All

this led to two new court cases: one for contempt of court and the other for assaulting a civil servant.

He would never be released again. The judicial route to freedom had just been closed to him, and he had tried the political route a month previously to no avail. In April, when the elections were repeated in some provinces, he had managed to get himself included in the right-wing candidacy for Cuenca thanks to the intervention of the CEDA and his friends Serrano Suñer—once more a member of the parliament for the CEDA and part of its more Fascist section, the JAP—and Goicoechea. However, José Antonio was upset Serrano Suñer had also managed to have his brother-in-law, Franco, included in the candidacy, so he persuaded his friend to convince the general not to take part. José Antonio felt the candidacy had too great a presence of the military—there were several generals on the list—and he did not have much respect for Franco. He was scandalized by his lack of spirit and his excessive caution, which he had noticed in the various contacts he had had with him up to that time (e.g., the response to the letter he had sent him in September 1934 and, in particular, an interview they had several years before).[200] In the end, however, it all came to nothing because the Electoral Board accepted none of the new lists, and the elections were repeated with the same candidates.

After this setback, on 8 June 1936, the Supreme Court issued another ruling confirming the Falange was a legal party, against the criteria of the public prosecutor's office (and the government), which had appealed the first decision. But this did not trigger José Antonio's release either, because of the new lawsuits that had been initiated and because the Law of Public Order, which had replaced the Law for the Defense of the Republic on July 1933, gave the government the power to keep certain prisoners in prison.[201] And that is precisely what it did with José Antonio. Three days before the Supreme Court's sentence, on 5 June, he and several other Falange leaders, including his brother Miguel, were transferred to various prisons throughout the country to isolate them from one other. The two Primo brothers were transferred to the Provincial Remand Prison of Alicante. The transfer was made impulsively, and many of the National Leader's papers were left behind in La Modelo.[202] Among these papers were some letters he had exchanged with a young woman who, apparently, since late 1935 had been his girlfriend, or "special friend," a member of the Women's Section or of the SEU, about whom we only know that her Christian name began with

"I."[203] As we shall see, however, she was not the only one to allege to be the object of José Antonio's affections. At the moment of the transfer, José Antonio and his comrades kicked up a tremendous fuss in the prison, which he would later regret, as he confessed in a letter to "I": "I left the Moncloa in the midst of one of those biblical rages that recently I have succumbed to quite regularly."[204]

The transfer, however, did not prevent him from fulfilling his role as party leader, a task he would continue to carry out until several months after the outbreak of the Civil War. This was largely because of the permissive way in which the Alicante prison director treated José Antonio and his brother, in compliance with Director General of Security Manuel Muñoz's orders to treat them as "distinguished people." Bearing in mind the repressive measures the Popular Front government was implementing against the Falange, this was quite a contradiction. He was treated with a great deal of leniency: he was not subject to the strict regulations that governed visits, his correspondence was not censored, and the parcels he received were not examined. This lenient treatment was extended his family members who had moved to Alicante in early July (his Aunt Ma, his sister Carmen, and his brother Miguel's wife, Margarita "Margot" Larios)[205] and the numerous visitors whom José Antonio received, including the intermediaries with the military and civil conspirers (including members of the provincial Falange). In his first thirty-five days in prison, José Antonio received more than 1,800 visits. Some (seven or eight hundred) were from people who visited regularly (in the case of family, even as many as three of four times in a single day).[206] If we also consider the permissiveness in terms of correspondence and packages, it could not have been very difficult to direct the Falange and negotiate its participation in the military coup from prison.[207] Meanwhile, his immediate objective was to be transferred back to prison in Madrid. He never managed it.[208]

As soon as he was imprisoned, and to José Antonio's great mortification, Calvo started to acquire more and more power in the parliament. He (as well as others, both friends and foes) regarded himself as the champion of the anti-Republican far right wing. He gladly accepted being referred to as a "Fascist," which is what the Left used to call him. But while this was going on, the Falange was operating underground, and José Antonio, much to his tremendous irritation, was unable to occupy his seat in the parliament and capitalize on the political situation of that spring because he was

languishing in a prison cell while someone else was taking center stage. José Antonio had always refused to entertain the notion that Calvo was a Fascist, so, in response, he chose to hurl abuse at him from the party's underground press. In one article, he referred to the "Shrewd One in extremely harsh terms:

> You will never see the "Shrewd One" when times are tough . . . However—and this goes without saying—if others, at the expense of the best human lives, manage to make a particular idea or behavior respectable, then the "Shrewd One" will have no scruples about making it his own. So now, when the Falange is just beginning to get the first signs of public recognition after three years of hard work—Oh, how much blood has been shed!—the "Shrewd One" comes out and says, "What the Falange thinks is precisely what I think! I too want a corporate and totalitarian state! I am even prepared to pronounce myself a Fascist." The "Shrewd One" has no scruples . . . , he always counts on the Army as one more means of support; he is convinced a few military commanders will risk their lives, careers, and honor to further the puffed-up, ridiculous ambition of those who flatter them . . . We [the Falange] will not be the vanguard or the shock troops or the inestimable assistant of some confused reactionary movement . . . All his shrewdness will come to nothing. Even if the "Shrewd One" is victorious, his victory will count for little. The Falange, with its youthful impetus, its accumulated intellect, its militant spirit, will turn its back on him. Then we shall see who will give life to these puffed up Fascists. To watch their corpses come past, all we need to do is to sit at the door to our house under the stars.[209]

This was not the first time José Antonio had spoken in this fashion after he had refused to allow Calvo to join the Falange. According to José Antonio, he had ridiculed him in a short front-page article in *Arriba* the previous December: "There's a speaker going around saying the only national forces are the Falange and his own. Why can't he leave the Falange alone? His praise means about as much to us as that old Spanish saying 'The ugliest men and bears are the most beautiful.' We are not bothered at all about being called ugly; but comparing us to bears, well . . . "[210]

After Calvo's assassination on 13 July 1936, he would regret some things he had said about him. On the day before the assassination, he responded to a letter by Giménez Caballero: "Another false experience I fear is the violent implementation of a false Conservative Fascism, with no revolutionary courage or young blood. Of course, Fascists of this sort will never be able to take power. But what if it is given to them?" He was clearly afraid a military coup might hand over power to the National Block leader. And José Antonio's desire to be the center of attention was clear, because he was afraid that somebody else might be handed the leading role on a plate. But not only Calvo was of concern to José Antonio: he was also

against the possibility of a Republican national dictatorship under the highly unlikely leadership of the duo Maura and Prieto. To prevent such a possibility, he told Gecé: “As I told you, I am working without respite and with no little success. In a few days now, the way ahead will be free and clear. And then I believe nobody will be able to stop us.”[211] Did he believe he could get the better of the military insurgents after they had been successful because he was on good terms with their leader, Sanjurjo, his father’s faithful friend and subordinate? Quite possibly. And, whatever happened, he was sure he would be given such a major political role to play “the day after” the victory of the coup, that he would be able to neutralize Calvo and any other adversary. He agreed to the Falange taking part in the military uprising on the condition that the party remain autonomous and that the Army not hand over power in any province until at least three days after it had been seized. These were the three days he felt he needed to get to Madrid, have a word with Sanjurjo, and convince him he was the right man to take power (or at least be given an influential position in the new political situation).

It had not taken him long to decide to renounce a coup of his own. He very quickly went from alerting and warning his subordinates of the possibility that the insurgents would exploit them to ordering them to take part in the uprising in the aforementioned conditions. On 20 June, in a *No Importa* article entitled “A Warning to the Shrewd Ones: The Falange Is Not a Subordinate Force,” he said:

> We are being murdered by the Left (although sometimes these murders are mere attempts, because we know what we are doing, too, thank God). The Popular Front government is suffocating us (or trying to suffocate us, because it’s clear all their precautions have not done much good). But, comrades, we must beware. Not all the danger is to our Left. There are still some people on the Right who, so it seems, have little respect for the two score and ten of our fallen, our thousands of prisoners, our struggle against all sorts of adversity, our effort to shape a Christian Spanish conscience. These people, who we cannot write about without feeling rage and disgust, still assume the Falange’s mission is to provide them with naive combatants. At regular intervals, our provincial leaders are visited by mysterious conspirers from the right wing who have only one question to ask: “Could you give us so many men?” . . . What is this rabble thinking? That the Falange is a sort of butcher shop where you can acquire this or that many men by weight? Do they really think every local group of the Falange is a troop waiting to be hired out for the convenience of others?[212]

And just four days later, he sent the same message in the form of a circular, warning once again that the FE de la JONS may be exploited by other

forces:

> Should the Falange take part in one of these premature and naive schemes, it would be a most serious responsibility and would lead to its extinction, even if it were to be victorious. There is a reason for this. Almost all those who count on the Falange for a venture of this kind regard it not as a doctrine, or as a force that is about to take complete control of the state, but simply as a way of absorbing the shock of confrontation.

However, he ordered the local Falange leaders to take part in the military movement with new instructions:

> 1. All territorial or provincial leaders will only speak to the commander of the military movement in the territory or province, and with no one else. This commander will identify himself to the territorial or provincial leader with the code word "Covadonga," which he will give at the beginning of their first meeting.
> 2. The Falange will intervene in the movement with its own units under their own commanders and their own insignia (shirts, emblems, and flags).[213]

His main fear was the fifth point: that other leaders and political groups could monopolize power once the military coup had been successfully completed. He also must have been concerned that the Army would keep power for itself (which, in fact, is what eventually happened). But he made no mention of this in his circular, because the military was also going to read it. One version of José Antonio's change in attitude about the Falange's involvement in the military uprising was recorded many years later in the memoirs of a Political Board member who had remained imprisoned in La Modelo—together with Ruiz de Alda and several others—when José Antonio had been transferred to Alicante. According to Manuel Valdés Larrañaga, one of the various attitudes within the Falange was

> pessimistic (this was the camp headed by Julio Ruiz de Alda), in the sense that they felt things were slipping away from us. And another, which was how I felt, was that we had to join the Movement because our people—whether we took part or not—would join anyway, driven on by an uncontrollable force, which we could not and should not oppose. We had no choice but to take part so as not to disappoint our grassroots support and, as leaders, what we had to do "was ride the crest of the Movement that was about to take Spain over."[214]

Whether this is true or not, and whether José Antonio actually took the final decision, the reality of the Falange grassroots being prepared to join a coup of any sort is perfectly credible.

The coup was put off several times over the course of three weeks, but not because of José Antonio and the Falange. The first reason was the delegate leader of the Carlists, the exile Manuel Fal Conde. In exchange for the participation of the militias (the Requetés), he demanded the uprising take place under the monarchist flag, the Republican constitution and all the secular legislation be repealed, and a temporary military government be set up under Sanjurjo's command with two civil advisers sympathetic to the Traditionalist Communion.[215] One of the two, so it has been claimed, could have been José Antonio,[216] because he had previously been in touch with Fal Conde and the most influential of the Navarre Carlists, the Count of Rodezno. After a tense series of talks, and once Mola had been promised the support of the important Navarre Carlist organization and its leaders (including Rodezno and others who were prepared to take part in the coup without Fal Conde's conditions), José Antonio accepted. The other reason was the reservations of some of the most influential generals—including Franco, who felt the coup might be a damp squib, like Sanjurjo's previous attempt—until they were convinced by Calvo's assassination.[217] The assassination was a decisive event for Franco and other military personnel, because it did much to generate a climate of frustration among important right-wing, Conservative, and Catholic sectors that were critical of the government for not only being incapable of stopping what had happened but also taking part in it. They longed for a coup that would end the current state of affairs and even the Republic itself. For José Antonio, this assassination and the horror it provoked cleared up one of his major fears: the issue of who would be the leading figures on the political stage "the day after" the coup had triumphed.

In the early afternoon of the day after the assassination, a CEDA member of the parliament and friend of José Antonio, José Finat y Escrivá de Romaní (Count of Mayalde), had visited him and then traveled to Madrid and Pamplona with the instructions for the Falange's participation in the coup. In fact, these instructions threatened Mola: if he did not initiate the uprising at once, José Antonio would do it himself from Alicante. (Finat, by the way, had managed to get a couple pistols into prison for José Antonio and his brother.)[218] Two clerks from José Antonio's office—Rafael Garcerán and Manuel Sarrión—had acted as liaison between José Antonio and the Madrid Falange, through whom he had given detailed instructions about the shared objectives the party and the military had in the capital. He

also ordered a plane from the Spanish Postal Airlines be made available to take him to Madrid as soon as he had been released. Sarrión was also entrusted with taking to the capital the insurgents' manifesto, of which there was a copy for the military in Alicante.

José Antonio spent the last few hours before the coup giving instructions to the Falange members in the province and packing his cases.[219] He believed his release from prison was imminent. The manifesto he had drafted and sent to Madrid was never actually published in *No Importa* or any other newspaper because a group of armed left-wingers burst into the workshop where Mariano García Canales (the party's administrative secretary), Mateo, and other "comrades" were setting it up for printing. Despite this, the assailants did not find the document,[220] so some doubts have been cast on the authenticity of the version that has been conserved.[221] However, a manifesto of any sort would not have been of any great use: in Madrid, the insurgent troops did not make it out of the barracks. And in the siege of the Montaña Barracks, numerous insurgents and attackers were killed and the rest captured. In Alicante, the troops decided against joining the coup.

Solitude and the End of the Leader: José Antonio in the Civil War

The coup took place gradually: it began in Melilla four days after Calvo's assassination, on the afternoon of 17 July, and then spread throughout the protectorate and the rest of the country for the next two days as troops trickled out of the barracks in several capitals to unilaterally declare a "state of war." At first, the government thought it was up against a repeat of the 1932 rising, the Sanjurjada. In fact, Sanjurjo was once again the visible leader, and Casares opposed him, just as he had before. But the second time around was a much bigger event. The two leaders very quickly disappeared from the scene. Sanjurjo died in an air accident in Portugal when he was preparing to fly to Spain to take command of the insurgents, and Casares resigned. And, like before, the coup was not a success but on this occasion was the spark that would set off a civil war.

Many things had changed between the two coups. To start with, more soldiers were now involved, and the Falange and the Carlists assisted them. However, they met greater resistance, which was predictable, since the authorities and the left-wing political and social organizations had been expecting the uprising for some weeks by then. Prime Minister Diego Martínez Barrio, whom Azaña had entrusted with forming a Republican-Socialist government, failed in his attempt to stop the insurgents through conversations with some of the generals involved (e.g., Miguel Cabanellas and Mola) and consequently resigned.[222] This resignation came about after the PSOE had refused to participate in the new cabinet, and Socialists, Anarcho-syndicalists, and Communists had expressed their reluctance to enter into talks with the insurgents and decided to send weapons to their own organizations so that they could fight against the coup. The new Republican Prime Minister José Giral agreed to this measure. The uprising's failure in the capital and major cities was the spark that ignited the civil conflict, which had not been sought but neither had it been totally unexpected.

One city that remained in the hands of the Republic, and where the uprising never actually materialized, was Alicante. The military governor, José García Aldave, who had agreed to join the insurgents, did not eventually rise up, and Falange members from all over the province were arrested when they attempted to get to the capital and release José Antonio.[223] Also arrested were Aunt Ma, Carmen Primo, and Margot, who had helped set up the coup by conveying José Antonio's orders.[224] The two brothers, meanwhile, kept their weapons out of sight and waited anxiously for their "comrades" to release them. They waited in vain: they were not released at this time, and José Antonio never would be.

So, he remained in prison just as the war broke out, a war that represented the failure of his hopes to play a major role in the new political landscape that the victorious coup would have created. He had not managed to take power by means of a Falange-led coup or by taking part in a more generalized coup, which ended up triggering a war. However, his personal conviction that he was the savior of Spain prompted him to take action to stop it.[225] Unrealistically, he set about attempting to invert the course of events and prevent the fracture between Spaniards from getting any deeper because it was the exact opposite of his idea of Fascism, the aim of which was to reunite the Spanish people through a comprehensive program of

national resurgence. In this program, there was no place for squabbling political parties or class struggle.

The new course he was about to take was quite different from anything he had done before. It had been inspired by his former teacher Sánchez Román's proposal the previous May and probably based on his belief that the outbreak of war, with its enormous dramatic impact, paved the way for a great national agreement that would bring it to an end. Imprisoned, isolated, and amid quite extraordinary and dramatic circumstances for the country, José Antonio believed the solution was the constitution of a Democratic, reforming government made up of Republicans, one Socialist, a Conservative Catalanist, and two leading intellectuals. This government should set about reinforcing the Democratic rule of law and implement two reforms he felt were fundamental to reconciliation. One was economic (the agrarian reform) and the other political (the authorization of Catholic education); both were designed to satisfy the demands of the opposing factions. Also essential to pacification was the abolishment of all militias (including the Falange's). His proposal was an emergency one, formulated in an absolutely exceptional situation. And we must assume he was prepared to accept all its consequences, which would mean he had no chance of being in any position of authority in the short term.

José Antonio formulated the proposal in early August 1936. He offered to travel to Burgos (leaving family members as hostages to guarantee that he would return to Alicante) to convince the insurgent generals of the need to come to an agreement with the Provisional Government of the Republic on the terms for a ceasefire and the constitution of a new cabinet. José Antonio may not have known it at the time, but these generals were grouped into a Junta de Defensa Nacional (National Defense Board) led by the longest-serving member, Cabanellas, who had been a Republican and a mason until 18 July, and almost certainly neither of these things afterward. The government would have to implement the reform program that José Antonio was proposing, just as he had expected Azaña to do after the elections in February.

All the proposal details are known because it was found among his personal papers that were confiscated from his cell after he had been shot. These papers were handed over to then Minister of the Navy and Air Force Prieto, who took them with him when he went into exile in Mexico. He subsequently published the proposal in one of his memoirs.[226] In January

1977, after Franco's death, his executor Víctor Salazar (of the PSOE)[227] handed Miguel Primo de Rivera y Urquijo the keys to the Bank of Mexico safe where the case with the documents was deposited.[228] Miguel, Fernando Primo's firstborn (he had two younger sisters) and the only male descendant of the three Primo de Rivera y Sáenz de Heredia brothers, took care of retrieving the documents. José Antonio's proposal was as follows:

> My offer:
>
> 1. General amnesty.
> 2. Reinstatement of the civil servants who were laid off after 18 July.
> 3. Dissolution and disarmament of all militias. The parties with which they are clearly related will be held responsible for any militarily organized groups that are proved to exist.
> 4. Cancellation of the state of alarm and prevention. (If for reasons of law and order this is not considered possible, the Law of Public Order should be modified as follows: *a)* People may only be held in custody for a maximum of fifteen days and cannot be held on more than two occasions every six months; *b)* the closures of all political headquarters should be subject to the same regulations; *c)* government fines can only be imposed based on well-founded decisions and, since they are not imposed for fiscal reasons, need only be paid after all the legal channels have been exhausted.
> 5. Review of all confiscations during the period of exception with a view to bringing them into line with the legislation prevailing before 18 July.
> 6. Statement confirming the permanence of the contracts of all civil servants, notwithstanding the regulations prevailing on 18 July.
> 7. No political intervention in the administration of justice. This will depend on the Supreme Court, constituted just as it is, and will be governed by the laws in force before 16 February last.
> 8. Immediate implementation of the Law of Agrarian Reform.
> 9. Authorization of religious education, subject to inspection by the state.
> 10. Formation of a government presided over by Mr. Diego Martínez Barrio, with the following members: Álvarez (Melquíades), Portela, Sánchez Román, [Juan] Ventosa [Calvell], Maura (Miguel), Ortega y Gasset, and Marañón.
> 11. Preparation of a national political program to reconstruct and bring peace to the country.
> 12. Closure of the parliament for six months and authorization for the government to legislate within the lines laid down by the program.

Another document explained the composition of the cabinet in detail: "Presidency: Martínez Barrio. State: Sánchez Román. Justice: Álvarez. War: The President. Navy: Maura (M.).[229] Interior: Portela. Agriculture: [Mariano] Ruiz Funes. Treasury: Ventosa [Calvell]. Education: Ortega y Gasset. Development: Prieto. Industry and Trade: [Agustín] Viñuales. Communication: [no name]. Labor and Health: Marañón."[230] To convince the government to accept his plan (thus allowing him to be released and transferred to "Nationalist Spain"), he first needed to send the proposal to

the cabinet. To this end, and in the knowledge that Prime Minister Martínez Barrio was the president of the Generalitat Valenciana delegate board "with jurisdiction in the provinces of Valencia, Alicante, Castellón, Cuenca, Albacete, and Murcia"[231] (as well as someone he knew and was fond of), he requested an interview on 9 August:

> After lengthy and thorough deliberation and with my sights set on serving the Spain that belongs to us all, which is under such a grave threat at the present time, I have decided to request an appointment with you. It should not be difficult to arrange. You could have me transferred one night to the civil government, as if I were to be interviewed by the governor, where we could meet without anyone being any the wiser. The meeting may be useful and under no circumstances detrimental. Whatever the case may be, it is your decision. I believe I have fulfilled my duty by writing these lines.[232]

We do not know whether Martínez Barrio discussed the issue with the other board members (Minister of Agriculture Mariano Ruiz Funes, Undersecretary of the Presidency Carlos Esplá, and Undersecretary of Industry Leandro Martín Echevarría). However, he did consult Prime Minister Giral (who had replaced Casares after the outbreak of hostilities). Giral agreed with the proposal but felt Martínez Barrio was not the right person to be entrusted with the interview. Thus, on 14 August, Echevarría was sent to the prison in Alicante to see José Antonio. Although we know nothing about the meeting itself, we do know the government later rejected the plan and José Antonio's proposal for a national agreement.[233]

His program was designed to bring peace to the country and to reinforce the Democratic rule of law. It focused on ensuring certain legal guarantees and at the same time questioned some of the government's decisions before the uprising that had directly affected the Falange (in particular, the closures, fines, and imprisonments). It also aimed to end the politicization of justice, of which José Antonio felt he was a victim. As far as social issues were concerned, he included the Law of Agrarian Reform—he must have assumed it had been suppressed or suspended in the areas controlled by the insurgents—because it affected a considerable number of the poorest workers. It was a measure that compensated another one designed to satisfy the needs of a different collective (the Catholics): the authorization of religious education. However, he made no attempt to represent all political parties proportionally in his proposal for a new cabinet. There was a majority of prestigious, moderate Republicans alongside the Socialist leader

whom José Antonio also regarded as moderate (his much-admired Prieto) and leading figures from the world of letters (Ortega y Gasset) and medicine (Marañón). There was also a well-respected Conservative Catalanist from the world of finance (Ventosa Calvell of the Regionalist League of Catalonia) but not a single moderate CEDA member, which is almost certainly a sign of his prejudices or the difficulty he had to find just the right person, or anyone from the PRR, perhaps because the party had lost a great deal of credit because of the cases of corruption of some of its most prominent members.

The political foundations of his proposal were contained in another document that had been found alongside the others. It was entitled *National Front* and consisted of two main sections. "Exclusions (1. For historical reasons: those who miss outdated systems and have reactionary ideas about social economics. 2. For moral reasons: those who have got used to an ethical climate like the black market that furthers their own interests)" and "Demands (1. Construct the material life of Spaniards on humane foundations. 2. Restore Spaniards' collective faith in the unit of destiny and a resolute desire for resurgence.[234] He had based his proposal—marked, as usual, by his desire to play a leading role—on the following analysis:

> Situation. I have no information about who takes the lion's share. So, this synthesis is purely moral.
>
> A) If the government wins: *1)* shootings; *2)* dominance of the workers' parties (class, war); *3)* consolidation of Spanish castes (out-of-work civil servants, Republicanization, etc.). People will say the government is not to blame. It was the others who rebelled. No. A rebellion—especially one so widespread—does not come about without a deep-seated reason. Social reactionism? Nostalgia for the monarchy? No. This uprising is, above all else, a middle-class one. (Even geographically, it has most taken root in regions that are largely petit bourgeois.) The main factor behind it is the unbearable policy of Casares Quiroga. Persecutions. Humiliations. Outrages . . . Example: myself. My parliamentary activity, agrarian reform . . . Accusation . . . The issue of Guinea . . . My political conduct: persecution by the right wing. Exclusion from electoral lists . . . With hard work and sacrifice I have managed to bring discipline to young people who know not where they are heading and who would probably have taken action that would have had little effect. The 16 February comes round. OUR ATTITUDE. BRING THE STUPID BIENNIUM TO AN END. Closures. Tolerance of the murder of our people. And after a while. Searches. Imprisonments (by the thousand). Against me: false lawsuits. Result? Impossible for the party to lead a controlled, law-abiding existence. Reduced to uncontrolled, lawless existence in bands of guerillas. The pressure in a boiler cannot be increased indefinitely. Something had to blow. And it blew. But now
>
> B) What will happen if the insurgents win? They are a group of generals with honorable intentions but with depressingly little political acumen. Pure rudimentary clichés (order, pacification, etc.). The driving force behind them is: *1)* Old, intransigent, simple-minded,

> unpleasant Carlism. *2)* Conservative, self-interested, shortsighted, idle classes. *3)* Agrarian and financial capitalism. That is to say, the impossibility of constructing a modern Spain for several years. The lack of any long-range sense of nation. And after a few years, in reaction, once again a negative revolution.

That is, he believed Casares's government's policy of repression against the Right and its tolerance of the Left were responsible for the state of the nation. And he used him and the Falange as examples of the government's partisan behavior. He accused the government of manipulating trials and of making it impossible for him to remain in control of his own party members, forcing them to engage in underground, "guerilla" warfare. And although he did not say so, he attached great importance to the issue of religion, because he included it in his proposal for pacification. In his formulation of hypothesis A (a governmental victory), he predicted fierce repression and the dominance of workers' parties but made no explicit mention that it would trigger a revolution (probably because he believed it would take place sometime in the future). As far as hypothesis B was concerned (the victory of the insurgents), he believed it would lead to a Conservative regime controlled by the wealthy classes in general (capitalists included), so there would be little or no chance of making changes (the construction of modern Spain). He felt this hypothetical state of affairs "lacked any long-range sense of nation," which in the long term would again lead to a "negative revolution" (i.e., leftist and destructive).

From all this he concluded that the only solution was to stop the war "and initiate a period of national political and economic reconstruction with no persecutions and no reprisals, which will make Spain a *peaceful, free,* and *busy* country."[235] This simple but impossible solution was his attempt to adapt his alternative to what could have been a Republic dedicated to social and national reforms. It was by no stretch of the imagination a Fascist proposal, although its objectives were the same as those of his previous project, which he now used as the basis for this new adaptation. The changes he made were realistic ones, because by this stage and in these circumstances, any attempt to impose a Fascist dictatorship with him as its leader was, if anything, even more ridiculous than before. He was now backing a reforming government that would restore peace and take measures designed to bring about national reunification. These measures also reflected the brief hopes he had held before the Republic took power

on 14 April 1931 and the enthusiasm he had felt in February 1936 after Azaña’s first speech on his return to office.

Nevertheless, he had no intention of ceasing to be involved the Falange, so what role did he imagine he would play if he were to help end hostilities and form the new cabinet? To start, he must have thought he would be regarded as the main instigator of peace, the man of providence who had managed to halt the incipient Civil War, which would set him up as the new savior of Spain. Not quite the sort of savior he had imagined but its savior nonetheless, which was essential if he were to fulfill his ambitions. He also must have thought about how his newfound prestige would give him the chance to influence the government, to play a part in the decisions that could change the history of his country, to help solve what he regarded as Spain’s two major problems: nation and society. It would have been no mean achievement.

Or perhaps he simply aspired to continue working with his Falange so that he could take power and become a dictator or the head of government, even though it meant he would have to renounce using the militias for his political ends, which distanced him from the Fascist model and Fascist practice. It is possible, however, he had never felt completely comfortable with this model, as we shall see when we analyze his political thought. So, once again, another facet of José Antonio was emerging. He was no longer the man who was moved by the desire to emulate and exceed his father by becoming a Fascist leader. Rather, as part of his aim to “save Spain,” he was now more inclined to be less mimetic, more open to agreement, and prepared to play a role that was not so direct or central. He was, then, ready to collaborate with others in his search for that “salvation” and had no need to be the only point of reference. So, in the tragic circumstances that were devastating and dividing the country emerged a reconciliatory José Antonio who believed the outbreak of war created an exceptional situation in which the previously impossible agreement was now possible. This agreement was necessary if the great national problems were to be dealt with and Spain were to become a “unit of destiny” once again, and it would only require him to moderate, not sacrifice, his own protagonism and the perception he had of himself as a savior.

What would have happened if the Republican government had accepted his proposal for an agreement and allowed him to travel to Burgos? Once there, the generals certainly would have refused to consider his proposal.

He would have had a serious problem trying to justify it as an attempt at mediation with the insurgents[236] who were amid a full-scale repression that was unparalleled for its ferocity and counted on the participation of the forces of law and order, and the right-wing militias, the most important of which at the time was the Falange's. The FE de las JONS was growing at a considerable rate and becoming a party with mass support for the first time in its history. The initial increase in numbers in the spring of 1936 had been just the beginning of a huge increase in popularity. José Antonio would have been met with the flat refusal of the generals who were hell-bent on battle for two reasons: to take power and "annihilate" the opposition, the "enemy." José Antonio had not counted on this in his plans, and it was not part of his Fascist project of integration. Also, many of the Falange members who were taking part in the repression shared the desire for annihilation and were quite happy to take an active part in it. And on top of this, the subsequent Franco regime, which came into existence on 1 October 1936, would never have been prepared to reveal such a proposal had ever been made and would do all it could to wipe out any trace of it. Even as late as 1963, the Falange supporter José María Mancisidor's book on José Antonio's trial at Alicante prison, which included the transcription of the shorthand notes of the proceedings, made no mention of the proposal. Special care was taken to remove all indications that the interview between José Antonio and Echevarría had ever taken place.[237] It did not "tally" with the mythical image the Francoists constructed to extol their most important martyr.

Above all else, however, it was simply impossible for José Antonio to halt the war, appoint a new government, and apply the program described because of the reality of the conflict itself. It had triggered two periods of repression of unprecedented brutality in the country. There was considerable revolutionary subversion in the government-controlled zone. And, in the rebel zone, the Army had overthrown authority with the support of the Conservative classes, the Church, the Carlist and Alfonsist right-wing monarchists, most AP leaders and followers, sectors of the rural and urban middle classes, and even peasants, employees, workers, and, at the forefront, the Falange. In the following months, the Falange would be responsible for transcendental repressive interventions—although they were not the only ones in the Nationalist zone—but they would also do their best

to adapt their National Syndicalist program to times of war in an attempt to hegemonize civil political power.

José Antonio saw none of this. During the first few weeks of the war, he had been informed of events, thanks to his privileged status, but his situation changed radically in mid-August when Adolfo M. Crespo Obrios replaced Teodorico Serna Ortega as prison director. The new director flew into a rage when he saw the privileges the Primo brothers enjoyed and stopped them at once. He refused to allow them to continue occupying cells adjacent to those of thirty other Falange members; he searched their cells and found the two pistols; he put them into solitary confinement and informed Madrid at once.[238] At the same time, he ordered all his visits be monitored, which gave rise to several arrests. People suddenly decided not to visit him anymore. Because the weapons were found alongside a sketch of the front lines of the Civil War and a map, José Antonio and Miguel, together with his wife, Margot, were once again put on trial. The previous prison director and some warders entrusted with the custody of the prisoners and/or the supervision of visits were also prosecuted.

They were supposed to have used the revolvers to help in their failed release attempt of 18 July, and they used to take them to the prison yard whenever they went for exercise because there had been a confrontation between some common prisoners and two Falange members. The tension between the two groups was palpable.[239] In fact, the Alicante branch of the CNT had been aware of the existence of the pistols before they were found, because in late July they had interrogated and killed a former comrade—Inocencio Feced, who was thought to be a traitor—when he was released from prison. They even (mistakenly) thought they knew how the weapons had been sent to the two brothers: inside a paella. According to Feced, before 18 July the Primo brothers were "convinced the Movement will be victorious. They have already packed their cases and they are optimistic." As soon as they had acquired this information, the CNT had informed the director, Serna Ortega, although they did not manage to get him to take any action.[240] The security around the prison was in the hands of the alliance between the CNT and the Federación Anarquista Ibérica (Iberian Anarchist Federation—FAI), and the real power in Alicante was in the hands of a revolutionary committee made up of all the forces of the Popular Front despite the continued existence of the civil governor, the Republican Francisco Valdés Casas.

In mid-August, the Alicante Committee of Public Order, at the proposal of the PCE, decided to execute José Antonio and Miguel. More specifically, with the excuse of a transfer to the prison in Cartagena, on the way there they would be *paseados* (i.e., shot without trial, a common practice in the two zones into which war-ridden Spain was divided). The decision had not had the support of the Republican Union or the Republican Left representatives and was going to be carried out by Vicente Alcalde (of the PCE). In response to this plan, the Republicans phoned President of the Republic Azaña,[241] Prime Minister Giral, and Prieto, who all intervened and managed stop the operation, apparently when the two brothers had already been told of their imminent transfer.[242] Azaña subsequently spoke about his involvement in this episode to the ambassadors of Chile, Mexico, and Peru[243] and to Manuel Ossorio y Gallardo.[244] Later, in his diary entry for 17 June 1937, he wrote: "When I told Ossorio about the part I played in preventing Primo de Rivera from being murdered by a group of fanatics from Alicante, he went quiet. 'What! Do you think I made a mistake? Should I not have done it?' 'I don't know, I don't know . . . ' 'Do you think I got it wrong?' 'Maybe.'"[245]

Under these new conditions of solitary confinement, neither José Antonio nor Miguel received the news of the death of their brother Fernando, murdered on 23 August in La Modelo in Madrid alongside Ruiz de Alda, Melquíades Álvarez, and other right-wing politicians. And from 23 August to 20 November, the day on which the National Leader was shot, the only news made public about José Antonio's life in prison was the interview published in the US *Chicago Tribune,* on 9 October, and the UK *News Chronicle,* on 24 October. Meanwhile, rumors were rife throughout Nationalist Spain that he had been murdered or sent to Moscow, where he had been castrated (a highly unlikely tale that on one occasion Franco himself had discussed with Serrano Suñer: "They have probably handed him over to the Russians, and they might well have castrated him").[246] The Pro-Republican North American journalist Jay Allen interviewed José Antonio on 3 October. The government—under the Largo presidency—and then the Alicante Committee had decided to authorize the interview precisely because it was in their interests to prove José Antonio was not already dead. For this reason, the article published in Chicago was entitled "'Slain' Spanish Fascist Chief Found in Jail." The interview was not

published in the Nationalist zone because the censor would not have tolerated it.

After being taken to the prison, the journalist met the two brothers in the exercise yard in the company of four Alicante Committee members. He had been instructed that under no circumstances could he tell José Antonio anything about the war. This meant the interview took the form of "I will ask you some hypothetical questions that you can answer or not."[247] In this way, José Antonio's desire for news was frustrated. When asked "What would you say if I were to tell you that General Franco's movement has not been following orders, and, whatever its initial purpose was, it now merely represents the old Spain that is fighting to preserve its lost privileges?" he answered, "I know nothing. I hope it is not true, but if it is, it is a mistake." And to "If I said your men are fighting alongside mercenaries in the pay of landowners?" he replied:

> You remember my firm attitude and my speeches in the parliament. You know I said if the Right, after October [1934], persisted with its negative repressive policy, Azaña would return to power in very little time. And that is what happened. It is the same now. If all they do is to put back the clock, they are making a mistake. They will never be able to control Spain if there is nothing more to it. I represented something else, something positive. You have read my program of National Syndicalism, agrarian reform, and all that.

After this reply, Allen ironically pointed out, "It seems the Spanish people did not believe in your sincerity." José Antonio responded: "I was sincere . . . If I had wanted popularity, I could have become a Communist." The journalist insisted: "But your men now . . . " but José Antonio interrupted him: "I hope and believe what you are saying is not true. But do not forget that after I was sent to prison, they had no leaders, and do not forget they and many others were forced into violence by Casares's provocative policies." Allen went on: "I seem to remember it was you who introduced political gunmen into Madrid." José Antonio replied: "That was never proved. My men have killed others but only after they had been attacked." He knew this was not the whole truth.

With reference to the causes of the situation, José Antonio told Allen: "Gil-Robles is to blame for everything. For two stupid years, when he could have done everything, he did nothing. And Casares Quiroga, too, because of his politics of provocation." When the journalist asked, "What would you say if I were to tell you that General Franco, a Nationalist patriot, has

brought Germans and Italians here, promising the Italians Spanish territory in Majorca and the Germans Spanish territory in the Canary Islands, and bringing Europe closer than ever to war?" José Antonio said:

> That is not true. I know nothing. I don't even know if I will be a member of the new government if we win. What I do know is, if the Movement wins, and it turns out it is simply a force of reaction, I will pull the Falange out, and in a few months I will probably be back here or in some other jail. If what you say is true, they are mistaken. They will be provoking an even worse reaction. They are pushing Spain toward the edge of an abyss. They will have me to face. You know I have always fought against them. They called me a "heretic" and a "Bolshevik."

A few weeks later, during his final trial, the prosecutor asked him about this interview, the text of which had been partially reproduced in a newspaper from the provinces of Levante for the first time just a few days or hours before. More specifically, the question was about José Antonio's reaction to Allen's comment that "all the old forces have united." He replied: "That's right. I told him I was against the Movement. I do not believe the Army has rebelled to restore the old political system. If this were the case, I do not believe some of those who are involved would have given their support, but this is why the left-wing regime will soon be restored."[248]

Allen was very impressed by José Antonio's "brilliant performance" and wrote he knew "what the Alicante Committee was thinking. They were thinking of the Falange men who used to hire gunmen or play at being gunmen and who are now on the prowl in rebel Spain, 'finishing off' not just Marxists but all the Liberals they could possibly find." There was quite a lot of truth in this. In this way, Allen highlighted the contradiction between what José Antonio said, his doctrine, and the reality of things in the Nationalist zone. When he left the prison after the interview, Allen asked the Alicante Committee members who had accompanied him what they were going to do with José Antonio and was told there would be a trial that, in Allen's words, would judge "not only the man but Spanish Fascism." He reached the inevitable conclusion that he simply could not "imagine a circumstance in which this man might be saved."

Indeed, a trial had been planned, and on 3 October 1936, the Supreme Court of Spain appointed Judge Federico Enjuto Ferrán to conduct the preliminary investigation into the case against José Antonio Primo de Rivera "for allegedly being involved in the current military rebellion."[249]

This lawsuit was in addition to the one that had been taken out for the discovery of the pistols in his cell. It was the political trial of the leader of one of the factions responsible for the most ferocious anti-Republican repression and the struggle to topple the Republic. Judgment would be passed on the leader of a Falange that, paradoxically, was quite different from José Antonio's. It had grown enormously, and not one of its former leaders was still in charge. José Antonio, Julio, and Onésimo were no longer at the helm. The party was in the hands of provincial leaders who, with very few exceptions, openly and enthusiastically supported the repression being meted out. Hedilla did make some internal calls for moderation, but they were largely ignored.

José Antonio's fate seemed to have been decided by the recent investigation, and several failed attempts to exchange prisoners confirmed this. On one occasion, a deal negotiated with Prieto by Sánchez Román for thirty Republican prisoners and six million pesetas had fallen through because the prison was in the hands of CNT-FAI. On another, an exchange for one of Largo's sons was not successful. And, on top of this, in September and October 1936, two plans to release him, by bribery or by force, came to nothing. Falange members in the Nationalist zone had set the plans up with the assistance of Nazi Germany and Franco (although there is a whole wealth of literature that questions Franco's attitude on this issue).

The first plan had been set in motion by the last of the Falange's Primera Línea leaders before the war, Aznar Gerner. He had now become the chief of the FE de las JONS militias and was a leading provisional Command Unit member, which, under the presidency of the provincial chief for Santander, Hedilla, directed the party.[250] He was the fiancé of one of José Antonio's cousins and a friend. The plan was to organize an expedition of Falange members to Alicante, where they would bribe the warders and/or politicians in control of the city and rescue him. They had the support not only of Franco and the commander of the Nationalist Army of the South—José Antonio's old adversary Gonzalo Queipo de Llano—but also of the German Navy and the honorary German consul in the city, the Nazi Hans Joachim von Knobloch. However, after they had disembarked, Aznar Gerner did not manage to make the bribes. He spoke to the man in charge of the PSOE, faithful to Prieto, who told him that the CNT and a few Republicans controlled the prison. An Assault Guard captain recognized him, and he had to escape disguised as a German sailor. As a result, von

Knobloch’s involvement in the affair was discovered, and the government expelled him from Alicante.

The second plan, which was to be carried out in October after Franco had been sworn in as Generalissimo, consisted of two stages. First, another attempt would be made at bribery, and, if unsuccessful, a mixed contingent of the Falange, the Spanish Legion, and Moroccan regulars would disembark in Alicante, transported by a vessel belonging to the shipping company Ybarra, and lay siege to the prison. To prepare the operation, the Ybarra delegate in Alicante, Gabriel Ravelló; Aznar Gerner; the former leader of the Association of Catholic Students at the University of Seville who had recently joined the Falange, Pedro Gamero del Castillo; and the now ex-consul von Knobloch had met on board a German battleship. Ravelló was supposedly going to play a fundamental role because he was a friend of the civil governor whom they were planning on bribing. And, in Seville, the Falange had started training for the assault on the prison. However, things started to go wrong from the very beginning, because the German consulate, headquartered in Alicante, feared a new incident between von Knobloch and the Republican authorities and had prepared its own plan to bribe the CNT-FAI warders. Moreover, Franco had sent several telegrams to the team members on the German battleship, ordering them to haggle the price, not to use force, and, if José Antonio were to be released, to inform not von Knobloch but a Spanish emissary who would be sent from Salamanca. Likewise, he prohibited José Antonio from disembarking in any port in Nationalist Spain because he had doubts about his mental health.[251]

All this may have been because Franco had read Allen's interview and this was how he interpreted José Antonio's responses. Or maybe after reading it, he felt José Antonio needed to be isolated from his troops, which were playing such an important role in the "national" war effort. The Army was still only at half strength, and he simply could not do without the Falange, Carlist, and other lesser militias. However, Berlin did not authorize contact to be made with the civil governor. So, the first stage of the plan came to nothing. And the second (disembarkation in Alicante and armed assault of the prison) had to be called off. The typical brashness of the Falange squadrons and their talkative nature meant the supposedly confidential plan had become such a badly kept secret that it had come to the attention of the Republican authorities in Alicante, who reinforced their vigilance of the prisoner.[252] In parallel to all these plans, which José Antonio might have been aware of, the two brothers had to come to terms with their

new legal situation. In the previous months, some of the Falange members in the province who had attempted to march on the city to release their National Leader had been found guilty of military rebellion and been shot. Now, it was José Antonio and Miguel's turn to be put on trial. However, it was not always as clear as the Alicante Committee had suggested to Allen that the trial would inevitably end in José Antonio being shot.

In fact, three factors contributed to the guilty verdict and the subsequent execution. The first was the change of government that Largo made on 4 November 1936 in which the Anarcho-syndicalist Juan García Oliver replaced Minister of Justice Mariano Ruiz Funes (of the Republican Left), a reputed criminal lawyer (and professor in criminal law) who was making a considerable effort to moderate the repression. With the government now in Valencia because Franco's troops were drawing ever closer to Madrid and it was feared that the capital would soon to be taken, the new minister of justice (he had been in office for just three days) called a meeting with the judge, prosecutor, and court clerk assigned to José Antonio's trial and told them to find him guilty. He had to be sentenced to death. García Oliver added that, given its global impact, the trial had to appear to have a solid legal base, "but it must be quick." The court clerk gave this version to the Francoist *Causa General* (the investigation carried out after the end of the Civil War into crimes committed in national territory while the left-wing parties were in power).[253] On the same day, the first prosecutor assigned to the trial, Attorney General of the Republic Juan Serna Navarro, was dismissed and replaced by the prosecutor of Alicante, Vidal Gil Tirado, president of the Tribunal Popular de Alicante (Popular Court of Alicante) since its creation by decree on 25 August 1936.[254]

On 12 September, Gil Tirado had sentenced to death about fifty Falange members from Callosa, Orihuela, Rafal, and Dolores, some of whom had attempted to converge on Alicante with another group on 19 July to release José Antonio. They had all been immediately sent to the firing squad. In this and other trials, Gil Tirado had shown he was an extremely hard-line judge. He was quite unlike the more moderate Serna Navarro,[255] who had intended to seek a two-year prison sentence for José Antonio on the charge of conspiracy because he was a prisoner when the military uprising took place and could not, therefore, be accused of rebellion. Serna Navarro had discussed this issue with Ruiz Funes on the previous 25 October,[256] and President Azaña had probably done the same before him. On the same day,

during a personal interview, Prieto had asked Judge Enjuto to take his time with the trial proceedings, probably because he was hoping to exchange the prisoner for an important Republican held by the Francoists.[257] By bringing José Antonio into the Nationalist zone, he was planning to encourage controversy between the Fascist leader and the military, Franco in particular. He did not succeed then, but he made another attempt in 1937 with Fernández-Cuesta, although, once again, to no avail, because after the exchange had been completed in Burgos, Fernández-Cuesta meekly followed Franco's orders.

The appointment of the new prosecutor Gil Tirado had been the response to an urgent request (a telegram sent on 5 November) by the Provincial Committee of Popular Defense and Justice for Alicante to the undersecretary of justice in Madrid. On the very same day, Alicante had been subject to an air raid for the first time, killing two and injuring one.[258] The telegram in question ran as follows: "Given mood after bombing, it is urgent to appoint Special Prosecutor Mr. Vidal Gil Tirado in the trial heard by Mr. Enjuto. Regards."[259] García Oliver responded to this request by dismissing Serna Navarro and preparing for the trial. That is, the decision to speed up proceedings against José Antonio was directly related to this "mood after bombing." On top of this, there was an attempt to assault the prison and lynch the two Primo brothers. Judge Enjuto managed to thwart this attempt by spending the night with his two eldest sons in the cell opposite José Antonio's (if we are to believe the testimony of his direct descendants and while we await the publication of his memoirs).[260] We should bear in mind that on the night of 28–29 November, after José Antonio had been shot, a second Franco bombing sparked another assault, this one successful, of Alicante prison, which would end up with forty-nine "Fascists" being shot (we do not know how many of them were Falange members).[261]

The second factor that led to José Antonio's execution was that President Azaña, Minister of Justice Ruiz Funes, and Minister of Development Julio Just Gimeno had been unable to delay the proceedings against José Antonio. The changes in the government and the new minister of justice were too much for them. In the notes he took for his memoirs, Azaña described his delaying tactics: "Conversation with Just about the fate of P. [Primo] de Rivera.—With Ruiz Funes, to spin out the process.—When I phone him to discuss saving P. de Rivera, he tells me he has just found out

about the fifty-two shootings in Alicante.[262]—The Murcia affair."[263] This must have occurred in October, when the legal proceedings against José Antonio were underway and the shootings of 12 September had taken place. But he could not prevent José Antonio's death, which he connected to the reprisals for the first Francoist bombing of Alicante on 5 November 1936. On this, Azaña wrote: "Reappearance of P. de Rivera's trial. Background.—Reasons for my disgust.—He was shot in Alicante after the bombing."[264] Before this, he had sent him a personal message through former Minister of the Interior Amós Salvador Carreras (of the Republican Left), who in turn handed it over to a Seville doctor, an old acquaintance of José Antonio's from the discussion groups in Madrid. The doctor, Francisco Vega Díaz, traveled to the prison and gave José Antonio the message from Azaña. After reading it, he said: "I expected no less of him. I am grateful with all my heart." And there and then, the two men burned the note.[265] In all likelihood, Azaña had expressed his regret for not being able to delay the trial.

Some years later, Prieto wrote about his involvement in all these events but mistook the second bombing (which led to an assault on the prison and the shooting of forty-nine prisoners) for the first (which had a direct effect on José Antonio's fate): "Shortly before the trial began, I went to Alicante to explore any options for a moderate sentence. Impossible! The whole area was up in arms as a result of the bombings by the Italian Air Force, and common or garden Falange members, who had less responsibility than their leader, had been shot in reprisal."[266] This is a fundamental point: the effect of the first bombing mentioned by Azaña, on 5 November 1936, was twisted by the Franco regime in its construction of the myth of José Antonio[267] to make the "red" cruelty seem greater than it actually was.[268] The third and final factor came into play, as we shall see, after José Antonio had been sentenced to death.

As was only to be expected, the trial and preliminary investigation were reactivated after the "safe" Gil Tirado had been appointed prosecutor. Events moved swiftly. In less than two weeks, the preliminary investigation was completed, and José Antonio was judged, sentenced, and executed. On 9 November, the prison officials made their statements; on 10 November, it was José Antonio's turn; on 14 November, he was indicted, so he requested permission from the Alicante bar association to act in his own defense, and in defense of Miguel and his sister-in-law Margot; on 15 November, he was allowed to see the indictment for the first time; on Monday, 16 November,

the hearing began; two days later, in the early morning of 18 November, he was sentenced to death; and forty-eight hours after that, on 20 November, he was shot at dawn. Unfortunately, for the interests of justice, such swiftness was by no means exceptional.

