

García Lorca: Fraud and endless history

García Lorca: Fraude e historia interminables

García Lorca: Fraude e história sem fim

José Antonio Fortes

Literature Lecturer, University of Granada (retired).
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6670-8402>
curvaalaizquierda@gmail.com

Abstract

More than two decades of research have resulted in the monumental work, at least in size, *Lorca: Another Look. Fraud and Legend*. A minimum of 38 schools, institutes, and preschools, nine of them in the province of Granada, including Fuente Vaqueros, bear Lorca's name. But... were we given the opportunity to know who he really was, or were we subjected to a mythologizing, beatification, and unconditional love, forced to read his books? Do they really know this man? Do they call themselves secularists or atheists, yet venerate those for whom they lack the information to truly evaluate him? Critical research, using the widest possible range of sources, allows us to understand much more than the official versions, which elevate consumer intellectuals to the status of myths.

Keywords: Literary Analysis, Literary Criticism, Federico García Lorca, García Lorca, Literary History, Literature, Contemporary Literature, Critical Thinking.

Resumen

Más de dos décadas de investigación dan lugar a la monumental, como mínimo, en tamaño, obra *Lorca: otra mirada. fraude y leyenda*. Un mínimo de 38 colegios, institutos y escuelas infantiles, nueve de ellos en la provincia de Granada, incluida Fuente Vaqueros, tienen el nombre de Lorca. Pero... ¿nos dieron la oportunidad de saber quién era realmente, o se nos impuso una mitificación, beatificación, y amor incondicional, obligándonos a leer sus libros? ¿Conocen realmente a este señor? ¿Se autodenominan laicos/as, ateos/as, pero veneran a quienes carecen de datos para evaluar realmente? La investigación crítica, y con el mayor número de fuentes, nos hace realmente entender mucho más allá de las versiones oficiales, que elevan a categoría de mitos a intelectuales de consumo.

Palabras clave: Análisis Literario, Crítica Literaria, Federico García Lorca, García Lorca, Historia Literaria, Literatura, Literatura Contemporánea, Pensamiento Crítico.

Resumo

Mais de duas décadas de investigação resultaram na obra monumental, pelo menos em tamanho, *Lorca: Um Novo Olhar. Fraude e Lenda*. No mínimo, 38 escolas, institutos e pré-escolas, nove deles na província de Granada, incluindo Fuente Vaqueros, têm o nome de Lorca. Mas... será que nos foi dada a oportunidade de conhecer quem ele realmente foi, ou fomos sujeitos a uma mitificação, beatificação e amor incondicional, obrigados a ler os seus livros? Será que conhecem realmente este homem? Será que se dizem secularistas ou ateus, mas veneram aqueles sobre os quais não possuem informação suficiente para o avaliar verdadeiramente? A investigação crítica, utilizando o mais vasto leque possível de fontes, permite-nos compreender muito mais do que as versões oficiais, que elevam os intelectuais de consumo ao estatuto de mitos.

Palavras-chave: Análise Literária, Crítica Literária, Federico García Lorca, García Lorca, História Literária, Literatura, Literatura Contemporânea, Pensamento Crítico.

Introduction

We know this. By mandate of its Organic Law (20 November 1878; 1889; Cánovas, Discursos en el Ateneo de Madrid, 10 November 1890), the Spanish National Army was legally constituted as the primary and ultimate defender of class interests -specifically, the interests of the ruling classes- since, in its own terms, “the armies shall for a long time, perhaps forever, remain a robust pillar of the present social order”; they would serve as that “invincible bulwark against the illegal temptations of the proletariat, which will achieve nothing but the useless spilling of its blood in unequal battles”...

And so, the Law of the National Army was carried out, through its direct intervention in Asturias (October 1934) under the command of General Franco. Likewise, our lawful generals fulfilled it, rallying under the cry of “Long live the Republic!” in their military response to the politically and socially revolutionary state of upheaval in Spain, with their bloody “assault on the State” following fraudulent general elections, orchestrated and carried out by the so-called Popular Front, which would in turn impose itself through illegal armed force across the national territory, using political and social unrest as the means to sustain and consolidate those events.

This was, then, an “extreme” and openly combative situation -one of blood and fire- with hundreds of killings in the streets, demanding the immediate and lawful intervention of the National Army through a decisive political and social coup, even if this still did not yet amount to a formal declaration of war. No, it did not, not yet. Impossible, according to its own legal framework and the obligations imposed upon it as the National Army, whose duties were explicit and unequivocal. Nothing more need be added. Among many other “circumstances,” there was also the decisive fact that military barracks throughout Spain suffered from a general shortage of war ammunition and supplies for war itself (as Blanco Escolá notes), a situation carefully monitored by what was then still called the Popular Front government of the Spanish State. Only the Army of Africa stood apart, being the sole force fully prepared for the inevitable and decreed national battles of war. All the more so given that military

legality had already collapsed in Madrid, while in Badajoz the illegal militias of Popular Frontism -no longer state or republican forces, but openly Stalinist ones- had entrenched themselves in suicidal resistance.