Much of what we know about the hearing is thanks to the stenographic records, even though they have been subject to certain (Francoist) mutilations. The trial was held in the prison itself before a popular court of three professional magistrates and a prosecutor, and a jury consisting of members of the parties and syndicates that were part of the Alicante Committee: two from the Republican Left, two from the UGT, and two from the CNT.[269] The first prison director with whom José Antonio had coincided, Serna Ortega, was declared to be in default for not appearing when in fact he had been murdered in Madrid.[270]

During the hearing, José Antonio responded to the prosecutor who accused him of being the leader of a "group of a dictatorial nature"[271] that was responsible for attacks and, in a clear gesture of complicity with the jury, made it quite clear the Falange was a revolutionary organization. He also brought up the issue of his attempt to mediate between the two sides through Undersecretary Echevarría, although his nonappearance (despite being summoned as a witness for the defense by José Antonio) reduced the impact of his argument. José Antonio gave lengthy explanations[272] about his political thought and the Falange's program, with particular emphasis on the "social" aspects of the National Syndicalist ideology (again in an attempt to convince the left-wing jury). He was particularly careful to point out what differentiated it from right-wing Conservatism:

> The policy of the right wing toward my party has always been the same; they have wanted to exploit the fighting spirit of my men . . . Despite this, they wanted to prevent me from leading them at all cost—and I mean at all cost. Why? Because they say all the things I was saying about the land were merely to hook the working classes. The right wing has always made the mistake of believing it is easy to deceive the working classes . . . Right-wing parties have this attitude to me, but they still say: "All those thousands of brave, daring young men—a little crazy perhaps—are really useful. We must have them on our side." So, they conspire to create disagreements within my movement. They set Ramiro Ledesma and [Álvarez de] Sotomayor against me; they put me under the most frightful political, economic, and personal siege; they left me penniless. For four months, we couldn't pay for [the party headquarters in Calle del Marqués de Riscal]; we had our phone cut off and the house confiscated. And all because the right wing did not want me to get in the way. Then I was sent to prison, and they had to strike while the iron was hot: now it's easy for them to inflame the courage of these magnificent,

> brave, and slightly naive young men without that buffoon who keeps going on about agrarian reform and the National Syndicalist movement.[273]

At another moment, he added: “Revolution as subordinates [to the right wing], my men are fighting with spirit and passion, and God knows what we will get out of it. Not that!”[274]

More than anything else, he did everything he could to conceal his role in preparing the uprising. But to no avail: “On 18 July this year, as is public knowledge, a military movement rose up in many parts of Spain, assisted, so it is said, by groups from the Falange. These groups have not received, nor could they receive, orders from their leader. If these orders had been given, there would have been clear political and even personal guarantees, which would have determined the conditions of taking active part in the Movement.”[275] He had a weak point, however. The prosecutor and some jury members—who made the most of their right in this sort of trial to ask him several questions—reminded him the Falange was fighting alongside all the other rebel forces. José Antonio’s counterargument (pure fantasy on his part) was that the right wing had conspired to isolate him from his followers: “The right wing knows that if I had been a free man, the Movement may or may not have happened, but I would not have been separated from my men [the Falange] in Alicante, Madrid, Coruña, et cetera.” And when asked “How do you explain that they are fighting with great spirit alongside all the reactionary forces in the country?” he said, “I have just given my explanation. Because I am not a free man. Because I have been deliberately isolated.”[276] It was not a strong argument; the right-wing parties had not sent him to Alicante. José Antonio, somewhat paranoid, even proffered the conspiracy theory that the UME, the clandestine organization of insurgents, had been plotting against him at the moment of the uprising in Alicante:

> The court is perfectly aware that in this area, in this region of Levante, the dominant force among the military . . . the UME . . . had the leader they had always dreamed of, poor Calvo Sotelo, and a newspaper, *La Época,* which is a small ultra-reactionary, military, intellectual focus, and Calvo Sotelo was the prophet. Exactly how *La Época* felt about me can be seen in the tremendously offensive article published on 1 July in response to the article I had written and I have just mentioned . . . I was in prison, and I was being insulted. This is the UME’s neck of the woods. It has no power in almost any region in Spain except here in Alicante. The barracks here are precisely the ones that did not join in the uprising. Some have bravely gone on to stick by their decision. But these barracks do not rebel, and they form a ring round Alicante, which is where I am. It is the center of a perfect geographic semicircle. None of these

> barracks rebel except the one in Albacete, where a valiant lieutenant colonel sent a telegraph message ending, "*Arriba España*!" What happened to this lieutenant colonel? Days passed and nobody went to his aid. It was in the first few days when you had made no attempt at organization, and against your lack of organization, you had almost the whole Army in rebellion. I believe this lieutenant colonel behaved very bravely. He persisted day after day, and from time to time, he would have the temerity to say, "*Arriba España*." "Send me help." And nobody helped him. Lieutenant Colonel [Fernando] Chapuli [*sic* for Chápuli] [Ansó], who had broken this geographic semicircle, failed. It is the most notable failure of the rebellion.[277]

He tried to reinforce this last argument by saying he was not on any of the lists of possible governments that had been found in the hands of the regional UME: "This whole rebellion has taken advantage of the fact that I am in prison"—which is, at the very least, conceited—and "as I did not know what was happening I could not rest easy in my cell, so I passed the days and the hours writing." He went on to list all the articles he had written against the right wing's use of the Falange in an attempt to conceal the fact that he had ordered his men to join the rebels. The prosecutor took him to task on this issue: "You say you were arrested because of a right-wing maneuver. Was it not because you refused to obey a court?" In his response, José Antonio gave a summary of his imprisonment (which the Popular Front government, not the right wing, had ordered):

> No, Sir. I was arrested on 14 March. I was given two months, which I endured. Before they had finished, I was given another one for clandestine publication. So, I was sentenced to two months, which is what the law stipulates, and when I had almost done my time, the Supreme Court extended the sentence by another month for illegal association. We were absolved, but before we were absolved, I was given a fourth month so that I would never get out of prison because they said they had found I was in possession of two pistols. As luck had it, they were found in the place that could do me most harm. The court, which saw they had not a speck of dust on them in a drawer covered in dust, found me guilty. That's when I lost my temper. This happened in June, and I have been in prison since 14 March.[278]

The pistols found in his home may have been part of a police plan to frame him and keep him in prison, but there could be no doubt about the two found in prison. Even so, he flatly refused to recognize he had been caught red-handed and denied they were his.

At this point, he described how his attempt to negotiate with the government had come to nothing:

> I wrote . . . a letter to Martínez Barrio in early August about the current tragedy. I said I was witnessing Spain being split asunder and that this could bring about the return of the little wars

> between Spaniards and be a step back in social, political, and economic terms. It could lead to a state of confusion and darkness. I felt I could do only one thing: I asked to be provided with an airplane so that I could go to the other zone leaving my word of honor to return, with the personal guarantee of my family. I would leave behind my brother and sister, and an aunt who has often acted as mother. This would be my guarantee. I would go to the other zone where I would try to put a stop to all this. I was told the government could not accept my proposal. I said if I could render this service, not to the Republic but to the peace of Spain, I had no intention of pretending to suffer a sudden attack of jealousy. I was ready and willing. My offer was not accepted. What I offered may not have been possible, but I made the offer and received no reply.[279]

He based much of his defense on the legality of the Falange, which was seeking to replace the bourgeois Democratic system with another system of a Syndicalist nature:

> We are Syndicalists, but we cannot be said to belong parties that are only Syndicalists because we add "National" to "Syndicalist." All the youth of Spain, all the vigorous classes of Spain, the passionate youth, are divided into two bitterly opposing groups. This is why every now and again we kill each other like wild animals. It is also why some aspire to a more just social order, forgetting they are part of a unit of destiny with their fellow citizens, and others wave the flag of patriotism, forgetting there are millions of starving Spaniards and that it is not enough to unfurl the flag of the Fatherland without finding a solution for those who are hungry.[280]

In response to the prosecutor's references to the young men of leisure of the Falange, he said: "All Spaniards who are not disabled are duty bound to work. The National Syndicalist state will not have the slightest respect for he who fulfills no function and aspires to live as a guest at the expense of others . . . These are the typical men of leisure, this is the man of leisure. So the prosecutor will now have a clear idea of what the Falange thinks of men of leisure." In the middle of another denouncement in which he again attempted to distance himself from the right wing, he recalled his previously reviled Calvo and the article he had written in *Arriba* comparing him to a bear:

> He worked alongside my father, and that is sufficient for me to mention his name always with respect and affection. But as far as politics is concerned, with some regret I must tell you I treated him badly: he was a passionate man, and his rhetoric was confusing because the floods of words sometimes lost all meaning. Calvo Sotelo used to go around saying, "There are only two national forces: the Falange and the men of the National Block." I was quick to respond by writing some very harsh words in one of those rags with the big headlines that are such a feature of our newspaper.[281]

He added:

> [The Falange] did not totally and enthusiastically embrace everything that the Right did. Nor the Left. I believe Casares Quiroga's government must bear much of the blame for making this movement possible because it disconnected all the forces, it sent an enormous number of people to prison—of whom I am one—it introduced small discomforts into people's lives that predisposed everybody, and the critical spirit grew. Without any of this, you can be sure that not so many young people would have joined the struggle and such madness as this could not have come about behind the backs of responsible people . . . I have no intention of being hypocritical and saying I would not have joined the rebellion. I believe that, on occasions, rebellion is licit and the only way out of a period of great distress.

He made references to what was being said about German and Italian help in exchange for Spanish territories and wealth in the war being waged, and, above all, the role the Falange played in it:

> A rebellion has been prepared from inside and outside Spain by negotiating with Germany and Italy, two countries where discussions are particularly difficult, where diplomacy is at its most intricate and complex, and where it takes months to understand the vocabulary. And suddenly one day in prison, I find that everything's been done, although we don't know where we are going and many of my men are involved, some killing, some dying and others committing the atrocities I have just heard about from the prosecutor for the first time. These atrocities, by the way, I shall have to ignore, because I know my comrades are not capable of committing them. The preparations are difficult and have shady, or at least inexplicable, purposes, with agreements being made about whether part of our territory will be handed over, and all the while I am locked up in Alicante prison, unable to communicate with anybody and at the mercy of a popular court. This would not have happened if I had not been imprisoned, and it would not have happened if the leaders of my organizations had not been hunted like vermin, separated from their families and from their comrades. It was only because Spain had got into such a mess that this conflict, which we will all regret, could possibly break out.

He commented further on his problems with the right wing—"my dissidence with the right wing has been constant"—when he defended himself against the accusation of being "an enemy of the people" by pointing to his speeches in the parliament, which he claimed were in favor of the left wing and agrarian reform:

> One day in the parliament, I took the floor to ask for an extension to the amnesty given by the right wing, thanks to which several thousand members of the National Confederation of Labor were released. And on another occasion, when a motion was presented to withdraw the agrarian reform, I made two speeches to prevent the first agrarian reform from being withdrawn . . . And during the Asturias revolution, I stood up in the parliament and said you must always do two things in a revolution: first, get the situation under control, and then see if the people were right. Revolutions do not break out for no reason.[282]

And he made it quite clear he had never ordered any murders, which, in light of his party's history (in the months before the war in particular), is hardly credible. Perhaps he had not done so in so many words, but he had certainly authorized reprisals that had ended in murder. When questioned by the prosecutor, he argued:

> In twelve years, I have not acted on a single occasion as counsel for the defense in a crime of violence, for Falange members or non-Falange members. This can be checked in the register of the Bar Association [of Madrid]. I have acted as defense on many occasions for the illegal possession of firearms and other things. As general party policy, as something organized by the party, not a single violent crime has been committed. But what doubt is there that at times of such fierce struggle as this between political groups of opposing ideologies there are deaths on both sides! This is infinitely sad. I feel equally sorry for the blood spilled on one side and the other. It has pained me that anarchist workers and Socialists have fallen in struggles with our members, although I know not who these may be. We have been accused of some of these deaths. I too have submitted a list of sixty-five deaths to the court, but it does not occur to me to accuse any other party of being responsible.[283]

The argument that the party as a matter of policy had agreed to deny that Falange members had committed crimes of violence was also very fragile.

The crucial legal issue in the trial would prove José Antonio had been involved in the coup. He was very aware of this and argued: "The court needs some kind of positive proof . . . What does this proof consist of? That I received communications and visits."[284] In his opinion, this was not concrete proof, which led him to conclude: "How can you find me guilty if you have no proof against me? . . . This whole rebellion has come about as the result of my imprisonment."[285] Hence, he argued he should be acquitted, as should his brother and his sister-in-law, whom he exonerated of everything. His last words of the hearing were the following:

> I am not going to say anything like, "I don't mind giving up my life for this or that." The prosecutor has said I am courageous. I am not. I may not be a coward, but, yes, I do mind giving up my life. One should face up to the events in life with decent conformity. I tell you I would much prefer not to die. I believe life has not been given to us to burn like a flare at the end of a firework display. If I have not played a part in this, if I have not participated, why should I come here and act the victim?[286]

It was a long speech.[287] But in his conclusions, the prosecutor maintained the accusation that he had led the Falange and been involved in organizing the coup.[288] However, he referred to Miguel and Margot as "collaborators,"

and he withdrew the charges against the prison officers. His report was based on solid arguments that, from a historical point of view, were true: José Antonio had helped organize the coup and had fully involved the Falange, even though this was difficult to prove in a court of law because of the weak evidence. However, the Popular Court was no ordinary court of law; it was a political body, and the guilty verdict was guaranteed. Even so, the prosecutor, Gil Tirado, had the greatest respect for José Antonio's eloquence and its possible effect on the jury, which was clear when he said, in a somewhat garbled fashion:

> You are now going to hear a vigorous protest by the defense in which he will deny all the facts, just as he denied them in his definitive conclusions in an attempt to decrease his responsibility, to cut them and reduce them to their minimum expression. I now await his arguments and his eloquence. The great difference between this humble representative of the public ministry and the counsel for the defense, whose eloquence may put my speech in the shade, may detract from my performance. Although he does not have the years of experience I do, in just a few years he has worked considerably more than I have and has acquired extensive knowledge of legal issues. He is a parliamentarian who is among the finest in Spain, he is a self-made man, and I imagine all this will show up my oratory for what it is. I am telling you this because the facts and my arguments are not based on law; they are based on logic and a steadfast spirit of justice and José Antonio Primo de Rivera's gifts for oratory, art, and wit must not, and cannot, prevail.[289]

José Antonio accepted the praise and gave his thanks:

> At the beginning of the proceedings, although not at the end, the prosecutor pointed to me as an example of the prototype of the wealthy young man of leisure. He did not tell the court at the time that I have been working every day for twelve years, as he has just said by recognizing that I have worked on more cases than he has, even though he has been practicing for longer and I am younger. In my work, I have acquired a certain skill, which is my greatest sign of (professional) dignity, and this skill enabled me to examine that pile of papers in two and a half hours, prepare my defense, and submit it to your consciences. This tribute of my habitual, honorable, and tranquil craft is the best way, without fuss or flattery, of expressing my thanks.[290]

In fact, José Antonio's performance had attracted the attention of the public and seduced at least one journalist. According to the newspaper report on the hearing of 17 November, his defense had been "direct and clear. Gesture, voice, and word combine to form a masterpiece of forensic rhetoric which absorbs the public who listen attentively, with evident signs of interest." Once the trial had finished (on the same Tuesday), the Popular

Court asked the jury various questions, which then retired to deliberate. In the meantime, some left-wing journalists approached José Antonio and engaged him in conversation. And in the course of this conversation, he told them: “You will have seen we are not separated by great ideological gulfs. If we men were to get to know one another and speak to one another, we would discover the gulfs we believe we see are no more than small valleys.”[291]

The jury returned with a decision at 2:30 a.m. on 18 November:[292] all three defendants were found guilty as charged. The Popular Court immediately sentenced José Antonio to death, Miguel to life in prison, and Margot to six years and a day. Shaken, José Antonio immediately lodged an appeal. He asked for the sentence to be reviewed and the death sentence to be commuted to life imprisonment. The jury returned to its deliberations but very shortly denied both requests. At this point, José Antonio’s nerves cracked, although he soon managed to control himself and congratulated his brother and sister-on-law on being saved.[293] The report described his nervous breakdown: “And here, in the presence of his brother Miguel and his sister-in-law, Jose Antonio Primo de Rivera lost his calm. His nerves broke. Readers will be able to imagine the scene. Everybody was touched by the emotion and the pathos.”

He had one last chance of a reprieve: the Council of Ministers, which had to approve the sentence in Valencia. José Antonio immediately dispatched a telegram of appeal alleging that a grave error in judicial form had affected the verdict and requesting a new review. At the same time, his brother and sister-in law, Aunt Ma, and Carmen sent another telegram to the government requesting a pardon. Meanwhile, the Popular Court sent the sentence to the Ministry of War, whose legal adviser, Emilio Valldecabres, recommended the review and the requests for a pardon be rejected “unless there are pressing political reasons for accepting them of which the undersigned is unaware.”[294]

At this point, the third factor that would affect the final outcome—death by firing squad—came into play. For reasons of his own or acting under instructions—and after consulting Undersecretary Esplá, also now the first minister of propaganda[295]—Valdés Casas, the civil governor,[296] sent a questionnaire to the parties and syndicates of Alicante that suggested two alternatives to the execution of the prisoner. Azaña described these initiatives in his *Apuntes*.[297] The argument against shooting José Antonio

was that it might lead to reprisals (bombings) against the city, and he suggested getting José Antonio to sign a "condemnation of the movement" based on the arguments he had made during his defense. Specifically, he said: "Is it in our interests to execute the sentence immediately, since the air attack on this province from the Balearic Islands has been officially announced—the proof of which is available to all parties in the civil government—or should we put it off until a more opportune moment or commute the sentence to life imprisonment?"[298] However, nobody responded to the questionnaire. Azaña wrote: "Nobody dared take the responsibility. Terrible reprisals."[299] Franco finally bombed Alicante on the night of 28–29 November, which would have consequences for the prisoners.

According to the version of Minister of Justice García Oliver (published in his memoirs), when Valldecabres's negative report was sent to the Council of Ministers, Esplá suggested José Antonio could be exchanged for Largo's son who was being held by the Francoists. Largo himself rejected the proposal.[300] García Oliver does not explain, however, he had been the main driving force behind the initiation of legal proceedings—at the request of the Alicante Committee—and the enforcement of the sentence. Even so, Azaña commented in his *Apuntes* that things were more complex than they seemed: "Esplá is mistaken about the government's function in terms of pardons: he believes they are reviews." He also referenced Princess Bibesco and the letter sent by José Antonio's brother and family from Alicante, although he only mentioned Miguel (probably because his signature was first),[301] pleading for clemency or a pardon, and the commutation of his sentence. Apparently, Princess Bibesco—a friend of Azaña's and very close to José Antonio[302]—had made a phone call in an attempt to help José Antonio.[303] There are also accounts of Prieto and Negrín's refusal to get involved.[304] Likewise, Montes, who had been negotiating in Paris, had managed to convince former Prime Minister Count of Romanones and French Minister of Foreign Affairs Yvon Delbos to intervene and try to save José Antonio, although their plea arrived in Valencia after the sentence had already been carried out.[305]

Once Largo had ratified the sentence, however, there was nothing more to be done.[306] Several years later, he gave a barely credible version of events. He said he had not wanted to get involved in the issue because he was the prime minister and it was a fait accompli: "I refused to ratify the

sentence so as not to give legal validity to a deed carried out in violation of the procedures I had imposed for one reason only: to prevent executions being carried out by political passion. In Alicante, they suspected the committee would have commuted the sentence. That may have been so, but it did not happen."[307] Whatever the case, García Oliver and some ministers —and others, like Prieto, who decided to respect the decision even though they had worked to prevent it[308]—gave their approval for the sentence to be carried out. The Alicante Committee had also played a fundamental role in the turn that events would take: it had not responded to the governor's proposal and had been responsible for initiating legal proceedings against him. We should not forget that this committee, as well as being convinced about the course of action it was taking, was also under pressure after Franco's first bombing of the city.

José Antonio spent his last hours in the chapel separated from his brother. He made his final confession to a priest, a fellow inmate, and spent the rest of 18 November and all of 19 November writing his will. In the introduction, he denied the argument he had used in his defense that the rebels had deliberately isolated him and said he refused to believe Allen's report that his Falange was collaborating with mercenaries brought in from Africa. In particular, he tried to explain his role as National Leader of the Falange and what his aims had been. He also showed, once again, his constant preoccupation that the Falange would be exploited by Conservative and reactionary sectors, although he did not say so explicitly:

> May God grant that their passionate naivety never be used for any other service than that of the great Spain dreamt of by the Falange . . . If only the last drop of Spanish blood to be shed by civil conflict were mine! If only the Spanish people, so abounding in good and pleasing qualities, could find in peace its Fatherland, bread, and justice. I do not believe I need say anything more about my public life. I now await my impending death without self-importance, for there is no joy in dying at my age, but without complaint. May our Lord accept it as a token of sacrifice, as partial compensation for the selfishness and vanity that have been in my life. From the bottom of my soul, I forgive all those who have hurt or offended me, without exception, and I beg forgiveness from all those with whom I have an outstanding debt, however great or small.[309]

He also wrote several farewell letters: to his brother Fernando (who he thought was still alive); Aunt Carmen, a nun; Uncle Antón Sáenz de Heredia; and his colleagues Ruiz de Alda (of whose death he was also unaware), Sánchez Mazas, Sancho Dávila, Fernández-Cuesta, Valdés

Larrañaga, Pemartín, and Carmen Werner Bolín. He also wrote to Serrano Suñer, whom he had named as executor, and three clerks in his office: Garcerán, Sarrión, and Cuerda. In all these letters, he expressed some hope that the pleas for clemency sent to the Council of Ministers would be heard, a hope he also communicated to Aunt Ma, Carmen, and Margot when they came to visit, after 9 p.m.[310]

The three women were brought to his cell from their confinement in the reformatory in Alicante, and, as soon as he saw them, José Antonio asked the governor if they had come because his pardon had been denied. The governor said no decision had been taken. His sister Carmen cried and said, "It is not possible, José . . . , they cannot do this to you." José Antonio replied: "It is only natural. So many Falange members have already fallen that it is only natural for me, their leader, to fall, too. But there is still hope. The odds are three to seven against, but there is still a chance." He asked after his brother Fernando, and they said they had been told he was in Seville (none of them had had news of his murder in Madrid). His response: "He has been saved. So it's only me." The women saw he had lost weight. Carmen gave him a crucifix for which José Antonio thanked her. He then asked the governor if they would be able to come and see him again if the sentence was not carried out at once. He said they would.[311] However, they did not get the chance. They had already left when he was given the news that the sentence had been confirmed.

The last family member to see José Antonio before he died was his brother Miguel, who was taken down to his cell so that he could say goodbye. Emotionally shattered, Miguel embraced José Antonio, who asked him (in English so that the guards would not understand) to help him die with dignity.[312] Then, Miguel asked Judge Enjuto—as he would declare in France on his way into exile in the United States in 1938—to clean the prison yard of blood so that his brother "would not be obliged to walk in it."[313] Apparently, he also asked the governor to forgive him for anything he might have done to offend him.[314] At 6:40 a.m.[315] on 20 November 1936, José Antonio was shot by a firing squad of CNT members who were guarding the prison and FAI members brought in from outside,[316] in a corner of the remand prison's yard number 5, alongside two Falange members and two Carlist Requetés from Novelda (Alicante). Their names were Ezequiel Mira Iniesta, Luis Segura Baus, Vicente Muñoz Navarro, and Luis López López.[317] Apparently, he had a few words with them and then

took up his position to their left and at a short distance. Everything suggests he died with the dignity he had hoped for. There are various accounts of the execution, which became public knowledge through the courtroom statements of some members of the firing squad who were later captured by the Francoists. There are also some completely fabricated versions, which historical research has proved false.[318] The most reliable accounts all agree he dropped his coat before he took up his position, but there are discrepancies about whether his last words were "Come on" or several cries of "*Arriba España*!" The evidence also seems to suggest he was shot before the order to fire was given.

They were quite clearly in a hurry to execute him, perhaps because the CNT and the FAI wanted to carry out the shooting rather than the officially assigned firing squad from the Assault Guard. In fact, when the official squad reached the prison, the second lieutenant in command saw the ambulance was already leaving with the bodies of the victims. There also seems to have been quite a lot of expectation outside the prison, because the same officer said: "When the ambulance left, the red mob tried to get hold of José Antonio's body, so my troops and I had to clear a way for it to pass and escort it to the cemetery."[319] This situation seems to be in consonance with the climate of revenge and reprisal that prevailed in the Alicante Committee and among some local people after Franco's first bombing of the city. In fact, after the execution, Miguel was transferred to another prison, the Adult Reformatory of Alicante,[320] one kilometer from the previous one, apparently because the government intervened in an attempt to save his life.[321] Thanks to this intervention, he was not in the prison when the mass lynching took place after Franco's second bombing, when forty-nine inmates lost their lives.

José Antonio's life had ended in a somewhat sordid but heroic fashion. This was the tragic culmination of a political career largely but not exclusively marked by his commitment to Fascism as the system with which he planned to "save Spain," emulating and surpassing his father. More than once, he must have imagined he was going to go down in History (with a capital H) and, such was the intensity of his commitment, to die for what he believed in, which made having lived worthwhile. He also must have imagined his "sacrifice" would be remembered for posterity, which, somehow, would have been a comfort. What he probably never contemplated was the enormous extent to which the Franco regime and the

single party would idolize his person. He acquired such status that he not only eclipsed his father but also became the “martyr” par excellence (the “protomartyr” being Calvo) and the most important *caído* of Francoism. His victory, then, came postmortem, and, in light of this discussion, it is not unreasonable to think he would have been extremely displeased with many features of the regime that praised him to the heavens. I shall tackle these issues in the final chapter, but, first, let us take a more in-depth and detailed look at his political thought.

Notes

1. Ramiro Ledesma Ramos, *¿Fascismo en España? Discurso a las juventudes de España,* ed. Roberto Muñoz Bolaños, (Madrid, 2013), 261–262.
2. Ibid, 269–270.
3. Miguel Ángel Ruiz Carnicer, *El Sindicato Español Universitario (SEU), 1939–1965: La socialización política de la juventud universitaria en el franquismo* (Madrid, 1996) 51; David Jato Miranda, *La rebelión de los estudiantes: Apuntes para una historia del alegre SEU* (Madrid, 1965). The SEU was not officially recognized until 1934.
4. “Puntos iniciales,” *FE* 1, 7 December 1933, in José Antonio Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas de José Antonio Primo de Rivera,* ed. Agustín del Río Cisneros (Madrid, 1950), 343–350.
5. Juan Antonio Ansaldo, *¿Para qué . . . ? De Alfonso XIII a Juan III* (Buenos Aires, 1951), 72.
6. Julio Gil Pecharromán, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera: Retrato de un visionario* (Madrid, 1996), 239. For an account of another incident involving José Antonio and the sale of *FE*, see Víctor de la Serna, “Voz y diálogos con José Antonio con sus amigos: Recuerdos de La Ballena que ríe,” in *Dolor y memoria de España en el segundo aniversario de la muerte de José Antonio* (Barcelona, 1939), 238–239.
7. During Franco’s dictatorship, the SEU, which had become the official syndicate, marked the anniversary of his death with the Day of the Fallen Student.

8. José Antonio Primo de Rivera, “La muerte es un acto de servicio,” *FE* 5, 1 February 1934.
9. *FE* 7, 22 February 1934.
10. Ledesma Ramos, *¿Fascismo en España?,* 266–267.
11. Ramón Serrano Suñer, *Entre el silencio y la propaganda: La historia como fue—Memorias* (Barcelona, 1977), 475.
12. Gil Pecharromán, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera,* 226.
13. Ibid., 232.
14. Ansaldo, *¿Para qué . . . ?,* 82.
15. “Last night, in the Mexican embassy, Princess Bibesco had the nerve to suggest she would introduce me to Primo de Rivera’s son.” Entry for 22 April 1933, in Manuel Azaña, *Diarios completos: Monarquía, república, Guerra Civil* (Barcelona, 2000), 781.
16. “La revolución, ocasión de un césar,” *Arriba* 17, 31 October 1935, in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas,* 395-399.
17. Eugenio Vegas Latapié, *Memorias políticas: El suicidio de la Monarquía y la Segunda República* (Barcelona, 1983), 196.
18. Felipe Ximénez de Sandoval, *José Antonio: Biografía* (Madrid, 1949), 24.
19. And from then on, one day under the monastic oak trees of the Pardo, and an afternoon by Álvaro de Luna’s carved stone pool in Cadalso de los Vidrios, and an evening in the Real Club de la Puerta de Hierro with the smell of freshly watered grass, and then on to the Bakanik bar before supper. He came in for some criticism for going to the Bakanik, and he protested, “A workingman can go with his friends to the tavern after work, but I am criticized for going with mine to the bar.” . . . I have seen him in so many different places and in the same place at such different times! He told me once when we were in La Tasca, “We have never been here because yesterday we were here at night and today we got here in the morning. Time must be like space. Even though the place is the same, it is different when you go there at a different time.” . . . I remember him in La Ballena Alegre, standing under the blue cartoons of sea animals, holding his glass of anisette and talking about the size of the moon, exotic literature, Florence or hunting. And at the Charlemagne, high-society medieval banquets in his dinner jacket, standing among the flickering candles in the Hotel de

París, writing a telegram to the mayor of Aquisgrán, savoring a turtle soup with quotations from Pliny. He frequented the salons; I remember him under the green screens and the oil painting of Duchess Leticia. There we would read plays and poetry, and José Antonio would speak intelligently about politics. (Agustín de Foxá, “José Antonio: El amigo,” in *Dolor y memoria,* 217–220)

The discussion groups in La Ballena Alegre and the so-called Charlemagne banquets held in the Hotel de París were presided by an armchair draped in deerskin and attended by twelve guests invited by José Antonio, of whom six or seven were regulars. Apparently, he sometimes invited “political enemies.” Jacinto Miquelarena, “Las Cenas de Carlomagno,” in *Dolor y memoria,* 186–187.

20. He did not agree to the merger because he thought the Falange fell too far Right. Xosé Manoel Núñez Seixas, *La sombra del César: Santiago Montero Díaz, una biografía entre la nación y la revolución* (Granada, 2012), 83, 106; Xosé Manoel Núñez Seixas, “Comunismo, fascismo y galleguismo ‘imperial’: La deriva particular de Santiago Montero Díaz,” in *Los heterodoxos de la patria: Biografías de nacionalistas atípicos en la España del siglo XX*, ed. Xosé Manoel Núñez Seixas and Fernando Molina Aparicio (Granada, 2011), 182; Stanley G. Payne, *Franco y José Antonio: El extraño caso del fascismo español* (Barcelona, 1997), 186.
21. José María Mancisidor, *Frente a frente: José Antonio Primo de Rivera, frente al Tribunal Popular—Texto taquigráfico del Juicio Oral de Alicante, Noviembre 1936,* 59.
22. Ledesma Ramos, *¿Fascismo en España?,* 273–274.
23. Mancisidor, *Frente a frente,* 59.
24. Ibid., 62.
25. Payne, *Franco y José Antonio,* 188.
26. Ibid., 271–272.
27. Vegas Latapié, *Memorias políticas,* 197.
28. Gil Pecharromán, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera,* 277.
29. Vegas Latapié, *Memorias políticas,* 203.
30. Gil Pecharromán, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera,* 281–282.

31. Some years later, he explained his political origins to his colleague García Venero: "I was first a monarchist, then a follower of Albiñana and a Requeté, and finally I joined the Falange." See Maximiano García Venero, *Falange en la Guerra de España: La unificación y Hedilla* (Paris, 1967), 170.
32. On 11 July 1934, he was shot at and injured by some gunmen from a taxi; his wife, Ana María Marín Vidal, was unhurt. The press mistakenly said Groizard was the "leader of the Falange's militias." He did not hold this post but was one of the party's most important figures. See *La Prensa*, 12 July 1934, 7.
33. Gil Pecharromán, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera*, 267
34. At some point I have been unable to pin down, José Antonio discussed with Sánchez Mazas, Ledesma, José Félix de Lequerica (the Basque millionaire who financed the JONS), and Manuel Aznar the possibility of setting up another Falange newspaper entitled *SÍ*. The project never actually got off the ground because of a lack of funds. See Manuel Aznar, "Una noche en casa de José Antonio: El nonnato periódico de Falange Española titulado *SÍ*," in *Dolor y memoria*, 190–192.
35. Gil Pecharromán, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera*, 284.
36. *Ahora*, 12 June 1934.
37. *El Sol*, 7 June, 4 July, and 13 July 1934, cited in Payne, *Franco y José Antonio*, 213.
38. Ansaldo, *¿Para qué . . . ?*, 79.
39. Mancisidor, *Frente a frente*, 66.
40. Núñez Seixas, *La sombra del César*, 23.
41. Jürgen Matthäus and Frank Bajohr, eds., *Alfred Rosenberg: Diarios 1934–1944* (Barcelona, 2015), 240–241. The diaries were found in the United States almost sixty years after a prosecutor at the Nuremberg trials had taken them with him.
42. Ibid., 414.
43. Ibid., 558.
44. Ansaldo, *¿Para qué . . . ?*, 84.
45. Ledesma Ramos, *¿Fascismo en España?*, 303–304.
46. Ibid., 85.
47. Ferran Gallego, *Ramiro Ledesma Ramos y el fascismo español* (Madrid, 2014).

48. Ismael Saz, *Mussolini contra la Segunda República: Hostilidad, conspiraciones, intervención (1931–1936)* (Valencia, 1986), 51.
49. Ledesma later gave a misleading account of his attitude to Calvo and the controversy when he wrote: "He was a representative of the haute bourgeoisie and the aristocracy that obviously clashed with the party's youthful, revolutionary purpose, and its final objective: National Syndicalist revolution. In this regard, Primo, who was gradually becoming more radical, was undoubtedly right." Ledesma Ramos, *¿Fascismo en España?,* 291–292. On Ledesma's interest in Calvo joining the Falange, see Saz, *Mussolini contra la Segunda República,* 52; Gallego, *Ramiro Ledesma Ramos,* 243–245 passim. On Ledesma leaving the party, see Ferran Gallego, *El Evangelio fascista: La formación de la cultura política del franquismo (1930–1950)* (Barcelona, 2014).
50. Primo de Rivera y Urquijo criticized former Minister of Finance Calvo for not staying in Spain to justify his role in the dictatorship in 1931. Miguel Primo de Rivera y Urquijo, *No a las dos Españas: Memorias políticas* (Barcelona, 2003), 21.
51. "At that time [1935], it had become fashionable to suggest the Falange leader was not fit for the post because, as the most benevolent critics argued, he was an essayist and a man of letters, not a political leader. Others compared him to Hitler and Mussolini and regretted he was not a bricklayer." Francisco Bravo, "Con José Antonio sobre César," in *Dolor y memoria,* 236–238.
52. When the vote was tied at sixteen, Secretary Jesús Suevos (the youngest councillor) voted for José Antonio. Payne, *Franco y José Antonio,* 222.
53. The following anonymous article was published four years later (20 November 1938) in the Salamanca newspaper *El Adelanto*:

> And then came the discussion about the uniform. From the very beginning of the Congress [*sic*], a thin, gaunt man, whom not many of us knew, had been listening somewhat restlessly. He was wearing a mechanic's blue shirt. He was no less than Luis Santamarina, a magnificent writer who was representing the comrades from Barcelona, and he was sitting next to Roberto Bassas. Julio Ruiz de Alda also sometimes wore a blue shirt in his work as a driver in Madrid. It was as if he had sensed what the leader would have to

sense later. The discussion began immediately. Some thought simply of the Italian “black shirt,” but this idea was soon discarded. We were not happy with accepting a mere copy, which our worst adversaries were sure to throw back in our faces. Ruiz de Alda and Santamarina argued in favor of nankeen. Ernesto Giménez Caballero, who had recently written a typically suggestive article on the subject, advocated a brownish or bluish shirt or smock that was reminiscent of the austere simple lands of Castile. Luis Aguilar, who had always had somewhat military leanings, suggested the shirt be horizon blue or dull gray so that if it came to war, it would be difficult to see. Aguilar was right, even though nobody could possibly admit he was, because nobody believed the Falange would be embroiled as one of the main protagonists in the present dramatic conflict. And some even dared to suggest green or other more striking colors. For more than an hour, the delegates [*sic*] gave their discreet opinions and bizarre theories about the garment that was to be our symbol . . . And when the issue had been exhausted and the speakers were going around and around in circles, José Antonio showed the determination of the great occasions, dressed up in courtesy, but which brooked no argument. He said, “That’s enough. Since you have elected me, honoring me with your trust, this will be the first time I exercise my authority. The Falange needs a shirt with a color that is clean, whole, serious, and proletarian. I have decided we shall have a blue nankeen shirt. There is nothing more to be said. (“6 October 1934: El primer acto de autoridad de José Antonio—Una organización rotunda, varonil y firme precisaba un color neto, entero, serio y proletario y se instituye la camisa azul,” in *Dolor y memoria*, 259–261)

Blue was also the color of the characteristic overalls the industrial workers of the Republican militias wore during the subsequent Civil War. The material, nankeen, was brought by merchant ships from China that used to dock in British Minorca before continuing their journey. It was yellowish, tough, and resistant and often dyed blue to make working clothes.

54. For different points of view on the meaning of 6 October in Catalonia from the various protagonists, see Enric Ucelay-Da Cal, “El gran dia de la revolta: Illusions i enganys del Sis d’Octubre,” in *6 d’Octubre:*

La desfeta de la revolució catalanista de 1934, ed. Arnau Gonzàlez Vilalta, Manel López Esteve, and Enric Ucelay-Da Cal (Barcelona, 2014), 55–111.

55. Letter from José Antonio to Franco, 24 September 1934, cited in Ramón Serrano Suñer, José Antonio, estudiante, enamorado y parlamentario: Conversación con el ministro del Interior," in *Dolor y memoria de España,* 205–207.
56. Paul Preston, *Franco: "Caudillo de España,"* (Barcelona, 1994), 136.
57. Fernández-Cuesta, "Raimundo Fernández-Cuesta nos habla de José Antonio," in *Dolor y memoria,* 181.
58. "Carta a un militar Español," in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas,* 461–462.
59. Ledesma Ramos, *¿Fascismo en España?,* 328.
60. "El programa de Falange Española de las J. O. N. S.," *ABC,* 30 November 1934, 32–34.
61. *ABC,* 3 November 1934.
62. On the same day the "Twenty-Seven Points" was published, the *ABC* inserted the following note in the newspaper:

> Francisco Moreno y de Herrera, Marquess of Eliseda and member of the National Council of the FE de las JONS, has seen with great sadness that in its new doctrinal program, passed by the policy board and published by its leader, National Syndicalist movement adopts a lay attitude to religion and regards the interests of the Church to be subordinate to those of the state. In my opinion, this doctrinal standpoint is unsustainable, but my sorrow is deepened even further by the underlying spirit of article 25 that is frankly heretical and brings to mind that, for similar reasons, the movement Action Française was condemned. For all this, with great sorrow but doing my duty as a Catholic, I feel obliged to stand down from the FE de las JONS.

José Antonio responded with another note the very next day:

> For some time now, the Marquess of Eliseda has been looking for a pretext to leave the Falange, with which he has very little in common. And he has not wanted to take the final step without leaving behind, by way of a farewell, a noisy declaration, which we can only assume was intended to challenge the religious conscience

of the numerous Catholics affiliated with the Falange. These, however, are quite intelligent enough to realize, first, the statement on the religious problem contained in point 25 of the Falange's program coincides exactly with the understanding of the problem of our most illustrious and Catholic kings, and, second, the Church has its own experts who pass judgment on religious issues, but, of course, at the present moment, the Marquess of Eliseda is not one of them. (*ABC*, 1 December 1934)

63. An Italian report mentions the point in question was along the same lines as the one passed the previous year in the "Initial Points." Saz, *Mussolini contra la Segunda República*, 51. Indeed, it was, which probably just goes to show Eliseda used it merely as an excuse to justify his leaving.
64. Ian Gibson, *En busca de José Antonio* (Barcelona, 1980), 110.
65. Gil Pecharromán, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera*, 344.
66. According to José Antonio during his final trial, Álvarez de Sotomayor played a key role in the split: "He betrayed us, and I had to throw him out. I had a note published in the papers. Precisely because of the things the JONS and the Falange had in common, I wanted them to work together and eventually merge. Then [Álvarez de] Sotomayor came on the scene, and suddenly nobody could agree on anything." Mancisidor, *Frente a frente*, 77.
67. Groizard published a note in the press about his departure, which had been "prompted by the Falange's latest public actions and which, given his status within the party, could undeservedly have been thought to be his responsibility." *ABC*, 12 December 1934, 35–36. He was, among other things, a member of the National Council and the Remunerations Board. After he left the FE de las JONS, we know nothing of his political activity before the outbreak of the Civil War when he was involved in combat in Somosierra and finally sought refuge in the Mexican Embassy, from which he was evacuated to Marseille in 1937. When he got to Nationalist Spain, he joined the Generalissimo's headquarters in Salamanca as an informer on the Falange. He was under the orders of the chief of security, the Civil Guard General Lisardo Doval Bravo (see García Venero, *Falange en la guerra*, 170, 343–344). While he was working in this position, Franco took control of the FE de las JONS and created the Traditionalist Spanish Phalanx

of the Councils of the National Syndicalist Offensive (FET de las JONS). When he had arrived in Salamanca, he had attempted to be readmitted to the Falange and reinstated to the position he had occupied "before separating from the organization," a request that was denied by the Provisional Command Board presided by Manuel Hedilla, who did agree to his being "a mere member." Joan Maria Thomàs, "Actas de las reuniones de la Junta de Mando Provisional Falange Española de las JONS celebradas durante el período 5 de diciembre de 1936–30 de marzo de 1937," *Historia Contemporánea* 7 (1992): 350–351. Apparently, he later worked on other tasks at the headquarters.

68. Francisco Bravo, *José Antonio: El hombre, el Jefe, el camarada* (Madrid, 1939), 218.
69. Mónica Carbajosa and Pablo Carbajosa, *La corte literaria de José Antonio: La primera generación cultural de la Falange* (Barcelona, 2003), 79.
70. Gibson, *En busca de José Antonio*, 211–212.
71. *Juventud*, 8 December 1949, cited in Carbajosa and Carbajosa, *La corte literaria de José Antonio,* 91.
72. Foxá, "José Antonio."
73. De la Serna, "Voz y diálogos con José Antonio."
74. Jacinto Miquelarena, "José Antonio, hombre," in *Dolor y memoria,* 239–241.
75. José Antonio agreed with Sánchez Mazas, at least insofar as Caesar was the Falange's point of reference. As he told Bravo: "Julius Caesar is, possibly, the greatest figure in the history of the West. He is the example from the past we choose to follow. What Mussolini is doing is the same as he first put to the test. He was a great revolutionary; the prophet of a new classical and imperial age. It remains to be seen whether we are capable of showing such a magnanimous soul, such steadfast courage as his." Bravo, "Con José Antonio sobre César," 237. For another reference to José Antonio being a new Augustus made by Gecé on the occasion of the foundation of *El Fascio,* see Juan Aparicio, "Mi recuerdo de José Antonio," in *Dolor y memoria,* 256.
76. Javier Martínez de Bedoya, *Memorias desde mi aldea* (Valladolid, 1996), 78.

77. José Luis Mínguez Goyanes, *Onésimo Redondo 1905–1936: Precursor Sindicalista* (Madrid, 1990), 68.
78. Letter to the editor, *Heraldo de Madrid*, 14 January 1935, 2.
79. *Heraldo de Madrid*, 18 January 1935, 16.
80. Bravo, *José Antonio: El hombre*, 83.
81. Joan Maria Thomàs, *Falange, Guerra Civil, Franquisme: FET y de las JONS de Barcelona en els primers anys del règim franquista* (Barcelona, 1992), 44.
82. Matteo Tomasoni, "Onésimo Redondo Ortega: Vida, obra y pensamiento de un sindicalista nacional (1905–1936)" (PhD diss., University of Valladolid, 2014), 253, 663.
83. Mancisidor, *Frente a frente*, 77.
84. Douglas W. Foard, *Ernesto Giménez Caballero (o la revolución del poeta): Estudio sobre el Nacionalismo Cultural Hispánico en el siglo xx* (Madrid, 1975), 213; Bravo, *José Antonio: El hombre*, 83; Gonzalo Álvarez Chillida, "Ernesto Giménez Caballero: Unidad nacional y política de masas en un intelectual fascista," *Historia y Política* 24 (2010): 282.
85. Enrique Selva de Togores, *Ernesto Giménez Caballero: Entre la vanguardia y el fascismo* (Valencia, 2000), 259–260.
86. Dionisio Ridruejo, *Con fuego y con raíces: Casi unas memorias* (Barcelona, 1976), 156–157.
87. *Informaciones*, 18 February 1935, cited in Selva de Togores, *Ernesto Giménez Caballero*, 261.
88. Bravo, *José Antonio: El hombre*, 228.
89. *Informaciones*, 18 January 1935, cited in Payne, *Franco y José Antonio*, 235.
90. "When he spoke, he pronounced the letter *r* in the French fashion, in the velar region of the mouth . . . At one time he used to comb his hair like Hitler, and at others he would grow a goatee beard like Italo Balbo, so Bergamín sarcastically referred to him as a Balbo oblongata." Ernesto Giménez Caballero, *Memorias de un dictador* (Barcelona, 1979), 78.
91. José Antonio Primo de Rivera, "Arte de identificar revolucionarios," *Arriba* 1, 21 March 1935, 4.

92. “Discurso sobre la revolución española,” speech delivered at Cine Madrid, 19 May 1935, in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas*, 55.
93. Ibid., 61–62.
94. Ángel Viñas, *La Alemania nazi y el 18 de julio* (Madrid, 1977), 424.
95. Saz, *Mussolini contra la Segunda República*, 139–140.
96. Payne, *Franco y José Antonio*, 263.
97. Saz, *Mussolini contra la Segunda República*, 143.
98. Gil Pecharromán, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera*, 373–374.
99. Jon Juaristi, *Miguel de Unamuno* (Madrid, 2012), 409.
100. Ibid., 417.
101. Ibid., 407.
102. Bravo, *José Antonio: El hombre*, 87. Another version, almost certainly by Bravo himself, was published unsigned in *La Gaceta Regional* of Salamanca on 20 November 1938. Francisco Bravo, “José Antonio y Salamanca: El mitin del 10 de febrero y Don Miguel de Unamuno,” in *Dolor y memoria*, 277–280.
103. *Ahora*, 19 April 1935.
104. Miguel de Unamuno, “Otra vez con la juventud,” *Arriba*, 23 March 1935, cited in Juaristi, *Miguel de Unamuno*, 411.
105. Ibid., 436–443 (see also photograph no. 33, which shows the transcript of his speech). In reprisal, Unamuno was removed from his posts as rector of the University of Salamanca and city councillor. With De la Serna as leader, the FE de la JONS tried to exploit his figure to differentiate the party from the new regime’s other sectors. When he died two months later, Falange members played an exaggeratedly prominent role at his funeral and even shouted “¡Presente!” in his honor. Shortly before his death, he said the “nationals” fought against all sorts of Liberalism and suggested Franco was different from the others. He wrote to his friend Quintín de la Torre:

    > How innocently and lightheartedly I went to join Franco’s movement, without even considering the others. And how much I trusted—and still do—that alleged National Leader who has not managed to civilize and humanize his followers. I said, and Franco repeated it, what must be saved in Spain is the “Christian Western civilization” that has been threatened by Bolshevism, but the methods they use are not civil or Western, they are African . . . and

by no stretch of the imagination are they Christian. (Letter, 13 December 1936, cited in ibid., 454–456)

106. Marino Gómez Santos, *Diálogos españoles* (Madrid, 1958), 24.
107. Ibid.
108. *La Vanguardia*, 4 May 1935.
109. “Discurso de clausura del segundo Consejo Nacional de la Falange,” 17 November 1935, in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas*, 65.
110. Mancisidor, *Frente a frente*, 60–61.
111. Ibid., 80.
112. “Sobre la reforma agraria (Discurscos pronunciados en al Parlamento),” 23 July 1935, in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas*, 283–288.
113. Claudio Sánchez Albornoz, *Mi testamento histórico-político* (Barcelona, 1976), 181.
114. Joan Maria Thomàs, *Lo que fue la Falange: La Falange y los falangistas de José Antonio, Hedilla y la Unificación, Franco y el fin de Falange Española de las JONS* (Barcelona, 1999), 53–55.
115. “Discurso de clausura,” 75–76.
116. Rafael Sánchez Mazas, “Nación, Unidad, Imperio,” *Arriba*, no. 1 (21 March 1935).
117. Mancisidor, *Frente a frente*, 61.
118. In Gredos, he ran into Pilar Azlor, who had just gotten married and was spending her wedding night there. José Antonio told his biographer that night was the worst of his life. Ximénez de Sandoval, *Biografía*, 327.
119. Payne, *Franco y José Antonio*, 277.
120. Rafael Ibáñez Fernández, *Estudio y acción: La Falange fundacional a la luz del diario de Alejandro Salazar (1934–1936)* (Barcelona, 1993), 36.
121. Thomàs, *Lo que fue la Falange*, 57.
122. Ibáñez Fernández, *Estudio y acción*, 38–39.
123. Gibson, *En busca de José Antonio*, 136–141.
124. Ibáñez Fernández, *Estudio y acción*, 39.
125. “Los muertos de la Falange en el parlamento,” 8 November 1935, in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas*, 305.

126. Payne, *Franco y José Antonio*, 274.

127. Marqués de Valdeiglesias, “El día que querían matar a José Antonio,” in *Dolor y memoria*, 249–251.

128. “Discurso de clausura,” 71.

129. *Arriba* 22, 5 December 1935.

130. Julio Gil Pecharromán, *Conservadores subversivos: La derecha autoritaria alfonsina (1913–1936)* (Madrid, 1994), 232.

131. “Discurso de clausura,” 66–67.

132. “El Frente Nacional,” *Arriba* 24, 19 December 1935.

133. Ibáñez Fernández, *Estudio y acción*, 39.

134. José María Gil-Robles, *No fue posible la paz* (Barcelona, 1968), 434–435.

135. Ximénez de Sandoval, *Biografía*, 624–625.

136. Gil-Robles, *No fue posible*, 444–445.

137. Selva de Togores, *Ernesto Giménez Caballero*, 271.

138. Juan Ignacio Luca de Tena, “En propia defensa: Contestación a Ernesto Giménez Caballero,” *Burgos*, 3 December 1938, cited in ibid., 259.

139. According to Gecé’s version:

> José Antonio reprimanded me and told me how disappointed he was. Sometimes back then I had what I called the “nerve” to respond. Today I call it “vanity” or “petulance” and I asked him, there in the prison in Madrid, to forgive me for it . . . He did not just grant my wish; he hugged me and entrusted me before witnesses—Raimundo, Gregorio Sánchez Puerta, Miguel Primo de Rivera and, if I am not mistaken, Alfaro—with the task of publishing a magazine representing the thought of the Falange for the month of October. These were his words, his legacy to me, and it was José Antonio who provided, there and then, the title for the magazine he wanted me to publish: *Unidad* [Unity]. (Selva de Togores, *Ernesto Giménez Caballero*, 273)

140. Ximénez de Sandoval, *Biografía*, 665–666.

141. Ibid., 664–665.

142. Apparently, he had entitled the 1934 score “Dawn in Cegama,” after his native village. Iker González-Allende, “Gender and Nation in Basque Narrative during the Spanish Civil War (1936–1939)” (PhD

diss., University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, 2007), 248. The Spanish state purchased the original score in 2000, as well as other items the musician left.

143. Francisco Bravo, “La canción de guerra y amor de la Falange,” in *Dolor y memoria*, 243–247. Bravo’s article is based on information provided by Ridruejo and Foxá. Apparently, José Antonio had threatened to give those who did not attend a dose of castor oil, insisted the meeting would not finish until the lyrics were complete, and ordered two militia leaders to guard the door: Aznar Gerner and Aguilar. The idea of the meeting had been put forward the previous day at another meeting in the home of Marichu de la Mora attended by José Antonio, Alfaro, Sánchez Mazas, and Ridruejo. It was the day after the première in Madrid of Julien Duvivier’s 1935 film *La bandera*, based on the 1931 novel by Pierre Mac Orlan and starring Jean Gabin and Annabella. It was set in the Spanish protectorate in Morocco, and the leading character was a Legionnaire. Apparently, when it premiered, at least in France, the opening credits contained a reference to General Franco.

144. Since it was not possible to produce a record with the anthem, Falange members sang various versions of the lyrics after the war broke out. This situation lasted until Ridruejo managed to lay his hands on an original copy Pilar Primo had given her sister Angela and had the original lyrics published in Valladolid. Tellerín spent the war in the Republican zone, where he composed melodies for propaganda films. In the postwar period, he composed more anthems for the Falange and Franco.

145. Gil Pecharromán, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera*, 429–430.

146. Number of party members according to to Mariano García Canales, the Falange administrative secretary (1935–1936), in conversation with Stanley G. Payne in 1959. Number of activists according to José Luis Arrese, an FE de las JONS activist and later the general secretary of the Movement, in conversation with Juan José Linz in 1960. Payne, *Franco y José Antonio*, 304n177.

147. Gil Pecharromán, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera*, 429–430.

148. *ABC*, 14 February 1936, 15.

149. After he read the report of what he had said, he wrote a letter to the editor:

> When I spoke of the huge poster of Mr. Gil-Robles in the Puerta del Sol, I did so in a slightly ironic tone, incompatible with the desire for fire and mob action. Those who know me understand I am little inclined to solemn invitations. Quite apart from the fact that, in this case, the topic of conversation (that sad hoarding with the face of the man who went "for the three hundred") was hardly likely to incite the rage of Heaven, or even the rage of the mob. Don't you think so? (Ximénez de Sandoval, *Biografía*, 675)

150. "Aquí está Azaña," *Arriba* 33 23 February 1936, in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas*, 675–677.

151. "La revolución, ocasión para un césar," 395–399; see also Mancisidor, *Frente a frente*, 341–346.

152. *La Vanguardia*, 21 February 1936.

153. "Aquí está Azaña," 676. In January 1936, he had written:

> The middle-class Left will govern once again, sustained in difficult equilibrium by the tolerance of the center and the demands of the subversive masses. If our governors—Azaña, for example—were to be so fortunate as to chance upon a national policy that could ensure the replacement of this precarious support with other stronger, longer-lasting partners, Spain may once again enjoy more fruitful times. But it is more likely he will not hit upon a solution, and, in this case, Spain's lot will be decided by either the Marxist revolution or the national revolution. (*Arriba* 26, 2 January 1936)

154. Ibáñez Fernández, *Estudio y acción*, 41.

155. "Por mal camino," *Arriba* 34, 5 March 1936. José Antonio changed his attitude to a government that was not prepared to put up with the Falange's activities, even though Azaña's did not change the discourse that had so impressed him. On 3 April 1936, for example, at the opening of the parliament, he said:

> We are here to end all abusive concentrations of wealth, wherever they may be; to find a more equitable balance of social duties using a criterion that is neither new nor invented by us but is designed to extirpate the idle parasite and not to consider that Spanish society consists of just two types of men: those who participate in

> production and those who live off the work and labor of others . . . We need to think that in Spain there are also thousands of Spanish citizens who do not live from not working but who cannot live because they do not work . . . When we attack politics in these terms, we are convinced we are undertaking a task of national dimensions, of national importance. Please understand, gentlemen, when I use the word "national," I do not do so in the sense that what is national is unanimous. It is often thought or said something is national as a reason for demanding unanimity or assuming there is already unanimity. No, no, no. There are national problems, and the solutions will probably be rejected by a considerable part of the nation. When I use the term "national," I refer to the magnitude, volume, and content of problems, the interests they affect and the position the Republican government adopts to face up to them and find solutions. (Manuel Azaña, *Discursos políticos,* ed. Santos Juliá [Barcelona, 2004], 450–451)

But by this time, the Falange was in a headlong downward spiral of violence and refused to listen to reason.

156. Jorge Bonilla, *La historia no contada de los Primo de Rivera* (Madridm 2016), 227.

157. Julián Zugazagoitia, *Historia de la Guerra de España* (Buenos Aires, 1940), 7–8; Rodolfo Llopis, "Spain Awaits Her Hour," *Ibérica* 7 (1957): 4–6, cited in Payne, *Franco y José Antonio,* 309–310n4.

158. "Prieto se acerca a la Falange," *Aquí Estamos,* 23 May 1936, in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas,* 403–404.

159. Eduardo González Calleja, *Cifras cruentas: Las víctimas mortales de la violencia sociopolítica en la Segunda República española (1931–1936)* (Granada, 2015), 297.

160. The defense lawyer of one of Ortega's comrades was Goicoechea, who visited José Antonio in La Modelo to coordinate the defense strategy. Finally, Ortega was spared the death sentence and was imprisoned in the El Dueso penitentiary, where he was murdered shortly after the war broke out. He also helped others escape by plane. Antonio Goicoechea, "José Antonio, abogado," in *Dolor y memoria,* 188–189.

161. Gil Pecharromán, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera,* 441.

162. Ansaldo, *¿Para qué . . . ?,* 115–118.

163. Raimundo Fernández-Cuesta, *Testimonio, recuerdos y reflexiones* (Madrid, 1985), 60.
164. Ximénez de Sandoval, *Biografía*, 715–718.
165. Fernández-Cuesta occupied Wenceslao Carrillo's cell. For his account of the arrest, see Felipe Ximénez de Sandoval, "José Antonio en la cárcel Modelo," in *Dolor y memoria*, 226–232.
166. On this issue and the life of José Antonio and the other Falange leaders in the Modelo, see ibid., 284–286.
167. Gil Pecharromán, *Conservadores subversivos*, 467–468.
168. Azaña, *Discursos políticos*, 378; *ABC*, 14 April 1936; see also José Luis Galbe Loshuertos, *La justicia de la República: Memorias de un fiscal del Tribunal Supremo en 1936* (Madrid, 2011), 141; Julio Aróstegui, "De lealtades y defecciones: La República y la memoria de la utopía," in *Al servicio de la República: Diplomáticos y Guerra Civil*, ed. Ángel Viñas (Madrid, 2010), 48.
169. González Calleja, *Cifras cruentas*, 306.
170. Ibid., 286–287.
171. Mancisidor, *Frente a frente*, 169.
172. González Calleja, *Cifras cruentas*, 287. A Falange source cites the number of Falange, JONS, and FE de las JONS members killed in combat as eighty-one, the result of counting the list given by Francisco de Asís de la Vega Gonzalo, *Aniquilar la Falange: Cronología persecutoria del nacionalsindicalismo* (Oviedo, 1999), 225–227.
173. Eduardo González Calleja, *En nombre de la autoridad: La defensa del orden público durante la Segunda República española (1931–1936)* (Granada, 2014), 257.
174. For a detailed analysis, see ibid., 259–325.
175. Ibid., 264.
176. Ibid., 269–270.
177. Fernando del Rey Reguillo, *Paisanos en lucha: Exclusión política y violencia en la Segunda República española* (Madrid, 2008), 512–520.
178. González Calleja, *En nombre de la autoridad*, 272.
179. Edward Malefakis, *Reforma agraria y revolución campesina en la España del siglo XX* (Barcelona, 1971), 428, cited in ibid., 292.
180. González Calleja, *En nombre de la autoridad*, 283. He went on to say:

The documents available suggest the doom-ridden diatribes about the Popular Front deliberately surrendering law and order must be seriously called into question. The government responded to the tumultuous manifestations of joy and demands for the release of prisoners in February and the armed reaction to right-wing provocation in March with measures of goodwill of varying effectiveness, such as the amnesty and the failed attempt to call municipal elections. But when the violence started to get out of hand, it did not hesitate to implement extremely tough measures against the owners of weapons and any local Popular Front authorities who abused their powers to impose a partial privatization of public law enforcement. After May, they gave nobody any privileges, although compliance with governmental orders was far from total or uncontested. The so-called zero tolerance with Conservative groups was really little more than a moderate repression that led to hundreds or thousands of arrests, but only a very small part of these lasted for any length of time. With the exception of the Falange, the political activity of the right-wing groups was limited because of the ongoing state of alarm, but their freedom of expression was not restricted, as can be seen at the newsstands (where censorship affected the publications of all political groups), lecture halls, and the parliament. The situation was very similar to the one the Left experienced in 1935, the difference being that the workers at that time did not take advantage of the progressive legalization of their organizations to carry out the insurrection that had failed in October 1934, while in 1936 the various right-wing groups exploited the relative opportunity the government's deficient handling of the situation had given them (particularly in terms of gaining the loyalty of the various police forces and the Army) to thoroughly prepare a coup.

181. For a description, see ibid., 309–310.

182. Ibid., 310–311.

183. Ian Gibson, *La noche que mataron a Calvo Sotelo* (Barcelona, 1982), 207. Some not always reliable sources, such as Ángel Alcázar de Velasco, suggest the murderers were Falange members.

184. The government measures had been to order the closure of the headquarters of Spanish Renewal and Traditionalist Communion on the

one hand and of the Anarcho-syndicalists and libertarian cultural associations on the other. González Calleja, *En nombre de la autoridad,* 314.

185. Manuel Valdés Larrañaga, *De la Falange al Movimiento (1936–1952)* (Madrid, 1994), 14.
186. Payne, *Franco y José Antonio,* 321–322.
187. Fernando del Rey Reguillo, "La República de los socialistas," in *Palabras como puños: La intransigencia política en la Segunda República española,* ed. Fernando del Rey Reguillo (Madrid, 2011), 224–226.
188. Manuel Ballarín, *La razón en marcha: Crónica del Frente Popular de Zaragoza* (Zaragoza, 2004), 76.
189. Gonzalo Álvarez Chillida, "*Negras tormentas* sobre la República: La intransigencia libertaria," in Rey, *Palabras como puños,* 106.
190. Hugo García, "De los Soviets a las Cortes: Los comunistas ante la República," in Rey, *Palabras como puños,* 144–155.
191. Saz, *Mussolini contra la Segunda República,* 164–165.
192. *No Importa,* 6 June 1936.
193. Alfonso Lazo, *Retrato de fascismo rural en Sevilla* (Seville, 1998); Alfonso Lazo, *Historias falangistas del sur de España: Una teoría sobre vasos comunicantes* (Seville, 2015); José Antonio Parejo Fernández, *La Falange en la Sierra Norte de Sevilla (1934–1956)* (Seville, 2004); José Antonio Parejo Fernández, *Las piezas perdidas de la Falange: El sur de España* (Seville 2008); José Antonio Parejo Fernández, *Señoritos, Jornaleros y Falangistas* (Seville, 2008).
194. In early May 1936, Gil-Robles complained to Prime Minister Casares of the CEDA members whom the government had arrested, which he quoted as being 2,500:

> Mr. Casares told me he would release all those who really belonged to Popular Action but that he would do nothing to help those who seemed to be members but really belonged to the Falange. I responded that if things continued to go as they had been doing, he wouldn't have to release anyone because everyone was leaving to join them. Then, Mr. Gil-Robles spoke to a group of members of the parliament and journalists about the situation and he said, the way things were going, he predicted he would soon bring his political

venture, which had begun in 1931, to a close since the party he led had been created to have its say in the parliament, and the parliament was gradually losing interest because the situation could only be resolved by taking action in other spheres. ("Gil-Robles espera que en breve tiempo cerrará el paréntesis de su actuación política," *El Correo de Andalucía*, 6 May 1936, 2, cited in Santiago Navarro de la Fuente, "¿Y ahora qué? Los católicos y el Frente Popular," lecture, "La España del Frente Popular 80 años después" symposium, University of Seville, 17–18 May 2016)

I would like to thank the author for providing me with a written copy of his presentation.

195. Sid Lowe, *Catholicism, War and the Foundation of Francoism: The Juventud de Acción Popular in Spain, 1931–1939* (Brighton, 2010), 147, 149.
196. "Carta a los miltares de España," 4 May 1936, in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas*, 485–488.
197. Saz, *Mussolini contra la Segunda República*, 165–166.
198. Ibid., 168–170.
199. Ibid., 177.
200. In the interview, Franco had refused to give in to José Antonio's demands and had spoken at great length about a new type of cannon.
201. González Calleja, *En nombre de la autoridad*, 199–208.
202. Letter from José Antonio to "I.," 27 June 1936, cited in Bravo, *José Antonio: El hombre*, 129–130.
203. Ibid., 126–130.
204. Ibid., 130.
205. Margarita "Margot" Larios Fernández de Villavicencio, daughter of Josefa Fernández de Villavicencio y Crooke (Marchioness of Marzales), had been educated in England and married Miguel in Algeciras, where she was living, on 27 April 1935. The couple later moved to Jerez de la Frontera. They often spoke to each other in English (Miguel, like all his brothers, had had an English nanny, but his father had also sent him to live in the United States after his dalliance with Infanta Beatriz). After they had both been released from prison (they were exchanged for leading Republican prisoners), and once the war was over, they lived in Madrid. There, Miguel occupied

the posts of civil governor and minister of agriculture. They had no children. Some years later, when Miguel was ambassador of the United Kingdom (1951–1958), they separated, and Margot remarried in 1955 with the anthropologist Julian Pitt-Rivers, the author of major studies on Andalucía. She divorced him, too, in 1971. Miguel Primo died in Madrid in 1964. After their time in Alicante prison, Margot, Carmen, and Aunt Ma were sent to Alacuás prison (Valencia), apparently at different moments. The prison was located in an old Jesuit residence where the Republic guarded "distinguished female prisoners" who were Francoists. There, Margot coincided with her sisters María Isabel and María Luisa, voluntary nurses in the Falange who had been captured at the Battle of Brunete. Apparently because of British intervention, all three of them were swapped at the port in Valencia. Aunt Ma and Carmen were exchanged for the Irujo brothers. Also in the prison at the time were Pilar Millán Astray, Rosario Queipo de Llano, and Pilar Jaráiz Franco, among others. It is not clear when exactly the three Primo family members coincided in the prison. For an account by María Teresa Mayesa Lucia Mingarro, daughter of Luis Lucia, leader of Derecha Regional Valenciana (Valencian Regional Right), see Lola Alfonso Noguerón and Tomás Rosselló Jaunzarás, "Entrevista a Mayesa Lucia Mingarro: Memòries del campament de presoneres d'Alaquàs (1937–1938)," *Quaderns d'investigació d'Alaquàs* (2010): 279–292. For information about the two sisters who were nurses, see *Blanco y Negro,* 4 July 1959. For a poem about Margot, see Pilar Millán-Astray, *Cautivas: 32 meses en las prisiones "rojas"* (Madrid, 1940), 22–23, cited in Antonio Cazorla Sánchez, "Los franquistas como víctimas de la Guerra Civil: Claves de un proyecto de memoria histórica," in *El Franquismo y la Transición en España: Desmitificación y reconstrucción de la memoria de una época,* ed. Damián A. González Madrid (Madrid, 2008), 52–53.

206. Mancisidor, *Frente a frente,* 185.

207. Ibid., 73.

208. According to Serrano Suñer, he had spoken to Prime Minister Diego Martínez Barrio about possibly transferring José Antonio to Burgos, Vitoria, or some other city where the coup was guaranteed to be a success. José Antonio had shown no real interest in the matter and had asked him to take care of his brother Miguel: "Don't worry about that.

I want you to use the little influence we have to get him out of here [pointing to Miguel, who was sulking just behind them] because he has nothing to do with what we are doing and he's always reproaching me for the difficulties I'm creating for the family." Serrano Suñer, *Entre el silencio*, 61. Given the rather biased nature of Serrano Suñer's autobiographical work, and of the biographies he commissioned, we should take this comment with a grain of salt and assume it was made to discredit Miguel Primo, who was a minister and a member of the Political Board under the presidency of Serrano Suñer himself. For a general overview of Serrano, see Adriano Gómez Molina and Joan Maria Thomàs, *Ramón Serrano Suñer* (Barcelona, 2003).

209. "Vista a la derecha: Aviso a los 'madrugadores'—La Falange no es una fuerza cipaya," *No Importa* 3, 20 June 1936, in Obras Completas de José Antonio, http://www.rumbos.net/ocja/jaoc2170.html; Mancisidor, *Frente a frente*, 317–320.

210. *Arriba* 22, 5 December 1935, 1.

211. Letter, 12 July 1936, cited in Bravo, *José Antonio: El hombre*, 135–136. He went on: "I agree with you that I can see in their arguments some recognition of our viewpoints." But this was as far as he was prepared to go, and he immediately spoke of the danger of power falling into the hands of the Maura-Prieto tandem, "who will artificially stimulate business, public works, et cetera, in order to create a false economic prosperity with no deep foundations. At the end of this feverish activity in search of well-being a great economic crisis will come upon us, and our people will be spiritually unprepared to resist the last and decisive Communist attack (which, if we were to have our way, would have little chance of succeeding amid a period of middle-class calm.)" And he finished: "Thank you for your trust and discipline. If you do your best to help, I will be quite happy. All the best, José Antonio."

212. "Vista a la derecha," 4.

213. "A todas las jefaturas territoriales y provinciales," 29 June 1936, in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas*, 755–756.

214. Valdés Larrañaga, *De la falange*, 13–14.

215. Martin Blikhorn, *Carlismo y contrarrevolución en España 1931–1939* (Barcelona, 1979), 340.

216. Antonio Lizarza Iribarren, *Memorias de la conspiración: Cómo se preparó en Navarra la Cruzada, 1931–1936* (Pamplona, 1953), 92–93.
217. Preston, *Franco,* 174–176.
218. Gibson, *En busca de José Antonio,* 154–155.
219. Ibid., 158–159.
220. According to García Canales's account published in José Antonio Martín Otín, *El hombre al que Kipling dijo sí* (Madrid, 2005), 137.
221. Bravo reproduced the text as that "conserved by a comrade who survived the Red persecution in Madrid." Bravo, *José Antonio: El hombre*, 243–245. It was later included in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas*, 491–492:

> A group of Spaniards, some of whom are soldiers and others civilians, have no desire to witness the total disintegration of the Fatherland. Today this group rises up against the treacherous, incompetent, cruel, and unjust government that is on the point of ruining our country. For the past five months, we have been putting up with dishonor. Power is in the hands of a bunch of rebels. Since they came to power, we have not had a moment's peace, our homes have not been respected, our jobs are not safe, our lives are not safeguarded. While these lunatics, who are incapable of working, rant and rave in the parliament, private houses are profaned by the police (if they have not been set on fire by the mob), churches are pillaged, decent people are shut up in prison on a whim. Justice is not the same for everybody: the members of the Popular Front have preferential treatment. The Army, the Navy, and the police are all infiltrated by agents of Moscow, sworn enemies of Spanish civilization; an unworthy press poisons people's minds and encourages the basest of passions, from hatred to indecency; all villages and homes have been transformed into infernos of resentment; separatist movements are encouraged; hunger is on the rise; and to bring all this to its most evil peak, an illustrious Spaniard who had confided in the honor and the sense of duty of his fellow public officials has been murdered in Madrid by government agents. The cowardly ferocity of this deed has no parallel in modern Europe and can be compared with the darkest pages of Russian Czechia. That is the situation in our country just when the circumstances in the world require us to fulfull our destiny of greatness. After

centuries of being eclipsed, the essential values of Spanish civilization are once again coming to the fore, while other nations that had pinned their hopes on fictitious material progress see their light is waning. This ancient land of ours with its missionary and military pride, its rustic and seafaring virtues is opening up paths of great splendor. Whether we set out on these paths depends only on we Spaniards, on whether or not we live in unity and at peace, attempting with our body and soul to make our Fatherland great, to build a great Fatherland for all of us, not just a privileged few, a Fatherland that is great, united, free, respected, and prosperous. In defense of our country, today we openly defy the enemy forces that hold it captive. Our rebellion is an act of service for the Spanish cause. If our aspiration were merely to replace one party with another, one tyranny with another, we would not have the courage—which requires a clear conscience—to run the risk of this supreme decision. Neither would we have the support of men who wear the glorious uniforms of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Civil Guard. They are well aware they cannot use their weapons on behalf of any particular side; they can only protect the permanence of Spain, which is what is now threatened. Our victory will not be that of a reactionary group, and the nation will not lose anything from it. On the contrary: we will be working for the nation, and we will succeed in raising the people's standard of living—which is truly gruesome in some regions—and enable them to share in the pride of a great destiny regained. Workers, farmers, intellectuals, soldiers, sailors, guardians of our Fatherland: shake off your despair at the sight of its collapse and help us make Spain one, great, and free! May God be with us! *Arriba España*!

222. Santos Juliá, *Vida y tiempo de Manuel Azaña 1880–1940* (Madrid, 2008), 389–390.

223. On 18 or 19 July, the defendant [José Antonio] received a visit from Antonio Macía [*sic* for Maciá, the brother of the provincial leader in Alicante, José María, who was in the same prison] "El Pollo." José Antonio gave him a letter he took at once to the Benalúa barracks in Alicante. At the time, [Maciá] was the capitain of a group of over sixty armed Falange members who he had left, strategically deployed, just outside the city with the firm intent of storming the capital and

submitting the legally constituted authority. They did not manage to do so because of the opportune intervention of the assault troops on which they opened fire in an attempt to join forces with the Army in the capital. On one of the aforementioned dates, the defendant himself received a visit from Carlos Galiana, in the company of the Baron of Linde and Victoriano Pineda, who, on the afternoon of 19 July, returned to Alicante with a machine gun.

For the final conclusions of the public prosecutor's office, see Mancisidor *Frente a frente,* 163. For more on the visit and José María Maciá, see Vicente Ramos, *La Guerra Civil 1936–1939 en la provincia de Alicante,* vol. 1 (Alicante, 1972), 89.

224. Gibson, *En busca de José Antonio,* 153.

225. According to Serrano Suñer, in the middle of the conspiracy but before the war had broken out, José Antonio had spoken to him about his lack of confidence in the Army and his fear that the coup would be Conservative. He had suggested the government be a coalition with Prieto, Gil-Robles, Calvo, and others and that the Army's role was precisely to help bring about this government. The only source of this information is Serrano Suñer, *Entre el silencio,* 60.

226. Indalecio Prieto, *Convulsiones de España: Pequeños detalles de grandes sucesos,* 3 vols. (Mexico City, 1968). Prieto had already published them on 24 May 1947, in the Mexican journal *Mañana,* and they appeared later in a PSOE pamphlet in Toulouse. Fernández-Cuesta, who was exchanged for Justino de Azcárate in 1937 after negotiations by Prieto (who was attempting to incite the Francoist rearguard), says Prieto gave him photographed copies of José Antonio's will—of which Raimundo was joint executor—and other copies of papers about his proposal for a coalition government and a promise of immunity issued by Prime Minister Giral. However, the documents were taken from him in Biarritz before he crossed the border. Fernández-Cuesta, *Testimonio,* 119. For his part, Prieto sent a copy of the will to the other executor, Serrano Suñer, during the war. Primo de Rivera y Urquijo, *Papeles póstumos,* 11.

227. Primo de Rivera y Urquijo, *Papeles póstumos,* 9.

228. Not all the documents published in Primo de Rivera y Urquijo, *Papeles póstumos,* were actually contained in the Mexican suitcase (e.g., the documents that belonged to José Antonio's brother Miguel

were from his personal archive). The list of the documents that were really from Mexico has recently been published in Bonilla, *La historia no contada*, 128–130.

229. Bonilla, who classified the material once it was in Spain, said that after "War," "a general" had been written, crossed out, and replaced with "The President." Likewise, after "Navy," "an admiral" had been replaced with "Maura (M)." Bonilla, *La historia no contada*, 119.

230. Primo de Rivera y Urquijo, *Papeles póstumos,* 142–145. In late 1934, or 1935, maybe as part of the failed project to plan an uprising in Salamanca and probably to encourage the most anti-Republican sectors of the Army to take part, José Antonio had drafted a very different list of government ministers, full of Falange members, generals, specialists, professional diplomats, former Primo de Rivera supporters, and the occasional friend from the CEDA: National Defense, Franco; State, Bárcena (*sic* for Bárcenas); Justice, Serrano Suñer; Education, Eduardo Aunós; Undersecretary, Valdés Larrañaga; Economy, Carceller; Interior, Mola; Security, Vázquez; Development, Manuel Lorenzo Pardo; Corporations, Mateo; Undersecretary, Garcerán; Communication, Ruiz de Alda; Undersecretary, José Moreno Osorio; Morocco and Colonies, Goded. Payne, *Franco y José Antonio,* 277.

231. Ramos, *La Guerra Civil*, 100.

232. Diego Martínez Barrio, "Episodio en Alicante: Sobre José Antonio Primo de Rivera," in *Homenaje a Diego Martínez Barrio,* ed. Antonio Alonso Baño (Paris, 1978), 183–189, cited in Payne, *Franco y José Antonio,* 345, and in Gibson, *En busca de José Antonio,* 250–253.

233. According to Martínez Barrio in 1941: "There was no chance of plucking the leader of the Falange from the grasp of justice," quite apart from the fact that the Francoists would never have provided the weapons. He believed José Antonio made the proposal because he regretted past errors, which is hardly credible. In his own words: "One of the organizers of the rebellion—possibly the most intelligent and therefore the most dangerous—expressed regret since, from the solitude of his cell, he said an effort needed to be made to contain the danger that was threatening the Spain that belonged to everybody." Martínez Barrio, "Episodio en Alicante," cited in Gibson, *En busca de José Antonio,* 252.

234. The first “Demands” section was the only one divided into subsections: industrial reform, bank reform (the nationalization of the credit service), and, above all, agrarian reform, which distinguished between economic and social measures. The section on economic agrarian reform spoke of “*a*) delimiting farm land and habitable land; *b*) reforesting land not suitable for farming. Cattle restocking; and farm land should be divided up into units for specific purposes: dry farming, irrigated farming, and [illegible] crops.” “Industrialized syndicate farming” was included as part of dry farming, “family smallholdings. Family and cooperative farming” as irrigated farming, and “olive trees. Other irrigated crops. Small side industries” as crops. The section “Social [Agrarian Reform]” stated: “Resettlement of the Spanish people on habitable land and farm land, either with or without compensation: I attach a proposal with a political solution: *National Front*.” Primo de Rivera y Urquijo, *Papeles póstumos,* 146.

235. Ibid., 142–145 (emphasis added).

236. The journalist Jay Allen interviewed Franco on 27 July in Tétouan and published the conversation: “Allen: ‘For how long will you put up with the current situation now that the coup has failed?’ Franco: ‘There can be no agreement, no ceasefire. I shall save Spain from Marxism at any price.’ Allen: ‘Does that mean you are prepared to shoot half of Spain?’ Franco: ‘I said at any price.’” Jay Allen, “How I Found Leader of Spain’s Fascist Phalanx in Alicante Prison: Jay Allen Interviews Primo’s Son,” *News Chronicle*, 24 October 1936, cited in Paul Preston, *Idealistas bajo las balas: Corresponsales extranjeros en la guerra de España* (Barcelona, 2007).

237. The deception included removing the following paragraph from the defense attorney’s conclusions: “José Antonio Primo de Rivera offered himself to the (Provisional) Government of the Republic, in the person of the Undersecretary of Agriculture, Mr. Martín Echevarría, to negotiate with the rebels and thus limit the effects of the rebellion.” This and other things—like the “disappearance” of a previous prosecutor who did actually take part—prompted Jeroni Miquel Mas Rigo (quite appropriately) to entitle his book *La manipulación del proceso de José Antonio Primo de Rivera* (Madrid, 2014). As Mas Rigo explains, Francisco Bravo (*José Antonio ante la justicia roja* [Madrid, 1941], 134) had already mentioned the interview in an

excerpt from a report by the legal adviser of the Ministry of Defense, Valldecabres, in which he said, "They [José Antonio's family] claim José Antonio negotiated with Martínez Barrios [*sic*], through Echevarría, in an attempt to bring peace to Spain, and is therefore innocent of what he is accused of." For more on the controversy about the alleged refusal of the Movement's secretary general to allow Mancisidor's book to be published and the support of Miguel Primo and Fernando Herrero Tejedor on the issue, see Juan Arias-Andreu, *Memoria de un triunviro* (Madrid, 1976), 362. Also excluded was José Antonio's script of his defense. The shorthand transcript of the trial was found a few weeks after the end of the war in Madrid by members of the Ramón Laguna Centuria of the Alicante FE de las JONS, which was first under the command of Miguel Primo. In the liberation of Alicante, this unit had functions of policing and vigilance. It was made up of Falange members from Madrid. However, the Falange's activity in Alicante, including taking control of the city before Franco's troops arrived, was carried out by members of the Alicante fifth column, commanded by José Mallol Alberola. José Mallol Alberola, *La estampida (final de la Guerra Civil en el puerto de Alicante)* (Alicante, 2000), 60; Ramos, *La Guerra Civil*, 254–255.

238. He had found that the two brothers

> were in cells adjoining a section where there were thirty or more prisoners of the same ideology. I waited until the next day because some civil servants were taking up their posts, and I sent a man whom I trusted completely, Abundio Gil, to search their cells. As a result, we found the two pistols, four clips, and two razor blades. Just in case there was anything else in the prison, we changed everbody and searched all the other Fascists. I searched them in person . . . They are now absolutely incommunicado. (Mancisidor, *Frente a frente*, 141–142)

239. For details about this incident and another apparently inconsequential one between the Primo brothers and two CNT members, see Ramos, *La Guerra Civil*, appendix 11, 312–313.

240. Antonio Vázquez Vazquez, a twenty-six-year-old water worker, gave the following response to the prosecutor's questions:

> I can't say on which day it was. I think it must have been at the end of July. A man was released whom we were interested in

> interrogating. I belonged to the CNT’s public health section. The man was Inocencio Feced. Because of his social and criminal history, we were interested in talking to him so that he could clear up a few points, and while we were about it, we wanted to know what he thought about these gentlemen [indicating the Primo brothers] because he was known to have been in touch with them, and we wanted to take effective action in defense of our ideals. He was released at 9:30. He managed to give us the slip at the prison gates. He caught a train, so when we realized, we caught up with him at Villena. When we had him, he said, “I want to be useful to the CNT. I know you are going to kill me and I want to be useful to you.” We interrogated him, and we found out there were pistols inside the prison, because other colleagues of ours had also heard the same rumor. When we asked him about this, he said, “They have pistols, and they are hidden in the drains of their cells.” We also asked him what the atmosphere was like in the prison, and he said, “They are convinced the Movement will be victorious. They have even packed their cases and they are optimistic.” Then we checked a few other things, and he was killed.

José Antonio asked him, “Did you do this job on Feced in the heat of the moment or with a cool head, at one o’clock at night?” The answer was, “Not with a cool head. I didn’t go by myself. There were several of us.” (Mancisidor, *Frente a frente*, 143–144)

241. Manuel Azaña, *Memorias políticas y de guerra*, vol. 2 (Barcelona, 1978), 84.
242. Signed document: 2.1/2.204, Carlos Esplá archive, cited in Mas Rigo, *La manipulación*.
243. Juliá, *Vida y tiempo*, 395.
244. Enrique de Rivas Ibáñez, *Comentarios y notas a “Apuntes de memoria” de Manuel Azaña y a las cartas de 1938, 1939 y 1940* (Valencia, 1990), 197–203. I am grateful to Jeroni Miquel Mas Rigo for making this book available to me.
245. Azaña, *Diarios completos*, 991.
246. Serrano Suñer, *Entre el silencio*, 169.
247. Allen, “How I Found Leader of Spain’s Fascist Phalanx.”
248. Mancisidor, *Frente a frente*, 75–76.

249. General Cause 1501-1 and 2, National Historical Archive, cited in Mas Rigo, *La manipulación*.
250. For details on attempts at exchange and release by bribery or force, see Thomàs, *Lo que fue la Falange*, 108–111. For a good summary about all the movements in this respect, see Francisco Torres García, *El último José Antonio* (Madrid, 2013), 287–388.
251. Ángel Viñas, *Guerra, dinero y dictadura: Ayuda fascista y autarquía en la España de Franco* (Barcelona, 1984), 91; Thomàs, *Lo que fue la Falange*, 110; Ramos, *La Guerra Civil*, 189–190.
252. José de Mora-Figueroa, *Datos para la historia de la Falange gaditana 1934–1939* (Jerez de la Frontera, 1974), 118–119; José Antonio Girón de Velasco, *Si la memoria no me falla* (Barcelona, 1994), 43.
253. Statement by López Zafra to the General Cause, cited in Ministerio de Justicia, *Causa General: La dominación roja en España—Avance de la información instruida por el Ministerio Público* (Madrid, 1944), 27.
254. *Gaceta de Madrid*, 26 August 1936, 1,479.
255. Ramos, *La Guerra Civil*, 185–186. Official communication from the Ministry of Justice of the time taken from the documents belonging to the Serna family, cited in Mas Rigo, *La manipulación*. The sentence of the Supreme Council of Military Justice in 1943 says Serna Navarro went to the Ministry of Justice "to point out that the judge of the trial, Federico Enjuto, was being partial. Serna's protest merely prompted the Marxist authorities to ratify their confidence in Enjuto and remove Serna from office." On the other hand, according to Montes Agudo: "Juan Serna had been appointed prosecutor. He came on the scene when Enjuto had already started his investigation. They discussed the case but did not see eye to eye. So then they went to Madrid, where the government placed its confidence in Enjuto and dismissed Serna." Gumersindo Montes Agudo, *Vieja Guardia* (Madrid, 1939), 305–306. Likewise, he says Enjuto was Prieto's right-hand man (303), he took his time on things because he wanted to remain in Alicante for as long as posible so as not to go back to Madrid, and the prosecutor Gil Tirado accelerated the whole process (308).
256. Mas Rigo, *La manipulación*, 5.
257. Testimony by Serna Navarro's son cited in ibid.; Fernández-Cuesta, *Testimonio*, 109.

258. Ramos, *La Guerra Civil*, 140.
259. Ibid., 313, appendix 12.
260. Mas Rigo, *La manipulación*, chapter 2.
261. After this bloody and destructive bombing, on the same day, 29 November, a mob assaulted the prison and captured forty-nine Francoist prisoners—including the provincial chief of the FE de las JONS, José María Maciá—who were shot in the city's cemetery (one of them managed to escape, so the final death toll was forty-eight). The bombing was known as the "eight-hour bombing" because it had lasted from 8 p.m. of 28 November to 3 a.m. of 29 November, resulting in three civilian deaths and twenty-six injured, the Campsa deposits being set on fire, and damage to various buildings. Ramos, *La Guerra Civil*, 143–144.
262. A reference to the shooting of fifty-two Falange members from Alicante who were involved in the uprising and executed on 12 September 1936, after a trial presided over by Gil Tirado. One more, Antonio Maciá, was sentenced to death in his absence. Ibid., 186.
263. Rivas Ibáñez, *Comentarios y notas*, 115.
264. Ibid., 137.
265. Enrique de Aguinaga, "José Antonio y Azaña," *ABC*, 6 June 1996, 48.
266. Indalecio Prieto, "Si Primo de Rivera viviese," *El Socialista*, 15 August 1957, 3. According to another Socialist, Julián Zugazagoitia, the authorities in both Cartagena and Alicante were opposed to exchanging important prisoners because they believed they were insurance against Nationalist bombings. Zugazagoitia, *Historia de la guerra*, 246.
267. An article by Juan de Valencia published in *Amanecer* and *La Gaceta Regional* on 20 November 1938 describes the bombing as bloodless and the starting point of the legal proceedings against José Antonio. In fact, the bombing reactivated the proceedings, and, of course, there were casualties: "The highly effective bombing the national air force carried out in Alicante, destroying nearly all the targets—*without causing a single victim* [emphasis the original]—was the event that set the trial in motion." Juan de Valencia "La 'Justicia' roja trama y consuma la condena de José Antonio a la última pena," in *Dolor y memoria*, 298.

268. The bombing and the change in the minister of justice are the two main reasons Mas Rigo gives for José Antonio's death sentence. Mas Rigo, *La manipulación*, 29.

269. Ramos, *La Guerra Civil*, 183.

270. Mancisidor, *Frente a frente*, 37.

271. Ibid., 40. In the *Guión* (Script) of his defense, which was not found in the famous "Mexican suitcase" but was first published in *Papeles póstumos de José Antonio*—albeit with some mistakes—and which he used as a guide for his interventions in the trial, José Antonio questioned the use of the adjective "dictatorial": "Dictatorial character . . . Where has he got that from? . . . Modestly I would say some parallel can be drawn (but that's about it: not that imaginary inherited dictatorial ambition the judge attributed to me; neither my father nor I have ever had the slightest inclination to be dictators)." Bonilla, *La historia no contada*, 225, 230. For information about their being not in the suitcase but among his brother Miguel's papers, see ibid., 142. Any mention of the suitcase would have been censored in Mancisidor's book.

272. An article in the Alicante newspaper *El Día* on 18 November 1936, says the following about José Antonio during the hearing, in the stage before the jury retired for deliberations:

> Quite oblivious to the hustle and bustle of so many people crowded into the chamber, during a short break in proceedings José A. Primo de Rivera reads a copy of the prosecutor's summing up. He barely blinks. He reads as if those sheets of paper hold information that does not affect him. Not the slightest grimace; not the slightest frown; not the slightest change in expression crosses his visage. He reads, he reads eagerly, with all his concentration, without the incessant buzz of the chamber putting him off for an instant. The papers are nothing less than the prosecutor's terrible request for severe punishment for the reader. For him and his family sitting a little farther away, holding hands, whispering an endless, tender dialogue overseen by the warders who are guarding them. Then, almost as soon as the session restarts, it is the prosecutor's turn to read those pages impassively, no changes in tone, no nuances. [José Antonio] listens to the drone, seemingly with little interest as if all that horror has nothing to do with him. While the prosecutor reads,

> he reads, writes, and tidies his papers. He shows no sign of being affected, no sign of nerves. Margarita Larios is hanging on to every word and gazing at her husband, Miguel, who is paying attention, perplexed . . . [illegible]. The prosectuor reads and reads amid the emotion of the general public and the attention of the jury. José Antonio only raises his eyes from his papers when the accusation against the prison officials is withdrawn and he sees them walk free to the shouts of approval from the public gallery. This attitude, however, only lasts a moment, during which he expresses not surprise but vague hope. At once, he begins to read, unhurriedly and calmly, his own conclusions, which the public listen to with rapt attention. The prosecutor makes his report. It is a difficult one. He makes charge after charge based on the evidence provided. Margot wipes the tears from her eyes with a small handkerchief. Miguel listens but does not dare to look at the prosecutor: his eyes are fixed on his brother's face, avidly searching for some encouraging gesture or a sign of despair. But José Antonio remains inscrutable and only livens up when it is his turn to speak in his own defense or in defense of the other defendants.

A photograph of the newspaper article is in Ministerio de Justicia, *Causa general,* annex 2, and was published in 1939 as "La justicia popular: Impresiones de una sesión histórica," *Dolor y memoria,* 203–204.

273. Mancisidor, *Frente a frente,* 209.

274. Ibid., 65.

275. Ibid., 170.

276. Ibid., 82–83.

277. Ibid., 209–210. This is his own version of events in Albacete, where loyalist troops defeated Chápuli (of the Civil Guard) and the other rebels. See Francisco Sevillano Calero, "La sublevación de julio de 1936 en Albacete," *Al-Basit: Revista de Estudios Albacetenses* 35 (1994): 133–151.

278. Mancisidor, *Frente a frente,* 84.

279. Ibid., 211–212.

280. Ibid, 194.

281. Ibid., 198.

282. Ibid., 200–201. In the *Guión* he had prepared for his defense, he had written:

> When I (successfully) argued in favor of extending the 1934 amnesty to several thousand CNT members; when, after Asturias, I said in the parliament that being victorious was the least of it, we now had to find out in what respects the revolutionaries were right, and do something about it; when I spoke about agrarian reform, the accusation against Azaña, the end of the Monarchy (19 May), the end of capitalism (17 November and the lecture at the [Círculo Mercantil]) and the replacement of the capitalist economy with a Syndicalist one, the right wing said, "Stop! This man is an undesirable." (Bonilla, *La historia no contada,* 230)

283. Mancisidor, *Frente a frente,* 63.
284. Ibid., 203.
285. Ibid., 208, 212.
286. Ibid., 215. In the script for his defense, he had written:

> Summary. Will you punish me for founding the Falange? (Illicit association, says the T. S. [2. f.] of the Rep.) For the charges you level at the Falange? (There is not the slightest proof. All before 17 July.) For taking part in the rebellion? (You can all see it is just the opposite!) (How could I? I was locked up in here!) For plotting? (If you do not believe all I did was for purposes of prevention, then you will assume I was plotting; you cannot possibly assume I was a leader.) Do not forget you are judges and I am an adversary obliges you to greater rectitude. Face up to the consequences of my acts, and still die? Maybe; but I am not a show-off; I prefer not to lose my life or my freedom when I do not deserve to do so; to deny taking part would be cowardice; to claim responsibility for something I have not done would be puffed-up, ridiculous arrogance. I prefer to live and to work [illegible] the Spanish people with the three parts of one of our mottos: the Fatherland, bread, and justice. (Bonilla, *La historia no contada,* 233)

In light of what he wrote, it is not surprising this *Guión* was not included in Mancisidor's book. Whatever the case, in 1963, it was in Spain and not in Mexico, in the hands of Miguel Primo, who wrote the prologue for Mancisidor's book.

287. Mancisidor, *Frente a frente,* 208.
288. In the "Conclusions" of his script, José Antonio had written: "1st. None of the three took any part at all. No Exchange." Mancisidor, *Frente a frente,* 214.
289. Mancisidor, *Frente a frente,* 190.
290. Ibid., 194.
291. *El Día,* 18 November 1936.
292. The same report says: "Then came the deliberations of the jury, a torture for everybody—the public and the defendants—which lasted for hours and hours of uncertainty."
293. The report makes no mention of this second deliberation.
294. Mancisidor, *Frente a frente,* 239–240. Valldecabres was executed in 1940. His family believes he was against the death penalty but was forced into it "by some men who obliged him to sign." Mas Rigo, *La manipulación,* 10.
295. For details about the appointment of Esplá as minister and the first few days of November 1936, see Pedro Luis Angosto Vélez, *Sueño y pesadilla del republicanismo español: Carlos Esplá—Una biografía política* (Madrid, 2001), 284–285.
296. Joan Serrallonga i Urquidi, "El aparato provincial durante la Segunda República: Los gobernadores civiles, 1931–1939," *Hispania Nova: Revista de Historia Contemporánea* 7 (2007).
297. Rivas Ibáñez, *Comentarios y notas,* 197.
298. Mancisidor, *Frente a frente,* 236.
299. Ibid., 197.
300. Juan García Oliver, *El eco de los pasos* (Barcelona, 2008), 342–343.
301. Rivas Ibáñez, *Comentarios y notas,* 197.
302. Azaña, *Diarios completos,* 491 and *passim*.
303. In England, she published a novel, which she dedicated: "To José Antonio Primo de Rivera. I promised you a book before it was begun. It is yours now that it is finished. Those we love die for us only when we die." Elizabeth Bibesco, *The Romantic* (Kingswood, 1940).
304. Mariano Ansón, *Yo fui ministro de Negrín* (Barcelona, 1976), 167–168.
305. Ximénez de Sandoval, *Biografía,* 827.

306. Mancisidor, *Frente a frente,* 240; José María García de Tuñón Aza, *José Antonio y la República* (Oviedo, 1996), 179.
307. Francisco Largo Caballero, *Mis recuerdos* (Mexico, 1976), 196.
308. "As a minister, I voted for the sentence handed down by a popular court to be carried out." Prieto, "Si Primo de Rivera viviese," 3.
309. J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas*, 771–774.
310. Ximénez de Sandoval, *Biografía*, 814–818.
311. Carmen Primo de Rivera, "Alicante," in *Dolor y memoria*, 220–223.
312. Ximénez de Sandoval, *Biografía*, 819.
313. *La Nación* (Buenos Aires), 14 July 1938, cited in Agustín del Río Cisneros and Enrique Pavón Pereira, *Los procesos de José Antonio* (Madrid, 1969), 371–373.
314. C. Primo de Rivera, "Alicante," 223.
315. Carmen Primo, Aunt Ma, and Margot heard the shots from their prison at this time. Ibid.
316. Statement by Diego Molina Molina, cited in Herbert R. Southworth, *Antifalange: Estudio crítico de Falange en la guerra de España de M. García Venero* (Paris, 1967), 162–163.
317. J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas*, 193.
318. See, e.g., Santicatén [Joaquín Martínez Arboleya], *Porque luché contra los rojos* (Montevideo, 1961), esp. 61–63. For a convincing refutation of the authenticity of the account contained therein, see Jeroni Miquel Mas Rigo, "¿Presenció Santicatén el fusilamiento de José Antonio Primo de Rivera?" *El Catoblepas* 127 (2016): 11.
319. Statement by Juan José González Vázquez in Mas Rigo, *La manipulación*, cited in Ministerio de Justicia, *Causa General*, 29.
320. Mallol, *La estampida*, 60.
321. Ibid., 151.

Chapter 4

José Antonio’s Fascist Ideology

Having analyzed José Antonio’s political career and his ambition to become, first, the leader of the Fascist party and, then, the leader of a Fascist regime in Spain, we shall now explore the fundamental features of his political thought, of his own political and ideological synthesis, as expressed in his texts. His Fascism, like all Fascisms, was quite specific and peculiar. It should be said from the outset that rather than looking on his thought as an original theoretical corpus, I consider his “doctrine” a mixture of interpretations of various philosophers, thinkers, historians, and politicians. The resulting synthesis is heavily dependent on some of them, although it does contain some original ideas. The contributions from other sources clearly outnumber his own contributions, even though the idolized image painted of him by the Franco regime was not only that of an original thinker but as the absolute last word in original thought of his time. Of course, the real Spanish Fascist “intellectual” was not José Antonio but Ramiro Ledesma Ramos.[1]

Of the writers who influenced his political thought, particular mention should be made of Christian theologians such as Saint Thomas Aquinas; philosophers and thinkers like José Ortega y Gasset, Eugenio d’Ors, Ramiro de Maeztu, and Miguel de Unamuno,[2] as well as the traditionalist Víctor Pradera; historians such as Spengler and Berdiaeff; legal theorists such as Rudolf Stammler and Hans Kelsen; political thinkers such as Georges Sorel and Karl Marx; politicians such as Mussolini; “comrades” such as Ledesma, Ernesto Giménez Caballero, and his closest and most faithful friend, Rafael Sánchez Mazas; regenerationists who were reacting to the evils of restoration and the Disaster of 1898 like Ángel Ganivet and Joaquín Costa; and poets and writers like Rudyard Kipling and the Krausists.

José Antonio’s thought is a synthesis, in varying degrees, of them all, with some additions of his own to a personal Fascist doctrine that was

differentiated from Italy's and Germany's by the Christianity component. Of all the influences, Ortega y Gasset was clearly the greatest, followed by D'Ors. In fact José Antonio's appropriation of some of Ortega y Gasset's key concepts is quite embarrassing,[3] and even more so because of the extent to which his exegetes described his work (and continue to describe it) as an original corpus.

Nevertheless, this dependence on Ortega y Gasset's thought did not stretch to his adopting the same Liberal political stance. José Antonio's enthusiasm for Fascism clashed head-on with Ortega y Gasset's refusal to embrace Fascist regimes and his respect for Liberal democracy, even though some of his ideas showed a certain attraction for authoritarian solutions. In fact, in the wake of Giménez Caballero's criticism of Ortega y Gasset in his book *Genio de España*[4] (although he did not mention him by name), José Antonio himself publicly questioned why Ortega y Gasset had not taken his thought to what he believed were its ultimate consequences: his support for an authoritarian, Fascist solution to the ills of Spain. In an article published in *Haz* at the end of 1935, he wrote:

> A generation that under the influence of Ortega y Gasset almost woke Spain from its lethargy has entrusted itself, tragically, with the mission of organizing the country. Many of those who joined up would have preferred to follow their intellectual vocation . . . The time we are living in shows no mercy. Our destiny is war, for which we must uncomplainingly spare no effort and give our all. Accepting our destiny, we travel from place to place and endure the embarrassment of public exhibition. We are forced to proclaim out loud all that we have thought out in the most austere of silences, which is deformed by those who do not understand us and those who do not wish to understand us. We struggle in this absurd practice of conquering "public opinion," as if the people, who are capable of love and rage, could collectively be subject to opinion. All this is painful and difficult, but it will not be useless. I would like to make a prediction for José Ortega y Gasset. Before his life, which we all hope is a long and fruitful one, comes to an end, the day will arrive when, in view of the triumphal march onward of this generation, of which he was the distant teacher, he will have to utter the joyful cry, "That is it!"[5]

The reference at the end is to the famous "That is not it, that is not it" that had been part of Ortega y Gasset's "Rectification of the Republic" speech given four years earlier when the Republican Constitution was being debated. Ortega y Gasset had criticized the articles on the regional autonomies and the Catholic Church and argued in favor of

> rectifying the profile and the tone of the Republic, which requires the emergence of a great political movement in the country, a giant party that links expressly with that exemplary fact of national solidarity, inherent in the Republic, and interprets it as an instrument of all or nothing to forge the new nation, making it agile, skillful, harmonious, up to date, able to spring forward on the hindquarters of historical fortune, a fabulous animal that has always raced past nations.[6]

In fact, José Antonio said: "When he sees our Falanges marching, José will have to exclaim, 'That's it, that's it!'"[7] Ortega y Gasset, however, did not take the hint, and when he finally did, many years later, the myth surrounding José Antonio was in full flow in Franco's Spain.[8] Nevertheless, he was always aware of the influence that some aspects of his thought had had on Spanish Fascists—in particular, José Antonio and, before him, Ledesma and Giménez Caballero. Jordi Gracia has explained: "Even though Ortega says he 'didn't have the slightest idea,' he knew full well that an idea developed 'by myself as far back as 1921 had a decisive influence on an eminent young man, whom I never got to know and whom was one of the most illustrious and tragic victims of the Civil War.'"[9] He knew this because he had been told by Justino de Azcárate—an ASR member and friend of José Antonio—and his own son Miguel Ortega Spottorno, a medical schoolmate of Fernando Primo and a regular at La Ballena Alegre. Among the other regulars were Sánchez Mazas, Agustín de Foxá, José María Alfaro, Samuel Ros, Jacinto Miquelarena, Eugenio Montes, Pedro Mourlane Michelena, Dionisio Ridruejo, Víctor de la Serna, Luis Bolarque, Luis de la Serna, Fernando de la Quadra Salcedo, Luis Peláez, Javier de Salas, Antonio de Obregón, Juan Cabanas, Alfonso Ponce de León, Juan Tellería, and Juan Antonio de Zunzunegui.[10] Giménez Caballero, also a Falangist (although somewhat intermittently), was not a member of the group. These discussion groups were held in the same place as others of different ideologies. Ortega Spottorno, for example, took part in one with Communists such as Gabriel Celaya. The place was frequented by university students who lived in the Residencia de Estudiantes (Student Residence), some of whom were also members of Federico García Lorca's theater group, La Barraca. García Lorca, too, had been known to attend some discussions. Apparently, such a wide variety of attendees sometimes led to outbursts of rivalry. Celaya told the following story:

> We were there at a table. And there was another discussion at the table opposite, occupied by the founders of the Falange: José Antonio Primo de Rivera, Jesús Rubio (who went on to become a minister), José María Alfaro . . . We knew them all and we would insult one another,

> but it was like a game. We would say “Bastards!” “Fascists!” “Reds!” This would have been 1934 . . . We were always insulting one another, but there was no real hostility. The discussion groups were quite separate and we would criticize one another in the newspapers, but there was no outright war. It was all quite friendly, a rivalry between intellectuals and students. We would see one another at the same exhibitions, the same concerts, the same plays. Madrid was very small.[11]

Some members of José Antonio’s discussion group (e.g., Ponce de León) were also members of La Barraca.

Apparently, García Lorca and José Antonio did actually know each other. They finally met after José Antonio had made several attempts to set up a meeting, although there are varying opinions about the extent of their friendship.[12] García Lorca’s alleged claims they used to dine together every Friday should not be taken at face value. José Antonio also attended other discussion groups, one of which was held at the home of Marichu de la Mora, with some participants from La Ballena Alegre among the guests.[13] And in San Sebastián, he used to frequent GU from the first day it opened to the public in August 1934. It was a society for artists (most of whom were painters, apparently) and gastronomists founded by the architect José Manuel Aizpurúa (Falange leader of Gipuzkoa and a national councillor, who was responsible for the interior design), Sánchez Mazas, and other comrades like Cabanas and Tellería. It was there he met Picasso.[14] Other discussion groups also met at La Ballena Alegre, one of which was led by José Bergamín, who also knew José Antonio.

José Antonio never publicly recognized the extent of Ortega y Gasset’s influence on his thought. When a comrade (the Salamanca journalist Francisco Bravo) asked him about it, he replied: “There is no doubt the intellectual roots of our doctrine lie in Ortega, particularly the postulate of the ‘unit of destiny’ I believe is fundamental if our movement is to be able to face up to the problems of Spanish reality and the future state.”[15] This was extremely reductionist, given the philosopher’s influence on him went much further and affected such attitudes as his irrationalism and his exaltation of minorities and, among these, “egregious” men and aristocratic values. He was also affected by the discovery of his concept of generation as the driving force behind history[16] and his theses on the decadence of Spain. Likewise, José Antonio’s concept of nation can be traced back to Ortega y Gasset, although in this instance, D’Ors, Maeztu, Gecé, and Unamuno also influenced him.[17] On the other hand, he did recognize his

debt to Bravo ("I have attended his classes on philosophy at the Central University [of Madrid], and I am familiar with all his work") and that he had been "introduced" to Ortega y Gasset but could not be regarded as friends.[18] He explained this somewhat distant relationship a little pretentiously but in accord with the facts: "Our coolness toward each other may have been caused by his attitude to my father in the latter stages of the dictatorship. But I know he takes heed of what we are doing, even when he persists in the Liberal error of his ways, which gives him a mistaken vision of the historical facts of Fascism."[19]

Ortega y Gasset's indifference to the Falange—quite apart from the fact that, in the years of the Republic, the party had little objective influence—was in stark contrast to the attitude of another thinker who affected José Antonio: Eugenio d'Ors ("Eugeni" before his resounding split, in 1920, with the Commonwealth of Catalonia and Catalanism). D'Ors had immediately and publicly congratulated José Antonio on the speech he made at the Teatro de la Comedia because he believed he had been "courageous" and had defined the "direction, if not the program, of a new force that is preparing to act with spirit in Spanish politics."[20] Alongside Ortega y Gasset, Maeztu, Giménez Caballero, and Unamuno, D'Ors was to be a crucial influence on such issues as José Antonio's anti-national and imperial concept of nation.[21]

It was thanks to Ortega y Gasset's work *La rebelión de las masas*, published in 1929, that José Antonio understood the idea of society being divided into "masses" and "excellent minorities," which gave him his aristocratic vision of history. According to the philosopher, there was a division not "between social classes" but rather "between types of men." Ortega y Gasset believed there were more "minorities" in the higher class than in the lower and that their members were distinguished by their discontent with themselves, a self-critical discontent that involved their imposing duties on themselves to strive for more and encouraged them to fulfill "a mission." This was in stark contrast with the idle self-satisfaction of "the masses." They were different "ways of being." For him, the "minorities" were made up of "egregious men" who felt the need to commit themselves to "something superior" and frame their life in a discipline that would serve to achieve something "transcendental." In this way, they sublimated their discontent by subordinating it to a "destiny," to a mission, that transcended them and raised them to the highest form of human

condition. They lived with perpetual tension and effort and, in this way, came to terms with the “nobility” of their lives and their pasts. In all this, it is not difficult to find in Ortega y Gasset the influence of Nietzsche and his “supermen.” But they did not only have “duties.” The minorities also had rights, such as being able to devote themselves to “certain artistic or luxurious pleasures.” The problem, however, was that in the twentieth century, unlike previous times, the “masses” had access to all these things but also entertained aspirations to govern, something that historically had been reserved for the “minorities” and for which they had been proved to be completely unsuited. This was the reason behind Ortega y Gasset’s criticism of Bolshevism and Fascism as “typical movements of mass-men directed, as they all are, by mediocre men who act precipitately and have no historical memory or historical conscience.”[22]

Likewise, he held that history was aristocratic because the minorities were always in power. And if things were to work, “illustrious” men had to direct and guide “vulgar” men, and transmit systems of beliefs and values. They had to “govern,” bearing in mind a “public opinion” that was little more than the reflection of what the “minority” had previously transmitted to the “masses.” That is, even in a Liberal democracy, it was not the “inferior” men who really took the decisions; the “masses” abided by the decisions taken by one “minority” or another. And the minorities not only commanded; they “gave people something to do,” “fitted people into their destiny,” and prevented their “extravagance,” “which often involved wandering aimlessly about in an empty, desolate existence.” The masses were instructed to take part “in a venture, in a great historical destiny.”[23]

José Antonio accepted all this but not Ortega y Gasset’s belief that “the best class of life known to date, the political form that has shown the greatest desire for people to live in harmony is Liberal democracy. We should do well to remember today that Liberalism is supreme generosity: it is the right the majority gives the minorities and it is, therefore, the noblest cry ever to have resounded on the planet.”[24] José Antonio, on the other hand, believed the “minority” surrounding him—with himself at the center, although he never actually said so—was obliged to impose its plans on the “masses” in an authoritarian and dictatorial fashion. He and his Falange were the “select and illustrious men” of the time. They had been singled out to save Spain because the masses were incapable of saving themselves from the threats that hung over their heads (more specifically, from a new “grim,

Asiatic invasion of barbarians," from Bolshevism and Communism.) Spain could only be saved by him and those who followed him, the Falange "minority immune to discouragement." He wrapped his message up with a good deal of heroism and missionary zeal, presenting it as his life's work. According the José Antonio, "life is for living, and it can only be lived by carrying out or trying to carry out a great venture." In this were echoes of Nietzsche, the direct result of his reading the works of the German philosopher, but he had also been influenced by Ortega y Gasset, Giménez Caballero, and Ledesma: he idealized the aristocracy, he glorified self-discipline, he had a vocation for power, and, to some extent, he was in love with danger.[25]

For all these reasons, José Antonio did not plan to follow the political route Ortega y Gasset had embarked on in 1933, the year in which the Falange came into being. After being a member of the parliament for the ASR, Ortega y Gasset did not take the opportunity to become the leader "of the Spanish youth," which he regarded as an "extremist" option—which probably meant Fascist or semi-Fascist. At the time, he wrote:

> It is highly likely the generation that is now listening to me, like others from this country and from abroad, will allow itself to be whisked away by the futile force of some extremism or other (that is to say, something that is substantially false). I am not unaware that in twenty-four hours I could have almost all Spanish youth, as one man, behind me: I would need to utter only a single word. But that word would be false. And I am not prepared to invite you to falsify your lives. I know, and you too will know it in not too many years from now, all the movements of this time are historically false and condemned to terrible failure. There was a time that condemning extremism inevitably meant one was a Conservative, but today it is clear this is not the case, because extremism can be either progressive or reactionary. My condemnation stems not from the fact that I am Conservative but from my discovery that it is truly a vital fraud.[26]

José Antonio, on the other hand, did opt for extremism, as Ledesma had done before him—a Fascist extremism. In his belated reproach of Ortega y Gasset—for withdrawing from politics and deliberately keeping silent after his experience with the ASR—he criticized the fact that when

> he discovered "all that" was not what he wanted it to be, he became disenchanted and turned his back on it. And leaders have no right to be disenchanted. They cannot capitulate and give up the battered illusions of those who have followed in their wake. Don José harshly imposed on himself a long sentence of silence, but the generation he left unprotected was in need not of his silence but of his voice. His prophet's voice; his leader's voice.

But José Antonio was there to do what "Don José" would not. In 1935, he was theorizing about his political experience—the experience of his own "minority"—and he claimed that, unlike the work of an intellectual, which is based on doubt, the work of a politician requires

> great faith: looking out from within—people, history—the function of the politician is a religious and poetic one. The lines of communication between the leader and his people are now not just intellectual but poetic and religious. If a nation is not to become so diluted that it loses its shape, its structure, the masses must follow their leaders as if they were prophets. This understanding between the masses and their leaders is achieved by a process similar to that of love.[27]

That is, the process is an irrational one, within the domain of feelings. His intention, then, was to reveal essences and push the "masses" toward their "destiny" with "poetry"—"people have only ever been moved by poets," he wrote—and an almost religious commitment. And he was to be their guide.

He described his membership of the Falange "minority" as a sort of inevitable personal sacrifice that required him to adopt a heroic and tragic attitude to life. He claimed the Falangists aspired to nothing more than to be "the first to face danger" and that they had no interest in riches or honors. He predicted that, on the day their revolution was victorious, they would end up losing everything[28] because they were noble and generous and had to act as the historical driving force behind the country (as if this were an unavoidable obligation). Being one of them meant, above all, sharing not a way of thinking but rather a "way of being" (paraphrasing Unamuno). They did not need votes, he said (although this does not explain why he presented himself as a candidate in the 1936 elections) but the Truth (with a capital T). The important thing was their "mission," and only they knew what this involved, because, as he had claimed in his speech at the Teatro de la Comedia, "it has been inscribed in the stars" since the beginning of history. They were now interpreting what was inscribed there. But what attitudes should they adopt to particular problems? The answer to this question was given a few years ago by the most lucid Spanish critic of Falange thought, Javier Pradera: "All the Falange needs to do is to take advice from within as long as it takes care to go from one place to another and take heed of old veins that are buried and alive."

It hardly need be said the Falange's truth was not the same as the truth of the Democrats, who, following Rousseau's example, were continuously

putting political truth to the vote. Their Truth was a "permanent entity" and dictated to the Falangists how they should act. As I have pointed out in my analysis of José Antonio's 1931 talk "La forma y el contenido de la democracia," he started his speech by criticizing the conceptions of "that terrible man" Rousseau. His anti-Rousseau ideas were in keeping with those of Ortega y Gasset—and perhaps even more so with those of D'Ors—and he did not accept popular truth as the source of all wisdom and justice. This belief, he said, had had, and continued to have, disastrous consequences, because, for Liberalism, "nothing was just in itself." Everything depended on the will of the people, which was in a constant state of flux. And as the people were sovereign, according to Rousseau, their decisions were right simply because they were theirs. There was no transcendental or superior Reason or Will. Truth was no longer above men but instead depended at all times on the vote. This was José Antonio's interpretation. It had nothing in common with what he said about Truth being "inscribed in the stars." In the past, he said, if a tyrant did not respect the Truth, he was unjust, and his oppressed subjects could act against him. With the advent of Rousseau's thought, this Truth no longer existed. Therefore, it needed to be recovered at all costs, and this was now possible thanks to the Falange. With the Truth, Spain could attain a new order, superior and Fascist, which reflected the classical feudal society theorized by Aquinas.[29]

On the other hand, by formulating a democracy "in form but not in content," Rousseau, according to José Antonio, postulated the existence of a general truth that stemmed from suffrage and then became the will of the state. Rousseau, then, had relativized truth as "a permanent category of reason," ignoring transcendental categories, and by so doing, the components of the state were subject to no ethical demands and accepted neither historical nor ethical legitimation.[30] José Antonio also personified in Rousseau the Liberal state, the state that guaranteed the laissez-faire economic system that had led to such inequality and the emergence of Socialism. In the face of all this, he took his lead from Aquinas and the neo-Kantians, claiming true democracy was "life in common not subject to tyranny, pacific, happy, and virtuous." It should be founded on quality not quantity:

> If instead of focusing on political and social movements we look at the trends in legal thought, we will not find a single contemporary writer who shares the theses underlying *The Social Contract*. The jurists of our time regard justice as belonging to the realm of reason, not to the

> will of many or just a few. So, in response to the claim by one of Rousseau's forerunners, [Pierre] Jurieu, that "the people do not need to be right to validate their acts," Stammler, representing the neo-Kantians, argued the following: "The majority is a concept related to quantity; justice, however, involves quality. The mere fact that many people proclaim something or aspire to something does not mean it is necessarily just. Whether the majority is supported by justice in the practice of the law is something that will have to be seen in each case."[31]

Both José Antonio and Sánchez Mazas[32] borrowed from the German historian Oswald Spengler—and from Nietzsche (one of his teachers) and Goethe—to define the Falange "minority" as a sort of military brotherhood—or, rather, a clerical-military brotherhood. In the words of José Antonio: "There are only two serious ways of living: the religious and the military (or, if you prefer, only one, for all religions are militias, and all militias are steeped in religious feeling)." Spengler glorified the warrior who becomes an ascetic: "One must be a hero or a saint. Between these two extremes lies not wisdom but vulgarity."[33] And we know José Antonio was quite familiar with all things military because of his early army vocation and his family origins.

He took his conception of a spiritual life from Aquinas, Ortega y Gasset, and D'Ors. And he made calls for heroism, self-denial, and permanent sacrifice for an idea and a "mission." "Life means nothing if it is not burned away in the service of a great venture," he wrote in his description of Falangists as ascetics and soldiers, austere men devoted to their mission of saving Spain.[34] Encountering death in their undertaking was just one more act of service, a "heroic sacrament," because individuals only justified their existence through their ability to carry out tasks. This was their "destiny."[35] To sum up, the sense of human existence was to carry out a task, to have a function within the state, in harmony with one's own destiny. "We understand life as service," he said, almost paraphrasing Ortega y Gasset.[36] This principle was so engrained that it would lead to his death. In his thought and his life, there was a profound tragic sense, which would end in tragedy: his execution by firing squad.

From all these military, ascetic, and missionary features, as well as the Italian and German models, José Antonio devised the Falange not as a typical political party but rather as a "militia," conveniently divided into officers and soldiers, or, rather, leaders or hierarchies and members. The leaders were always right and never made mistakes because of their ability

to interpret the Truth. The leaders were clad in uniforms of blue nankeen shirts, saluted with their arm held high in the Roman/Fascist fashion, were organized in paramilitary formations, brandished flags and scripts, sang the anthem “Cara al Sol,” constantly gave lusty cries of “*Arriba España*!” (among other things) and remembered the fallen (when the names of the fallen were read out at roll call, the other members would shout “Present!” because the dead were still “on active service under the stars”). So, like their Italian and German counterparts, the Falange rallies were meticulously prepared with slogans, the party’s flag, and the list of those “fallen in battle” (i.e., in street fights). At the top of the structure (the Falange’s vertex) was the single leader, the National Leader, a reflection of a general or generalissimo (i.e., José Antonio himself). José Antonio accepted and encouraged his enthronement as a lofty figure, like some sort of mythological hero within the organization. The leadership of the nation would arrive in due course. The Falange leaders required blind obedience from its members and were guided by the Truth so that they knew exactly what to do at all times. All this was wrapped up and delivered with its very own metaphor-ridden metalanguage. As Javier Pradera graphically and shrewdly pointed out:

> It seems that adolescents [Falange members] must have been particularly prone to falling under the spell of rhetoric involving the heavens—planets, stars, paradises, and firmaments—the sea—sails, compasses, oceans, slipstreams, and navigations—agriculture—furrows, yokes, ploughs, wheat fields, sheafs, and underground streams—or simply the climate—early mornings, dew, dawns, or frost—because José Antonio, Sánchez Mazas, and the others constantly resorted to reiterative, “poetic,” and mystifying discourse to reinforce their role as the “initiated,” the holders of the truth, and to guide the party and—presumably—the “masses” toward the National Syndicalist revolution.[37]

Ortega y Gasset’s concept of “minority” leadership partly reappeared in José Antonio’s ideas on nation, although he also drew on D’Ors, Maeztu, Giménez Caballero, and even Unamuno. José Antonio’s nation as a “unit of destiny in the universal” meant, in fact, the same and was nominally very similar to (arguably, an exact imitation of) Ortega y Gasset’s “community of destiny,” “community of historical destiny,” and “unit of historical destiny,[38] concepts that were partly based on some aspects of the thought of the traditionalist Víctor Pradera:

> The truly substantive power that drives and feeds the process [of national unity] is always a national dogma, a suggestive project for a life in common. We reject all static interpretations of a common national life; we regard it as dynamic. People do not live together for no reason; this a priori cohesion only exists in families. The groups that make up a state live together for a reason; they are a community of proposals, of desires, of great utility. They do not live together *to be* together, but *to do* something together.[39]

Like D'Ors and all the anti-Romantics, Ortega y Gasset did not believe race, language, customs, and folklore shaped the nation. However, like Ernest Renan, he did believe the nation was a project of coexistence. The nations that some (not all) modern states had generated by unifying their feudal territories offered a common project to those subjects prepared to accept it. Of course, for Ortega y Gasset, this project was the work of the governing "minorities." A single language and other features were secondary, not priority. Moreover, in *España invertebrada*, published in 1921 and inspired by the work of the German historian and jurist Theodor Mommsen, he had claimed nations are processes of incorporation that have historically included, subjugated, and used violence to drive a "spiritually superior" project forward. Not all states had a project: only those that had a special "genius," a divine gift, an "imperative talent . . . , that knows how to want and how to command." It was the talent of the "creative and imperial peoples." This was the case, among others, of the Spanish nation, the center of which was Castile, singled out as the crucible of the country. Castile resounded with the voice of one of its greatest authorities, Unamuno, for whom "Castile's patriotic, indeed human, duty is to try to Castilianize Spain and even the world,"[40] because Castile was home to the very essence of Spain. Likewise, the authentic collective spirit, or *Volksgeist*, of the Spanish people resided in the Castilian language and literature.[41]

José Antonio also took Ortega y Gasset's idea that the history of all nations—jn particular, a "Latin" nation—is a system of incorporation. And Víctor Pradera influenced him:

> If the nation is a higher unit that brings together various historical units with a common link, these would cease to be what they historically are if they were not to remain united because the link, the link that defines them all, would be broken. Universal destiny, the link, can be seen quite clearly, in our historical mission, which has propagated a civilization throughout the world. Nations are defined from without, which is why Spain, since it lost its mission, seems also to have lost even its unity. And thus, in this land of ours, Biscay, as in other regions of Spain, emerged those separatisms, the ultimate crime of treason, which the principles of Liberalism, the source and the cause of our present situation, have brought to our Fatherland.[42]

Both Ortega y Gasset and Pradera claimed Castile had made Spain hegemonic and projected it out into the world to create an empire. Castile had been the nationalizing force behind Spain, and its now weakened state had given rise to local Nationalisms. But it could once again take on the role it had played in the past when it had embodied the project "One Spain." After America, colonization, and the empire, at the end of the reign of Philip II, a slow decadence had begun that involved the gradual loss of Spain's hegemony in Europe, the American colonies, and, ultimately, at the end of the nineteenth century, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. This decadence had then been prolonged with the emergence of internal regionalisms and separatisms in the country. All this was an unequivocal sign that the common project was floundering or even ending. However, for José Antonio, the important thing was, as Ortega y Gasset said, there was hope. The decadence of the modern age and the twentieth century was also affecting the leading nation-states, which, paradoxically, meant there were opportunities for the lesser states, like Spain at the time, to rise up again and stake their claim in the world. For this to happen, however, the "masses" had to accept their subordinate role and recognize that they needed the guidance of "the best."

José Antonio made this approach his own, linked its historicist aspects to Spengler's ideas, and copied the idea of "Spain as a unit of destiny." But he disagreed with Ortega y Gasset on one point, which is where Maeztu, D'Ors, and Gecé entered the fray. In accordance with the first two, he claimed the state was not the nation but that the nation existed previously. As D'Ors said, the nation created and used the state to fulfill a "mission." He sought support from Maeztu, who in April 1934 had published his articles from *Acción Española*—the journal he had directed since 1933—in a volume entitled *Defensa de la Hispanidad*, in which he claimed the Fatherland was not a being but a value and therefore a spirit.[43] Maeztu held that for the Fatherland to exist, some sort of spiritual event had to have created it, as had been the Spanish case with the Visigothic king Reccared's conversion to Christianity in the sixth century. He believed the existence of a nation was not connected to but rather independent of and superior to the will of individuals:

> The Fatherland is made . . . up of people and land, but it is made by the spirit and with spiritual elements. Spain was created by Reccared when he adopted the religion of the people. The Hispanic world is the empire that is founded on the hope that the inhabitants of unknown

> lands, like us, can be saved. Ontic elements, land and race, are little more than prehistory, conditions sine qua non. A being comes into existence by the association of a universal value or a set of values with the ontic elements. To sum up, every fatherland is an embodiment.[44]

This conception was in stark contrast with Ortega y Gasset's, but José Antonio had no objection in mixing it with his own synthesis, even though he considered the foundational moment to be the work of the Catholic kings, not Reccared's conversion. Influenced by Giménez Caballero, who had written *Genio de España,* he had argued that under these monarchs, and later under Charles V, Spain had managed to be Catholic, universal, and imperial, which is when the first Fascism or Spanish unity had emerged.[45] On other issues, he took his ideas from Maeztu: "All historical processes are, in their origin, religious processes. If the religious *substractum* is not revealed, nothing is understandable."[46] Based on this mixture of Ortega y Gasset, D'Ors, Maeztu, and Gecé, he formulated his own concept of nation: "If patriotism were emotional tenderness, it would not be the best of human loves . . . So, in the Fatherland, we should not see the brook and the grass, the song and the bagpipes; we should see a destiny, a venture. The Fatherland is that which has undertaken a collective venture in the world. Without a venture, there is no Fatherland; without faith in a common destiny, everything becomes native regions, local tastes, and colors."[47] That is, the nation—since it preceded Ortega y Gasset's nation-state—was the unit of destiny (also Ortega y Gasset's) that had to be followed:

> How, then, can we revive the patriotism of the grand heterogeneous units? Simply by revising the concept of "nation" and constructing it on a different foundation . . . A people is not a nation for physical reasons, colors, or local flavor but for universal reasons; that is to say, for having a destiny that is different from that of other nations. So, not all peoples or all groups of people are nations: only those that fulfill a different universal historical destiny. Clarifying whether a nation complies with the requisites of geographical unity, race, and language is superfluous; the important thing is to determine whether there is a unity of historical destiny in the universal.[48]

The situation was the same in Castile—the Castile so lauded by Unamuno, Ortega y Gasset, Pradera, and Gecé—of which he said:

> Those of us who live at some distance from the land and sky of Castile have much to learn from them. The land of Castile does not put on airs and graces; it is an absolute, a land that is not local color, the river, the boundary, or the hillside. The land is by no means simply the sum of a number of farms, or certain landed interests to be discussed in assemblies. It is the land:

> the repository of eternal values, austere behavior, the religious sense of life, speech, and silence, the solidarity of ancestors and descendants. And above this absolute land is the absolute sky. The sky so blue, so free of cloudscape and the greenish reflections of leafy groves, so purely blue that it could almost be said to be white. With its absolute land and absolute sky facing each other, Castile has never resigned itself to being just another region. It has felt obliged to aspire at all times to being an empire. Castile has never understood what is local; *Castile has only ever understood what is universal,* and for this reason, Castile denies itself, it pays no heed to its limits, perhaps because it has no physical limits. So Castile, a land of wonderful names—Tordesillas, Medina del Campo, Madrigal de las Altas Torres—the land of the chancery, of fairs and castles, that is, of justice, militia, and trade, reveals to us what the Spain that is no more used to be like, and our hearts suffer with the nostalgia of loss.[49]

Castile, then, was the model on which the Spanish "genius" or essence would be built: "The concealed genius of Spain is its strict, severe way of understanding life, always prepared to take a second look at things from the viewpoint of eternity."[50] This genius was embodied in a faith, in the permanent idea of Spain, "the eternal and implacable metaphysics of Spain."[51] José Antonio admired Castile's (in my opinion, alleged) qualities of austerity and discipline, the religious way of life, the understanding of the land as the repository of eternal values, and the solidarity between ancestors and descendants.[52] He also regarded Castile as an example of Spengler's and Nietzsche's calls to the asceticism of the warrior and the religiosity of the mission he had been entrusted. He even resorted to the stoicism expressed in the work of thinkers and writers from the Spanish Golden Age, such as Baltasar Gracián and Francisco de Quevedo. Paradoxically, his analysis led him to accept the existence of "local Nationalisms"—in particular, that of the nation of Catalonia[53]—but, of course, only so that they could be defeated and incorporated into a common project. Nevertheless, he accepted that they existed, which distinguished his ideology from that of the rest of the far right wing of the age.

With all this, José Antonio was in alignment with a national palingenesis, a regenerationism inspired by the Generation of '98, Unamuno in particular, which would lead, or so they thought, to Spain's conquering another empire. A new empire. His was an "archi-Nationalism" or a "non-Nationalism,"[54] an idea he and Sánchez Mazas adopted and for which they were heavily indebted to D'Ors and his idea of empire.[55] Throughout 1932 and 1933, José Antonio paid regular visits to the Catalan thinker, who lived in Madrid. They got on well. José Antonio said he "was as charming as anyone can be"[56] and wrote him letters saying Nationalism "is utter nonsense."[57] D'Ors, whose son Víctor was contributing to the

Falange newspaper *FE*, had also been friends with Sánchez Mazas since 1915 when he belonged to the Bilbao-based Escuela Romana del Pirineo (Roman School of the Pyrenees), the source of many of his later ideas about the Falange "style." He said "the 'young Marquis of Estella' filled him with excitement, hope, and satisfaction," and he regarded his ideas as

> the fruit of "a dark process of ideological maturity lasting several years" and "the well-guided study of the principles of mission politics" (his own). And on the whole, he was right even, though the pupil's philosophizing did not quite come up to the mentor's standards. José Antonio used sentences such as the following: "The heart has its reasons that reason does not understand. But intelligence also has its own way of loving that the heart does not know of."

D'Ors had drawn up an imperial doctrine for Catalonia and the Catalan Nationalists, and it had been adopted by the president of the Commonwealth of Catalonia, Enric Prat de la Riba, in 1914. D'Ors later transferred it to Castile. The imperialism he advocated was contrary to Nationalism—which was regarded as a product of Naturalism, Romanticism, and Liberalism—and had emerged from "classicism, human artifice, and authority."[58] José Antonio, Sánchez Mazas, and Giménez Caballero had adopted and adapted the doctrine for their imperialist project and, with the support of Ledesma, who had been convinced by Ortega y Gasset and Gecé of the need for an empire, included it in the third point of the Falange's program: "We are committed to the empire. Spain's historical prime is the empire. We will seek a leading position in Europe for Spain. We will not put up with international isolation or foreign meddling. With regard to the countries of Spanish America, we aim for a unification of culture, economic interests, and Power. Spain claims its status as the spiritual axis of the Hispanic world fully justifies the leading role that it needs to have in world affairs."

With regard to Spanish America, then, this imperialism included a unification of Power (with a capital P). Before this, however, they had to spiritually unify the nation by quashing the Catalan and Basque "individualistic" Nationalisms—but not their specific regional characteristics, which were regarded as common heritage—and setting up the new mission, which would also be common to all. Subsequently, within a Europe and a world that were changing thanks to the Fascist states of Germany and Italy—and would change even more with the emergence of others like Spain—the Spanish Fascist state would make its contribution in

the form of powerful armed forces. In fact, the fourth point of the Falange's program stated: "Our armed forces—on land, at sea, and in the air—must be both able and numerous enough to ensure total independence and the appropriate world status for Spain at all times." These armed forces would make it possible for Spain to once again "seek glory and wealth from the sea routes. Spain must aspire to become a great seafaring power, for when the country is in danger and for purposes of trade. We demand our Fatherland give equal status to its fleets and air routes."

This empire José Antonio and the Falange were fighting for went beyond D'Ors's cultural concepts, and it called for conquests and/or reconquests. Although José Antonio never said so publicly, his imperialist projects were quite clearly not only cultural. It was generally claimed—in particular, during the Franco regime, after the defeat of Fascism in 1945—his was a cultural imperialism, but he had his sights firmly set on the construction of a great Iberian and American empire. There are some witnesses to this. For example, José Antonio said to Felipe Ximénez de Sandoval:

> The Falange's Spanish empire [will have] . . . a single flag, a single language, and a single capital. Its flag will be the Catalan one, for it is the most ancient, the one with the most glorious military and poetic tradition of the Peninsula. Its language will be Spanish, for it has the greatest expansive force and universality. It is the language that is used to speak to God, according to Charles V. And its capital shall be Lisbon, the point of entry of the Tagus, from where we can gaze upon the immense Hispanic world of our American blood.

He asked his comrades not to tell too many others about these opinions.[59]

José Antonio's desire to create an empire, then, was inherent to his understanding of Fascism, just as it was in Italy and Germany. Nevertheless, this does not appear in his writings, so most historians—of whom I am one—have made the mistake of not attaching a great deal of importance to it and regarding the imperial claim as a merely cultural aspiration.[60] The fact is that José Antonio frequently referenced the Falange's "desire for an empire" but did not go into much detail about any specific aspirations. A good example is what José Antonio said in a newspaper interview in 1934:

> The Fatherland is a mission. If we regard the Fatherland merely as a territorial or ethnic concern, we run the risk of losing ourselves in fruitless individuality or regionalism. The fatherland must be a mission. There are no continents left to conquer, it is true, and there can be no hope of conquest. But the Democratic notions proposed by the League of Nations are

> already going into international decline. Once again, the world is tending toward being led by three or four racial entities. Spain can be one of these. It has a privileged geographic location, and a spiritual content that entitles it to aspire to be one of these leaders. And that is what we can fight for. We do not aspire to be just another country, for either we are an immense country with a universal mission, or else we are a meaningless and degraded people. We must return to Spain its ambition to be a world leader.[61]

He returned to this issue in the last months of his life as he languished in his prison cell with texts that did not see the light of day until many decades after his death and contained reflections such as:

> What is Spain? A nation? But first, what is a nation? Nationalism = the individualism of peoples. The individual, the native; the nation, the native; against the individual, the person; against the nation (this nation), unit of destiny = several units of destiny in the universal. Among these, Spain = the destiny of Spain, bringing a world into the Catholic culture. Spain was precisely at its peak (in "shape") when the world was in this situation. Spain resolutely assumed responsibility for the Catholic cause: Alexander VI's papal bull, Trento, Lepanto, Valtellina, the Thirty Years' War, etc.[62]

His conception of empire also included the defense of colonialism and its scholars such as his much-admired Rudyard Kipling, whose famous poem "If—" he had hung on the wall in his office.[63] The poem sang the praises of stoicism based on the feats of British colonization in South Africa and the wars with the Boers, the colonists of Dutch origin. The parliament had actually debated this colonialism after the League of Nations proposed to impose sanctions on Italy for invading Abyssinia from its possessions in Somalia and Eritrea in 1935. Jose Antonio contributed the following to the debate:

> Are we going to pretend to be scandalized by another colonial campaign? All European countries have done the same. Colonization is a mission, not a right but the duty of all civilized peoples. Does anyone who aspires to universal brotherhood want to accept de facto exclusion from universal brotherhood that barbarism necessarily involves? Are we going to believe we are defending the right of backward peoples to be members of this universal brotherhood by allowing them to continue being backward? I think it is too late to be scandalized by a country's colonial venture. Spain's glory lay in colonizing.[64]

Colonialism was, and had been from the very beginning, part of Spain's "mission" in the world. More generally, it was part of the "burden" white men had to shoulder of taking civilization to places that it had not yet reached, which Kipling himself had described in his 1899 poem "The White

Man's Burden" (paradoxically dedicated to the United States after its victory in the Spanish-American War and had to cope with the colonization of the Philippine Islands).

The whole issue of the new opportunities that, in José Antonio's opinion, were (allegedly) opening up for Spain was closely related to his vision of history, a vision that stemmed from Ortega y Gasset, the work of Spengler, and other authors like Nicolas Berdiaeff[65] and the Nobel Prize–winning surgeon Alexis Carrel. José Antonio was a faithful follower of Spengler and an avid reader of his *The Decline of the West, The Hour of Decision,* and *Prussianism and Socialism*.[66] He took from him the idea that humanity does not "believe" in developing but instead limits itself to "fulfilling the mission" it has been assigned within an inevitable circle of the birth and death of "civilizations." In *The Decline of the West* (1923), Spengler imagined this cycle was made up of biological organisms "called by their fatal logic to inevitable decline and consumption. Each one of the historical ages seems like a transition to other ages" with their own values.[67] He regarded Western civilization, which he referred to as "Democratic," as "the classical manifestation of civilization as the irrevocable destiny of a culture that has surrendered to social demagogy and sold itself to worker socialism." But he believed it was in its last throes and that the emerging form that would replace it was "Caesarism, which grows out of democracy but whose roots penetrate the subsoils of blood and tradition."[68] This "Caesarism" would be a "dictatorship, but not the dictatorship of a party, but of one man against all parties and particularly against his own [because] every revolutionary movement attains power with a praetorian vanguard, which is thenceforward not only useless but dangerous."[69] In 1933, Spengler had greeted Hitler's rise to power with enthusiasm because he saw in him the "hope that, as in Bismarck's day, we shall at some time be subjects and not mere objects of history."[70] Likewise, Carrel had, in 1935, called for a world led by intellectuals and had postulated eugenics.[71]

José Antonio borrowed Spengler's theory that civilizations pass through the same succession of ages as biological organisms, with classical and middle periods. The former were characterized by the unity of values and beliefs—such as the period that had reached its zenith between the thirteenth and the sixteenth centuries—and were followed by disasters or "barbarian invasions" that left the country barren. The middle periods, on the other hand, were the preparation for other classical periods during

which “the permanent values of the sunken age bloomed.”[72] In “classical” medieval Europe, according to José Antonio: “The world had a hearty, solid, life. It was in total harmony. The world revolved around an axis.” The key to this happy combination had been the unity of values and beliefs: “Everybody’s idea is metaphysical unity, unity in God.” That is, “religious orthodoxy and the monopoly over the thought of scholastic philosophy is . . . the root of unity and harmony in the other fields—economics, politics—of human endeavor.”[73] However, unfortunately, the “universal” domination of scholastic philosophy, Catholic dogma, and this unity had started to crumble with the emergence of Protestantism and then the Enlightenment. And this led inevitably to reviled Liberalism and the “perverse” Rousseau, who denied absolute truth and introduced free will as the legitimating foundation of society.

Fortunately, Ortega y Gasset had explained that modern states such as England, France, and even Germany were falling into decadence. Their rationalism, Democratism, mechanism, industrialism, and capitalism had begun “to lose their vigor of vital stimulants . . . , which will inevitably bring with it the depressed potentiality of the great nations, and the minor countries [like Spain] can take advantage of the situation to initiate their life in accordance with the intimate nature of their character and appetites.” José Antonio was in total agreement with all this. He believed Europe at this time was weakened by Liberalism and democracy and that the Democratic Liberal state was not defending itself against the dangers of revolution. Therefore, they were at the mercy of a new “barbarian invasion,” in the form of the grim Communist mob. After the failed attempt in 1934, he was convinced this Bolshevik revolution would soon arrive in Spain if it was not thwarted in time. According to Salvador de Brocà, he firmly believed “the Western world was living the final moments of the agony of the Liberal and capitalist order, which had been responsible for breaking the harmony between man and his surroundings, between man and country. He believed it was on the threshold of a new barbarian invasion, brought about by the rootless feeling that capitalism and the atomization of parties had instilled in Europe.”[74] Of course, this perception was completely mistaken, given the policies of Stalin and the Comintern in 1935 and 1936 toward Western Europe. This, however, did not mean that, in Spain between 1934 and 1936, a revolution seemed to be in the making. At times, it really did.

Significantly, José Antonio, having read Ortega y Gasset, felt this process could be interrupted or circumvented for the first time in history. A window of opportunity was being opened for the "minor states," and the emerging (Fascist) forces were ready and willing to stop the revolution. In this respect, he wrote that, although "all the signs are that the world is sinking (predicted by Marx) . . . , not everything is lost: much must live and will even survive the catastrophe that our generation feels is imminent . . . and which will put an end to an era (see books by Spengler, Berdiaeff, Carrel)."[75] Neither José Antonio nor his followers were prepared "to be witnesses to the catastrophe predicted by Marx."[76] They would resist it and, if successful, "save Spain" and bring about the advent of a new age of splendor through the National Syndicalist revolution. The Falange minority "immune to discouragement" were working tirelessly for this great undertaking: they were fighting for it and were even prepared to die for it. If they were victorious, they would take power. In 1936, José Antonio said:

> What is the future of Europe? Undoubtedly, there will be another invasion of the barbarians. But there are two ways of looking at this. The catastrophic view believes such an invasion is inevitable and that all that is good will be lost, and one can only hope a new Middle Ages will germinate after the catastrophe. And then there is our own view, which hopes to bridge the invasion of the barbarians, take advantage, with no intervening catastrophe, of all that is good about the new age and salvage from the age in which we now live all the spiritual values of civilization.[77]

He also must have assumed the new Spain to which he would make a major contribution would count on the support of two other Fascist regimes in power, which would help in the construction of a new classical age.[78] A new Spain, a new Europe, and a new world. Rising above the "barbarian invasion" (i.e., Soviet Communism with its "Asiatic" understanding in contrast to the Western, Christian, and Spanish way of life) required "a religious solution: the recuperation of the harmony between man and his environment for a transcendental purpose." This purpose could not be either "Fatherland or race, which cannot be purposes in themselves: the purpose must be that of unifying the world, for which the Fatherland can be used as an instrument; that is to say, the purpose is 'religious.' Catholic? Of course, it must be Christian." In my opinion, it could not have been Catholic, because the European "units of destiny" would have had trouble reaching a consensus. One of these units was Germany, where most of the population

was Protestant. The general Christian option was more likely. This world unification would restore the unity that had been broken by the Protestant Reform, which had brought so much perversion to the world and to Spain, and Spain would once again be a great power. The new Spanish, National Syndicalist state would once again be at the service of the faith, thus closing the virtuous circle. It would be a state in which men could "acquire the dignity of a free, active, and cooperative subject in the great work of Creation."[79]

So, José Antonio conceived of politics from a Christian perspective, which, in my view, was the feature that best defined the Fascism he was advocating. It could be traced back to Aquinas and was based on a purpose-oriented state doctrine. Unlike the reviled aspiration of achieving the common good through policies that administered power in a particular way and ensured the people's happiness, his Fascism aspired to achieve this common good through politics of substance (the "bare minimum" of political life), the fundamental reason for the existence of the state. His Fascism "emerged from the minds of friars who challenge and deny power to those who use it for ends other than the good of the people."[80] It was in stark contrast to that "awful" Rousseau (as José Antonio never tired of saying), who claimed the voters expressed a general "truth" that then became the will of the state. The resulting democracy relativized the truth as a permanent category of reason, ignored all that was of fundamental importance to individual will, made no ethical demands on those who were part of the state, accepted no historical or moral legitimation, and permitted the laissez-faire economic system.[81] Inequalities were such that people were quite reasonably led to embrace Socialism. Against all this, José Antonio argued for a democracy that was "a life in common not subject to tyranny, peaceful, joyful, and virtuous," which should be the ultimate goal of a state imbued with faith, with "substance," as a permanent category of reason.

To sum up, José Antonio's model of a religious state was an idealization drawn from thirteenth-century Europe, where (allegedly) the state and the doctrine it was based on had prevailed. "At that time," wrote José Antonio, "the idea common to all was 'metaphysical' unity, unity in God; these absolute truths explained everything, and the whole world, which in this case was Europe, functioned with the most perfect economy ever . . . The world had found itself."[82] The sort of state he aspired to had two goals: "One, outward, reinforcing the Fatherland; the other, inward, to make more

men happier, more human and with a greater share in human life."[83] In this sort of state, men would, supposedly, be "free." What concerned José Antonio, then, was that freedom would be lost to the dangers that were lurking, a freedom of the individual, of the "free" individual and "bearer of eternal values." He used this argument to refute the accusations he was defending state pantheism,[84] a feature of European Fascisms:

> The total revolution, the total reorganization of Europe, must begin with the individual, because it is the individual who has suffered most from this madness, who has become little more than a molecule, without personality, substance, content, or existence. It is the poor individual, who is the last to notice any of the improvements in life. The whole of the organization, the whole new revolution, the whole reinforcement of the state, and the whole economic reorganization will be designed so that the masses who have been uprooted by the Liberal economy and the attempt at Communism will be able to enjoy these improvements.

The state had to be based on the individual, "as the bearer of a soul, as the holder of a patrimony; the family, as the nucleus of society; the municipality as the unit of life, once again restored to its communal and traditional richness; the syndicates, as the unit of professional existence and the repositories of economic authority for each one of the branches of production."[85]

> We must begin with man, and carry on through his organic units. In this way, we go from the man to the family, and from the family to the municipality and to the syndicate. And we culminate in the state, which is the harmony of everything. Our economic solution is implicit in this political, historical. and moral conception with which we contemplate the world: we shall dismantle the economic apparatus of capitalist property, which absorbs all the profits, and replace it with individual private property, with communal property and syndical property.[86]

Moreover, José Antonio's defense of the organic state and the harmony of the state with man contains echoes of Hegel's philosophy of history.[87]

José Antonio also attempted to write historical essays, one of which he wrote in his last months of life and was on a topic he had been reflecting on for several years. He wrote it while he was in Alicante prison, but it remained unpublished until the appearance of *Papeles póstumos de José Antonio* (although it had errors, even in the title).[88] The text, inspired by Ortega y Gasset, discusses the interpretation of the history of Spain in terms not only of masses and aristocratic minorities but also of ethnic groups (Germanics, Arabs, and Berbers), right up to 1936. In this pessimistic vision

of what he believed was happening at that time, he predicted the triumph of the “masses.” He wondered whether people like himself, who, “because of the solidarity of culture and even the mysterious call of blood” (aristocratic, of course), felt part of “the European destiny,” would succeed in changing their lineage-based patriotism for a more “earthy” type, with no “mission” after this triumph. José Antonio had closely identified with all things Germanic for a long time. In his memoirs, Javier Martínez de Bedoya mentioned a conversation he had had with José Antonio and Sánchez Mazas that had ended with the latter admonishing him: “Just don’t forget that the best thing we’ve got is José Antonio, a pure Goth, who is well aware of the disastrous effects of the Berbers.” Apparently, José Antonio had interrupted at this point by saying, “Don’t be so like Ortega, Rafael! You shouldn’t be joking about your origins.” However, Bedoya remarked, “For the first time, I noticed his blue gaze was smiling and that he curled his lip in a gesture of cheerful superiority.”[89]

In the historical essay, José Antonio reflected Ortega y Gasset’s interpretation of the Reconquest and the subsequent history of Spain in his discussion of the minorities (Germanics/Goths and Arabs) ruling over the masses, and the Berbers mixing with the native “Spaniards” during the centuries of Muslim domination. The Goths would not have mixed with the original settlers, and neither the Arabs with other ethnic groups. These minorities, “a Semitic minority with a long lineage” (the Arabs) and “an Arian minority with a long lineage” (the Goths), were the conquerors, and the Reconquest had been little more than another Germanic conquest: the leaders had been “princes of Germanic blood and mentality,” and their undertaking, deep down, had been a European one. The feudal structure they imposed was much more severe than the Arabian structure, so “the whole enormous framework—monarchy, church, aristocracy—could be used to justify its weighty privileges as a minority with a great destiny in history. And it attempted to fulfill this destiny in two ways: the conquest of America and the Counter-Reformation.” José Antonio denied that the conquest of America had been the result of “Spanish popular spontaneity” (according to him, this version of events had been circulated by “Berber literature”), and by so doing, he extended the concept in history.

The conquest of America had had “a sense of universality” that only “Rome and Germanic Christianity” had been able to transmit to Spain. This Germanic Spain—doubly Germanic later under the Habsburg dynasty—

brought to Europe “the Catholic struggle for unity.” But when it was defeated, it lost the justification for its existence, which was quite simply “the idea of the religious unity of the world.” As “Catholicism was the justification of power in Spain,” the country was left “with nothing to fight for.” Now bereft of a mission, decadence had set in, and “the latent force” (that of the “subjugated” Berber people) had “slowly started to exact its revenge. For José Antonio, the Berbers were the “masses” and in the previous one hundred years had been impregnating the whole of the intellectual Left “from [Mariano José de] Larra to the present day.” In his writings on the subject, he showed his disdain for various—in particular, leftist—intellectuals: “The monarchy, the Church, the aristocracy, the militias all make left-wing intellectuals nervous, a left wing that in many respects begins some considerable way to the Right. It is not that they subject these institutions to criticism; it’s just that, in their presence, a feeling of ancestral unease takes hold of them, like the feeling that takes hold of gypsies when they are provoked. The two effects are manifestations of the same old call of Berber blood.”[90] José Antonio’s conception of law was based on Stammler:

> The jurists of today are returning justice to the realm of reason, not to the will of many or just a few. So, the words of Jurieu, a forerunner of Rousseau, “The actions of the people do not have to be right to be valid,” are countered by the new Kantians in the words of Stammler “The majority is a relation of quantity; justice, on the other hand, implies quality. The mere fact that many proclaim something to be true or aspire to something does not necessarily mean it is just. Whether the majority is to be assisted by justice must be determined on the merits of every case.”[91]

He had learned from the German, then, that the essence of the law belonged to the Kingdom of Ends: “It is a discipline of means in relation to ends . . . [with] rules [that] impose themselves on human conduct with the acquiescence or against the acquiescence of the subjects; that is to say, both autarchic and legitimate.”[92] And from another German jurist, Kelsen, he took his distinction between law and politics, a distinction that fired his indignation because he had suffered in the flesh the arbitrary nature of political power, including arrests and imprisonments. It was not common practice in the existing Fascist regimes to respect this distinction. So, although he generally wanted his Falange regime to mirror the Fascist regimes in other countries, this law-politics distinction was another peculiar

feature of the Fascism he was advocating. Political interference in justice and the corruption so prevalent in the legal system were abhorrent to him, and he had spoken privately of the need to shoot corrupt judges and civil servants of the judiciary.[93]

José Antonio also borrowed Ortega y Gasset's concept of values. He conceived of them as a hierarchy that went from those that were absolute and eternal to those that arose organically from society and every generation. In this respect, he disagreed with Ledesma, for whom the greatest political value was the national state, which would "replace individuals and groups."[94] After all, Ledesma's Fascism was more orthodox than José Antonio's. The Christian concept of existence José Antonio defended forced him to relativize the role of the state, a concept he included in the Falange's program, first in its "Initial Points" and then in the "Twenty-Seven Points." Clearly influenced by D'Ors, the "Initial Points" stated:

> The spiritual has always been the mainspring in the lives of men and nations. The most important aspect of the spirit is religion. No man can help pondering the eternal questions about life and death, about creation and eternity. These questions cannot be answered evasively; they must be answered positively or negatively. Spain has always responded with Catholic assertion. The Catholic interpretation of life is, first of all, the truth, but it is also historically Spanish. Spain's sense of CATHOLICISM, of UNIVERSALISM won unknown continents from the sea and barbarism. Spain conquered them as part of a universal commitment to salvation. So, any reconstruction of Spain must have Catholic significance. This does not mean the state will take over the Church's religious functions. Neither does it mean the state will tolerate the Church interfering or plotting, which may damage the dignity of the state or national integrity. It means the new state will be inspired by the traditional religious spirit of Spain and enter into agreements with the Church so that it will receive all the care and protection it is due.[95]

Subsequently, the "Twenty-Seven Points," much more austerely (thanks to Ledesma's intervention), stated: "Our movement integrates Catholic meaning—which has played a glorious, leading role in Spain—into national reconstruction. The Church and the state will agree on their respective powers, although no interference will be tolerated, and no activity likely to undermine the dignity of the state or the integrity of the nation will be allowed."[96] As we know, this last distinction (the separation between the Church and the state) differentiated the Falange from the other right-wing forces of the time. Another issue that never appeared in José Antonio's texts (or any of the Falange's texts in general) was the relation between the new

Spanish Fascist regime and the Pope. If we are to believe the leading Nazi thinker Alfred Rosenberg during his 1934 visit, José Antonio spoke of Spain electing a new Pope with See in Toledo.

As well as the "national" issue, José Antonio was also concerned about the "social problem" and the need for social justice, which could only be resolved through Fascism. In this respect, he was influenced by Marx and by Sorel's concept of revolutionary Syndicalism in *Réflexions sur la violence*.[97] He was impressed by Sorel's glorification of syndical power and Nationalism, and he recognized that Marx's predictions about the concentration of capital and the proletarianization of the masses were coming true. Although he was aware the German's thought was quite different from the reality of Communism in the USSR, he did not reject his analyses or thoughts about proletarianization and the exploitation of workers. For José Antonio and the Spanish Fascists, the social problem needed to be solved if Spain were to be reborn. Therefore, there was a pressing need for a National Syndicalist revolution, the principles of which were expressed—thanks to contributions by Ledesma and other "comrades"—in six of the "Twenty-Seven Points." These points concerned the new economic organization of the state (including, as we have seen, the proposal to nationalize the banks):

9. In economic terms, we conceive of Spain as one gigantic syndicate of producers. We shall organize Spanish society along corporate lines through a system of vertical unions for each of the various branches of production at the service of national economic integrity.

10. We condemn the capitalist system, which ignores people's needs, dehumanizes private property, and changes workers into formless masses full of misery and desperation. Our spiritual and national feeling also rejects Marxism. We shall guide the force of the working classes, who are at present being misled by Marxism, and require them to take active part in the great task of the national state.

11. The National Syndicalist state will not cruelly stand off from economic struggles between men, nor will it be a passive witness as the weaker class is subdued by the stronger. Our regime will make the class struggle completely impossible, because all those who take part in production constitute an organic whole. We condemn, and shall do all we can to prevent, the abuse of one party by another and anarchy in the system of labor.

12. As our state will make clear, the main aim of wealth is to improve the standard of living of all the people. We will not tolerate enormous masses of people living in poverty, while a few enjoy a life of luxury.

13. The state will recognize private property as a valid means of fulfilling individual, family, and social purposes and will protect it from the abuses of finance capital, speculators, and moneylenders.

14. We are in favor of nationalizing the banks and, by means of corporations, the leading public services.[98]

But make no mistake: the capitalism referred to in these points is of the financial and speculative sort, not the general economic-social system based on private property, which the Falange defended fiercely. So, although José Antonio had adopted his most radical "anti-capitalist" stance by 1935 and was against a "rural, financial, and industrial capitalism, that has gradually taken over the artisans, small industrialists, and small farmers and has gradually placed everything in the hands of large 'trusts,' large banking groups," he never questioned private property. He believed in neither "Capitalism" (in scare quotes) nor Communism (without scare quotes), the quotation marks being speculators of all kinds. Like all Fascisms, José Antonio's sought to implement a "third way" (as we would say in modern parlance) to combat the threat of "lurking" Communism and the financial capitalism of bankers, which "squeezed" the "producers," whether these were entrepreneurs, technical experts, or manual labor. The Falangist state would be a Syndicalist one, a National Syndicalist one, in which these "producers" would join vertical syndicates and work for the supreme purpose of aggrandizing the Fatherland. At one point, he even said , given the general crisis of the capitalist system and the refusal to accept the Socialist-Communist solution of the dictatorship of the proletariat (in which the state took all surplus value for itself), the Syndicalist solution would mean this surplus value would revert to the "producers."

For José Antonio, the Falange fell in neither the left nor right wing. This is somewhat questionable, since Fascists belonged to far right-wing parties that aimed to destroy democracy and, in their hearts, respected the capitalist system even though they wanted to modify it. He presented it as the champion of a particular order (Christian Western civilization) in danger of being destroyed by the "barbarians" and could only be saved by a profound change that provided a solution to the problems of "nation" and "social justice":

> In our search for the means to avoid the catastrophe, the Falange has adopted highly original doctrinal standpoints: thus, in national terms, we conceive of Spain as a unit of destiny, compatible with regional differences. This is the root cause of a policy, the prime aim of which is to preserve this unit, which transcends the opinions of parties and classes. In economic terms, the Falange tends to total Syndicalism. This means the surplus value of production remains wholly in the hands of the organic, vertical syndicate of producers [i.e., entrepreneurs,

> technical experts, and manual labor], whose own economic power will generate the credit required for production so that there is no need to borrow from—of course—the banks. These economic strategies may be more similar to the German program than the Italian. But, on the other hand, the Falange is not and can never be racist.[99]

It could not be racist because the Falange was a Catholic movement, and racism would have detracted from its "universality."[100] This was something it shared with Italian Fascism, and it was one of the principles that differentiated Spanish, Italian, and German Fascism.

There were also differences in the concept of "totalitarian state." José Antonio included this in the sixth point of the Falange's program ("Our state will be a totalitarian instrument at the service of the integrity of the Fatherland") and in 1934 defined it as a state "that will achieve internal peace and national optimism, that will make everyone's interests its own . . . and get to the heart of the reality of Spanish society, that will demand far-reaching reforms . . . and will put all its energy at the service of this national and social totalitarian state that regards itself as an instrument of the total destiny of Spain." Nevertheless, the next year, he questioned this and said totalitarian states did not exist (he was probably referring to Europe and not the USSR), although, along the same lines as Spengler, he also said there were "dictators of genius who have substituted the state" temporarily.[101] He defended them but was critical of their solutions for their temporary nature:

> Their passionate endeavor can be sustained by the genius of few men, but in their soul there surely beats the desire for provisionality . . . They know their temperament is suited to times of transition but that, in the long run, more mature approaches will be required. For disconformity is solved not by annulling individuals but by uniting them with their environment by reconstructing those organic, free, and eternal values that are called the individual, the bearer of a soul; the family, the syndicate, the municipality, all natural units of coexistence.

In this new stage, the state would be relieved of many functions it used to have, and it would keep for itself only "those duties of its own mission, in the eyes of the world and history. Hence, the state, the synthesis of so many fruitful activities, takes charge of its universal destiny."[102] And, of course, every mission requires a leader "who is entrusted with the noblest task and who is therefore he who most serves. Coordinator of the numerous individual destinies, navigator of the course of the great ship of state, he is the first and foremost servant; he is the embodiment of the highest magistracy in the land, 'slave of the slaves of God.'" In other words, he is a

dictator who governs "more mature forms that do not consent to annul individuals but encourages them to unite with their environment, the harmony of the destiny of the Fatherland and of the destiny of men in the Fatherland."[103] That is, José Antonio was once again being guided by the doctrine of Aquinas and the thought of Ortega y Gasset, for whom the state was merely the driving force behind the nation. In the words of Ortega y Gasset: "Russia and Italy have preferred to go the wrong way about it, and instead of making far-reaching innovations, they have followed the utopic tradition of the past two centuries: they have opted for the transitory phantom of a 'perfect' state to the future of a vigorous and healthy nation. For our Spain, I desire the opposite solution, more complete and with more lasting prospects."[104] Once again, the role of the Fascist party, unlike that of its leader, had not been made clear. Nevertheless, it is difficult to believe José Antonio had not reserved a role for it. He had found roles for the "natural entities" (family, municipality, and syndicate) as organic structures of the "Syndicalist state," which he never defined very precisely, although he saw it as the alternative to both capitalism and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Even so, the National Syndicalism of the Falange would not have been credible without a proletariat presence in the party, which is why José Antonio and Ledesma made the effort to construct a Confederation of National Syndicalist Workers (CONS). Despite their efforts, however, it never fully got off the ground. It was also why José Antonio initiated conversations with the leader of the Partido Sindicalista (Syndicalist Party), Ángel Pestaña, who had broken away from the CNT's apoliticism precisely because he believed in the need for political parties to commit to the struggle. These conversations were held in Barcelona but failed to reach any agreement. Likewise, José Antonio's need for the proletariat was the main reason he felt so close to one of the leaders of the PSOE, Indalecio Prieto, who he believed represented the most "national" version of Spanish (internationalist) socialism. In the spring of 1936, he even praised one of Prieto's speeches because he thought it echoed his own thought.[105]

We should put special emphasis on the fact that Ortega y Gasset's thought had a big influence on José Antonio's analysis of the historical role of the aristocracy. As we have seen, he was highly critical of the prototype of the "wealthy young man of leisure" and demanded the nobility once again be prepared for sacrifice and "service" as historically they had been.

He used this first demand to respond to one of the most unanimous criticisms leveled at his party: that it was a group of “violent young men” who acted as members of the wealthy classes, and at their service, to protect their properties from the leftists who were fighting to save most of the population from poverty. After he founded the Falange, José had used the party’s press to respond to this criticism with articles arguing in favor of the “wealthy young men” but against those who were leisurely. In one of them, significantly entitled “Señoritismo,” he explained, “The Falange is not interested in the slightest in the ‘wealthy young man of leisure’ as a social type.” On the other hand, genuine señores or hidalgos were quite different because, “until very recently, they had written the most glorious pages of our history . . . They were able to ‘renounce’—that is to say, sacrifice—privileges, comfort, and pleasures in honor of the ideal of ‘service.’ ‘Noblesse oblige . . . , that is to say, nobility ‘demands.’ The more one has, the more one has to give. Hence, from the ranks of the nobles came the majority of those who sacrificed most.” On the other hand, “wealthy young men, unlike gentlemen, believe social position does not oblige but exempts. It exempts them from work, from self-denial, and from solidarity with other mortals.” And he was quick to point out his own status as an aristocrat: “Of course, among the wealthy young men, there are many who are capable of being gentlemen. How can we not be aware of this? These reproaches are not aimed at them.” The “leisurely young men” should be done away with “for the good of the lowly, millions of whom lead a subhuman life, and whose lot we must all strive to improve. And for the good of the ‘wealthy young men of leisure,’ who, by finding employment worthy of their gifts, will regain the true hierarchy they wasted in too many hours of idleness.”[106]

As mentioned, José Antonio, like his father, was heavily influenced by regenerationism. He was influenced by Unamuno and by Joaquín Costa, who advocated setting up a great national party that would bring about the revolution from a position of power and espoused the need for political “surgery” and an “iron surgeon” who would carry out the “revolution from above.”[107] Costa “gave national content to two common themes of the age: dictatorship and revolution,” although “dictatorship for Costa is not the expression of a political ideology but the result of conditions in the country. In his opinion, Spain needed an ideologically neutral dictatorship that would subordinate ideas to effectively saving the country from the situation it was in . . . Thus, he created and promoted both things at the same time, a

vague idea and feeling of admiration for totalitarian and Nationalist dictatorship."[108] So, it is not difficult to find echoes of Costa in José Antonio. He was also influenced, but to a lesser extent, by Liberal Krausist thought, which argues in favor of a political transformation of society through ethical education, which some of Krause's followers had attempted to use to overcome individualism with a corporate political representation.[109]

These, then, are the fundamental features of José Antonio's politics and ideology—his Fascism—analyzed through his own texts. His Fascist thought was tinged with Christianity, which had obliged him to qualify one of the most fundamental features of his ideology (statism), and the result of an ideological development I believe was completed in the course of 1935, when he wrote about "anti-capitalist" economy and society. With these texts, he finished his "revolutionary" political plan in both its "national-imperial" and "social" aspects. In parallel, he was working to take power on his own or with the assistance of certain sectors of the army sympathetic to the Falange. Alternatively, the army would take over the country and then hand power to him.

Nevertheless, at the heart of José Antonio's thought are elements that suggest he was not as convinced as he seemed about the dictatorial Fascist route to power or his personal aspirations of becoming a new Fascist dictator. These elements were revealed in some initiatives he took as leader of the FE de las JONS. For example, we know that twice in 1936 he discussed the possibility of leaders and/or governments other than the Falange (i.e., non-Fascists) going ahead with reforms he believed Spain needed. In the second of these two cases, he even agreed to dismantling the section of the party responsible for direct action (the militia). The first of these two events occurred after the Popular Front's victory in the February 1936 elections. José Antonio was extremely enthusiastic and hopeful about the first declaration of intentions made by the new President of the Republic Manuel Azaña, because he felt there were real possibilities of solving some of the country's problems. His "comrades" did not share his short-lived euphoria. In fact, he was brought abruptly down to earth when he witnessed—and suffered in the flesh—how the new government operated in practice.

The second event came about in the dramatic circumstances of the beginning of the Civil War and José Antonio's imprisonment in Republican Spain. These circumstances prompted him to call for the cessation of

hostilities, the immediate formation of a government of peace, and the implementation of measures such as an amnesty, some social and political reforms, and the dissolution of all the left- and right-wing militias, including his own. Meanwhile, the parliament would be suspended for six months, and the government would have the authority to legislate within the constraints of a program that aimed to restore the rule of law in jurisdictional aspects and political practice. He also contemplated adopting some economic and social measures the left-wing parties were fighting for (e.g., agrarian reform) and others that were ideologically more right wing (e.g., the authorization of a religious education system). In other words, he had proposed a program of reform with reconciliation and reunification in mind that would be put into practice by a fundamentally Republican government. And he believed the dramatic nature of the outbreak of the war would lead to a quick agreement to end it.

José Antonio regarded the ongoing conflict as a war between classes, a clash between the forces of the Left and Right and the failure of his Fascist option for reunification. In this context, he proposed setting up a reformist and legalist government such as the one he believed Azaña had been going to head. As we know, it was all to no avail. According to his brother Miguel, José Antonio said about war at this time: "All wars are, in principle, examples of savagery. And a civil war, as well as being an example of savagery, is an example of vulgarity. Because those who are obliged to engage in civil war make it apparent they have wasted one of the greatest gifts humanity has received from the Almighty: intelligence and a common language to understand one another."[110] This was quite a change, highly illustrative of the existence of "another" José Antonio. In prison, with no political influence, he must have believed the acceptance of his proposal would put him back in a leading position, restore his preeminence, and make him appear to be the man who had brought peace to the country. But did his proposal mean he had given up on his Fascist ideology, on his struggle for national reunification, on the quest to find the solution to the country's two great problems (the "national" and the "social"), and on the desire to aggrandize the Fatherland? I do not believe he had. Rather, it was an exceptional response to an exceptional moment. He was inspired by his passion and his conviction that at all times he was in possession not only of "a" solution but "the" solution, even though this meant not being a part of the government and sacrificing his militia.

Had they known about it, José Antonio's proposal would have surprised and confused his "comrades," just as his enthusiasm for Azaña's government had the previous February. It was the second time he seemed to be renouncing his and his party's aspiration of playing a central role in the country's politics in exchange for reforms he believed were the right ones. Did these two moments conceal a desire to withdraw and leave the field free for others to take on the "heavy burden" of saving the country that until that point had been on his shoulders? Probably. Clearly, there was no need for a total withdrawal. He could have played a less central role, not as the only figure, the Fascist dictator the country needed, but rather a "collaborator" or "inspirer" of others with his "doctrine" and his guidance toward the country's "unity of destiny." Or he may have thought that, after this interlude, he would continue his quest for total power.

So, were there two José Antonios, both inspired by the desire to emulate and exceed their father in their desire to save the country? Was one of them following the Fascist road map to dictatorial power while the other was more open to collaborating and taking part in different political frameworks, even Democratic or semi-Democratic ones (the government acting by decree and with the parliament closed down), and not occupying the pinnacle of power? Did this second José Antonio really exist, almost always concealed by the first and only coming to the fore on special occasions such as February 1936 and July and early August 1936? Without renouncing his essential political objectives—solving the country's two main problems as a way of aggrandizing the Fatherland—or his desire to emulate and exceed his father, this second José Antonio also may have occasionally wanted not to aspire to be a new dictator but to play a less central role. If this were the case, it tallies with what Ledesma said about him in 1935. He believed José Antonio was stuck between his well-intentioned acceptance of the role of Fascist leader and his less visible and more moderate parliamentary inclinations:

> One of the features that most characterizes [José Antonio] is that he works on a series of unresolvable contradictions, which stem from his intellectual and political-social background. He is serious in his purposes and sincere in his motives for achieving them. The drama or difficulties arise when he realizes these purposes are not his, that he is the victim of his own contradictions, which might make him devour his work and—what is worse—the work of his collaborators. He has set about organizing Fascism, that is to say, a task that requires faith in the virtues of impetus, sometimes blind enthusiasm, the most fanatical and aggressive national and patriotic feeling, a deep concern for the whole of the nation's society. He worships all that

> is rational and abstract, he is fond of skeptical and moderate styles, he adopts the most timid forms of patriotism, he rejects everything that appeals to the emotions or the exclusive impulse of the will, etc. All this, with his polite temperament and his legal training, would logically lead him to political forms of the Liberal and parliamentary type. Various circumstances, however, have prevented him from taking this route. Being the son of a dictator and living among the highest classes of the bourgeoisie are sufficiently important to influence one's destiny. These factors forced José Antonio to take a different path and to seek a political and social standpoint that would reconcile his contradictions. He took an intellectual approach to finding this standpoint, and he found it in Fascism. And from the very day of the discovery, he has been stubbornly struggling with himself in his attempt to believe his attitude is a true and profound one. In his heart of hearts, he suspects it is artificial and false. That it has no roots. This explains his hesitations and everything that happens to him.[111]

Perhaps José Antonio was aiming to emulate and exceed his father by two different routes, but the dominant one led him to taking the role of Fascist leader, and his desire to take power was frustrated, as was his other desire to influence and intervene in politics in more open ways.[112] He set out on the first of these two routes in 1933 with a group of other men. It led him and others (many on his side and even more on the other) to their deaths at the hands of the army that had rebelled, the "national" forces of law and order and the "militias," the most important of which belonged to the FE de las JONS.

All this raises the question of whether José Antonio would have agreed with this repression, which genuinely sought to annihilate the political enemy—whom he referred to as the "separatist Reds." Perhaps he would have opted for a more selective strategy of trying to win over at least a part of the ideological and political enemy, because he was passionately convinced his Fascist message and doctrine would reveal the error of their ways and enable them to join his National Syndicalist revolution. But history is what it is. And it shows that during and immediately after the war, his successors—his own blue-shirted men (the "old shirts") from his FE de las JONS and the "new shirts" from Franco's FET y de las JONS—largely approved of the extraordinarily brutal repression. They took active part on their own or jointly with other forces under orders from the army.

The repression was to some extent comparable to the confrontations with the left-wing forces in the previous months but adapted to the new context in which the revolt had triumphed. The Republicans responded with a wave of repression of their own directed against the clergy, Conservatives, capitalists, and Fascists. It, too, was quite brutal in nature and could barely be distinguished from that of the rebels. The "national" repression was pro-

Conservative and pro-Catholic and allegedly carried out in the name of law and order. It could not be described as Fascist in the sense we have been using. It was to be even bloodier than in Fascist Italy or in Nazi Germany before the beginning of World War II. José Antonio may not have approved, but that does not mean he would not have approved of a repression of a different sort. But whatever the case, he was not there to approve or disapprove of anything.

During and immediately after the war, many but not all the Falange leaders had no objection to combining their discourse on Fascist integration with their participation in this repression. At the beginning of the war in particular, as we have seen, there were moments when Manuel Hedilla, provisional leader of the FE de las JONS, attempted to stop the indiscriminate nature of the repression and prevent it from degenerating into a solution for personal not political feuds. Hedilla was José Antonio's temporary successor at the head of the party before the CT subsumed it under Franco's orders on April 1937 and, shortly before this, had been elected as deputy National Leader of the party, just when the events of Salamanca had taken place.[113] As head of the party, he made it clear how the FE de las JONS should take part in the repression, and in an order on what he referred to as "rearguard action," he said: "It is advisable that all provincial and territorial headquarters [of the FE de las JONS in the National zone] take due care with any repressive actions implemented against the enemies of the National Movement. They should follow the instructions of the military authorities and avoid committing any outrages in response to personal feelings that are often unconfessable."[114] The very fact that he felt the need to give instructions on this issue is a good example of what historiography has been able to document—that is, that the Falange members often took reprisals on their own account and sometimes for reasons that were not directly political. In other cases, they acted under the military jurisdiction that had authority over questions of "law and order."

The announcements published in the party's press did not seem to have much effect. One proclaimed: "The Falange speaks to all Spaniards. WHEREVER YOU MAY GO, MAKE THE RED AND BLACK OF THE [FE] DE LAS JONS PROUD OF YOU. . . . For the Fatherland, bread, and justice! For Spain, one, great, and free! *Arriba España*!"[115] With respect to the desire of the party's "enemy" to integrate, Hedilla made an appeal to "the Falange members entrusted with the political and police investigations

in cities and villages," urging them only "to purge the ringleaders and murderers": "Nobody should take personal revenge and nobody should punish or humiliate those who may have voted for the left-wing parties out of hunger or desperation. We all know that in many villages there were—and maybe there still are—right-wingers who were worse than the Reds. I want there to be no more arrests of this sort, and, wherever they may have taken place, you need to provide guarantees to those who are unjustly persecuted." He finished with the following appeal: "Open your arms to the worker and the peasant! There must be only one form of nobility: work! There must be only one class of people: Spaniards! Let us rid industry, the fields, the banks, and the cities from the power of the local political leaders! Let us remove the idle!"[116] Of course, this appeal was a response to violent events. Voting for the Left or simply being thought to be a Republican was often more than enough for people to suddenly disappear or to be imprisoned or court-martialed.

In 1938, the first general secretary of the FE de las JONS, Raimundo Fernández-Cuesta—imprisoned but then released as part of an exchange thanks to Prieto in late 1937 and made general secretary of the single party FET de las JONS—also made conciliatory speeches, albeit with less conviction. In one of these, which he gave on the National Radio of Spain on the second anniversary of José Antonio's execution, he refused to recognize the authority of the Republican government led by Juan Negrín (without mentioning him by name):

> All you Spaniards of good faith fighting for the other side, I speak to you now in the name of unity and in memory of José Antonio to reproach you for your useless sacrifice and the gullible belief you have in your leaders who, at the beginning of the war, taught you to shout "Long live Russia!" and hate Spain. And now they adopt national attitudes because that is what suits their personal well-being or their political tactics, but they are attitudes that are completely lacking in authenticity.[117]

In light of what really occurred during the war and the immediate postwar period, the repression the Falange meted out bore little resemblance to the theory. On the other hand, appeals such as Hedilla's did have a real effect on recruitment: the FE de las JONS was snowed under with requests to join the militias and to fight on the fronts or in the Segunda Línea. Such was the mobilization in National Spain at the time that many men, women, young people, and children volunteered to join the party and its Women's Section

or Frente de Juventudes (Youth Front). Among the new arrivals were people from the Left, many of whom were seeking to escape the clutches of the repressors, which led to the other political sectors from the rebel coalition referring to the Falange as the "FAIlange." Therefore, as a sign of the new times, the first of a series of internal purges was carried out shortly after unification in an attempt to "cleanse" the FET y de las JONS of all those with a left-wing, Republican, "separatist," or, of course, masonic past. In general, the new arrivals had little or no idea about the Falange's ideology. Later, after unification, Carlists and members of the military from other parties joined, and by 1939 the single party was several times the size of the original Falange.

The Falange's inclusive discourse was not incompatible with some aspects of Francoism, such as the need to "redeem" the enemy. But it was with other aspects such as the line drawn between the victors and the vanquished who were treated in a completely fashion at all levels. In fact, we can still see the effects of this differentiation today: the graves of thousands of murdered Reds are scattered throughout the country, while all the "fallen" from the national side were carefully exhumed and given a dignified burial with full honors. Their families received compensation almost as soon as the war had ended. With the exception of those who were exhumed and taken to the Valley of the Fallen, the Reds were not given the same treatment. In practice, once the first destructive wave had passed (the war and the whole of 1939), the Franco regime began to introduce redeeming penitentiary policies in accordance with the Christian ideology it shared with the Falange. But the repressive measures increased in intensity (often with the collaboration and even the leadership of the Falange), and "red separatists" were treated without compassion and indiscriminately, whether there was evidence against them or not.

Did the Falange agree with this sort of repression? Well, many more were in favor of it than against it, and an overwhelming number of witnesses are prepared to testify to their enthusiastic involvement. But other witnesses (considerably fewer) say some party members did not agree with these methods. One of these was José María Fontana,[118] head of the province of Tarragona, who protested the repressive methods being used in 1939 and 1940. Some ordinary Falange members also expressed their discontent with what was happening. García Lorca's murder created tensions between the Falange, the military, and other right-wing forces.

Attempts were also made to implement policies to win the enemy over, the most notorious case being Ridruejo and a group of Catalan Falange members who drew up plans to occupy Barcelona. These plans included concessions to the Catalan language and the numerous workers in the city who they knew were hostile but aimed to recruit them to the National Syndicalist cause nonetheless. These plans did not prosper, however, because the military and some pro-Franco Catalans rejected them. Another well-known incident is that of Gerardo Salvador Merino, national delegate of syndicates since September 1939, who proposed creating vertical syndicates that would counter the "selfishness" of employers. José Antonio may well have agreed with him. As a result of all the above, the FET y de las JONS—known as the National Movement as of the 1950s—ended up being the most "social" component of the Franco regime, the (supposed) champions of the most disadvantaged sectors of the population. They played the card of "blue" populism, which was compatible with the general policies of the regime and clashed with other sectors, with one another, and, most obviously, as of the 1950s, with the Opus Dei. This was all that remained of the "National Syndicalist revolution."

Notes

1. Herbert R. Southworth, *Antifalange: Estudio crítico de Falange en la guerra de España de M. García Venero* (Paris, 1967), 64. On Ledesma Ramos, see Ferran Gallego, *Ramiro Ledesma Ramos y el fascismo español* (Madrid, 2014).
2. Jon Juaristi, *Miguel de Unamuno* (Madrid, 2012), 268.
3. Gregorio Morán, *El maestro en el erial: Ortega y Gasset y la cultura del franquismo* (Barcelona, 1998), 43–44.
4. Ernesto Giménez Caballero, *Genio de España: Exaltaciones a una resurrección nacional y del mundo* (Barcelona, 1939), 50.
5. José Antonio Primo de Rivera, "Homenaje y reproche a Don José Ortega y Gasset," *Haz* 12, 5 December 1935, 3
6. José Ortega y Gasset, *Rectificación de la República: Artículos y discursos* (Madrid, 1932), 1
7. Agustín de Foxá, "José Antonio: El amigo," in *Dolor y memoria de España en el segundo aniversario de la muerte de José Antonio* (Barcelona, 1939), 218.

8. Jordi Gracia, *José Ortega y Gasset* (Madrid, 2014), 303.
9. Ledesma had even written him a letter on JONS-headed notepaper offering to be a “national party” member once he had distanced himself from the “Marxists and the masons.” Ibid., 490–491.
10. Samuel Ros, “José Antonio en ‘La Ballena Alegre,’” in *Dolor y memoria*, 209–210.
11. Ian Gibson, *En busca de José Antonio* (Barcelona, 1980), 219–220.
12. On the one hand, Ximénez de Sandoval, who knew García Lorca, says José Antonio was interested in meeting the poet “because he admired him terribly and said he would become the poet of the Falange.” To this end, José Antonio invited his biographer to the preview of *Bodas de sangre* in the hope that he would see the author in the theater and introduce him. Just a few days before, on the first night of one of Ximénez de Sandoval’s plays, García Lorca had not wanted to go backstage to congratulate his friend because he knew José Antonio would be there, and he did not want to be introduced. Felipe Ximénez de Sandoval, *José Antonio: Biografía* (Madrid, 1949), 689. On the other hand, the writer Pepín Bello said García Lorca and José Antonio did know each other and often arranged to meet:

    > Federico had an attraction that made him irresistible. It was also a great help that, despite all the problems that were unleashed shortly afterward, political beliefs were not sufficient reason for people to stop being friends or to prevent people from becoming friends. Even when someone seemed to be about to succumb to party loyalty—What a terrible thing! That’s why I have always been so Liberal!—whoever was nearest would quietly call their attention to it and show him up, as Federico did with Gabriel Celaya in San Sebastián. When they were together, José Manuel Aizpurúa came to speak to them. He was the extraordinary architect who did the La Concha Club Náutico, a building that looked like a boat that was setting out to sea. Gabriel showed a total lack of interest, and after Aizpurúa had left them, Federico took him to task quite severely. Celaya justified himself by saying Aizpurúa was a Falange member. Federico then retorted with something that was no surprise to us but left Gabriel so totally bemused that sixty years on he is still puzzled. He told him that every Friday he had dinner with Aizpurúa’s boss, José Antonio Primo de Rivera, so if he refused to speak to Aizpurúa, he would

> also have to refuse to speak to him. To tell the truth, I have no idea if Federico and José Antonio really had dinner together every Friday, but they did know each other because they used to frequent the Café Lyon [*sic*]. José Antonio used to attend a discussion group in the basement, where there was a giant mural by [Hipólito] Hidalgo de Caviedes, *The Laughing Whale*, and he was often there, as was Federico, who attended a discussion group upstairs. So, they knew each other, and although Celaya was absolutely shocked, the only thing that surprised us about all this was how quickly José Antonio and Federico made friends. It was hardly surprising, considering how intelligent and sensitive they both were even though they seemed so different. Well, the love affair between José Antonio and the Duchess of Villahermosa (whom I knew when she was the Duchess of Luna), Pilar Azlor, and the way in which it ended, could easily have been one of Federico's plays. It was amazing. I would love to have met him in person, but it was not to be because [José] Pepe Bergamín arrived late. We had arranged to meet in Bakanik. I got there punctually, and José Antonio was writing a couple tables away. He kept looking at his watch and taking notes. After a while, he got up and left. A minute later, Bergamín arrived, and as soon as I saw him, I said José Antonio had only just left. I would like to have been introduced because people have said such good things about him. And then Pepe goes and says he had been waiting for him. He had arranged to see both of us at the same time. I was so annoyed I could have knocked the glass out of his hand! (José Antonio Martín Otín, *La desesperación del té (27 veces Pepín Bello)* [Valencia, 2008], 79–80)

For his part, Celaya again referenced the poet and the Falange leader having dinner together by giving his own version of what had happened. He specified it had taken place on 8 March 1936:

> Federico asked me why I had not wanted to speak to José Manuel Aizpurúa and why, between the two of us, we had created such a tense situation for him. I tried to explain it to him with passion, maybe with sectarianism, while he took a more human approach and tried to tell me Aizpurúa was a good lad, very sensitive, very intelligent, who admired my poems, etc. Eventually, he reacted to my stubbornness, or perhaps he just wanted to open my eyes with

> the terrible revelation: José Manuel is like José Antonio Primo de Rivera. Another good lad. Do you know I have dinner with him every Friday? Well, I do. We usually leave in a taxi with the curtains drawn, because it is not in his interests to be seen with me, and it is not in mine to be seen with him. (Gabriel Celaya, "Un recuerdo de Federico García Lorca," *Realidad: Revista de Cultura y Política* 9 [1966]: 10–15, cited in Gibson, *En busca de José Antonio*, 218–219)

Celaya told Gibson it had been García Lorca who had introduced him, in the Cabaret Casablanca, to José Antonio in 1934 ("Come over here. I'm going to introduce you to José Antonio. He's a great lad"). He confirmed what had happened in San Sebastián, although with an important difference with reference to García Lorca's exaggerations: "When I tell the story about Federico, when he told me they had dinner together every Friday, maybe it was one of Federico's exaggerations. He had a lively imagination, but he did know José Antonio. That much is certainly true." Gibson, *En busca de José Antonio*, 220. As we can see, the versions—one from a Falange source and one from a non-Falange, left-wing source—are contradictory.

The García Lorca issue was highly uncomfortable for the Francoists (who had shot him even though he had taken refuge in the house of Luis Rosales, a friend who was a Falange member and a poet), which might explain why Ximénez de Sandoval's biography of José Antonio published in 1941 and 1949 made no mention of their friendship so as not to create friction among the Francoists. Or perhaps the issue literally could not be mentioned because of the censorship of the time. Nevertheless, the biography did mention José Antonio admired the poet, etc. And the 1963 edition had a footnote about a lecture the author had given on three occasions ("La amistad frustrada de Federico y José Antonio") and the reasons he believed José Antonio and García Lorca could have become friends, even though they were not. Likewise, Ximénez de Sandoval's attempts to personally introduce García Lorca to José Antonio completely contradict Celaya's version. Other Falange writers, however (even Ridruejo, a dissident who later opposed the Franco regime) never alluded to the friendship. They were undoubtedly unaware of it. Rosales, on the other hand, did mention it to Gibson in the course of his investigation into García Lorca's murder in Granada. It seems, then, José Antonio and García Lorca did meet

after several failed attempts, one of which took place in Salamanca or Palencia when they were both eating in the same restaurant but at different tables—José Antonio with a group of Falange members and García Lorca with several members of La Barraca. Apparently, José Antonio sent him a napkin with the message, “Federico, do you not think that with your blue overalls and our blue shirts we could make a better Spain?” Some versions of the story say he did not expect a reply; others, like Gibson’s, say he could hardly keep his nerves in check to see how García Lorca would react. Whatever the case, the frequency of their meetings García Lorca had mentioned to Celaya was highly exaggerated. José Antonio’s interest in meeting and getting to know García Lorca (despite the difficulties this entailed), and getting him to sign up as a Falange member (although this was hardly realistic), was probably because José Antonio was constantly denouncing the misery in Spain as a whole and in Andalusia in particular, where thousands of impoverished peasants and a highly polarized society had to be saved by the National Syndicalist project. He must have thought this linked up with the denouncement of inequalities that was a feature of García Lorca’s work. Whether what José Antonio wanted would have been possible is highly unlikely given the poet’s clearly Democratic position. The friendship between García Lorca and José Antonio has been the subject of specific essays. Jesús Cotta, *Rosas de plomo: Amistad y muerte de Federico y José Antonio* (Barcelona, 2015).

13. Ximénez de Sandoval, *Biografía*, 611.
14. For more information on GU, see Alina Navas, “Falange y arte: Una primera aproximación,” lecture, 13th Congress of the Contemporary History Association, University of Castilla–La Mancha, Albacete, 21–23 September 2016.
15. Francisco Bravo, *José Antonio: El hombre, el Jefe, el camarada* (Madrid, 1939), 52.
16. He wrote, for example, “Stronger than attitudes of Left and Right in Spanish youth today is the awareness of generation. The young lads nowadays may start shooting at one another, but, even though they fight, they all feel united by the same responsibility, the same style . . . soon they will have put aside their differences and together they will forge our true Spain.” *Arriba* 25, 26 December 1935, in José Antonio

Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas de José Antonio Primo de Rivera,* ed. Agustín del Río Cisneros (Madrid, 1950), 165.

17. Javier Pradera, *La mitología falangista (1933–1939)* (Madrid, 2014), 230.
18. Just before he was arrested and sent to prison, José Antonio had also met Gregorio Marañón, whom he corresponded with throughout his imprisonment. See Marino Gómez Santos, *Diálogos españoles* (Madrid, 1958).
19. Ibid., 53.
20. Eugenio d'Ors, "Del sufragio," *El Debate,* 26 November 1933, cited in August Rafanell, "El corbatín que estrangula: Antirromanticismo y anticatalanismo en el pensamiento de Eugenio d'Ors y de José Antonio Primo de Rivera," *Ayer* 97, no. 1 (2015): 129.
21. That D'Ors's influence, unlike Ortega y Gasset's, on José Antonio had been ignored was pointed out by Francisco Umbral, *Leyenda del César Visionario* (Barcelona, 1989).
22. José Ortega y Gasset, *La rebelión de las masas* (Madrid, 1959), 114.
23. Ortega y Gasset, quoted in Pradera, *La mitología falangista,* 246.
24. Ortega y Gasset, *La rebelión,* 124.
25. Salvador de Brocà, *Falange y filosofía* (Salou, 1976), 176.
26. José Ortega y Gasset, *En torno a Galileo* (Madrid, 1959), 168–169.
27. José Antonio Primo de Rivera, "Homenaje y reproche a Don José Ortega y Gasset," *Haz* 12, 5 December 1935.
28. "Discurso pronunciado en el Frontón Betis," *Arriba* 25, 22 December 1935, in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas,* 113.
29. Pradera, *La mitología falangista,* 354.
30. Brocà, *Falange y filosofía,* 134.
31. See Rudolf Stammler, *Tratado de filosofía del derecho* (1925; repr., Madrid, 2008).
32. Pradera, *La mitología falangista,* 262.
33. Oswald Spengler, *La decadencia de Occidente* (Madrid, 1966), 319–320.
34. "Discurso pronunciado en Carpio de Tajo," in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas,* 99.
35. Brocà, *Falange y filosofía,* 187.

36. “Discurso de José Antonio de Valladolid, en el acto de constitución del SEU el 21 de enero de 1935,” in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas*, 161.
37. Pradera, *La mitología falangista*, 125.
38. Ibid., 306.
39. José Ortega y Gasset, *España invertebrada* (Madrid, 1959), 32–33.
40. Although he went on: “Galicia must make Spain more Galician, Andalusia must make it more Andalusian, the Basque Country must make it more Basque and Catalonia must make it more Catalan.” Miguel de Unamuno, *Obras completas*, vol. 6 (Madrid, 1958), 536–537, cited in Francisco La Rubia Prado, *Una encrucijada española: Ensayos críticos sobre Miguel de Unamuno y José Ortega y Gasset* (Madrid, 2005), 39–40.
41. Ismael Saz, *España contra España: Los nacionalismos franquistas* (Madrid, 2003), 75.
42. José María de Oriol y Urquijo, “Por distintos caminos, hacia la misma meta,” in *Dolor y memoria*, 251–253.
43. Ramiro de Maeztu, *Defensa de la Hispanidad*, 2nd ed. (1934; Madrid, 1935).
44. Ibid., 237–238.
45. Saz, *España contra España*, 115.
46. “Cuaderno de notas de un estudiante europeo,” in Miguel Primo de Rivera y Urquijo, *Papeles póstumos de José Antonio* (Barcelona, 1996), 169.
47. “La gaita y la lira,” *FE* 2, 11 January 1934, in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas*, 407.
48. “Ensayo sobre el nacionalismo,” *Revista JONS* 16 (April 1934), in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas*, 215. He had said the following about Catalonia two months earlier:

   > In Catalonia, there is a resentful separatism for which the solution is difficult to see. I believe it is partly because people do not understand what Catalonia really is. The Catalans are essentially a sentimental people, although they are often, and mistakenly, regarded as mean and practical in all things. They are imbued with poetry, which is expressed not only in their typical forms of artistic expression, such as their ancient songs and the liturgy of the

sardana, but also in the most run-of-the-mill aspects of their bourgeois life, even in the inheritances of those Barcelona families who pass down the small shops in the ancient streets around the Plaza Real from father to son. Not only are the lives of these families touched with a sense of poetry, but they are well aware of it and perpetuate the wonderfully refined poetic traditions of their guild, their family, and their bourgeois society. This has not been understood; Catalonia has not been treated as it should have been, and for this reason the problem has festered. The only solution to this situation I can see is for a new Spanish poetry to inspire in the soul of Catalonia an interest for a collective venture, a path from which Catalonia was diverted by a movement that was at once separatist and poetic. ("Los vascos y España," speech delivered in the parliament, 28 February 1934, "Ensayo sobre Nacionalismo," in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas,* 419–423)

49. "Discurso de proclamacion de Falange Española de las JONS," speech delivered at Teatro Calderón, 4 March 1934, in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas,* 23 (emphasis added).
50. "España, incómoda," *Haz* 1, 26 March 1935, in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas,* 443.
51. "Discurso sobre la revolución española," speech delivered at Cine Madrid, 19 May 1935, in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas,* 615.
52. Brocà, *Falange y filosofía,* 216.
53. Saz, *España contra España,* 148.
54. Ibid., 149; Maximiliano Fuentes Codera, "Eugenio d'Ors y la génesis del discurso del nacionalismo falangista," in *Falange: Las culturas políticas del fascismo en la España de Franco (1936–1975),* ed. Miguel Ángel Ruiz Carnicer (Zaragoza, 2013), 161.
55. For more details on D'Ors's thought on empire, see Enric Ucelay-Da Cal, *El imperialismo catalán: Prat de la Riba, Cambó, D'Ors y la conquista moral de España* (Barcelona, 2003), chaps. 15–16.
56. Javier Varela, "El sueño imperial de Eugenio d'Ors," *Historia y Política* 2 (1999): 75.
57. Rafanell, "El corbatín que estrangula," 130.
58. Varela, "El sueño imperial," 76–77.
59. Ximénez de Sandoval, *Biografía,* 612.

60. A mistake, by the way, Southworth did not make. See Southworth, *Antifalange*, 18.
61. *Ahora*, 16 February 1934, in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas*, 549.
62. “Cuaderno de notas de un estudiante europeo,” 173.
63. See Rudyard Kipling, *Rewards and Fairies* [New York, 1910].
64. “Sobre política internacional española,” speech delivered in the parliament, 2 October 1935, in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas*, 293.
65. Nicolas Berdiaeff, *Una nueva Edad Media: Reflexiones acerca de los destinos de Rusia y de Europa*, trans. José Renom (Barcelona, 1933); Primo de Rivera y Urquijo, *Papeles póstumos*, 171.
66. Brocà, *Falange y filosofía*, 183.
67. Ibid., 179.
68. Spengler, *La decadencia*, 319–320 (author’s translation).
69. Oswald Spengler, *Años decisivos* (Madrid, 1962), 172 (author’s translation).
70. Ibid., 11.
71. Alexis Carrel, *Man, the Unknown* (New York, 1935).
72. “Cuaderno de notas de un estudiante europeo,” 171; see also Pradera, *La mitología falangista*, 342.
73. Pradera, *La mitología falangista*, 343.
74. Brocà, *Falange y filosofía*, 188.
75. “Cuaderno de notas de un estudiante europeo,” 174, 171.
76. Ibid., 174.
77. “España y la barbarie,” speech delivered at Calderón Theater, 3 March 1935, in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas*, 32–33. “The world—and Spain is part of the world—is witnessing the last throes of an era. Perhaps it is the end of the Liberal-capitalist age or the end of a longer period of which Liberal capitalism was the final stage. We are now before the imminent threat of a ‘barbarian invasion,’ a historical catastrophe that generally acts as the colophon to every age.” “Prieto se acerca a la Falange,” *Aquí Estamos*, 23 May 1936, in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas*, 402–403.
78. Pradera, *La mitología*, 367.

79. “Cuaderno de notas de un estudiante europeo,” 174–175.
80. “Estado, individuo y libertad,” lecture given for a training course organized by the Falange, 28 March 1935, in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas*, 365.
81. Brocà, *Falange y filosofía*, 134.
82. “España y la barbarie,” 31.
83. “Ante una encrucijada en la historia política y económica del mundo,” speech delivered at Círculo Mercantil, 9 April 1935, in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas*, 37.
84. “Estado, individuo y libertad,” 365.
85. “Ante una encrucijada,” 53–54.
86. “Discurso sobre la revolución española,” 55.
87. Brocà, *Falange y filosofía*, 152.
88. José Antonio Primo de Rivera, “Germánicos contra bereberes: 15 siglos de historia de España,” in Jorge Bonilla, *La historia no contada de los Primo de Rivera* (Madrid, 2016), 215–224. The essay was not among José Antonio’s documents that were taken to Mexico but comes from his brother Miguel’s archive. Bonilla, *La historia no contada*, 132. José Antonio must have given it to him before he died. Therefore, it has always been in Spain. The first news of its existence came in 1939 from the journalist José Escalera in the *Falange* newspaper published in Palma, as was revealed in Jeroni Miquel Mas Rigo, *La manipulación del proceso de José Antonio Primo de Rivera* (Madrid, 2014), in which it was mistakenly cited as “Germanos contra berberes” and said to be signed “José Antonio Primo de Rivera. Alicante Prison, 13 August 1936” when the original only states “13 August 1936.” It was also mentioned on 1 April 1969 in an *SP* article by Joaquín Aguirre Bellver. Bonilla, *La historia no contada*, 133–134. Among the documents brought from Mexico, several, such as “Izquierdas burguesas” and “27 de diciembre de 1936,” do not appear in Primo de Rivera y Urquijo, *Papeles póstumos*. Bonilla, *La historia no contada*, 144.
89. Javier Martínez de Bedoya, *Memorias Memorias desde mi aldea* (Valladolid, 1996), 78.
90. J. A. Primo de Rivera, “Germánicos contra bereberes,” 222.
91. José Antonio quotes Stammler, *Tratado de Filosofía*, 526.

92. “Derecho y política,” in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas,* 369–370.

93. Apparently, in a conversation with Bravo he published in Salamanca’s *La Gaceta Regional* several years after the event, he had said:

> I believe in Spanish magistrates and their fundamental honesty, but I am also aware of their problems and demands: they are badly paid, criticized the length and breadth of the peninsula, subject to the ups and downs of politics, disappointed by the spectacle of their best rulings being revoked in the Supreme Court by ministers and their cronies . . . , but blackmail has no justification, and the mission of he who judges must prevail over all possible misfortunes. He who does not agree with this should leave . . . This is a national problem. There can be no Fatherland without justice. The first step is to free it of all political contact. The second is to ensure that those who administer justice are well paid. The third is to shoot bad judges without compunction . . . We cannot do anything less. There is nothing more antipatriotic and antisocial than injustice. Those who do not believe in justice for their country have no Fatherland and cannot love it. The least the public can expect is that they will not be ridden roughshod over. And as we live through this Republican period, we can say loud and clear that nobody will be afraid of us when they realize we cannot be insulted without danger and that lawsuits, liberty, and individual honor are at the mercy of the coarse ways of any pettifogger who cracks open the safe using his gown as a picklock, and of the picaresque wink of a clerk who earns 150 pesetas a month in a court and has a small automobile. (“No existirá jamás una Patria mientras no exista Justicia,” in *Dolor y memoria,* 234–235)

94. Juan Aparicio, “La conquista del estado,” in *Semanario de lucha e información política,* ed. Ramiro Ledesma Ramos (Madrid, 1939), 2.

95. “Puntos iniciales,” *FE* 1, 7 December 1933, in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas,* 348–349.

96. “Norma programática de la Falange: Veintisiete puntos,” in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas,* 342.

97. Georges Sorel, *Réflexions sur la violence* (Paris, 1908).

98. “Norma programática de la Falange,” 342.

99. “Derecho y política,” 369.
100. “Sobre Cataluña,” in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas,* 183–184.
101. “España y la barbarie,” 31.
102. “Discurso de clausura del II Consejo Nacional de la Falange,” speech delivered at Cine Madrid, 17 November 1935, in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas,* 65.
103. “Estado, individuo y libertad,” 365.
104. José Ortega y Gasset, *Vieja y nueva política* (Madrid, 1953), 149.
105. The Socialist speech could have been given, almost from beginning to end, at a Falange rally. Some paragraphs, whole paragraphs, refreshed my spirit like joyful meetings with old friends who I have not seen for a long time . . . Sentences that were almost textually ours and, most importantly, characteristic thoughts have been transplanted to the speaker’s discourse, for example, when he said the following about Extremadura: “I said there in that land, which provided many of the men who crossed the ocean in one of the most beautiful historic adventures . . . , that we Spaniards . . . should place the boundless vigor of the Spanish temperament . . . at the service . . . of a conquest. The conquest of Spain. We need to conquer ourselves.” Or when he paid tribute to all things spiritual: “Man has not come into this world as a beast of the field. We are told by various religious points of view that man is superior to animals.” Or when he uses what was said in one of the greatest Falange rallies almost word for word to point out one of the blights of the capitalist system: “Man . . . is treated by the current capitalist system with less consideration than a beast of the field, because when an employer loses a head of cattle, he feels it in his pocket, as he has to find the money to replace it at the market. But when a day laborer dies, he does not feel it in his heart or in his pocket.” Or when he claims: “What sort of morality can possibly accept the monstrous phenomenon of the wheat surplus rotting while millions of Spaniards ‘from this our Fatherland’ cannot eat because they do not have the money?” Or when he proclaims: “As my life goes on . . . I feel increasingly more Spanish. I feel Spain in my heart and in the very marrow of my bones. So I speak to you as someone who feels more and more Spanish, and joined by bonds that will only be broken by death, if it is true they are broken by death, to his brothers in Spain

who I wish to live decently and in freedom." "Prieto se acerca a la Falange," 403–404.

106. "Señoritismo," *FE* 4, 25 January 1934, in J. A. Primo de Rivera, *Obras completas,* 435–436. In *Papeles póstumos de José Antonio,* there is a text entitled "Aristocracia y aristofobia," the authorship of which is attributed to José Antonio. The text was not actually in the "Mexican suitcase" Prieto kept (until, in 1977, the executor of his will gave Primo de Rivera y Urquijo the keys to the Bank of Mexico safe in which it was found) but among the documents held by Miguel Primo, which were also included in the book (which led to some confusion). The first person to sort through the contents of the suitcase, and Miguel's documents, says the document is written in Miguel's handwriting and was not found in the suitcase. Hence, we shall not consider it here. See Bonilla, *La historia no contada,* 128–129, 137, 153.

107. Brocà, *Falange y filosofía,* 195–196.

108. Enrique Tierno Galván, *Costa y el regeneracionismo* (Barcelona, 1961), 9–10, cited in ibid., 196.

109. Brocà, *Falange y filosofía,* 94.

110. José María Mancisidor, *Frente a frente: José Antonio Primo de Rivera, frente al Tribunal Popular—Texto taquigráfico del Juicio Oral de Alicante, Noviembre 1936* (Madrid, 1963), 14.

111. Ramiro Ledesma Ramos, *¿Fascismo en España? Discurso a las juventudes de España,* edited by Roberto Muñoz Bolaños (Madrid, 2013), 308.

112. José Antonio "had never been hostile to a serious reform government of notables of the Republican parties and the moderate left. His admiration for Azaña and Prieto is well documented. . . Under the pressure of a long prison sentence and a horrible civil war it is hardly surprising José Antonio turned toward a program of moderate Republican unity because it reflected an oft-repressed alternate polarity or contradiction at the heart of his political thought." Stanley G. Payne, *Franco y José Antonio: El extraño caso del fascismo español* (Barcelona, 1997), 348; Enrique de Aguinaga and Stanley G. Payne, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera* (Barcelona, 2003), 269.

113. Joan Maria Thomàs, *El gran golpe: El “caso Hedilla” o cómo Franco se quedó con Falange* (Barcelona, 2014), 68.
114. Circular dated 9 September 1936, cited in Maximiano García Venero, *Falange en la Guerra de España: La unificación y Hedilla* (Paris, 1967), 242. After the edition published by the anti-Franco Paris-based Ruedo Ibérico, a Spanish edition was published in 1970. It made no mention of this circular and omitted paragraphs and whole pages about cases of the Falange being involved in repressive acts. See Maximiano García Venero, *Testimonio de Manuel Hedilla: Segundo Jefe Nacional de Falange Española de las JONS,* ed. Manuel Hedilla (Barcelona, 1972).
115. Navarre University Archive.
116. García Venero, *Testimonio de Manuel Hedilla,* 238–239. He continued his speech with references to the treatment being given to Catalonia and the Basque Country, which also involved some Falangists:

> Some people in our rearguard have nothing better to do than spread hate against Catalonia and the Basque provinces. And every time they achieve their purpose by raking up the muck or settling old scores, they look as satisfied as if they had done something worthwhile. The Falange preaches love not hate, union not disunion. In Catalonia, there are good Spaniards and bad Spaniards, as there are everywhere. It would not occur to anyone to spread hate against the people of Madrid, because the city is now in the hands of the Reds. And in Bilbao and Barcelona, the great majority of those who are fighting against us are neither Basques nor Catalans but scum and thieves from all over Spain.

117. “Discurso del Secretario General del Movimiento Raimundo Fernández-Cuesta,” in *Dolor y memoria,* 60.
118. Joan Maria Thomàs, *José M. Fontana Tarrats: Biografia política d’un franquista català* (Reus, 1997), 61. Likewise, Mallol Alberola, who controlled access to the Port of Alicante before the Francoist troops arrived, according to the testimony of a family member, “prevented a massacre in the port by ensuring there were no executions by firing squad. A long list of names of people allegedly involved in crimes of violence was buried somewhere on one of the family’s properties.” Later, “his Falange ideals obliged him to resign from important posts and finally retire from politics because of his beliefs.” José Mallol

Alberola, *La estampida (final de la Guerra Civil en el puerto de Alicante)* (Alicante, 2000), 9.

Chapter 5

The Most Important Myth and Hero Worship in Franco's Spain, Second Only to Franco Himself

José Antonio's death was kept secret in National Spain until 18 July 1938 (i.e., almost two years after the event). General Franco had been informed immediately in his headquarters, as were Manuel Hedilla and the other members of the provisional Command Unit, who at the time were Sancho Dávila, José Antonio's "cousin" from Seville, the territorial chief of Andalusia; Agustín Aznar Gerner, the unit's "number two," National Leader of the Primera Línea, and romantically involved with one of José Antonio's cousins; Andrés Redondo Ortega, the brother of Onésimo—who had been killed in a skirmish with Republicans on the front during the first few days of the war—who had, in the "Visigothic" fashion, succeeded him[1] at the territorial headquarters of Old Castile; José Sáinz Nothnagel, territorial chief of New Castile; José Moreno Osorio, territorial chief of Navarre and the Basque Country; Jesús Muro, territorial chief of Aragon; and Francisco Bravo, the secretary from Salamanca.

The news had filtered through to National Spain largely thanks to the Republican press and radio. The newspapers in the Republican zone published news of both the sentence and the execution with headlines that clearly expressed the importance they attached to the event and the fact that he was regarded as the enemy: "José Antonio Primo de Rivera condemned to death," "Sentence carried out. At six o'clock in the morning, the sentence issued by the Popular Court against José Antonio Primo de Rivera, Ezequiel Mira Iniesta, Luis Segura Baus, Vicente Muñoz Navarro, and Luis López López was carried into effect. As you will remember, the last four of these are from Novelda and were sentenced ten days ago,"[2] "The people have ordered the head of the assassins of the Falange be brought to justice. May the sentence be carried out!"[3] The Republican radio stations also reported the news, which was just as important for them, for its positive effects on

morale, as for their Francoist enemies, for its negative effects. However, the news was also published in some “national” papers because of an oversight of the censorship system. For example, *El Pensamiento Alavés*, from Vitoria, reported José Antonio’s execution by firing squad on the very day it took place.

Both Franco’s headquarters and the party received the news of José Antonio’s death with some reservation. They needed confirmation, which they sought through foreign embassies in Republican Spain and other channels but to no avail. A good example of Franco’s partial belief in José Antonio’s death is his response to a letter asking for news about his whereabouts from María Santos Kant, who described herself as “José Antonio Primo de Rivera’s fiancée” and a member of the Women’s Section. She gave an address in the city of Segovia, although she wrote from an address where she would only be in passing. The letter seems to be from someone other than the “I” (the last person with whom José Antonio was romantically involved). M. S. Kant (which is how the letter was signed)[4] wrote to Franco three days after the news had been published in the Republican zone:

> My General:
>
> I am José Antonio Primo de Rivera’s fiancée. I prefer to give you this brief explanation, with the sobriety that characterizes his Falange, because it excludes any mention of what these last few months have been like for me during which there have been all sorts of rumors about José Antonio and all sorts of contradictory news. Today, after exhausting all other channels and methods, I have decided to write to you, my General, to ask whether you could shed any light on this matter. Please do not see in this request a lack of awareness of your preoccupations and work, or a lack of respect. The truth is that all Spaniards have acquired the habit of trusting and putting all our hopes in you, my General. I would not like to be sent an answer but not receive it—I shall not be in this place for very long—so the safest address to write to is: María Santos Kant, Women’s Section of the Falange, Juan Bravo, 6, Segovia.
>
> May God be kind to you, my General, and protect you for many years.
>
> M. S. Kant
> *Arriba España*![5]

The Generalissimo responded (without a signature) to the letter on 1 December, that is, less than a week later:

> Dear Madam,

> General Franco has asked me to tell you he received your letter dated 24 November referring to Mr. Primo de Rivera. The General has no direct information about the fate of the gentleman in question. However, reports from the Reds claim they have shot him, and we do not believe they would say such a thing if it were not true, because lying would serve them no purpose at all.

It was not a confirmation of the news in the strict sense, but it did express a belief in its truth.

For its part, the Command Unit was informed of the death of its National Leader in Burgos on the same night of 20 November. Muro, Moreno Osorio, Bravo, and several local Falange members heard the news from Republican radio broadcasts, though they had previously had news of the trial in Alicante through one of their own news services, which gave them access to the "red press" from Barcelona and Madrid.[6] According to the biographers of José Antonio and Hedilla, at the end of the party's third National Council (or after lunch, depending on which biographer you believe) on the day after José Antonio had been shot, Hedilla included José Antonio's full name in his roll call for the fallen. All the councillors responded with the rallying cry of "*Presente*!"—they had all accepted their National Leader was now one of the "fallen."[7] If the roll was indeed called after lunch and not at the end of the meeting, this suggests there was a conscious decision, which must have been taken that very day by the Command Unit or the National Council itself, to keep the death a secret. Thus, the news would not have been included in the note given to the press or in any of the reports on the third National Council. Neither would it have been disclosed by Franco or the press service of his headquarters.

The two main factors in this decision were the lack of confirmation and the fear of the negative effects the news might have on the recruitment of volunteers at a moment when these were vital to the war effort. At that time, the growth of the Army was subject to the slow rhythm of conscription and the recruitment of North African mercenaries. The party also must have been afraid of the effect of the news on the old and the new members, particularly because new recruits were made by constantly invoking the name of José Antonio. And, more generally, they must have wanted to conceal from the "National" population the bad news that had been inflicted by "the enemy."

The secret was kept for almost two years. This period can be divided into two: the months before Raimundo Fernández-Cuesta returned to the

National zone with the expected confirmation and the months afterward in which this confirmation was not disclosed. The fact that neither the party nor his family officially announced José Antonio's death contributed to the uncertainty. This uncertainty was fueled by supposedly reliable information from "witnesses" who said he had survived, rumors of a fake execution by firing squad, and stories about his being kept prisoner until the time was ripe for him to return to National Spain. There were even lurid accounts—believed by Franco, if we have to give credit to what Ramón Serrano Suñer said—of his being sent to Moscow and castrated. In fact, his own sister Pilar Primo actually believed he might have still been alive,[8] and a "comrade"—a former Falange leader—received letters that were supposedly signed by José Antonio, although they were later proved to be fakes.[9] Other Falange leaders such as Dionisio Ridruejo lived with the uncertainty for months until they confronted Hedilla and had the news of his death confirmed.

This period has come to be known as José Antonio's "Sebastianism," a reference to Sebastian I of Portugal, who was killed at the Battle of Alcácer Quibir in 1578 and had his kingdom taken over by Philip II. The myth arose that he had not really died and that he would return to save Portugal. In this period, it was quite common to hear Falange members saying, "When José Antonio comes back."[10] They also started to refer to him as *el ausente* (the absent one), in contrast to the response of "present" when the names of the fallen were announced. Agustín de Foxá first used this "pious"[11] expression (which would later enter widespread use among the Falange members) in Salamanca in 1936 to express the hope that José Antonio was still alive. And, I would add, to prevent the devastating effect the truth would have had on morale.[12]

Thus began the construction of an idealized image of José Antonio, and the cult of personality that had been fostered within the Falange ever since he first became National Leader began to spread. This was the beginning of the Myth (with a capital M) that became fully fledged as of July 1938, when the news was officially made public. However, the relative uncertainty of his death did not affect Franco's plans to set up the regime's single party. In fact, on 19 April 1937, he took control of the FE de las JONS and merged it with the Traditionalist Communion. Whether José Antonio was alive or dead had no effect on the decision to carry out this plan, fronted by Franco

himself and his brother-in-law Serrano Suñer, who had managed to reach the National zone after escaping from a Madrid prison in February.

So, a single party was created with Franco as the new National Leader. It was the result of Franco's desire to seize power, and he decided the best way to achieve this was to merge with the party that at the time clearly had the majority in National Spain: the FE de las JONS. Franco would have taken exactly the same course of action even if José Antonio were only in prison, but knowing he had been shot made things much easier. If José Antonio had suddenly reappeared, he would have had to accept the situation or react to it, with all the consequences, as Hedilla had done. Hedilla had dared not to accept the post Franco had given him in the "new" Falange[13] and ended up being sentenced to death (which was never actually carried out, but Hedilla did spend four years in prison). The merger was also made easier by the fact that the leader of the Carlists, Manuel Fal Conde, had had to flee to Lisbon after clashing with Franco.

The party's new name was almost identical to the previous one: Falange Española Tradicionalista y de las Juntas de Ofensiva Nacional Sindicalista instead of Falange Española de las Juntas de Ofensiva Nacional Sindicalista (i.e., the only added words were "Tradicionalista"—taken directly from the name of the Carlists' party—and the conjunction "y"). The new party remained largely in the hands of the former leaders of the "old" Falange. Despite being a different organization, it adopted the Falange's program almost wholesale (of the "Twenty-Seven Points," only the last one was removed because it referred to the need to avoid making agreements with other political forces, something the merger had rendered null and void), and its slogans, flag, and internal organization were "cloned" and adapted to the new name. This all meant José Antonio's old dream of making the Falange the backbone of a Fascist dictatorship under his command had largely come true. But he was not there to see it, his party was not the same, and it would not be all powerful because it had to govern with sectors that had been rivals in the past, the representatives of the "old" Spain he had tried to oust.

The man behind all this was his friend Serrano Suñer, who had become the intermediary between his powerful brother-in-law and the leaders of the old Falange, all relatives or close friends of José Antonio. Serrano Suñer had never been a Falange member but in recent times had drawn politically closer to José Antonio: he was anxious to include the Falange in the new

state he was helping create and to be given a leading role in the new party and government. Of course, he achieved both objectives.

During the years of the Republic, Franco had not been on the best of terms with José Antonio, but he had now, surprisingly, become National Leader of a Falange that owed much to its former leader. Despite personal misgivings that were never obvious or proven, Franco was quite ready to take part in glorifying José Antonio's name. Even though he had already become Generalissimo and Caudillo, he felt he had to differentiate himself from the other generals who were involved in the uprising to ensure he would continue in power after the war. To do this, he had to provide himself with a base of popular support so that his regime would be more solid and structured than the UPE that had been unable to ensure the survival of Primo de Rivera's dictatorship six years earlier.

Serrano Suñer was an old friend of José Antonio's and had, among other things, helped him in his attempts to be elected as a member of the parliament for Cuenca. He now played a fundamental role for the "old" Falange because, although he had not been the only person involved in the process of unification (Franco had also negotiated with Hedilla), he succeeded in making the old Falange much more powerful and influential in the new Falange than were the Carlists, the other sector involved in the merger. And the most surprising thing of all was that, as of 1939, Serrano Suñer himself would be the new party's "number two," second only to Franco. However, his excessive ambition led to constant clashes between the two men, and he vanished from the political scene in 1942.

Fernández-Cuesta's arrival in the National zone in October 1937 did not bring with it the official announcement of José Antonio's death, even though he discussed it with Indalecio Prieto and, more importantly, explained that José Antonio had given him photographic copies of the will in his capacity as executor. He also explained that, at the end of July 1936, José Antonio had given him his proposal for a new government, which Prieto thought he could exploit to cause dissent among the Francoists. This, however, was wishful thinking on his part. Although the documents had been taken from him in France before he entered National Spain, he had read them, knew exactly what they said, and must have told Pilar, all the other "old Falange" leaders, and, of course, Franco and Serrano Suñer. Not until the following July was anything done to announce the news of José Antonio's death. Even at the beginning of 1938, when Carmen Primo, Aunt

Ma, and Margot Larios were released in exchange for other prisoners,[14] nothing was done to make the news public even though Margot had read José Antonio's will (she had shown it to the governor of the Adult Reformatory, where she was being held before she was moved to Alacuás prison in Valencia) and the other two women had visited him the evening before his execution. And they had all heard the shots that had ended his life.

So, if Fernández-Cuesta's release clarified everything about José Antonio's death, why was the news not announced for another year?[15] Probably because the political and military situation was much more stable by that time than two years earlier (although, just one week later, National Spain was shocked by the unexpected beginning of the Battle of the Ebro). The Regular Popular Army was efficiently run and no longer depended on militia volunteers, the single party had been in operation for more than a year after the initial teething problems with Hedilla, and, above all, the Political Board (of which Fernández-Cuesta, Serrano Suñer, Pilar Primo, and Ridruejo were all members) believed the time had now come to announce the death of the founder and organize a huge outpouring of grief to reinforce the Falangist nature of the new state. On this last issue, the Falange had been struggling to impose its will on the other members of the coalition (among whom were Alfonsists, Carlists, anti-unificationists, the Army, the Catholic Church, employers, and landowners concerned with Fascist National Syndicalism).

Franco and Serrano Suñer decided the details of the tribute to José Antonio. Although Serrano Suñer was not the party's secretary general at the time (despite Franco wanting him to occupy the post and not Fernández-Cuesta, whom he did not trust) and held no position of importance other than that of Political Board member and national delegate of press and propaganda, he had considerable influence. Fernández-Cuesta was mortified by this situation. He felt insecure because he had reached the National zone as the result of an exchange organized by Prieto and was not as close to Franco as he would be years later. In January 1938, in addition to his responsibilities for press and propaganda, Serrano Suñer was appointed minister of the interior. Ridruejo also had a dual role in the government. After a meteoric rise, he was appointed head of the party's National Propaganda Service and minister of propaganda. He was one of the designers of the tribute to José Antonio.

The aim of the remembrance celebrations was to pay tribute, alongside the new and true guide and leader of the "new Spain" (Franco), to the "forerunner," creator, and "martyr" who had been sacrificed to save the country, José Antonio. Until this time, there had only existed the "protomartyr," José Calvo Sotelo, whose death was marked by a day of national mourning.[16] But Franco wanted to go much further with the memory of José Antonio and accepted the tribute insofar as he was portrayed

> as continuing [José Antonio's] work and the heroic and indispensable Caudillo who was taking up where the dead leader had left off to create the Spain he had announced. Franco came off well from this distribution of roles: he was made to seem a faithful follower of all things Spanish and someone whose skill, talents for warfare, and ingenuity had enabled him to win the war and round off his predecessor's work in a long-standing peace. Hence, he was the natural leader of the new Spain that was in the process of being forged.[17]

Who best reflected the doctrinal link between José Antonio and Franco, as we shall see, was the always heterodox Ernesto Giménez Caballero. He had written almost all the speech Franco had given to announce the merger of parties one year before, and now, on the occasion of giving the news of José Antonio's execution by firing squad, he also played a significant role.

The two moments chosen to make José Antonio's death public and pay the first official tribute to his memory were 18 July 1938 (the second anniversary of the uprising) and 1 October (the second anniversary of his proclamation as head of state). On the first date, in two speeches, Franco and Fernández-Cuesta referred to José Antonio's death at the hands of the enemy. Franco spoke in the studios of the National Radio of Spain and mentioned the letter José Antonio had sent him in which he had asked for action to be taken against the Republicans. He described him as "a glorious martyr of our crusade." The following day, the front page of at least one newspaper that reported it, the *ABC* of Seville, featured an enormous photograph of José Antonio and the headline "José Antonio Primo de Rivera: Prophet and Forerunner of the National Syndicalist Revolution."[18] Fernández-Cuesta also referred to his death in the speech he gave in Valladolid, in which he said, "José Antonio has left us forever."[19]

But it was not until 1 October that Franco communicated "the sad certainty, based on irrefutable facts, of the death of the founder of the Falange, José Antonio Primo de Rivera. It has been decided to appoint a

commission to determine the way in which the nation shall show its admiration and gratitude to his political genius, his self-sacrifice, and his heroism."[20] He gave this speech amid the tribute by the government, the Church, and the party to mark the occasion of his rise to power during a session of the National Council of the FET y de las JONS. Franco did not explain exactly what these "irrefutable" facts were, although it is highly likely he was simply referring to the will. This reinforces the idea that the announcement was made at this time because he felt it was best for the single party. We should stress here that José Antonio was no threat to Franco and that, up to this point, his presence in the press (with the exception of the Falange press, which had gained in circulation thanks to the closure of left-wing and Republican newspapers in National Spain) had in no way been comparable to the figure of the Generalissimo and Caudillo. But things were about to change. The process of change began on 1 October, but it really took off on 20 November and then gathered fresh impetus one year later.

The aforementioned commission, made up of Political Board members, worked diligently, and in the days preceding the second anniversary of José Antonio's execution, they issued a decree and three orders that paved the way for the first official tribute to José Antonio. Immediately before 20 November, a "radiophonic week" was organized during which many of the writers belonging to José Antonio's "literary court" gave speeches and published articles in the press. These were later collected in a book significantly entitled *Dolor y memoria de España en el segundo aniversario de la muerte de José Antonio*.[21] This very same week saw the Battle of the Ebro end in victory for Franco's troops. And to mark the day of the anniversary of the execution, planes from the base in Majorca bombed (literally) the prison and cemetery in Alicante with flowers.[22]

Franco's decree was the starting point of the "painful honor" that the "Spanish state emerging from the war and the national Revolution" was to come to terms with by commemorating the "murder" of a "national hero and a symbol of the sacrifice of the youth of our times." The decree ordered "the head of state and the Spanish Revolution" to proclaim a day of national mourning on 20 November and "to reach an agreement with the ecclesiastical authorities" to inscribe on the walls of all the parish churches in the land the names of all the "fallen, who had now become victims of the Marxist Revolution." It also ordered two university chairs of "political

doctrine" be set up at the universities of Madrid and Barcelona to "explain and develop José Antonio Primo de Rivera's political ideas." They would go under the name "José Antonio Chair," be funded by the single party, and be occupied by not incumbents but rather professors appointed by the National Leader himself. Likewise, it instructed the "Ministry of the Interior [and the National Delegation of] Press and Propaganda" to organize a "national competition" to find the best "artistic, literary, and doctrinal works on the figure of José Antonio Primo de Rivera." The first national institutions set up for the political training and discipline of young people and for the vocational training of workers were to be named after José Antonio. New military units on land, sea, and air were created with the same name. Finally, a monument would be built in his honor "of a magnitude in keeping with his stature," and all the above would be regulated by the ministries of defense, the interior, and education and the General Secretariat of the FET y de las JONS.[23]

Despite the forceful nature of the decree, only some of its dictates were actually put into practice. This indicates that the resources available did not match the party's eagerness to render a magnificent tribute and that the non-Falange sectors of Franco's regime were reluctant to implement measures that affected any power that was in their hands (and not in the hands of the FET y de las JONS). Thus, the name of José Antonio was never given to any military units, because they were not created, a sign of the bad blood between the party and the Armed Forces. After the war, the differences between them increasingly came to the fore as they struggled to claim the merit for the final victory and give the new state its definitive structure. The tension would eventually culminate in the Begoña bombing of August 1942.[24] The university chairs were not set up either, for unknown reasons because the ministry entrusted with the task at the time was under the control of the Alfonsist Pedro Sainz Rodríguez, who knew José Antonio well. And the order to inscribe the name of José Antonio and all the other fallen on church walls was met, at least in the diocese of Seville, with Cardinal Pedro Segura's refusal.[25] The monument was never built either, although this was probably because of one of Franco's personal projects, which was approved a few months later (in April 1940): the construction of an enormous mausoleum, the Valley of the Fallen, where José Antonio's remains were moved in 1959 and given pride of place. Franco himself was

buried there, on the other side of the altar, in 1975. This confirmed José Antonio's status as the regime's number one *caído*.

As well as the decree, the Ministry of Education and the party's general secretary also issued two orders. In the first, José Antonio's first interlocutor on issues of funding the Falange, Sainz Rodríguez, announced all universities and schools in the National zone would give a class on 22 November on the life and work of José Antonio.[26] For his part, Fernández-Cuesta ordered the National Council and the Political Board to attend the funeral held in honor of José Antonio in the capital of National Spain, Burgos.[27] He also changed the single party's uniform: from now on, the Falange's blue nankeen shirt, the Carlist' red beret, and the black trousers would be supplemented with a black tie "as a sign of permanent mourning for the death of José Antonio."[28] This last order justified the need for this measure by stating the "vain hope we all had that José Antonio was merely 'absent' from our beloved Fatherland, the one, great, and free Spain of our watchwords, has been resolved by the certainty of his loss."[29]

Seville and the other capitals of National Spain joined Burgos in holding funerals for José Antonio. This was the second most important political-religious (or religious-political) event carried out by the incipient new state (as it liked to call itself) after the members of the first National Council of the FET y de las JONS had been sworn in at Las Huelgas monastery (Burgos) in the presence of Cardinal Isidro Gomá. The ceremony was officiated by the Archbishop of Valladolid and presided over by Franco (who had entered the church wearing a pallium after arriving with Fernández-Cuesta) in the presence of the government, the Political Board, the National Council, the papal nuncio, the members of Franco's headquarters, the ambassadors, the Army, and José Antonio's family (Pilar and Carmen). The funeral was held after the National Council had met in a room in the cathedral itself. A false coffin was placed on top of El Cid's tomb, in front of which the Archbishop delivered a funeral oration in praise of the deceased. At the end of the service, on the steps of the cathedral, they chanted the ritual "*presente*" for the fallen José Antonio and sang hymns. Then, the inscription carved into the wall—his name in black with red initials—was unveiled, and wreathes of flowers were laid by his sisters, the government, the party, and "girls, students, and workers."[30]

The myth had begun. The "absence" the Falange first announced was replaced by a widespread official glorification throughout National Spain

that was second only to the stature of Franco himself since he took the reins of power on 1 October 1936. The mythification of José Antonio also included the "national collaborators" (employees) of the party and state press, so it affected everyone (it also embraced those collaborators from groups other than the old Falange, such as the Carlists, the Alfonsists, the CEDA, those who had given their support to Miguel Primo de Rivera, and others). Nevertheless, other sectors of the regime—in particular, the Church, the Army, the Alfonsists, and the Carlists who opposed the merger into a single party—were suspicious of the extent of this hero worship and did not take part or did so only timidly to keep up appearances. It even gave rise to conflict in important sectors of the ecclesiastical hierarchy (the case of Cardinal Segura, for example).

In November 1938, those intellectuals who had been close to José Antonio and were in National Spain (but not others, like Rafael Sánchez Mazas, who were in prison in Barcelona) played a central role in events. Ridruejo took the lead from the very beginning, and, several years on and with the advantage of hindsight, he said the glorification of José Antonio included "sacralizing his texts, his speeches, and his tastes. In many ways . . . it was paralyzing, and it turned the other not-too-many leaders of the Falange in those years—and here I include myself—into mere marginal actors. It triggered an inhibitory devoutness and converted him into someone whom his creators may not have recognized if he had come back—as many hoped he would—in his real human form."[31] To the very real admiration (verging on adoration in some cases) some had felt for José Antonio even before the war was now added sincere grief and the opportunism of many journalists and writers (many of whom had previously been quite critical of him) who were quick to jump on the bandwagon.

For example, in November 1938, while José Antonio was in La Modelo prison in Madrid, his subsequent biographer—Felipe Ximénez de Sandoval—wrote, "Those of us who had the misfortune not to be chosen by Providence to share the cell illuminated by José Antonio's presence felt jealous of those fortunate enough to be with him." According to Ximénez de Sandoval, another comrade had felt "such mysticism" for the National Leader that "one morning . . . walking up Calle Princesa clutching my arm, he said: 'I don't know whether this is blasphemy or not, but whenever I take my leave of José Antonio, I feel fear and a sort of anguished emptiness the

apostles are said to have felt when they lost their Lord.'"[32] And some years later, in reference to the execution by firing squad, he wrote in the biography: "There died a man—and what a man, good God!—and the myth began, with a poetic beauty that humanity had not seen for several centuries. For Spain, it was the beginning of a new ballad. The new Cid was partnered in true history by the most accurate poetry."[33] And many others expressed themselves in the same vein.

And this was just the tip of the iceberg. From the very beginning, comparisons were made between the figure of the National Leader, who had died when he was thirty-three years old and Jesus Christ, who had been crucified at the same age. The continuous outpouring of human and superhuman descriptions forced one scholar—Javier Jiménez Campo—to conclude that the veneration of José Antonio "was expressed in such terms that anyone who was not familiar with our history would begin to doubt whether he was human or divine. Indeed, there was an ambiguous analogy between the founder of the FE de las JONS and Christ." He justified his argument with a text written in 1941 by General Secretary José Luis de Arrese that was significantly entitled "Fragments of Adoration and Entreaty in the New Year" and full of prose such as, "We shall drive the merchants from the temple, and your blood will blossom. And the retinue of your martyrs will flourish like an inspiration."[34] This is just one example from Arrese, married to a cousin of José Antonio's. He was a member of the party "hierarchy" and in due course would stress Catholicism was more important to José Antonio's thought than Fascism was. This was not only his personal interpretation but also a fundamental part of the Franco regime's attempts to distance itself from Fascism because of the change in fortunes in World War II as of early 1943. These attempts were stepped up after the defeat of the Axis powers had left the Franco dictatorship in an extremely delicate situation.[35]

Stanley Payne described José Antonio with the fortunate phrase "the secular patron saint of the Franco regime."[36] Some also described him as a messiah, a prophet, the "Chosen One, who on 29 October 1933 had spoken to the Spanish people for the first time to reveal a new doctrine of redemption."[37] Whether this was the Falange's attempt to create a political religion[38] or the supreme expression of Catholicism and Fascism's compatibility in the new state José Pemartín was theorizing about at the

time, which Giuliana di Febo has defined as a “politicization of the sacred,”[39] this was the vision that was constantly being portrayed.[40]

In 1939, a second wave of tributes surpassed the first in importance, presence, resources, and impact. This was the height of what has been called the process of Fascistization of the Franco regime.[41] It involved the passing of various laws that gave the party considerable powers over syndication and the political socialization of women and young people. The second phase was the continuation and reinforcement of this process. But most importantly, they now had a body. The Falange had set about recovering it from the cemetery immediately after the fifth column led by José Mallol Alberola had taken control of the city and the port, where tens of thousands of people were waiting to be evacuated by sea because of the imminent arrival of the national troops. There, in the presence of Mallol Alberola, Pilar Millán Astray (sister of the general who had been in Alacuás prison with Carmen, Aunt Ma, and Margot), Javier Millán Astray, and other “comrades,” the grave in which he had been buried was opened up. Thus, the orders issued by Aznar Gerner were carried out.[42] The next day, 31 March, Miguel Primo arrived in Alicante, and it was decided to transfer the body to a tomb of its own. This occurred on 4 April.[43] José Antonio had been found at the bottom of a pile of bodies, in direct contact with the earth, which was injected with silicates and maintained in that state for several years.[44]

Not until 9 November did the Political Board decide to move the body to the El Escorial Monastery, the mausoleum for Spanish royalty. Apparently, it was Ridruejo’s idea and met the quite justifiable opposition of some Political Board members,[45] since the place had the greatest possible honorific significance. However, the proposal showed the extent of the esteem in which some Falange members held José Antonio. The body was to be carried to its new resting place by party members, a journey that would take ten days and culminate with the burial on 29 November. The spectacular nature of the event and its repercussion in the media (particularly in the party’s press) were such that high-ranking officers not only looked on askance but actively voiced their protest that this funeral was much grander than the others held in the same year for two generals.[46] The funeral for Emilio Mola, which Franco and other authorities attended, had been held in Alcocero (renamed Alcocero de Mola), the place where on 3 June 1937, exactly two years earlier, his plane had crashed. The funeral

for José Sanjurjo, on the other hand, had consisted of various ceremonies at the station in Madrid where his mortal remains had arrived from Portugal (on 20 October), at the station from which his body was to be taken to Pamplona and laid to rest, and in the streets of the capital through which the coffin was paraded in the presence of Franco, the government, the party, ambassadors, and other authorities. This massive outpouring of grief continued later in the towns through which the train passed: in particular, El Escorial, Ávila, Valladolid, Venta de Baños, and, finally, Pamplona.

The transfer of José Antonio's body was designed to be on quite a different level, befitting of the figure who had become the regime's second icon, below Franco but above officers such as the aforementioned ones and others such as Manuel Goded. The ceremony was much longer (ten days), on a much larger scale (provincial Falange organizations took part but so did state organizations and, very importantly, the Army), and a clear example of the Falange-Fascist way: austere (on foot), in the open air, and with the ritual commemoration of their "fallen." Despite the animosity many must have felt but was never made public, it was an impressive event that mobilized battleships, infantry, and war planes, because the party was aiming to enter into an alliance with the Army as part of the process of Fascistization. At the time, a few generals were Falange members (e.g., General Juan Yagüe and Agustín Muñoz Grandes, who had just been appointed general secretary of the FET y de las JONS), but most were not. The Army was suspicious of the leading role being given to the FET y de las JONS, in particular to some Alfonsists and to José Enrique Varela, the pro-Carlist minister of defense.

Crucially, however, Franco was in favor of the alliance. He did not fully share the Falange's aspirations to become the backbone of a completely Fascist regime, but he did regard the Falange as a fundamental piece in one of the two sectors that were essential to his project: the Army and a political party to which he was prepared to give considerable, but not absolute, power. And he had no misgivings about approving and presiding over tributes such as José Antonio's, because the party was presenting Franco as his successor, chosen to continue and culminate his work. The transfer of José Antonio's remains turned out to be the most spectacular outpouring of grief in which the incipient regime participated. It was only equaled exactly thirty-six years later with the death of Franco. The whole occasion was organized very quickly by a commission of the Political Board consisting of

Miguel Primo, Ridruejo (director general of propaganda), and José Finat (director general of security). Ridruejo and Finat belonged to the Ministry of the Interior that Serrano Suñer, Political Board president, had directed since February 1938.

Ridruejo laid down the general guidelines, which two of his subordinates then put into practice: Juan Cabanas, head of the Department of Music and Plastic Arts; and Samuel Ros, writer and member of the Falange's prewar literary group. The former was in charge of "creating and arranging ornamental themes, assigning a place to the official organizations and corporations who attended the event and the ritual that was to govern future ceremonies" and the latter of "inventing those symbols that should be identified with the day and perpetuate it."[47] The ceremonies were held in two main places—Alicante and El Escorial—with the spectacular funeral procession starting in one and ending in the other. It lasted several days, some of which were twenty-four-hour forced marches, and the body of José Antonio was borne from one place of interment to the other (almost always by Falange members, most of whom were "old shirts," i.e., from before the war and even from before February 1936).

From the very beginning, the ceremonies were not only markedly Fascist but also religious and military. They began on 19 November in Alicante, and the provincial Falange—which had attempted to release José Antonio and involve him in the coup—played a leading role. José Antonio's body was transferred to a heavy, new coffin and taken to the Cathedral of Saint Nicholas through streets lined with soldiers and Falange members, while rosaries were prayed in all the places of worship in the city. The procession passed in front of the old prison—converted into the "Home of José Antonio"—where the Women's Section prayed the rosary and a century of young armed "cadets" paid tribute. In the church, the National Council kept vigil over him throughout the night, while two enormous bonfires burned in the Santa Bárbara and San Fernando castles. The next day, the anniversary of his execution, Franco, the Political Board, and high-ranking military commanders arrived in Alicante to attend the funeral, which was officiated by the bishop of the diocese. The coffin was then carried in turns by members of the Political Board and the National Council to the port, the first leg of the journey to his final resting place. They passed through a city decked with black ribbons and a port full of contingents of Falange syndicates. Out at sea, there were motor launches, sailboats, and naval units

also decked with yokes and arrows or with national and party flags at half-mast and with their crews standing to attention on deck. A Falange member on the minelayer *Júpiter* gave the rallying cry for the fallen, which was answered by all the other ships.

One of the squares in the port (Plaza del Mar) had had its name changed, significantly, to Cónsul von Knobloch, after the Nazi who had taken part in the attempts to free José Antonio.[48] Once the procession had passed through, a crane laid a huge block of cement, within the boundaries of the port, the first of a whole series of commemorative monoliths that would line the route to El Escorial and record the dates for posterity. The first stone was larger than all the others, with the exception of the last one in El Escorial. Delegations from all the Falange's provincial organizations took part in the march, and the pallbearers were changed every ten kilometers. At the head of the procession was a cross behind which came members of the clergy and religious orders; the so-called Navas cross (before which the members of the National Council had been sworn in); the coffin (which weighed three hundred kilos) transported on a palanquin by twelve Falange members and flanked by twelve armed comrades; the head of the province through which the procession was passing and two other high-ranking officials; Falange members to replace the pallbearers; the militias; and various backup services, including an ambulance. Bringing up the rear, at some distance from the rest of the procession came the people who had decided to take part, which at times was quite a sizeable group.

At night, they carried torches and flares, and in all the villages, towns, and cities through which they passed, they were greeted by bonfires and the townspeople in the street, acting on instructions received from the party and the authorities. When they arrived, the parish priest would lead them in prayers and the Women's Section members would sing the "De profundis." These were the only moments that interrupted the absolute silence they had been ordered to observe. Nevertheless, whenever the pallbearers were changed, the bells of the local churches rang out, as were bells "throughout the land" (if we are to believe the official version of events). If there was a local military presence, gun salutes were fired, classes in schools and universities were interrupted to give the rallying cry for the fallen, and sirens called men to prayer in barracks and factories. After each change of pallbearers, the date was engraved on the corresponding monolith. Only

occasionally did the procession stay in one place all night (e.g., Albacete, where the coffin was guarded in the cathedral).

Things went according to plan, although there were various incidents. The pace set by the marchers was faster than had been predicted, the weight of the coffin was such that the palanquin had to be changed so that it could be carried by sixteen men, and the cold of the night caused some people to faint and others to drop out. There were also problems when the pallbearers were changed: some would remain as long as possible in the warmth of the bonfire, causing delays. Likewise, the representatives of each province had had to pay their own travel costs, and anyone who was not wearing the Falange uniform was turned away. The crowds in Alicante on 19 November were so large that a merchant ship (*Ciudad de Alicante*) had to be provided for temporary lodgings, although it was not big enough for them all. When the procession reached Madrid, the Army took charge of the coffin. The Army, the Navy, and the Air Force all paid their last respects to Captain General José Antonio, and the procession was joined by the whole government (with the exception of Franco), the Political Board, the National Council, the high command of all three armed services, and provincial and local authorities, amid an enormous multitude and flower-festooned balconies. Further tributes were paid as the procession passed the General Secretariat of the FET y de las JONS in Calle Alcalá and through the Plaza de España. After the coffin had been paraded through the university campus, the Falange once again took over.

At 3:30 p.m. on 29 November, the procession entered El Escorial Monastery, where Franco, the Political Board, the National Council, high-ranking Army officers, and Falange and military representatives were waiting. Within the grounds of the monastery, the route was lined with Falange militias "alternating weapons with candles," the fifty flags of the party's provincial organizations, two groups of Falange members standing to attention, and, close to the church entrance, the Primera Línea of the Madrid Falange. As the procession advanced, the artillery fired salutes, and bonfires blazed in the surrounding hills. Toward the end, as the Falange proffered the rallying cry for the fallen dedicated to José Antonio, there were changes among those at the head of the procession so that Franco led it in the final stages. When they finally reached the Courtyard of the Kings, Franco pronounced the words that José Antonio had used for the very first of those who had fallen for the Falange, Matías Montero ("May God grant

you eternal rest, and deny us ours until we are able to reap for Spain the harvest your death has sown”). Those Falange members who had been awarded the Silver Palm, led by Aznar Gerner, were entrusted with the task of placing the coffin in the tomb, which was then covered with a stone decorated with a cross and his name.[49]

Nobody had seen anything like it before[50] and would never see anything like it again until Franco’s burial on 23 November 1975. This was three days (and thirty-six years) after José Antonio’s execution, which some people think was mere coincidence, even though Franco was in a state of brain death and was being kept alive artificially by machines that could have been disconnected at any time. Whatever the case, he officially died on 20 November. He was buried alongside José Antonio, not in El Escorial but in the Valley of the Fallen, which he had ordered to be constructed from 1940 to 1958 by Republican political prisoners. It was inaugurated in 1959, the same year José Antonio’s remains were transferred there.

This second transfer was quite different from the first one twenty years earlier, in keeping with a regime that was not quite so imbued with Falangism as it had been then and much more influenced by the ultra-Catholics of the Opus Dei. This influence was largely because of Luis Carrero Blanco, undersecretary of the presidency since 1942 and Franco’s political right-hand man, particularly after the fall of Serrano Suñer in 1942. And not too long before (in 1957), the FET y de las JONS had suffered a setback when Arrese had attempted to regain some of the party’s influence. He ended up being sacked because of the resistance of other sectors of the regime—in particular, the Catholics (including the highest authorities of the Spanish church), the military, and the Carlists.

As the inauguration of the Valley of the Fallen approached, on 1 April 1959, Franco sent a letter to José Antonio’s two surviving siblings, Miguel and Pilar, to request permission to transfer his remains. They both agreed but asked for the transfer to be done, insofar as this was possible, “privately and quietly.”[51] Nevertheless, everything seems to suggest they did not approve of his remains being moved. In her memoirs, Pilar Primo mentions how upset they were about “moving José Antonio from El Escorial to the Valley of the Fallen for reasons that were far from clear but were of a monarchic nature and in the interests of Admiral Carrero Blanco.” Moreover, both the family and some sectors of the Madrid Falange and the SEU interpreted the lack of publicity and grandeur as an attempt not to give

it due solemnity. Essentially, they regarded it as just another maneuver by the Opus Dei and Carrero Blanco to sideline the party. For these reasons, on 29 March, after the exhumation had been witnessed at El Escorial by the governmental authorities—including Carrero Blanco but not Franco—and representatives of the FET y de las JONS, the Falange imposed its will. They refused to agree to the remains being taken to the Valley of the Fallen the next day by van, took charge of proceedings, and marched the fourteen kilometers separating the two places with the coffin on their shoulders. Miguel Primo himself took part in the somewhat chaotic march. After the interment, cries of "Down with Carrero!" were proffered outside the new basilica.[52] The next day, the official inauguration took place, during which Franco presided over the funeral for José Antonio and thousands of the "fallen" (and also "non-fallen" because the bodies of Republicans had also been taken to the mausoleum in an attempt to fill it).[53] According to Pilar, Franco "wanted to personally make up for the chaotic transfer of José Antonio's remains by paying him all sorts of tributes and making him more important even than himself in the burials at Cuelgamuros." Even so, it left a sour taste in the mouths of all the Falange members there.[54]

José Antonio remained there. Franco joined him sixteen years later. But the two figures who would lie in rest together at the foot of the high altar—and who can still be found there today—had already been inextricably intertwined for many years. As on other occasions, Giménez Caballero, the epitome of heterodoxy, flexibility, and imagination, had brilliantly described and summed up the connection between the two men as far back as 1938. Of course, the connection he made was quite outlandish, considering the actual relation between them, but Gecé believed:

> Our leader is dead! (Oh, José Antonio!) And today I proclaim on behalf of our people, "Long live our leader!" Franco! . . . On 20 November 1936, our leader José Antonio died. But he rose again in the form of our leader Franco and a national Falange of combatants. So when today I shout on behalf of our nation, "Long live Franco!" what I am saying is "José Antonio is alive in him! Long live Spain!" Here on Earth. And up above in the glory of God.[55]

The image of both men also depended on the connection between them. José Antonio's myth could only be sustained by his links with Franco. This passage, like other speeches Gecé had given about José Antonio, was certainly not to the liking of many of the old Falange leaders in 1938, who were now working within the confines of the FET y de las JONS. They

must have felt he had gone over the top. Even so, they had accepted Franco as the new leader of the Falange, albeit not quite so enthusiastically as Giménez Caballero (who remained the great opportunist he always had been throughout the Franco dictatorship). They accepted Franco because they were pleased and self-satisfied with the privileges that accompanied their new responsibilities in an official party (they were delighted to be in a position of power)—and because they were confident the preeminence that was being given to the old Falange within the new party would result in an authentic Fascist regime being set up in Spain, with the party—their party—holding the reins of power. This is what they believed and how things seemed to be going, at least in 1939 and 1940. When they realized they had not made a great deal of headway, in 1941 they attempted to force this regime setup (in what can only be described as an "armchair conspiracy") and get more power from Franco by presenting their resignations and sending letters with their demands. They failed. And from then on, they accepted they would have to abide by Franco's decisions. If he gave the "marching orders" toward the National Syndicalist revolution, they would follow them. If he did not, they would wait. And that is what they did until 1977, when the party, which had become the National Movement, was forced to disappear by decree.

By that time, it was more Franco's Falange than José Antonio's. It was still Fascist, that is true, but submissive and expectant (although increasingly less so) that the call to revolution would be given. This revolution was perpetually in a state of "on hold" while tens of thousands of party members and their leaders enjoyed the perks of their official positions in the Movement itself, its Syndical Organization, Women's Section, Youth Organization (which would subsequently become the Youth Front), and all the other sections and departments. These people owed everything they had to Franco and therefore were the grassroots of his regime until the day he died. The party would never cease to be an important part of Franco's new state and on several occasions (e.g., 1941, 1956, and 1957) attempted to take control of the key institutions. Likewise, in the 1960s, it resisted the prevailing technocratic project—the economic policy of which encouraged development and depoliticization—with its attempts at "political development" in the National Movement. There were also moments of dissent from within: various organizations emerged that were, to one extent or another, clandestine. These organizations demanded respect for José

Antonio's legacy and denounced Franco's betrayal, although they never had any significant influence.

On the other hand, numerous young people who were members of the Youth Front, the SEU, or the party, or who attended classes on National Syndicalist doctrine, found out José Antonio had been one thing and Franco quite another. Very few of these, however, made their feelings known in a critical fashion. In fact, this discovery would soon become a sort of rite of passage from adolescence to maturity. Young Falange members would be highly critical of the party's change in direction until it was their turn to be offered a job within the party or in one of its dependent organizations, at which point they would put their (relative) dissidence to one side in favor of a good wage. Some, of course, were so disappointed that they decided to leave the party, and others (a small minority) actually became anti-Francoists. Yet others moved on from Falangism to entertain genuinely democratic or left-wing convictions, partly as a result of José Antonio's preoccupation for "social justice" or simply because of ideological evolution. Ridruejo, for example, left the Falange to become a Democrat (a Social Democrat, to be more precise), but he was the only leading member to do so. And Ceferino Maestú played a part in founding the Comisiones Obreras (Workers' Commissions, the largest trade union in Spain) although he never abandoned his Falangist convictions. However, for most of those sympathetic to the regime, the José Antonio-Franco connection was valid, and they were quite capable of giving their loyalty to both José Antonio and Franco.

At this point, we should ask ourselves whether José Antonio, the second most important icon of Francoism with a protagonism that exceeded his father's, would have been pleased with the cult of personality that was being built around him. According to Foxá, José Antonio had told him at the end of 1935 that the revolution would win the next elections. When Foxá objected and asked about the Falange's chances, José Antonio said it was too late, that they had wasted two years. And in response to Foxá's insistent questioning about what the Falange could do, José Antonio had said they would fight to the bitter end but that all those who survived the catastrophe should hold Gregorian masses for his soul. He then immediately changed his tone "because he had the modesty of heroism."[56] Which may very well be true.

He must have imagined at times that he would posthumously be extolled as the forerunner, founder, and man behind the New Spain for which he was fighting. He must have predicted he would die in the attempt and that he would go down in the country's History (with a capital H). He must have thought he was doing his duty, what was expected of a member of the Primo de Rivera family. He had been capable of setting in motion a project for saving the country. He would die in the attempt, but this is something he thought might happen and for which he was ideologically and politically prepared. "Giving" his life "for Spain," to "save the country," was part of the script, part of his script, just as it had been part of the script of about one hundred of his "comrades" who "were now standing guard among the stars." He must have felt content to be acting like a real "gentleman," like the noble leader who guided the masses toward their destiny amid a struggle to the death with the enemies of Spain. All this might have been true. He might have imagined and fully accepted his party would pay homage to him. But he might well have been ashamed of the extent of the adoration and exaggeration of his "comrades" and the regime after his death, with their constant comparisons to the figure of Christ.

For all these reasons, the answer to our question cannot be clear. Like so many other aspects of José Antonio Primo de Rivera's life, there are numerous contradictions. Being put on a pedestal by the Franco regime probably would have pleased him to some extent. After all, it was the culmination of his narcissistic wish to go down in history for saving his country (or at least making an important contribution to saving it), something that had deep family and personal roots. But he almost certainly would have realized the Franco regime was not what he had fought and died for. He would have regarded it as highly deserving, because it was counterrevolutionary in nature and had put a stop to the Communist revolution he believed was imminent, but he would not have warmed to its lack of Fascism and excessive Conservatism. Moreover, rather than reuniting Spaniards in the Fascist way he had advocated, the new regime had maintained the division between the victors and the vanquished. He might have thought all this. But if his comrades from 1933–1936, survivors of the war, who sought more Fascistization and a greater role for the party within the regime in 1941 and 1956–1957, thought the same, then they kept it very much to themselves—something José Antonio almost certainly would not have done.

Notes

1. Dionisio Ridruejo, *Con fuego y con raíces: Casi unas memorias* (Barcelona, 1976), 172.
2. Ibid., 176.
3. *Mundo Obrero,* 19 November 1936, cited in ibid., 171.
4. María Santos Kant could be a pseudonym that Marichu de la Mora used to write to José Antonio in prison and later to Franco. This can be deduced from Inmaculada de la Fuente, *La roja y la falangista: Dos Hermanas en la España del 36* (Barcelona, 2006), 140–149.
5. Jesús Ruiz Mantilla, "El desprecio de Franco a José Antonio." *El País,* 12 March 2015. This letter, from Franco's personal archive (which means it was not incorporated into the archive of the FNFF but instead commercialized), was put on sale by an antiquarian in 1995 and purchased by the Fundación José María Castañé, which donated it to the Student Resident, in whose archive it, and its response presented here, is currently deposited. See José María de Tuñón Aza, "La carta de María Santos Kant," *Gaceta de la Fundación José Primo de Rivera* 2 (2015), http://www.fundacionjoseantonio.es/gaceta/gaceta2.pdf. I am grateful to Alfredo Valverde for sending me a copy of the letter and the response from Franco's headquarters.
6. Francisco Bravo, *José Antonio: El hombre, el Jefe, el camarada* (Madrid, 1939), 132.
7. Maximiano García Venero, *Falange en la Guerra de España: La unificación y Hedilla* (Paris, 1967), 258. Ximénez de Sandoval claims the roll call was announced after lunch ("not very appropriately, by the way"). Felipe Ximénez de Sandoval, *José Antonio: Biografía* (Madrid, 1949), 829.
8. Ximénez de Sandoval, *José Antonio,* 830. Even so, she must have found out about the shooting almost immediately. On 25 November, Bravo sent her one of many letters expressing his condolences. Bravo, *José Antonio: El hombre,* 133–134.
9. Ximénez de Sandoval, *José Antonio*, 831–832. Ximénez de Sandoval does not mention his name, but it might have been Vicente de Cadenas, who spent a period of exile in France after opposing the merger.
10. Ibid., 832.

11. Agustín de Foxá, “La eterna presencia,” in *Dolor y memoria de España en el segundo aniversario de la muerte de José Antonio* (Barcelona, 1939), 359–360.
12. Bravo never believed this: “The comrades who had been so shocked to hear the news on the radio [of José Antonio’s execution by firing squad] instinctively took solace in a sentimental, false Sebastianism, which never convinced me.” Bravo, *José Antonio: El hombre*, 132–133.
13. Joan Maria Thomàs, *El gran golpe: El* “*caso Hedilla*” *o cómo Franco se quedó con Falange* (Barcelona, 2014), 155.
14. Carmen and Aunt Ma were exchanged for the Irujo brothers. Pilar Primo de Rivera, *Recuerdos de una vida* (Madrid, 1983), 141.
15. For a reference to the status of Serrano Súñer (*sic*) and Fernández-Cuesta as executors in the foreign press, see Manuel Chaves Nogales, “Moyen du gouvernement du Général Franco,” *L’Europe Nouvelle*, 13 August 1938, 136–137, cited in Manuel Chaves Nogales, *Crónicas de la Guerra Civil (agosto de 1936–septiembre de 1939)*, ed. María Isabel Cintas Guillén (Seville, 2011), 119–118.
16. The decree was issued on 10 July 1937, and the day of remembrance was 13 July. See María Luisa Rico Gómez and José Sevillano Calero, “Franco y José Antonio: Caudillo y profeta de España—La construcción del carisma durante la Guerra Civil,” in *Studia Historica: Historia Contemporánea* 31 (2013): 95–111.
17. Zira Box, *España, año cero: La construcción simbólica del Franquismo* (Madrid, 2010), 169.
18. *ABC*, 19 July 1938.
19. *La Nueva España*, 2 October 1938.
20. *ABC*, 2 October 1938.
21. *Dolor y memoria*, 382.
22. Official war report issued by Generalissimo’s headquarters on 20 November 1938, in ibid., 85.
23. *Boletín Oficial del Estado*, 16 November 1938, 1.
24. Joan Maria Thomàs, *Franquistas contra franquistas: Luchas por el poder en la cúpula del régimen de Franco* (Barcelona, 2016), 121.
25. José Andrés-Gallego, ¿Fascismo o Estado católico? Ideología, religión y censura en la España de Franco 1937–1941 (Madrid, 1997), 213.

26. Order dated 16 November 1938, *Boletín Oficial del Estado*.
27. Order dated 12 November 1938, *Boletín del Movimiento de Falange Tradicionalista y de las JONS*.
28. Circular dated 12 November 1938, *Boletín del Movimiento de Falange Tradicionalista y de las JONS*.
29. Agustín de Foxá, "Las ceremonias de Burgos," in *Dolor y memoria,* 68.
30. Ibid., 65–68.
31. Ridruejo, *Con fuego,* 174.
32. Felipe Ximénez de Sandoval, *José Antonio,* 211.
33. Ibid., 828–829.
34. Javier Jiménez Campo, "Rasgos básicos de la ideología dominante entre 1939 y 1945," *Revista de Estudios Políticos* 15 (1980): 85, cited in Julio Gil Pecharromán, *José Antonio Primo de Rivera: Retrato de un visionario* (Madrid, 1996), 526.
35. E.g., José Luis de Arrese, *El estado totalitario en el pensamiento de José Antonio* (Madrid, 1945); *El Movimiento Nacional como sistema político* (1945); *Misión de la Falange* (Madrid, 1945); *Capitalismo, comunismo, cristianismo* (Madrid, 1947).
36. Stanley G. Payne, *Franco y José Antonio: El extraño caso del fascismo español* (Barcelona, 1997), 468.
37. "Hoy hace seis años que José Antonio levantó la bandera de la Falange," *Arriba,* 29 October 1939; F. de Urrutia, "Valorización histórica del 29 de octubre," *Vértice,* 6 November 1937. Retrieved from Box, *España, año cero,* 166.
38. Box, *España, año cero,* 164.
39. José Pemartín, *Qué es "lo nuevo": Consideraciones sobre el momento español presente* (Seville, 1937) (later editions were published in 1938 and 1939); Giuliana di Febo, "I riti del nazionalcattolecesimo nella Spagna franchista: José Antonio Primo de Rivera e il culto dei caduti (1936–1960)," in *Rituale civil: Storie nazionali e memorie pubbliche nell'Europa contemporanea,* ed. Maurizio Ridolfi (Rome, 2006), 189.
40. Giuliana di Febo, *Ritos de guerra y de victoria en la España franquista* (Bilbao, 2002), 180.
41. Joan Maria Thomàs, *La Falange de Franco: Fascismo y fascistización en el régimen franquista (1937–1945)* (Barcelona, 2001), 169.

42. Aznar Gerner was in prison at the time because he, alongside another Political Board member, Fernando González Vélez, had been accused of setting up work units that the Army regarded as inappropriate and, above all, because he often used radical Falange language and made disrespectful remarks about Franco.
43. Several photographs were taken of the exhumation. The body can be seen being carried on a stretcher in one of them, reproduced in P. Primo de Rivera, *Recuerdos*.
44. José Mallol Alberola, *La estampida (final de la Guerra Civil en el puerto de Alicante)* (Alicante, 2000), 107–108.
45. P. Primo de Rivera, *Recuerdos*, 148.
46. Pedro Montoliú Camps, *Madrid en la posguerra, 1939–1946: Los años de la represión* (Madrid, 2005), 74.
47. Samuel Ros and Antonio Bouthelier, *A hombros de la Falange: De Alicante a El Escorial* (Madrid-Barcelona, 1940), 15.
48. He was also awarded the medal of the city, as was Admiral Rolf Carls, who had also been involved.
49. Ibid. and passim.
50. Falange members held a commemorative “torch procession” in Madrid every 19 November from 1940 to 1944, after which the Old Guard would take a wreath of flowers to El Escorial. When the government banned this procession in the capital, they decided to take only the flowers. Every 20 November until 1958, Franco, the party, the government, and the authorities attended a funeral for José Antonio in the monastery. José Luis Rodríguez Jiménez, *Historia de Falange Española de las JONS* (Madrid, 2000), 508.
51. Ibid., 509.
52. P. Primo de Rivera, *Recuerdos*, 186.
53. José Luis Ledesma and Javier Rodrigo, “Caídos por España, mártires por la libertad: Víctimas y conmemoración de la Guerra Civil en la España posbélica (1939–2006),” *Ayer* 63, (2006): 239.
54. P. Primo de Rivera, *Recuerdos*, 186.
55. Talk given by Ernesto Giménez Caballero on 20 November 1938, in *Dolor y memoria*, 49–52.
56. “Conferencia de Agustín de Foxá,” 16 November 1936, in *Dolor y memoria*, 37–39.

Bibliography

Archives

Archive of the Francisco Franco National Foundation
Archive of the Students’ Residence
Archive of the University of Navarre
“Causa General” National Historical Archive

Interviews

Enrique García-Ramal Cellalbo
Fermín Sanz Orrio
Jesús Suevos
José María de Areilza
Manuel Valdés Larrañaga
María Mercedes de Despujol Magarola
Pedro Conde Genové
Pilar Primo de Rivera
Raimundo-Fernández Cuesta Merelo
Ramón Serrano Suñer

Press

ABC
Arriba
Boletín del Movimiento de Falange Española Tradicionalista y de las JONS

Boletín Oficial del Estado
El Socialista
Ellas
FE
Haz
Heraldo de Madrid
La Nación
No Importa
Teresa
Unión Monárquica
Unión Patriótica

Published Books and Articles

Aguilar, Enrique, and Julio Ponce. *Memorias de José Cruz Conde: Notas de un asilo diplomático (Madrid, julio 1936–enero 1939)*. Córdoba: Almuzara, 2011.

Aguinaga, Enrique de. "José Antonio y Azaña." *ABC*, 6 June 1996, 48.

Aguinaga, Enrique de, and Stanley G. Payne. *José Antonio Primo de Rivera*. Barcelona: Ediciones B, 2003.

Alfonso Noguerón, Lola, and Tomás Rosselló Jaunzarás. "Entrevista a Mayesa Lucia Mingarro: Memòries del campament de presoneres d'Alaquàs (1937–1938)." *Quaderns d'investigació d'Alaquàs* (2010): 279–292.

Allen, Jay. "How I Found Leader of Spain's Fascist Phalanx in Alicante Prison: Jay Allen Interviews Primo's Son." *News Chronicle*, 24 October 1936.

Álvarez Chillida, Gonzalo. *José María Pemán: Pensamiento y trayectoria de un monárquico (1897–1941)*. Cádiz: Universidad de Cádiz, 1996.

———. "Ernesto Giménez Caballero: Unidad nacional y política de masas en un intelectual fascista." *Historia y Política* 24 (2010): 265–291.

———. "*Negras tormentas* sobre la República: La intransigencia libertarian." In Rey, *Palabras como puños*, 45–110.

Álvarez Rey, Leandro. *Los diputados por Andalucía de la Segunda República, 1931–1939*. Vol. 2. Seville: Centro de Estudios Andaluces, 2010.

Andrés-Gallego, José. *¿Fascismo o Estado católico? Ideología, religión y censura en la España de Franco 1937–1941*. Madrid: Encuentro Ediciones, 1997.

Angosto Vélez, Pedro Luis. *Sueño y pesadilla del republicanismo español: Carlos Esplá—Una biografía política*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva-Universidad de Alicante-Asociación Manuel Azaña, 2001.

Ansaldo, Juan Antonio. *¿Para qué . . .? De Alfonso XIII a Juan III*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Vasca Ekin SRL, 1951.

Ansón, Mariano. *Yo fui ministro de Negrín*. Barcelona: Planeta, 1976.

Aparicio, Juan. "Mi recuerdo de José Antonio." In *Dolor y memoria de España,* 255–256.

———. "La Conquista del Estado." In *Semanario de lucha e información política,* edited by Ramiro Ledesma Ramos. Madrid: Ediciones FE, 1939.

Areilza, José María de. *Así los he visto*. Barcelona: Planeta, 1974.

Arias-Andreu, Juan. *Memoria de un triunviro*. Madrid: San Martín, 1976.

Aróstegui, Julio. "De lealtades y defecciones: La República y la memoria de la utopia." In *Al servicio de la República: Diplomáticos y Guerra Civil,* edited by Ángel Viñas, 23–54 . Madrid: Marcial Pons Historia, 2010.

Arrarás, Joaquín. *Historia de la Segunda República Española*. Vol. 1. Madrid: Editora Nacional, 1956.

Arrese, José Luis de. *Capitalismo, comunismo, cristianismo*. Madrid: Radar, 1947.

———. *El estado totalitario en el pensamiento de José Antonio*. Madrid: Ediciones de la Vicesecretaría de Educación, 1945.

———. *El Movimiento Nacional como sistema político*. Mardid: Imprenta de la Delegacion Nacional de Sindicatos, 1945.

———. *Misión de la Falange*. Madrid: Publicaciones del Movimiento, 1945.

Aunós, Eduardo. *El General Primo de Rivera: Soldado y gobernante*. Madrid: Alhambra, 1944.

Azaña, Manuel. *Diarios completos: Monarquía, república, Guerra Civil*. Madrid: Crítica, 2000

——— *Discursos politicos*. Edited by Santos Juliá. Barcelona: Crítica, 2004.

———. *Memorias políticas y de guerra*. Vol. 2. Barcelona: Crítica, 1978.

Aznar, Manuel. "Una noche en casa de José Antonio: El nonnato periódico de Falange Española titulado *SÍ*." In *Dolor y memoria de España*, 190–192.

Balfour, Sebastian. *Abrazo mortal: De la guerra colonial a la Guerra Civil en España* y *Marruecos (1909–1939)*. Barcelona: Península, 2002.

Ballarín, Manuel. *La razón en marcha: Crónica del Frente Popular de Zaragoza*. Zaragoza: Fundación Rey del Corral de Investigaciones Marxistas, 2004.

Barelli, Manlio. *José Antonio P. de Rivera, precursore et eroe*. Roma: Istituto Editoriale S. Michele, 1940.

Ben-Ami, Shlomo. *La dictadura de Primo de Rivera 1923–1930*. Barcelona: Planeta, 1984.

Berdiaeff, Nicolas. *Una nueva Edad Media: Reflexiones acerca de los destinos de Rusia y de Europa*. Translated by José Renom. Barcelona: Apolo, 1933.

Bibesco, Elizabeth. *The Romantic*. Kingswood: Windmill Press, 1940.

Blikhorn, Martin. *Carlismo y contrarrevolución en España 1931–1939*. Barcelona: Crítica, 1979.

Bolarque, Luis. "José Antonio y la verdad de *Cara al Sol*." In *Dolor y memoria de España,* 207–209.

Bonilla, Jorge. *La historia no contada de los Primo de Rivera*. Madrid: Espasa, 2016.

Bowers, Claude G. *Misión en España*. Barcelona: Grijalbo, 1977.

Box, Zira, *España, año cero: La construcción simbólica del Franquismo*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 2010.

Boyd, Carolyn. *La política pretoriana en el reinado de Alfonso XIII*. Madrid: Alianza, 1990.

Bravo, Francisco. "Con José Antonio sobre César." In *Dolor y memoria de España,* 236–238.

———. *José Antonio ante la justicia roja*. Madrid: Ediciones de la Vicesecretaría de Educación Popular, 1941.

———. *José Antonio: El hombre, el Jefe, el camarada*. Madrid: Ediciones Españolas, 1939.

———. "José Antonio y Salamanca: El mitin del 10 de febrero y Don Miguel de Unamuno." In *Dolor y memoria de España,* 277–280.

———. "La canción de guerra y amor de la Falange." In *Dolor y memoria de España,* 243–247.

Brocà, Salvador de. *Falange* y *filosofía*. Salou: Unieurop, 1976.

Carbajosa, Mónica, and Pablo Carbajosa. *La corte literaria de José Antonio: La primera generación cultural de la Falange*. Barcelona: Crítica, 2003.

Carrel, Alexis. *Man, the Unknown*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1935.

Casals, Xavier. "Miguel Primo de Rivera, el espejo de Franco." In Tamames and Casals, *Miguel Primo de Rivera y Orbaneja*.

Cazorla Sánchez, Antonio. "Los franquistas como víctimas de la Guerra Civil: Claves de un proyecto de memoria histórica." In *El Franquismo y la Transición en España: Desmitificación* y *reconstrucción de la memoria de una época,* edited by Damián A. González Madrid, 36–60. Madrid: Libros de la Catarata, 2008.

Celaya, Gabriel. "Un recuerdo de Federico García Lorca." *Realidad: Revista de Cultura* y *Política* 9 (1966): 10–15.

Chaves Nogales, Manuel. "Moyen du gouvernement du Général Franco," *L'Europe Nouvelle*, 13 August 1938, 136–137.

———. *Crónicas de la Guerra Civil (agosto de 1936–septiembre de 1939)*. Edited by María Isabel Cintas Guillén. Seville: Espuela de plata, 2011.

Cortés Cavanillas, Julián. *La dictadura y el dictador: Rasgos históricos, políticos* y *psicológicos*. Madrid: Talleres Tipográficos Velasco, 1929.

Cotta, Jesús, *Rosas de plomo: Amistad* y *muerte de Federico y José Antonio*. Barcelona: Stella Maris, 2015.

Cuenca Toribio, José Manuel. "García Lorca y su muerte: Un testimonio singular." *El Imparcial,* 25 June 2014, 4.

Dávila, Sancho. *José Antonio, Salamanca y otras cosas*. Madrid: Afrodisio Aguado, 1967.

Dolor y memoria de España en el segundo aniversario de la muerte de José Antonio. Barcelona: Ediciones Jerarquía, 1939.

Elorza, Antonio. *La razón y la sombra: Una lectura política de Ortega y Gasset*. Barcelona: Anagrama, 1984.

Farràs, Andreu, *Els Güell: La història d'una de les famílies més influents a Catalunya els últims dos segles*. Barcelona: Edicions 62, 2016.

Febo, Giuliana di. "I riti del nazionalcattolecesimo nella Spagna franchista: José Antonio Primo de Rivera e il culto dei caduti (1936–1960)." In *Rituale civil: Storie nazionali e memorie pubbliche nell'Europa contemporanea*, edited by Maurizio Ridolfi, 189–197. Rome: Gangemi Editore, 2006.

———. *Ritos de guerra y de victoria en la España franquista*. Bilbao: Desclée de Brouwer, 2002.

Fernández-Cuesta, Raimundo. "Raimundo Fernández-Cuesta nos habla de José Antonio." In *Dolor y memoria de España*.

———. *Testimonio, recuerdos* y *reflexiones*. Madrid: Dyrsa, 1985.

Foard, Douglas W. *Ernesto Giménez Caballero (o la revolución del poeta): Estudio sobre el Nacionalismo Cultural Hispánico en el siglo XX*. Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos, 1975.

Foxá, Agustín de. "José Antonio: El amigo." In *Dolor y memoria de España*, 217–220.

———. "La eterna presencia." In *Dolor y memoria de España*, 359–360.

———. "Las ceremonias de Burgos." In *Dolor y memoria de España*, 65–68.

Fuente, Inmaculada de la. *La roja y la falangista: Dos hermanas en la España del 36*. Barcelona: Planet, 2006.

Fuentes Codera, Maximiliano. "Eugenio d'Ors y la génesis del discurso del nacionalismo falangista." In *Falange: Las culturas políticas del fascismo en la España de Franco (1936–1975)*, edited by Miguel Ángel Ruiz Carnicer, 148–164. Zaragoza: Institución Fernando El Católico, 2013.

Galbe Loshuertos, José Luis. *La justicia de la República: Memorias de un fiscal del Tribunal Supremo en 1936*. Madrid: Marcial Pons Historia, 2011.

Gallego, Ferran. *Ramiro Ledesma Ramos y el fascismo español*. Madrid: Síntesis, 2014.

———. *El Evangelio fascista: La formación de la cultura política del franquismo (1930–1950)*. Barcelona: Crítica, 2014.

Gandarias, Miguel. *Perfiles síquicos del dictador y bosquejo razonado de su obra*. Madrid: Escuelas Profesionales Salesianas, 1929.

García, Hugo. “De los Soviets a las Cortes: Los comunistas ante la República.” In Rey, *Palabras como puños,* 111–157.
García de Tuñón Aza, José María. *José Antonio* y *la República*. Oviedo: Tarfe, 1996.
García Oliver, Juan. *El eco de los pasos*. Barcelona: Planeta, 2008.
García Valdecasas, Alfonso. *José Antonio y la vida española (Conferencia pronunciada dentro del ciclo Hombres de España en el Colegio Mayor Diego de Covarrubias el día 6 de mayo de 1963)*. Madrid: Imprenta Nacional del Boletín Oficial del Estado, 1964.
———. “Mi recuerdo del 29 de Octubre.” In *Dolor y memoria de España,* 257–259.
García Venero, Maximiano. *Falange en la guerra de España: La unificación y Hedilla*. Paris: Ruedo Ibérico, 1967.
———. *Testimonio de Manuel Hedilla: Segundo Jefe Nacional de Falange Española de las JONS*. Edited by Manuel Hedilla. Barcelona: Acervo, 1972.
Gibson, Ian. *En busca de José Antonio*. Barcelona: Planeta, 1980.
———. *La noche que mataron a Calvo Sotelo*. Barcelona: Argos Vergara, 1982.
Gil Pecharromán, Julio. *José Antonio Primo de Rivera: Retrato de un visionario*. Madrid: Temas de Hoy, 1996.
———. *Conservadores subversivos: La derecha autoritaria alfonsina (1913–1936)*. Madrid: Eudema, 1994.
Gil-Robles, José María. *No fue posible la paz*. Barcelona: Ariel, 1968.
Giménez Caballero, Ernesto. *Genio de España: Exaltaciones a una resurrección nacional y del mundo*. Barcelona: Ediciones Jerarquía, 1939.
———. *Memorias de un dictador*. Barcelona: Planeta, 1979.
Girón de Velasco, José Antonio. *Si la memoria no me falla*. Barcelona: Planeta, 1994.
Goicoechea, Antonio. “José Antonio, abogado.” In *Dolor y memoria de España,* 117–119.
Gómez Molina, Adriano, and Joan Maria Thomàs. *Ramón Serrano Suñer*. Barcelona: Ediciones B, 2003.
Gómez Navarro, José Luis. *El Régimen de Primo de Rivera: Reyes, dictaduras y dictadores*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1991.

Gómez Santos, Marino. *Diálogos españoles*. Madrid: Ediciones Cid, 1958.
González-Allende, Iker. “Gender and Nation in Basque Narrative during the Spanish Civil War (1936–1939).” PhD dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, 2007.
González Calbet, María Teresa. *La dictadura de Primo de Rivera: El directorio militar*. Madrid: El Arquero, 1987.
González Calleja, Eduardo. *La España de los Primo de Rivera: La modernización autoritaria 1923–1930*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 2005.
———. *En nombre de la autoridad: La defensa del orden público durante la Segunda República española (1931–1936)*. Granada: Comares, 2014.
———. *Cifras cruentas: Las víctimas mortales de la violencia sociopolítica en la Segunda República española (1931–1936)*. Granada: Comares, 2015.
González López, Emilio. *Memorias de un estudiante liberal (1903–1931)*. La Coruña: Ediciós do Castro, 1987.
González Ruano, César. *Miguel Primo de Rivera: La vida heroica y romántica de un general español*. 1935. Reprint, Madrid: Nuestra Raza, 1940.
Gracia, Jordi. *José Ortega* y *Gasset*. Madrid: Taurus, 2014.
Ibáñez Fernández, Rafael. *Estudio y acción: La Falange fundacional a la luz del diario de Alejandro Salazar (1934–1936)*. Madrid: Barbarroja, 1993.
Jato Miranda, David. *La rebelión de los estudiantes: Apuntes para una historia del alegre SEU*. Madrid: Talleres Graficos Cies, 1965.
Jiménez Campo, Javier. “Rasgos básicos de la ideología dominante entre 1939 y 1945.” *Revista de Estudios Políticos* 15 (1980): 79–117.
Juaristi, Jon. *Miguel de Unamuno*. Madrid: Taurus, 2012.
Juliá, Santos. “Introducción.” In Azaña, *Diarios completos*.
———. *Vida y tiempo de Manuel Azaña 1880–1940*. Madrid: Taurus, 2008.
Kipling, Rudyard. *Rewards and Fairies*. New York: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1910.
La Rubia Prado, Francisco. *Una encrucijada española: Ensayos críticos sobre Miguel de Unamuno y José Ortega y Gasset*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 2005.

Largo Caballero, Francisco. *Mis recuerdos*. Mexico: Ediciones Unidas, 1976.

Lazo, Alfonso. *Historias falangistas del sur de España: Una teoría sobre vasos comunicantes*. Seville: Espuela de Plata, 2015.

———. *Retrato de fascismo rural en Sevilla*. Seville: University of Seville, 1998.

Ledesma, José Luis, and Javier Rodrigo. "Caídos por España, mártires por la libertad: Víctimas y conmemoración de la Guerra Civil en la España posbélica (1939–2006)." *Ayer* 63 (2006): 233–255.

Ledesma Ramos, Ramiro. *¿Fascismo en España? Discurso a las juventudes de España*. 1935. Edited by Roberto Muñoz Bolaños. Reprint, Madrid: Sepha, 2013.

Lequerica, José Félix de. "Aportación decisiva del creador de la Falange." In *Dolor y memoria de España*.

Lizarza Iribarren, Antonio. *Memorias de la conspiración: Como se preparó en Navarra la Cruzada, 1931–1936*. Pamplona: Gómez, 1953.

López Rey, José. *Los estudiantes frente a la dictadura*. Madrid: Javier Morata, 1930.

Lowe, Sid. *Catholicism, War and the Foundation of Francoism: The Juventud de Acción Popular in Spain, 1931–1939*. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2010.

Llopis, Rodolfo. "Spain Awaits Her Hour." *Ibérica* 7 (1957): 4–6.

Machado, Manuel. "José Antonio, el poeta." In *Dolor y memoria de España*.

Maeztu, Ramiro de. *Defensa de la Hispanidad*. 1934. 2nd ed. Madrid: Ediciones Fax, 1935.

Mainer, José-Carlos. *Falange y literatura: Antología*. Barcelona: Labor, 1971.

Malefakis, Edward. *Reforma agraria* y *revolución campesina en la España del siglo XX*. Barcelona: Ariel, 1971.

Mallol Alberola, José. *La estampida (final de la Guerra Civil en el puerto de Alicante)*. Alicante: María Loreto Mallol Sala, 2000.

Mancisidor, José María. *Frente a frente: José Antonio Primo de Rivera, frente al Tribunal Popular—Texto taquigráfico del Juicio Oral de Alicante, Noviembre 1936*. Madrid: Senén y Martín, 1963.

Martín Otín, José Antonio. *El hombre al que Kipling dijo sí*. Madrid: Barbarroja, 2005.

———. *La desesperación del té (27 veces Pepín Bello)*. Valencia: Pre-Textos, 2008.

Martínez Barrio, Diego. “Episodio en Alicante: Sobre José Antonio Primo de Rivera.” In *Homenaje a Diego Martínez Barrio*, edited by Antonio Alonso Baño, 125–135. Paris: Imprimerie La Rouche Ouvrière, 1978.

Martínez de Bedoya, Javier. *Memorias desde mi aldea*. Valladolid: Ámbito, 1996.

Mas Rigo, Jeroni Miquel. *La manipulación del proceso de José Antonio Primo de Rivera*. Madrid: Cultiva Libros, 2014.

———. “¿Presenció Santicatén el fusilamiento de José Antonio Primo de Rivera?” *El Catoblepas* 127 (2016): 11.

Massot i Muntaner, Josep. *Antoni Maria Sbert (1901–1980)*. Barcelona: Departament de Vicepresidència, Generalitat de Catalunya, 2008.

Matthäus, Jürgen, and Frank Bajohr, eds. *Alfred Rosenberg: Diarios 1934–1944*. Barcelona: Crítica, 2015.

Maura, Miguel. *Así cayó Alfonso XIII: De una dictadura a otra*. Madrid: Marcial Pons Historia, 2007.

Millán-Astray, Pilar. *Cautivas: 32 meses en las prisiones “rojas.”* Madrid: Saturnino Calleja, 1940.

Mínguez Goyanes, José Luis. *Onésimo Redondo 1905–1936: Precursor sindicalista*. Madrid: San Martín, 1990.

Ministerio de Justicia. *Causa General: La dominación roja en España—Avance de la información instruida por el Ministerio Público*. Madrid: Ministerio de Justicia, 1944.

Miquelarena, Jacinto. “José Antonio, hombre.” In *Dolor y memoria de España*, 239–241.

———. “Las Cenas de Carlomagno.” In *Dolor y memoria de España*, 186–187.

Montero, José Ramón. *La CEDA: El catolicismo social y político en la II República*. 2 vols. Madrid: Aguilar, 1977.

Montes Agudo, Gumersindo. *Vieja Guardia*. Madrid: Aguilar, 1939.

Montoliú Camps, Pedro. *Madrid en la posguerra, 1939–1946: Los años de la repression*. Madrid: Sílex, 2005.

Mora-Figueroa, José de. *Datos para la historia de la Falange gaditana 1934–1939*. Jerez de la Frontera: Gráficas del Exportador, 1974.

Morán, Gregorio. *El maestro en el erial: Ortega* y *Gasset y la cultura del franquismo*. Barcelona: Tusquets, 1998.

———. *Los españoles que dejaron de serlo*. *Euskadi, 1937–1981*. Barcelona: Planeta, 2003.

Muñoz Alonso, Alejandro. *Un pensador para un pueblo*. Madrid: Almena, 1974.

Mussolini, Benito. *El fascismo*. Madrid: San Martín, 1934.

Navarro de la Fuente, Santiago, “¿Y ahora qué? Los católicos y el Frente Popular.” Lecture, “La España del Frente Popular 80 años después” symposium, University of Seville, 17–18 May 2016.

Navas, Alina. “Falange y arte: Una primera aproximación.” Lecture, 13th Congress of the Contemporary History Association, University of Castilla-La Mancha, Albacete, 21–23 September 2016.

Núñez Seixas, Xosé Manoel. “Comunismo, fascismo y galleguismo ‘imperial’: La deriva particular de Santiago Montero Díaz.” In *Los heterodoxos de la patria: Biografías de nacionalistas atípicos en la España del siglo XX*, edited by Xosé Manoel Núñez Seixas and Fernando Molina Aparicio, 169–196. Granada: Comares, 2011.

———. “Falangismo, Nacionalsocialismo y el mito de Hitler en España (1931–1945).” *Revista de Estudios Políticos* 169 (2015): 13–43.

———. *La sombra del César: Santiago Montero Díaz, una biografía entre la nación y la revolución*. Granada: Comares, 2012.

Oriol y Urquijo, José María de. “Por distintos caminos, hacia la misma meta.” In *Dolor y memoria de España*, 251–253.

Ortega y Gasset, José. *En torno a Galileo*. Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1959.

———. *España invertebrada*. Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1959.

———. *La rebelión de las masas*. Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1959.

———. *Rectificación de la República: Artículos y discursos*. Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1932.

———. *Vieja y nueva política*. Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1953.

Ossorio y Gallardo, Ángel. *Mis Memorias*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Losada, 1946.

Pardo, Doctor. “José Antonio y su hermano Fernando.” In *Dolor y memoria de España*, 215–216.
Parejo Fernández, José Antonio. *La Falange en la Sierra Norte de Sevilla (1934–1956)*. Seville: University of Seville, 2004.
———. *Las piezas perdidas de la Falange*. *El sur de España*. Seville: Universidad de Sevilla, 2008.
———. *Señoritos, Jornaleros y Falangistas*. Seville: Bosque de Palabras, 2008.
Payne, Stanley G. *Franco y José Antonio: El extraño caso del fascismo español*. Barcelona: Planeta, 1997.
———. *Los militares y la política en la España contemporánea*. Paris: Ruedo Ibérico, 1967.
Pemán, José María. *Mis almuerzos con gente importante*. Barcelona: Dopesa, 1970.
Pemartín, José. *Qué es “lo nuevo”: Consideraciones sobre el momento español presente*. Seville: Cultura Española, 1937.
Pemartín Sanjuán, José. *Los valores históricos de la dictadura española*. Madrid: Sáenz Hermanos, 1929.
Pérez, Dionisio. *La dictadura a través de sus Notas Oficiosas*. Madrid: CIAO, 1930.
Pérez Yuste, Antonio. “La Compañía Telefónica Nacional de España en la Dictadura de Primo de Rivera (1923–1930).” PhD dissertation, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, 2004.
Ponce Alberca, Julio. *Del Poder y sus Sombras: José Cruz Conde (1878–1939)*. Cabra: Gráficas Flora, 2001.
Pradera, Javier. *La mitología falangista (1933–1939)*. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales, 2014.
Preston, Paul. *Franco: “Caudillo de España.”* Barcelona: Grijalbo, 1994.
———. *Idealistas bajo las balas: Corresponsales extranjeros en la guerra de España*. Barcelona: Debate, 2007.
———. *Las tres Españas de 36*. Barcelona: Plaza & Janés, 1998.
Prieto, Indalecio. *Convulsiones de España: Pequeños detalles de grandes sucesos*. 3 vols. Mexico City: Oasis, 1968.
———. “Si Primo de Rivera viviese.” *El Socialista,* 15 August 1957, 3.
Primo de Rivera, Carmen. “Alicante.” In *Dolor y memoria de España,* 220–223.

Primo de Rivera, Pilar. *Recuerdos de una vida*. Madrid: Dyrsa, 1983.

Primo de Rivera, José Antonio. "En una tarde de Octubre." Prologue to Mussolini, *El fascismo*.

———. "Germánicos contra bereberes: 15 siglos de historia de España." In Bonilla, *La historia no contada*, 215–224.

———. "Los intelectuales y la dictadura." Prologue to *La dictadura de Primo de Rivera juzgada en el extranjero: Opiniones de hombres de estado, diplomáticos, técnicos, periodistas, etc*. Madrid: Sáez Hermanos, 1931.

———. *Obras completas de José Antonio Primo de Rivera*. Edited by Agustín del Río Cisneros. Madrid: Publicaciones de la Dirección General de Propaganda, 1950.

———. *Obras completas: Escritos y discurscos, 1922–1936*. 2 vols. Edited by Agustín del Río Cisneros. Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos, 1976. www.rumbos.net/ocja.

Primo de Rivera, José Antonio, and Miguel Macadho. "Palabras pronunciadas en el homenaje tributado en Madrid a Antonio y Manuel Machado en la noche del 27 de noviembre de 1929." In *Dolor y memoria de España*.

Primo de Rivera, Rocío. *Los Primo de Rivera: Historia de una familia*. Madrid: La Esfera de los Libros, 2003.

Primo de Rivera y Urquijo, Miguel. *No a las dos Españas: Memorias políticas*. Barcelona: Plaza & Janés: 2003.

———. *Papeles póstumos de José Antonio*. Barcelona: Plaza & Janés, 1996.

Quiroga Fernández de Soto, Alejandro. "Cirujano de Hierro: La construcción carismática del general Primo de Rivera." *Ayer* 91, no. 3 (2013): 147–168.

———. *Haciendo españoles: La nacionalización de las masas en la Dictadura de Primo de Rivera (1923–1930)*. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales, 2008.

Rabaté, Colette, and Jean-Claude Rabaté. *Miguel de Unamuno*. *Biografía*. Madrid: Taurus, 2010.

Rafanell, August. "El corbatín que estrangula: Antirromanticismo y anticatalanismo en el pensamiento de Eugenio d'Ors y de José Antonio Primo de Rivera." *Ayer* 97, no. 1 (2015): 115–140.

Ramos, Vicente. *La Guerra Civil 1936–1939 en la provincia de Alicante*. Vol. 1. Alicante: Biblioteca Alicantina, 1972.

Rey Reguillo, Fernando del. “La República de los socialistas.” In Rey, *Palabras como puños,* 158–225.

———. *Paisanos en lucha: Exclusión política y violencia en la Segunda República española*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 2008.

———. *Palabras como puños: La intransigencia política en la Segunda República Española*. Madrid: Tecnos, 2011.

Ribé, Manuel. *Memorias de un funcionario*. Barcelona: Marte, 1963.

Rico Gómez, María Luisa, and José Sevillano Calero. “Franco y José Antonio: Caudillo y profeta de España—La construcción del carisma durante la Guerra Civil.” *Studia Historica: Historia Contemporánea* 31 (2013): 95–111.

Ridruejo, Dionisio. *Con fuego y con raíces: Casi unas memorias*. Barcelona: Planeta, 1976.

Río Cisneros, Agustín del, and Enrique Pavón Pereira. *Los procesos de José Antonio*. Madrid: Ediciones del Movimiento, 1969.

Riquer, Borja de. *Alfonso XIII y Cambó: La monarquía y el catalanismo politico*. Barcelona: RBA, 2013.

———. *Francesc Cambó: Entre la monarquia i la república (1930–1932)—Com les memòries s’acomoden a les circumstàncies polítiques*. Barcelona: Base, 2007.

Rivas Ibáñez, Enrique de. *Comentarios y notas a “Apuntes de memoria” de Manuel Azaña y a las cartas de 1938, 1939 y 1940*. Valencia: Pre-Textos, 1990.

Roig Rosich, Josep M. *La dictadura de Primo de Rivera a Catalunya: Un assaig de repressió cultural*. Barcelona: Publicacions de l’Abadia de Monserrat, 1992.

Rodríguez Jiménez, José Luis. *Historia de Falange Española de las JONS*. Madrid: Alianza, 2000.

Rodríguez Tarduchy, Emilio. *Psicología del dictador: Caracteres más salientes morales, sociales y políticos de la dictadura española*. Madrid: Sáenz Hermanos, 1929.

Ros, Samuel. “José Antonio en ‘La Ballena Alegre.’” In *Dolor y memoria de España*, 209–210.

Ros, Samuel, and Antonio Bouthelier. *A hombros de la Falange: De Alicante a El Escorial*. Madrid-Barcelona: Ediciones Patria, 1940.
Ruiz Carnicer, Miguel Ángel. *El Sindicato Español Universitario (SEU), 1939–1965: La socialización política de la juventud universitaria en el franquismo*. Madrid: Siglo XXI, 1996.
Ruiz Matilla, Jesús. 2015. “El desprecio de Franco a José Antonio.” *El País*, 12 March.
Sáenz de Heredia, Nieves. “En la vida familiar.” In *Dolor y memoria de España,* 174–176.
Sagrera, Ana de. *Miguel Primo de Rivera: El hombre*, *el soldado* y *el politico*. Jerez de la Frontera: Ayuntamiento de Jerez de la Frontera, 1974.
Sánchez Albornoz, Claudio. *Mi testamento histórico-político*. Barcelona: Planeta, 1976.
Santicatén [Joaquín Martínez Arboleya]. *Porque luché contra los rojos*. Montevideo: Talleres Gráficos de Río Branco, 1961.
Saz, Ismael. *España contra España: Los nacionalismos franquistas*. Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2003.
———. *Mussolini contra la Segunda República*. *Hostilidad, conspiraciones, intervención (1931–1936)*. Valencia: Institució Alfons el Magnànim, 1986.
Seco Serrano, Carlos. *Militarismo y civilismo en la España contemporánea*. Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Económicos, 1984.
Selva de Togores, Enrique. *Ernesto Giménez Caballero: Entre la vanguardia y el fascismo*. Valencia: Institució Alfons El Magnànim, 2000.
Serna, Víctor de la. “Voz y diálogos de José Antonio con sus amigos: Recuerdos de La Ballena que ríe.” In *Dolor y memoria de España,* 238–239.
Serrallonga i Urquidi, Joan. “El aparato provincial durante la Segunda República: Los gobernadores civiles, 1931–1939.” *Hispania Nova: Revista de Historia Contemporánea* 7 (2007).
Serrano Suñer, Ramón. *Entre Hendaya y Gibraltar*. Barcelona: Nauta, 1973.
———. *Entre el silencio y la propaganda*. *La historia como fue*. *Memorias*. Barcelona: Planeta, 1977.

———. “José Antonio, estudiante, enamorado y parlamentario: Conversación con el ministro del Interior.” In *Dolor y memoria de España*, 193–207.

Sevillano Calero, Francisco. “La sublevación de julio de 1936 en Albacete.” *Al-Basit: Revista de Estudios Albacetenses* 35 (1994): 133–151.

Sorel, Georges. *Réflexions sur la violence*. Madrid: Alianza, 2005.

Southworth, Herbert R. *Antifalange: Estudio crítico de Falange en la guerra de España de M. García Venero*. Paris: Ruedo Ibérico, 1967.

Spengler, Oswald. *Años decisivos*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1962.

———. *La decadencia de Occidente*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1966.

Stammler, Rudolf. *Tratado de filosofía del derecho*. 1925. Reprint, Madrid: Editorial Reus, 2008.

Tamames, Ramón. *Ni Mussolini ni Franco: La dictadura de Primo de Rivera y su tiempo*. Barcelona: Planeta, 2008.

Tamames, Ramón, and Xavier Casals. *Miguel Primo de Rivera y Orbaneja*. Barcelona: Ediciones B, 2004.

Thomàs, Joan Maria. “Actas de las reuniones Junta de Mando Provisional Falange Española de las JONS celebradas durante el período 5 de diciembre de 1936–30 de marzo de 1937.” *Historia Contemporánea* 7 (1992): 335–351.

———. *El gran golpe: El “caso Hedilla” o cómo Franco se quedó con Falange*. Barcelona: Debate, 2014.

———. *Falange, Guerra Civil, Franquisme: FET y de las JONS de Barcelona en els primers anys del règim franquista*. Barcelona: Publicacions de l’Abadia de Montserrat, 1992.

———. *Franquistas contra franquistas: Luchas por el poder en la cúpula del régimen de Franco*. Barcelona: Debate, 2016.

———. *José M. Fontana Tarrats: Biografia política d’un franquista català*. Reus: Centre de Lectura, 1997.

———. *La Falange de Franco: Fascismo y fascistización en el régimen franquista (1937–1945)*. Barcelona: Plaza & Janés, 2001.

———. *Lo que fue la Falange: La Falange y los falangistas de José Antonio, Hedilla y la Unificación, Franco y el fin de Falange Española de las JONS*. Barcelona: Plaza & Janés, 1999.

———. *Los fascismos españoles*. Barcelona: Planeta, 2011.

———. “Ramón Serrano Suñer: El personaje real y el personaje inventado.” In Gómez Molina and Maria Thomàs, *Ramón Serrano Suñer*.

Tierno Galván, Enrique. *Costa y el regeneracionismo*. Barcelona: Barna, 1961.

Tomasoni, Matteo. “Onésimo Redondo Ortega: Vida, obra y pensamiento de un sindicalista nacional (1905–1936).” PhD dissertation, University of Valladolid, 2014.

Torres García, Francisco: *El último José Antonio*. Madrid: Barbarroja, 2013.

Tuñón Aza, José María de. “La carta de María Santos Kant.” *Gaceta de la Fundación José Primo de Rivera* 2 (2015). http://www.fundacionjoseantonio.es/gaceta/gaceta2.pdf

Tusell, Javier. *Radiografía de un golpe de Estado*. Madrid: Alianza, 1987.

Ucelay-Da Cal, Enric. “La Diputació durant la dictadura: 1923–1930.” In *Història de la Diputació de Barcelona*, vol. 3, edited by Borja de Riquer, 178–259. Barcelona: Diputació de Barcelona, 1987.

———. “El gran dia de la revolta: Illusions i enganys del Sis d’Octubre.” In *6 d’Octubre: La desfeta de la revolució catalanista de 1934*, edited by Arnau Gonzàlez Vilalta, Manel López Esteve, and Enric Ucelay-Da Cal, 55–111. Barcelona: Base, 2014.

———. *El imperialismo catalán: Prat de la Riba, Cambó, D’Ors y la conquista moral de España*. Barcelona: Edhasa, 2003.

Umbral, Francisco. *Leyenda del César Visionario*. Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1989.

Unamuno, Miguel de. *Obras Completas*. Vol. 6. Madrid: Afrodisio Aguado, 1958.

Urrutia, Ana. *La poetización de la política en el Unamuno exiliado: De Fuerteventura a París y Romancero del destierro*. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca, 2003.

Valdeiglesias, Marqués de. “El día que querían matar a José Antonio.” In *Dolor y memoria de España*, 249–251.

Valdés Larrañaga, Manuel. *De la Falange al Movimiento (1936–1952)*. Madrid: Fundación Nacional Francisco Franco, 1994.

Valencia, Juan de. “La ‘Justicia’ roja trama y consuma la condena de José Antonio a la última pena.” In *Dolor y memoria de España*, 295–301.

Varela, Javier. “El sueño imperial de Eugenio d’Ors.” *Historia y Política* 2 (1999): 39–82.

Vega Gonzalo, Francisco de Asís de la. *Aniquilar la Falange: Cronología persecutoria del nacionalsindicalismo*. Oviedo: Tarfe, 1999.

Vegas Latapié, Eugenio. *Memorias políticas*. *El suicidio de la Monarquía y la Segunda República*. Barcelona: Planeta, 1983.

Viñas, Ángel. *Guerra, dinero y dictadura: Ayuda fascista y autarquía en la España de Franco*. Barcelona: Crítica, 1984.

———. *La Alemania nazi y el 18 de Julio*. Madrid: Alianza, 1977.

Ximénez de Sandoval, Felipe. *José Antonio: Biografía*. Madrid: Lazareno-Echániz, 1949.

———. “José Antonio en la cárcel modelo.” In *Dolor y memoria de España,* 226–231.

Zavala, José María. *La pasión de José Antonio*. Barcelona: Plaza & Janés, 2011.

Zugazagoitia, Julián. *Historia de la Guerra de España*. Buenos Aires: Librería Española, 1940.

Index

Acción Catalana (Catalan Action), 25
Acción Española (Spanish Action), 84, 87, 98, 121, 278
Acción Nacional (National Action), 67n25, 87
Acción Republicana (Republican Action), 79
Adult Reformatory (of Alicante), 238, 319
Agrupación al Servicio de la República (Group at the Service of the Republic—ASR), 78
Agrupación Escolar Tradicionalista (Traditionalist School Group), 129
Aguilar, Luis, 243
Aguilar, Miguel, 6
Aguilera, Francisco (general), 33, 43
Aguinaldo, Emilio, 27
Air Force, 74n36
Aizpurúa, José Manuel (architect), 269, 305
Al Hoceima, 39
Alacuás prison, 254, 319, 326
Alba Bonifaz, Santiago (minister of finance), 36
Albiñana, José María, 25, 133, 141, 241n31
Alcalá Galiano, Álvaro (journalist), 84, 135, 153, 156
Alcalá-Zamora, Niceto (president and PM), 79, 86, 92, 115, 121, 175, 179
Alcalde, Vicente (PCE), 219
Alcázar de Velasco, Ángel (Falangist), 252n183
Alfaro, José María (writer, diplomat, politician), 17, 131, 155, 156, 157, 174, 184, 185, 248n139, 248n143, 268, 269
Alicante prison (Provincial Remand Prison of Alicante), 3, 14, 204, 217, 225, 231, 253, 258n236, 288, 310, 340
Alonso Mallol, José (security director general), 191

Álvarez, Melquíades (politician, lawyer), 43, 55, 219
Álvarez de Sotomayor, Nicasio, 146
Álvargonzález, Emilio, 130
Anarcho-syndicalist/Anarcho-syndicalism, 13, 30, 37, 40, 43, 67, 86, 121, 139, 197, 210, 224, 252n184
Andrada-Vanderwilde y Bachoué de Barraute, María (García Valdecasas’s wife), 129n88
Andrada-Vanderwilde y Pérez de Herrasti, José Luis de (Marquess of Cartagena), 129n88
Andrés-Gallego, José, 337n25, 340
Andreu Jiménez, María Luisa, 6
Ansaldo, Juan Antonio, 122, 129n89, 134, 137, 141, 142, 144, 145, 153, 190, 239n4, 240n14, 241n38, 242n44, 250n162, 340
anti-bourgeois, 139
anti-capitalism, 168, 170
anticlerical, 87, 111, 194
anti-dictatorial, 86
anti-leftist, 7
anti-military, 179
anti-national, 112, 118, 144, 270
anti-political, 12
anti-separatist, 7, 32, 187
Antwerp Telephone and Electrical Works, 54
Aparicio, Juan, 103, 126n37, 138, 159, 245n75, 311n94
Araquistain, Luis (politician), 45
Archivio Storico Diplomatico degli Affari Steri (ASMAE), 126n41
Areilza, José María de (national councillor), 17, 67n19, 113, 152, 153, 339, 340
Arlegui, Miguel (general), 31, 39
Armed Forces, 18, 19, 43, 48, 151, 175, 193, 281, 323
Army, 10, 15, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 38, 43, 49, 54, 71, 76, 141, 148, 149, 150, 174, 175, 176, 194, 195, 196, 200, 202, 205, 206, 207, 218, 221, 222, 223, 228, 252n180, 255, 256, 256n223, 257n225, 257n230, 275, 297, 300, 316, 320, 324, 327, 330, 337n42

Arrese, José Luis de (secretary general of the Movement), 249n146, 325, 331, 337n35, 340
Arteaga, Pilar de, 73n119
Asamblea Nacional Consultiva (National Consultative Assembly—ANC), 42
Asociación Católica Nacional de Propagandistas (National Catholic Association of Propagandists), 87
Asociación de Estudiantes Católicos (Association of Catholic Students), 21
Asquith, Elizabeth/Princess Bibesco, 57, 137, 236, 240n15, 264n303, 341
Asquith, Herbert Henry (UK PM), 57
Assault Guard, 195, 222, 238
Association of Friends of Russia, 8
Associazione Nacionalista Italiana (Italian Nationalist Association), 105
Asturian miners' strike of 1934, 147, 148
Ateneo de Albacete (Scientific, Literary, and Artisitic Athenaeum of Albacete), 61
Ateneo de Madrid (Scientific, Literary, and Artisitic Athenaeum of Madrid), 45, 46, 47, 50, 56
Aunós, Eduardo (minister of labor), 40, 50, 125n33, 257, 341
Autonomist Monarchic Federation, 32
Azaña, Manuel (prime minister), 4, 45, 79, 104, 105, 117, 137, 172, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 197, 210, 211, 216, 217, 220, 224, 225, 126, 235, 236, 240n16, 249n150, 249n153, 250n155, 251n168, 256n222, 260n241, 260n244, 260n245, 261n265, 263n282, 264n302, 297, 298, 313n112, 340, 341, 344, 348
Azcárate, Justino de, 105, 257n226, 268
Azlor de Aragón y Guillamas, María del Pilar, 56
Aznar, Juan Bautista (admiral, prime minister), 80, 82, 92
Aznar, Manuel, 341
Aznar Embid, Severiano (sociologist), 141
Aznar Gerner, Agustín, 135, 141, 142, 222, 223, 241n34, 248n143, 314, 326, 331, 337n42

Bagaria, Luis (illustrator), 45
Barber, Francisco (civil governor), 31

Barcelona City Council, 31
Barrera, Emilio (lieutenant general), 49, 50, 99
Barroso Sánchez-Guerra, Eugenio (lawyer), 55
Basque Country, 8, 99, 308n40, 313n116, 314
Bassas Figa, Roberto (lawyer), 25, 130, 146, 242n53
Batet, Domènec (Catalan general), 149
Battle of Alcácer Quibir, 317
Battle of Annual (Disaster of Annual), 22, 24, 35
Battle of the Ebro, 320, 322
Behn, Sosthenes (CTNE president), 53, 54
Benjumea, Rafael (minister of development), 76, 90
Berenguer, Dámaso (general, PM), 32, 35, 49, 50, 60, 63, 64, 72n103, 75, 82, 80, 92, 96
Berenguer, Federico (general), 32
Bergamín, José, 112
Berlanguilla (aka La Huerta del Coronel), 28
Bertrán y Musitu, José (lawyer), 55
Besteiro, Julián, 196
Bibesco, Antoine (prince), 57
Blasco Ibáñez, José, 45, 47
Board for Patriotic and Citizens' Propaganda, 75
Board of Propaganda for the Fatherland and the People, 42
Borbón y Battenberg, Juan de, 127n47
Bouthelier, Antonio, 105, 112, 338n47, 348
Bravo, Francisco, 154, 242n51, 245n68, 246n102, 248n143, 259, 269, 307n15, 314, 336n6
Brocà, Salvador de, 6, 285, 307n25, 308n30, 308n35, 309n52, 309n66, 310n74, 310n81, 310n87, 312n107, 312n109, 341
Burguete, Ricardo (general), 80, 81
by-election, 88

Cabanellas, Miguel (general), 210, 211
Cachón Cadena, Jesús
Cadenas, Vicente de, 336n9

Calle de Alcalá, 134
Calle de los Madrazo, 45
Calle del marqués de Riscal, 142, 153, 157, 227
Calle Princesa, 325
Callejo, Eduardo (minister of education), 44, 90
Calvet Pascual, Agustín (aka Gaziel; journalist), 196
Calvo Sotelo, José, 1, 39, 43, 47, 76, 95, 124n23, 145, 152, 161, 179, 182, 195, 196, 205, 206, 208, 209, 228, 230, 239, 242n49, 242n50, 252n183, 257n225, 320, 343
Cambó, Francesc (conservative), 49, 69n55, 72n102, 72n105, 80, 309n55, 348, 350
capitalism/capitalist, 4, 10, 12, 13, 105, 117, 150, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 178, 215, 263n282, 285, 288, 292, 293, 293, 295, 297, 300, 310n77, 337, 340
captaincy general, 23, 25, 33, 49, 50, 149
Carabanchel, 141
Carranza, Ramón de (Cadiz mayor), 58, 121
Carrero Blanco, Luis (presidency undersecretary), 331, 332
Carrillo, Wenceslao (Socialist leader), 251n165
Casa del Pueblo, 134, 135, 142, 192
Casares Quiroga, Santiago (minister of interior), 108, 192, 215, 220, 231
Casaus, Manuel Andrés, 143
Casino La Peña, 96
Castillo, José del (Assault Guard lieutenant), 195, 223
Castrovido, Roberto, 166
Cathedral of Saint Nicholas (Alicante), 328
Causa General, 224, 260n251, 263, 265n319, 339, 345
Cavalcanti, José (general), 32, 33, 99
Cazadores de Alcántara no. 14, 24
Cazorla Sánchez, Antonio, 6
Celaya, Gabriel (Communist poet), 268, 305n12, 306, 342
Central University of Madrid, 16, 20, 135, 189
Chafarinas Islands, 47
Chápuli Ansó, Fernando (lieutenant colonel), 229, 263n277
chíribis (young Madrid socialists), 141

Cierva y Peñafiel, Juan de la (minister of war), 24
Cine Madrid, 163, 170, 177, 246n92, 309n51, 311n102
Cinema Europa, 184
Círculo Mercantil, 168, 263n282, 310n83
cirujano de hierro (iron surgeon), 30, 70n66, 70n74, 70n80, 347
Civil Guard, 23, 50, 71n101, 99, 174, 175, 195, 245n67, 256n221, 263n277
Clemente de Diego Gutiérrez, Felipe, 22, 25, 53
Comisiones Obreras (Workers' Commissions), 334
Command Unit (of the Falange), 222, 314, 316
Committee of Public Order (Alicante), 219
Commonwealth of Catalonia, 32, 39, 270, 281
Communism/Communist (Reds), 3, 4, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 30, 36, 37, 43, 64, 67n20, 78, 86, 88, 93, 134, 146, 147, 172, 176, 177, 178, 179, 190, 191, 193, 196, 197, 198, 200, 210, 220, 255, 268, 271, 285, 286, 288, 292, 293, 335
Compañía de los Caminos de Hierro del Norte de España (CCHNE), 124n13
Compañía Telefónica Nacional de España (National Telephone Company of Spain—CTNE), 52, 73n112, 347
Companys, Luis (Catalan president), 147, 149
Comunión Tradicionalista (Traditionalist Communion; Carlists), 8
Conde Genové, Pedro (friend), 25, 68n46, 339
Condés, Fernando (Civil Guard captain), 195, 196
Confederación de Empresarios Nacional-Sindicalistas (Confederation of National-Syndicalist Entrepreneurs—CENS), 140
Confederación de Obreros Nacional-Sindicalistas (Confederation of National-Syndicalist Workers—CONS), 140
Confederación Española de Derechas Autónomas (Spanish Confederation of Autonomous Rights—CEDA), 8, 9, 10, 21, 68n25, 88, 108, 115, 116, 121, 122, 132, 136, 144, 147, 163, 167, 171, 178, 199, 203, 209, 214, 252n194, 257n230, 324, 345
Confederación Nacional del Trabajo (Confederation of Labor—CNT), 25, 40, 139, 160, 171, 193, 197, 198, 218, 219, 222, 223, 26, 238, 259n239, 259n240, 260, 263n282, 295
Congreso de los Diputados (Congress of Deputies, lower chamber), 242n53

Consejo de Ministros (Council of Ministers; cabinet), 49, 92, 121, 147, 235, 237
Conservative/Conservatism, 9, 13, 22, 23, 24, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 38, 39, 43, 52, 60, 62, 80, 96, 97, 102, 105, 111, 113, 121, 152, 153, 159, 167, 168, 172, 178, 188, 194, 196, 197, 198, 206, 208, 211, 214, 215, 218, 227, 236, 251n180, 257n225, 272, 300, 335
Constitución de 1876, 9, 41, 48, 75, 80, 92, 94
Cossío, Manuel Bartolomé, 88
Costa, Joaquín ('98 Generation), 30, 266, 296, 312, 350
Count of Rodezno, 208
Count of Romanones, 43, 60, 236
Count of Vallellano, 191
Court of Constitutional Guarantees, 149
Crespo Orbios, Adolfo M. (prison director), 218
Crónica (magazine), 98, 125
Crown, the, 37, 49
Cruz Conde, José (artillery commander), 33, 69n59, 74n131, 347
Cuéllar, Juan (Falange, killed), 141, 143
Cuerda, Andrés de la (secretary), 156, 237

Daban, Antonio (general), 32
Dato, Eduardo (PM), 23, 27
Dávila Fernández de Celis, Sancho (cousin), 63, 73n118, 74n136, 74n137, 130, 176, 237, 314, 342
Delbos, Yvon (French minister of foreign affairs), 236
Delgado Barreto, Manuel (*La Nación* director), 102, 103, 105, 126n40, 126n41, 126n42
democracy, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 38, 78, 79, 86, 93, 102, 105, 106, 107, 108, 152, 159, 196, 198, 267, 271, 274, 284, 285, 287, 293
Democratism/Democratic, 4, 12, 13, 26, 36, 37, 78, 79, 83, 86, 87, 93, 105, 106, 108, 113, 147, 170, 178, 195, 202, 211, 213, 230, 282, 284, 285, 299, 307, 334
Derecha de Cataluña (Right of Catalonia), 25
Derecha Liberal Republicana (Liberal Republican Right), 79
Despujol y Dusay, Eugenio (general), 25

Director General of Local Administration, 39
Director/Directorate General of Segurity, 39, 99, 143, 191, 202, 203, 204, 328
Disaster of 1898 (Spanish-American War), 29, 266
Domingo, Marcelino, 79
D'Ors, Eugenio (writer), 20, 40, 266, 267, 269, 270, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 291, 307n20, 307n21, 309n54, 343, 348, 350
D'Ors, Víctor, 131
Doval Bravo, Lisardo (Civil Guard officer), 245n67
Durán, Juan Manuel, 111
Duvivier, Julien (French director), 248n143

Eastman, Scott
Editorial Católica, 102
Ejército Popular (Popular Army), 320
el ausente, 317
El Dueso penitentiary, 250n160
El Encinar (estate), 18
El Escorial Agreement, 113, 146, 164
El Escorial Monastery, 44, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 338n47, 338n50, 348
El Rosario (estate), 28
El Sol (newspapers), 45, 66n7, 104, 241n37, 249n149
Enjuto Ferrán, Federico (judge), 221, 224, 225, 238, 261n255
Ericsson (Swedish Telecommunications Company), 54
Escorial-María Cristina Royal University Center, 44
escuadras/escuadristas, 130, 141, 142, 162, 164, 176, 183
Escudero, Tirso (entrepreneur running the Teatro de la Comedia), 45, 116
Escuela Romana del Pirineo (Roman School of the Pyrenees), 280
España con Honra, 47
Esplá, Carlos (undersecretary of the presidency and minister of propaganda), 213, 235, 260n242, 264n295, 340
Esquerra Republicana de Cataluña (Republican Left of Catalonia—ERC), 118
Estat Català (Catalan State), 25

Estremera private airfield, 141

Fal Conde, Manuel, 208, 318
Falange Española (Spanish Phalanx but referred to as the Falange), 1, 7, 42, 83, 116, 129n87, 140, 241n34, 243n60, 245n67, 341, 343
Falange Española de la Juntas de Ofensiva Nacional Sindicalista (Spanish Phalanx of the Councils of the National Syndicalist Offensive—FE de las JONS), 243n60, 245, 247n114, 309n49, 313n114, 318, 338n50, 343, 348, 349, 350
Falangist(s), 10, 12, 13, 59, 117, 144, 268, 273, 275, 293, 320, 334
*Falangista(*s*)*, 3, 4, 128n74, 129, 135, 143, 148, 247n114, 252n193, 307n17, 307n23, 308n29, 308n37, 309n54, 310n72, 313n116, 335n4, 343, 344, 346, 347, 350
Falla, Manuel de (composer), 128n74
Fanjul, Juan Manuel, 131
Faraudo, Carlos (captain), 192
Fascismo Español (Spanish Fascism), 116
Fascio, *El*, 11, 13, 83, 102, 103, 104, 106, 108, 109, 110, 111, 126n41, 127n53, 135, 245n75
Fascitized, 168, 172
Fatherland, 34, 42, 72n104, 74n131, 89, 107, 112, 114, 117, 118, 119, 120, 133, 139, 150, 151, 154, 156, 165, 169, 172, 173, 230, 237, 255n221, 256, 256n223, 264, 277, 278, 279, 282, 286, 287, 293, 294, 295, 298, 299, 301, 311n93, 312n105, 323
Feced, Inocencio, 218, 259n240
Federación Anarquista Ibérica (Iberian Anarchist Federation—FAI), 219
Federación Universitaria Escolar (University College Federation), 44
Federal Union of Students, 21
Federzoni, Luigi, 105
Ferlosio, Liliana (Sánchez Mazas’s wife), 105
Fernández Silvestre, Manuel (general), 24
Fernández-Cuesta, Raimundo (childhood friend and Falange general secretary), 18, 19, 25, 67n13, 67n16, 67n20, 140, 146, 149, 185, 191, 225, 237, 243n57, 250n163, 251n165, 257n226, 261n157, 302, 313n117, 317, 319, 320, 321, 323, 324, 336n15, 342

Finat y Escrivá de Romaní, José (Count of Mayalde), 209, 328
firstborn, 7, 75
Foxá, Agustín de (poet, writer), 6n2, 17, 67n24, 155, 156, 184, 240n19, 245n72, 248n143, 268, 304n7, 317, 334, 336n11, 337n211, 338n56, 342
Franco, Francisco (Generalissimo), 1, 2, 5, 12, 15, 18, 19, 21, 29, 38, 40, 41, 66n2, 69n65, 70n67, 70n72, 70n81, 73n127, 83, 104, 111, 127n47, 128n70, 129n86, 141, 144, 147, 148, 149, 176, 183, 196, 200, 203, 208, 212, 217, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 235, 236, 238, 239, 239n7, 241n20, 241n25, 241n37, 242n52, 243n55, 245, 246n89, 248n96, 247n105, 247n114, 247n119, 248n126, 249n143, 249n146, 250n157, 252n186, 253n200, 254n205, 256n217, 257n230, 258n230, 258n232, 258n233, 258n236, 258n237, 260n251, 266, 268, 282, 300, 301, 303, 306, 309n54, 313n112, 313n114, 313n118, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335n5, 336n13, 336n15, 337n24, 387n25, 337n36, 337n41, 338n50, 339, 340, 342, 343, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351
Franco, Ramón, 111
Frente de Juventudes (Youth Front), 302
Frente Español (Spanish Front), 105
Frente Nacional Anti-revolucionario (Anti-revolutionary National Front—FNA), 178
Frente Popular (Popular Front), 101, 252, 253n194, 341, 346
Fuentes de Oñoro, 174
Fuentes Pila, Santiago (UPE leader), 99
Fundación José María Castañé, 335n5
Fundación Nacional Francisco Franco (Francisco Franco National Foundation—FFNF), 350, 127n47

Galán, Fermín (captain), 79
Galarza, Ángel (radical Socialist), 99
Galarza, Valentín, 141
Galiana, Carlos, 257n223
Gallego, Ferrán, 304n1, 346, 242n47, 242n49
Gamero del Castillo, Pedro (German battleship plan participant), 223
Ganivet, Ángel (’98 generation), 78, 266

Garcerán, Rafael (clerk in Primo's office), 209, 237, 258n230
García Aldave, José (Alicante military governor), 210
García Canales, Mariano (Falange admin secretary), 209, 249n146, 255n220
García de Polavieja, Camilo (general), 27
García del Moral, Eliseo, 105
García del Real (Unamuno fellow lecturer), 47
García Hernández, Ángel (captain), 79
García Lorca, Federico (poet), 116, 128n74, 268, 269, 303, 304n12, 342
García Oliver, Juan (minister of justice), 224, 225, 235, 236, 264n300, 343
García Prieto, Manuel (Liberal PM), 24, 33, 36, 37, 60
García-Valdecasas, Alfonso, 45, 67n21, 105, 111, 112, 115, 116, 117, 118, 121, 122, 127n47, 128n74, 128n75, 129n78, 129n79, 135n79, 343
Garrigues, Antonio, 105
Garrigues, Joaquín, 22
Gascón y Marín, José (professor), 53
General Military Academy (Toledo), 28
General Secretariat, 320, 330
Gibson, Ian, 6, 66n3, 73n122, 122, 124n15, 127n49, 127n52, 127n59, 127n62, 155, 244n64, 245n70, 247n123, 252n183, 255n218, 257n224, 258n232, 258n233, 304n11, 306n12, 343
Gil Pecharromán, Julio, 6
Gil Tirado, Vidal (Alicante prosecutor), 224, 225, 226, 233, 261n256, 261n262
Gil-Robles, José María, 21, 87, 88, 92, 136, 137, 143, 147, 163, 175, 176, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 186, 248n134, 248n136, 249n149, 252n194, 257n225, 343
Giménez Caballero, Ernesto (Gecé), 103, 104, 105, 106, 127n45, 127n52, 131, 155, 157, 160, 161, 162, 182, 183, 206, 243n53, 246n84, 246n85, 246n87, 246n90, 248n137, 248n138, 248n139, 266, 267, 268, 270, 272, 276, 279, 281, 304n4, 321, 332, 388n55, 340, 342, 343, 349
Gimeno Álvarez, Miguel Ángel, 6
Guipúzcoa, 269
Giral, José (PM, minister of foreign affairs), 45, 210, 213, 219, 257n226
Girona, Jorge (best friend), 25

Gisbert, Jesús (Jiménez de Asúa's police escort), 190
Glorious Revolution, 26
Gobierno de España (Government of Spain; prime minister and Council of Ministers), 188
Goded, Manuel (general), 1, 48, 200, 258n230, 327
Goicoechea, Antonio de, 25, 87, 113, 124n23, 143, 146, 191, 201, 203, 250n160, 343
Gomá, Isidro (Cardinal), 324
Gómez Rico, Gumersindo (telephone company executive), 54
González Peña, Ramón (Socialist), 179
González Vélez, Fernando (Political Board), 337n42
González-Ruano, César, 64, 74n138, 125n33, 344
Gracia y Justicia (satirical magazine)
Grado, Joaquín de (PCE leader), 143
Groizard Montero, Manuel, 142, 153, 241n32, 244n67
Guariglia, Raffaele (Italian ambassador), 105, 114
Güell y López, Juan Antonio (Marquess of Comillas, Count of Güell, Count of San Pedro de Ruiseñada), 32, 69n56, 72n103
Guitarte, Miguel, 131
Gutiérrez Santamarina, Luis (Luys Santa Marina), 130

Hedilla, Manuel, 183, 222, 241n31, 245n67, 247n114, 301, 302, 313n113, 313n114, 313n116, 314, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 336n7, 336n13, 343, 349, 350
Heraldo de Madrid, 64, 74n138, 158, 166, 245n78, 245n79, 339
Hernández, Jesús, 141
Hernández Pinteño, José (lawyer), 55
Herrera Oria, Ángel (newspaper director), 87, 88, 126n40
Herrero Tejedor, Fernando, 259
Hidalgo de Cisneros, Ignacio (minister of war), 148
Hojas Libres, 47
Hotel Pont Royal, 51
Hotel Ritz, Madrid, 58
Húsares de Pavía (regiment), 74
Húsares de la Princesa (regiment), 25, 64

Ilustre Colegio de Abogados de Madrid (Bar Association of Madrid—ICAM), 25
Infantry Academy, 176
Institute for Catalan Studies, 39
Institute for Social Reforms, 37
Instituto Cardenal Cisneros, 161
International Telephone and Telegraph Company (ITT), 53
Isidore the Laborer, 44
IV Organic Division, 149
Izquierda Republicana (Republican Left), 183

Jaraíz Franco, Pilar, 254n205
Jédula (estate), 28
Jiménez de Asúa, Luis (professor), 22, 45, 47, 61, 190
Junta de Defensa Nacional (National Defense Board), 211
Juntas Castellanas de Actuación Hispánica (Castilian Groups of Hispanic Action), 7
Juntas de Ofensiva Nacional Sindicalista (Councils of the National Syndicalist Offensive—JONS), 7, 140, 318
Just Gimeno, Julio (minister of development), 225
Juventudes de Acción Popular (Youth of Popular Action—JAP), 168
Juventudes Socialistas de España (Socialist Youth of Spain—JSE), 108
Juventudes Socialistas Unificadas (Unified Socialist Youth), 196

Keyserling, Hermann (German count), 161

La Ballena Alegre, 157, 239n6, 240n19, 268, 269, 304n10, 348, 349
La Barraca (theater group), 268, 269, 306
La Caoba (women involved with Primo de Rivera), 41, 45, 62
La Concha Club Náutico, 305
La Conquista del Estado (magazine and group), 7, 104, 311n94, 340
La Época (newspaper), 105, 228
La Gaceta (newspaper), 92, 97, 104, 246n102, 261n267, 311n93
La Gaceta Literaria (magazine), 104

La Modelo prison, 99, 109, 191, 195, 200, 204, 208, 219, 250n160, 325
La Nación (newspaper), 42, 46, 58, 61, 64, 73n126, 74n128, 74n132, 74n139, 76, 80, 81, 82, 84, 91, 97, 102, 110, 113, 123n2, 124n4, 124n6, 124n7, 124n10, 124n12, 124n18, 124n21, 124n24, 125n25, 125n35, 126n41, 127n57, 127n66, 129n82, 134, 138, 165, 190, 241n20, 265n313, 339
La Voz (newspaper), 45, 53, 186
Largo Caballero, Francisco, 40, 104, 179, 191, 197, 265n307, 344
Larios, Margarita “Margot” (Miguel Primo’s wife), 204, 253n205, 262n272, 319
Las Huelgas monastery, 324
Law for the Defense of the Republic, 86, 204
Law of Agrarian Reform, 212, 214
Law of Public Order, 204, 112
Ledesma Ramos, Ramiro, 7, 102, 103, 104, 106, 113, 117, 122, 126n42, 129n78, 129n80, 130, 133, 138, 139, 140, 144, 145, 146, 147, 149, 150, 152, 153, 154, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 227, 239n4, 240n10, 241n22, 241n34, 242n45, 242n49, 243n59, 266, 268, 272, 281, 290, 291, 292, 295, 299, 304n1, 304n9, 311n94, 312n111, 338n53, 340, 343, 344
Lequerica, José Félix de, 113, 126n38, 161, 241n34, 344
Lerroux, Alejandro (prime minister, PRR president), 79, 121, 147, 148, 175, 188
Ley de Fugas, 23
Liberal/Liberalism, 9, 10, 13, 20, 24, 30, 36, 38, 43, 57, 59, 62, 67n15, 78, 79, 80, 86, 93, 102, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 117, 119, 121, 135, 152, 154, 161, 221, 247n105, 267, 270, 271, 274, 277, 281, 285, 288, 296, 299, 305, 310n77, 344
Libertad (JCAH magazine), 104
Liga de Educación Política (Political Education League), 116
Linz, Juan José, 249n146
Lissarrague Novoa, Salvador, 105
López López, Luis (killed by firing squad), 238, 314
López Ochoa, Eduardo (general), 148
Lorenzo Pardo, Manuel, 258n230

Luca de Tena, Juan Ignacio (*ABC* director), 99, 109, 110, 127n55, 146, 182, 183, 248n138

Mac Orlan, Pierre (French novelist), 248n143
Machado brothers (Manuel and Antonio), 58, 74n127, 345, 347
Maciá, Antonio, 256n223, 261n262
Maciá, Francesc, 25
Maciá, José María (Alicante provincial leader), 257n223
Maestú, Ceferino, 334
Maeztu, Ramiro de, 84, 99, 161, 266, 269, 270, 276, 278, 279, 308n43, 345
Majorca, 44, 105, 130, 134, 221, 322
Mallol Alberola, José, 338n44, 345, 259n237, 313n118, 326
Maqueda, Dora (Women's Section), 141
Marañón, Gregorio, 18, 35, 47, 78, 166, 167, 212, 213, 214, 307n181
Maravall, Juan Antonio, 105
March on Rome, 105
March Ordinas, Juan, 105, 126n40, 183
Marichu de la Mora (María Santos Kant?), 57, 248n143, 269, 315, 335n4
Marín Vidal, Ana María (Groizard's wife), 241n32
Maroto y Pérez del Pulgar, Juan (Marquess of Pozoblanco), 53, 55
Marquess of Valdeiglesias, 77, 248n127, 350
Martín Alonso, Pablo (Army leader), 141
Martín Echevarría, Leandro (undersecretary of industry), 213, 217, 227, 259n237
Martín-Artajo, brothers, 21
Martínez Anido, Severiano (general), 31, 32, 39, 49, 50
Martínez Barrio, Diego (PM), 210, 212, 213, 229, 254n208, 258n232, 258n233, 259n237, 345
Martínez Campos, Arsenio (general), 27
Martínez de Bedoya, Javier (JONS), 153, 157, 158, 159, 245n76, 289, 310n89, 345
Martínez de Velasco, José (lawyer), 92
Maura, Antonio (PM), 21, 27, 52, 62
Merry del Val, Alfonso, 142

Milans del Bosch, Joaquín (general), 30, 31, 34, 49, 50
Milhombres (Big Man), 84
Military Order of Santiago, 55
Millán-Astray, José (general), 166
Millán-Astray, Pilar, 254n205, 345
Ministry of Defense, 259n232
Ministry of Education, 323
Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Italy), 114
Ministry of the Interior, 42, 96, 116, 148, 190, 322, 328
Ministry of War, 33, 46, 163, 235
Miquelarena, Jacinto (journalist, writer), 17, 131, 155, 157, 240, 245n74, 268, 345
Mira Iniesta, Ezequiel (killed by firing squad), 238, 314
Miralles brothers, 99
Mola, Emilio (general), 1, 200, 208, 209, 210, 258n230, 327
Montero Díaz, Santiago (JONS member), 138, 241n25, 346
Montero y Rodríguez de Trujillo, Matías, 131
Montes, Eugenio, 17, 128n76, 155, 268
Montes y Jovellar, Joaquín de, 127n47
Montjuic, 33
Moreno Osorio, José (CCHNE president), 124n13
Moreno y Herrera, Francisco (Marquess of Eliseda), 121
Moscardó, José (colonel), 176
Mourlane Michelena, Pedro, 155, 156, 184, 185, 268
Movimiento Español Sindicalista (Spanish Syndicalist Movement—MES), 83, 112, 125n36
Muñoz Grandes, Agustín (FET y de las JONS [Movement] general secretary), 327
Muñoz Navarro, Vicente (killed by firing squad), 288, 314
Muro, Jesús, 130, 314, 316, 332

National Catholic Association of Apostles of the Faith, 21
National Corporate Organization, 40

National Council (of the Falange), 146, 147, 148, 152, 154, 170, 177, 179, 244n62, 244n67, 269, 316, 321, 323, 324, 328, 329, 330
National Delegation/Delegate of Press and Propaganda, 320, 322
National Delegation/Delegate of Syndicates, 303
National Movement (Movimiento Nacional), 1, 41, 140, 301, 303, 333
National Propaganda Service, 320
National Radio of Spain (Radio Nacional de España), 302, 321
National Spain, 302, 314, 317, 318, 319, 320, 322, 323, 324
Nationalism/Nationalist, 11, 13, 38, 39, 78, 108, 277, 280, 281, 283, 291
Navarro de la Fuente, Santiago, 6
Navy, 26, 27, 33, 57, 71n101, 76, 80, 212, 213, 222, 255n221, 257n229, 330
Nazi Party, 91, 132
Negrín, Juan (prime minister), 45, 189, 236, 265n304, 302, 340
New Spain, 286, 320, 321, 334
Nonexistent, 10, 98
Nonexpert, 118
Nonmilitary, 27, 141
Nonprofessional, 5
Nonretroactive, 85
Nonstop, 17
Nosotros (left wing magazine), 46
Nouvilas, Ramón (general), 34

Obregón, Antonio de, 268
Olano, Juan José (SEU leader), 190
Olariaga, Luis de (professor), 24, 25
Old Castile, 314
Old Guard, 338n50
Orbaneja y Pérez de Grandallana, Inés (grandmother), 28
Orbegozo, Matilde (poet), 165
Orgaz Yoldi, Luis (general), 99, 200
Ortega, Alberto, 190, 192
Ortega Spottorno, Miguel (José Ortega y Gasset’s son), 268

Ortega y Gasset, José (professor), 20, 45, 47, 70n88, 71n90, 78, 104, 105, 116, 127n47, 127n48, 162, 192, 212, 213, 214, 266, 260, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 281, 284, 285, 288, 289, 290, 295, 304n3, 304n4, 304n5, 304n6, 304n8, 307n21, 307n22, 307n23, 307n24, 307n26, 304n27, 308n39, 308n40, 311n105, 342, 344, 346
Ossorio y Gallardo, Ángel, 53, 73n110, 86, 91, 219, 346

Pact of Biak-na-Bato, 27
Pact of San Sebastian, 79
Palazzo Venezia, 114, 115
Parador Nacional, 174
Parliament (the parliament), 89, 21, 24, 27, 29, 33, 37, 42, 46, 48, 58, 59, 75, 78, 79, 83, 85, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 97, 98, 99, 100, 102, 103, 105, 113, 115, 116, 121, 122, 123, 127n47, 132, 135, 136, 137, 139, 142, 144, 145, 146, 150, 152, 159, 160, 161, 169, 170, 171, 172, 174, 175, 176, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 187, 189, 191, 192, 195, 203, 205, 209, 213, 215, 220, 232, 233, 250, 252, 253, 255, 263n282, 272, 283, 297, 299, 309n48, 309n64, 319
Partido Comunista de España (Communist Party of Spain—PCE), 88, 176
Partido Económico de los Patronos Españoles (Economic Party of Spanish Employers), 182
Partido Nacionalista Español (Spanish Nationalist Party—PNE), 25
Partido Republicano Radical (Radical Republican Party—PRR), 121
Partido Sindicalista (Syndicalist Party), 295
Partito Nazionale Fascista (National Fascist Party—PNF; Italy), 7
Paseo de la Castellana, 153
Payne, Stanley G., 5, 66n2, 70n67, 71n99, 128n70, 129n86, 241n20, 241n25, 241n37, 242n52, 246n89, 246n96, 247n119, 248n126, 249n146, 250n157, 252n186, 258n230, 258n232, 313n112, 326, 337n36, 340, 346
Pedrazzi, Orazio (Italian ambassador), 198
Pedregal, Manuel (Provincial Court of Madrid magistrate), 192
Peláez, Luis (Falange member), 268
Peman, José María, 42, 58, 59, 67n15, 70n79, 74n124, 76, 98, 104, 121, 145, 340, 347
Pemartín Sanjuan, José, 32, 70, 75, 145, 237, 326, 327n39, 347

Peña Blanca (party), 25
Pérez de Ayala, Ramón, 45, 78
Pérez Farrás, Enrique, 198
Pestaña, Ángel (Syndicalist Party leader), 295
Pétain, Philippe (marshall), 51
Picasso Report (Expediente Picasso), 24
Pistolerismo, 22, 23, 31, 34, 40
Pita Romero, Leandro (lawyer), 92
Plaza de la Independencia, 129n79
Polo Martínez-Valdés, Ramona (Serrano Suñer's wife), 148
Ponce Alberca, Julio, 6
Ponte y Escartín, Galo, 90
Port of Alicante, 313n118
Portela Valladares, Manuel (PM), 175, 184
Pradera, Javier, 273, 276, 307n176
Pradera, Víctor (Carlist), 121, 161, 266, 276, 222
Prat de la Riba, Enrique (president of Catalonia), 281, 309n55, 350
president (of the Republic; head of the State), 11, 51, 75, 219, 297
Preston, Paul, 6, 243n56, 255n217, 258n236, 347
Prieto, Indalecio, 66n4, 104, 137, 142, 144, 145, 152, 189, 196, 197, 206, 213, 214, 219, 222, 224, 226, 236, 250n158, 255n211, 257n225, 257n226, 261n255, 261n266, 265, 308, 295, 302, 310n77, 312n105, 312n106, 313n112, 319, 322, 347
Prim, Juan (general), 26
prime minister (Council of Ministers president/head of government), 21, 23, 24, 33, 52, 57, 117, 121, 137, 147, 148, 175, 186, 187, 189, 192, 210, 213, 219, 236, 252n194, 254n208, 257n226
Primo de Rivera, Lola, 141
Primo de Rivera, María Jesús (Aunt Ma), 16, 204, 210, 235, 237, 242n53, 254n205, 265n315, 319, 326, 336n14
Primo de Rivera y Orbaneja, Fernando (uncle), 18
Primo de Rivera y Orbaneja, Miguel (father, Marquess of Estella, the General), 2, 8, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 34, 51, 66n5, 66n7, 66n8, 68n32, 68n39, 68n49, 69n63, 70n72, 70n73, 70n77, 71n91, 71n92, 71n98,

71n100, 72n106, 72n107, 72n109, 72n111, 72n114, 74n134, 106, 125n331, 324, 342, 344, 349
Primo de Rivera y Sáenz de Heredia, Carmen (sister), 17, 18, 51, 68n27, 204, 210, 235, 237, 253n205, 254n205, 265n311, 265n315, 319, 324, 326, 326n14, 347
Primo de Rivera y Sáenz de Heredia, Fernando (brother), 16, 17, 18, 19, 24, 27, 57, 67n23, 67n24, 68n27, 125n36, 181, 195, 199, 212, 219, 237, 268, 346
Primo de Rivera y Sáenz de Heredia Miguel (brother), 15, 17, 18, 21, 24, 51, 55, 57, 63, 64, 66n8, 68n27, 68n44, 99, 191, 204, 218, 219, 224, 226, 233, 234, 236, 237, 238, 248n139, 253n205, 254n208, 257n228, 259n238, 262n271, 262n272, 263n272, 264n286, 298
Primo de Rivera y Sáenz de Heredia, Pilar (sister), 18, 51, 68n27, 141, 142, 249n144, 317, 319, 320, 324, 331, 332, 336n14, 339, 347
Primo de Rivera y Sobremonte, Fernando (great-uncle, “Uncle Fernando”), 18, 26, 27, 28
Primo de Rivera y Urquijo, Miguel (nephew), 66n4, 66n8, 67n12, 74n136, 212, 242n50, 257n226, 257n227, 257n228, 257n230, 258n234, 308n42, 308n46, 308n65, 309n65, 309n88, 312n106, 346, 347
Prince of Asturias, 33
protectorate, 24, 29, 30, 210, 249n143
Provincial Court of Madrid, 192
Provisional Government (of the Second Spanish) Republic, 85, 92, 211, 259
Puebla de Almoradiel, 190
Puerta del Sol, 148, 186, 249n149
Puig i Cadafalch, Josep, 32
Pujol Martínez, Juan (*Informaciones* director), 105, 126n40

Quadra-Salcedo, Fernando de la (Falange member), 268
Queipo de Llano, Gonzalo (general), 63, 64, 74n136, 79, 222
Queipo de Llano, Rosario, 254n205

Rada, Pablo, 111
Rada, Ricardo, 130, 141, 153
Ravelló, Gabriel (German battleship plan participant), 223

Real Academia de Jurisprudencia y Legislación (Royal Academy of Jurisprudence and Legislation), 56
Real Club de la Puerta de hierro, 55, 137, 240n19
Redondo Ortega, Andrés, 314
Redondo Ortega, Onésimo, 7, 102, 104, 138, 140, 153, 154, 158, 159, 160, 185, 245n77, 246n82, 345, 350
Reformist, 4, 29, 36, 37, 96, 298
Regionalist League of Catalonia (Lliga Regionalista de Catalunya), 25, 31, 32, 214
Remunerations Board, 244n67
Renovación Española (Spanish Renewal; Alfonsist party), 8
Republican Constitution, 208, 267
Republicanism, 37, 38, 130, 147, 264n295, 340
Requeté(s) (Carlist), 8, 130, 208, 238, 241n31
Residencia de Estudiantes (Student Residence), 268
Restoration, 22, 27, 43, 71n95, 80, 121, 127n47, 188, 266
Revista de Occidente, 104, 346
Revolution of October 1934, 146
Revolutionary Committee, 79, 80, 81, 92, 219
Reyes, Anastasio de los (Civil Guard lieutenant), 195
Riaño Lanzarote, Antonio, 105
Rico, Juanita (*chíribi*), 141, 142
Ridruejo, Dionisio, 155, 161, 184, 184, 246n86, 248n143, 249n144, 268, 303, 306, 317, 320, 324, 326, 328, 334, 335n1, 337n31, 348
Right, the, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 18, 21, 25, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 47, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 74n131, 78, 79, 81, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 93, 95, 100, 101, 102, 103, 105, 107, 108, 109, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 119, 121, 123, 131, 132, 133, 135, 136, 137, 139, 140, 143, 144, 145, 146, 148, 152, 153, 160, 163, 164, 167, 168, 169, 171, 172, 174, 175, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 185, 186, 188, 189, 190, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 203, 205, 206, 208, 215, 217, 218, 219, 220, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 241, 20, 251n180, 252n182, 263n282, 280, 290, 291, 293, 297, 298, 301, 303, 307
Rincón de Arellano, Adolfo (lawyer), 25
Ríos, Fernando de los (minister of justice), 45, 105, 127n47, 128n74

Rodríguez de Viguri, Luis (minister of development), 62
Rodríguez Tarduchy, Emilio, 70n75, 130, 348
Romero Moreno, José Manuel, 6
Ros, Samuel, 131, 268, 304n10, 328, 338 N47
Rosales, Luis, 306n12
Royal Polo Club of Barcelona, 56
Royal Spanish Academy, 39
Royal Spanish American Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters, 29
Ruiz Alonso, Ramón, 116
Ruiz de Alda, Julio (Falange founder), 67n20, 111, 115, 117, 118, 121, 122, 123, 130, 131, 134, 136, 138, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 147, 148, 176, 180, 181, 182, 183, 185, 191, 198, 208, 219, 237, 242n53, 258
Ruiz Funes, Mariano (minister of agriculture/justice), 213, 224, 225
Ruiz Gallardón, Alberto, 142
Russian Revolution, 22, 177

Sáenz de Heredia, Antón (uncle), 19, 237
Sainz Nothnagel, José (Falange's territorial chief of New Castile), 130, 314
Sainz Rodríguez, Pedro, 87, 161, 323
Salazar, Alejandro (SEU head), 131, 174, 175, 176, 180, 181, 186, 188, 247n20, 344
Salazar, Victor (PSOE), 212
Salazar Alonso, Rafael, 147
Salvador Carreras, Amós (minister of the interior), 225
Salvador Merino, Gerardo (national delegate of syndicates), 303
Sampol Cortés, Francisco de Paula, 134
Sánchez Albornoz, Claudio, 172, 247n113, 349
Sánchez Guerra, José (Conservative), 33, 43, 55, 58, 59
Sánchez Mazas, Rafael (writer and leader of the Falange), 17, 20, 59, 103, 105, 106, 112, 114, 121, 130, 131, 138, 140, 146, 155, 157, 161, 164, 165, 173, 174, 177, 184, 237, 241n34, 245n75, 247n116, 248n143, 266, 268, 269, 275, 276, 280, 281, 289, 324
Sánchez Román, Felipe (professor), 22, 25, 45, 127n47, 195, 211, 212n10, 213, 222
Sánchez Vílchez, José Manuel, 91

Sanjurjada (attempted coup), 99, 102
Sanjurjo, José (general), 1, 32, 33, 34, 50, 58, 99, 174, 200, 202, 206, 208, 210, 378
Santeiro, José Ramón, 105
Santiago Dragoons (regiment), 24
Sanz Rozalén, Vicente
Saro, Leopoldo (general), 32
Sarrión, Manuel (clerk in Primo's), 209, 237
Saz, Ismael, 6, 126n41, 126n44, 128n67, 128n68, 128n69, 242n48, 242n49, 244n63, 246n95, 246n97, 252n191, 253n197, 308n41, 308n45, 309n53, 349
Sbert i Massanet, Antoni Maria, 21, 44, 45, 64, 70n84, 80, 149, 345
School of Agricultural Engineers (Madrid), 21
Sección Femenina (Women's Section), 18
Second Spanish Republic (the Republic), 18, 21, 83
Segunda Línea, 141, 302
Segura Baus, Luis (killed by firing squad), 238, 314
Segura, Pedro (Cardinal), 323
Senado (upper house), 24, 37, 97
Serna, Víctor de la, 155, 239n4, 268
Serna Navarro, Juan (general attorney), 224, 225, 261n255, 261n256
Serna Ortega, Teodorico (prison director), 218, 219, 227
Serrano Suñer, Ramón, 21, 22, 25, 57, 68n34, 68n35, 68n43, 73n125, 136, 137, 148, 191, 203, 219, 237, 240n11, 243n55, 254n208, 254n210, 257n225, 257n226, 257n230, 260n246, 317, 318, 319, 320, 328, 331, 336n15, 339, 343, 349
Sevillano Calero, Francisco, 6
Silió, César (minister of public instruction), 21
Silveira Armesto, Blanca (journalist), 25n34, 98
Sindicato Español Universitario (Spanish University Union—SEU), 130, 239n3, 348
Sironi, Edith (Giménez Caballero's wife), 104
Socialist/Socialism, 12, 13, 22, 29, 37, 40, 45, 79, 80, 87, 88, 95, 99, 104, 105, 108, 109, 110, 111, 117, 118, 119, 134, 135, 136, 137, 140, 141, 142, 144, 145, 147, 152, 170, 171, 175, 176, 177, 179, 189, 190, 192, 193,

194, 196, 197, 210, 211, 214, 232, 252n187, 261n266, 274, 284, 287, 293, 295, 311n105, 339, 347, 348
Solalinde, Antonio (guest lecturer in Buenos Aires), 46
somatén (a local paramilitary militia), 30, 39, 42
Soriano, Rodrigo (MP), 46
Spanish Legion, 129n78, 233
Spanish Postal Airlines, 209
Spanish Socialist Workers' Party (Partido Socialista Obrero Español—PSOE), 40
squadrismo, 103, 136
Statute of Autonomy of Catalonia, 22, 102, 151, 165
Supreme Council of War and Navy (Supreme Military Court), 27, 80
Supreme Court of Spain, 2, 221
Syndicalism/Syndicalist, 4, 10, 12, 25, 83, 93, 108, 169, 170, 171, 230, 263n282, 288, 291, 293, 295

Teatro Bretón, 165
Teatro de la Comedia, 45, 83, 116, 121, 122, 123, 131, 136, 270, 273
Telegraphen-Union (German publication), 105
Tellería Arrizabalaga, Juan (musician), 184, 268, 269
Third Carlist War, 27
Thyssen-Bornemisza Museum, 57
Torre, Quintín de la, 247
Tradicionalist Spanish Phalanx of the Councils of the National Syndicalist Offensive, 1, 18, 245n67
Tribunal Popular de Alicante (Popular Court of Alicante), 224

Unamuno, Miguel de, 20, 45, 46, 47, 50, 58, 71n92, 71n93, 71n95, 71n96, 154, 165, 166, 246n102, 246n104, 246n105, 266, 269, 270, 273, 276, 277, 279, 280, 296, 304, 308n40, 341, 344, 348, 350
Unión General de Trabajadores (General Union of Worker—UGT), 40
Unión Militar Española (Spanish military Union—UME), 174
Unión Monárquica Nacional (National Monarchist Union—UMN), 75
Unión Patriótica Española (Spanish Patriotic Union—UPE), 41, 98, 123n3, 124n6, 340

University of Deusto, 44
Urgoiti, Nicolás María de (newspaper editor), 45
Urzáiz, Mariano de, 57

Valdes Casas, Francisco (Republican civil governor), 219, 235
Valdés Guzmán, José, 128n74
Valdés Larrañaga, Manuel, 131, 208, 237, 252n185, 255n214, 258n230, 339, 350
Valverde, Alfredo, 6
Valldecabres, Emilio, 235, 259n237, 264, 294
Vallecas (district), 134
Valley of the Fallen (Valle de los Caídos), 303, 323, 331, 332
Varela, José Enrique (colonel/general/minister of the army), 99, 129n78, 327
Vázquez, Abraham, 105
Vázquez Vázquez, Antonio, 259n240
Verga Díaz, Francisco (doctor), 226
Vegas Latapié, Eugenio, 84, 87, 117, 121, 124 L, 17, 129n81, 129n84, 138, 161, 240n17, 241n27, 241n29, 351
Velasco Simarro, Nicolás (lieutenant colonel), 128n74
Ventosa Calvell, Juan, 214
Vigón, Jorge, 141
Villalba Riquelme, José (general), 63
Viñuales, Agustín (minister of finances), 213
Von Knobloch, Hans Joaquim, 222, 223, 329

Werner Bolín, Carmen, 237
Weyler, Valeriano (general), 27, 32, 33, 34n3
World Congress of the Communist International, 198

Yagüe, Juan (general), 327
Yecla, 190

Zambrano, María, 105

Zaragoza, Luis, 131
Zunzunegui, Juan Antonio, 268