These were acts of “extreme violence” (to use General Mola’s words) during that first month -from July 18 to the end of August 1936- when a division of the National Army under General Franco reached Madrid and found it without a functioning government, already in the process of fleeing toward Valencia and Barcelona, while the city itself had effectively been handed over to the International Brigades under direct Stalinist command. At that point, what followed would indeed become a war, though even today it continues to be described as a “civil war.” But it was not that. It was a class war. A war in which “settling scores” and “blood vengeance” found unprecedented justification.

One such act of vengeance might be exemplified by what was referred to as “the murder of a child” (sic), which allegedly took place during the night and early morning of March 27, 1929, just after Holy Week had begun, and which FGL (Federico García Lorca) is said to have acknowledged through both word and deed, as he himself reportedly declared and implicated himself in speeches given on May 5 and 7 (FGL, Alhambra Palace, El Defensor de Granada). According to this account, the urgency of the situation forced Lorca to flee, accompanied by Fernando de los Ríos -who supposedly knew the facts well- embarking on his “magical” journey to New York and Cuba (1929–1930). There would be no turning back. On the contrary, he would later return “to his Granada,” though now fleeing from Popular Front violence and its crimes, seeking safety, refuge, peace, and even the protection of his “friends of always,” his “friends of the soul,” trusting in the public assurances with which he was welcomed -and awaited- on August 15, 1936, when FGL and “his Granada [were already prepared for their final and great] celebration.”

For “Granada was” entirely “a celebration,” one which Lorca joined three days before July 18, 1936; afterward, following the proclamation of the National Army, he remained under its protection and custody. In other words, he was complying with the new legal norms, which would become the laws of the National Army and later those of a New State, legitimized through victories both at the war front and in the daily life of a New Spain, a Spain to which Lorca was supposedly attaching himself at its very inception when he took refuge “in his Granada” on July 15, 1936.

This point should neither be forgotten nor confused: Lorca’s decisive flight from the Popular Front and from what the author calls the murderous social imperatives of “Red Terror” in Madrid. It was there that Lorca was afraid, and from there that he fled. That is the reality, the text argues, though no one wishes to acknowledge it, despite its long history. The facts, it claims, demonstrate as much. And this despite the absence of any direct daily confrontation with proletarian militias of whatever kind (socialist, communist, Stalinist, anarchist, and so on) who emerged from their “barracks” and “checas” in organized formations to regulate the very chaos they themselves had created in daily social life.

In such a world -one already defined by street violence, routine brutality, and even familial terror- what place could there possibly be for a “gentleman poet” dressed in the style of “El Piyayo” (sic), always

wearing high-heeled, “gypsy-style” shoes, with curled locks falling over his broad pale forehead, perpetually surrounded by “his entourages,” those equally “pale young boys,” forever “cheerful young admirers” devoted to “their poet,” applauding and cheering him at any hour and in any place (sic), utterly devoted to him... and to his money (of course; abundant and publicly known; sic; “public money” always flowing freely through his pockets)?

So, at least, we are told by Borges, Jorge Guillén and Pedro Salinas, Juan Ramón Jiménez, Arturo Cambours Ocampo, and others, long before -and even after- the newspaper *La Voz* (29 December 1934: 3) denounced such “public spectacles” involving Lorca during rehearsals for *Yerma*, spectacles that would later become the subject of increasingly crude and indulgent mockery, not only in *Gracia y Justicia* but also in *El Sol*, through the caricatures of Bagaría. Eventually, the author claims, Lorca was placed directly in the path of “Red Terror” by *Heraldo de Madrid* (18 July 1936), barely escaping for a few days the targeting allegedly decreed against him by the Popular Front in its wartime newspaper.

Yes, yes, and “thanks, thanks to divine providence...” because Lorca was already safe from the murderous Popular Front. Yes indeed, entirely safe, “in his Granada,” that Granada “which [already, yes] was a celebration.”

FGL’s sinecures and abundant streams of public money -dispensed with virtually no oversight or accountability- eventually came to an end. Yet all of it, the text argues, had its origins, rationale, and first principles “in his Granada,” during that accursed spring of 1929, when FGL was supposedly forced to flee Granada in great haste and, under the protection of Fernando de los Ríos, embarked on his journey to New York.

Upon returning in 1930, he remained in Madrid, lingering under the protection of Fernando de los Ríos. No longer merely through productions such as Mariana Pineda and its “tribute [financed by Don Fernando, then a distinguished minister] in *La Gaceta Literaria*,” but even more significantly after the proclamation of the Second Republic, when Fernando -acting in his ministerial capacity- allegedly granted, without public oversight, 100,000 pesetas to *La Barraca* in 1932, another 100,000 in 1933, and the same amount again in 1934, without any proper submission of receipts, accounting records, travel expenses, purchases, or related documentation. The text contrasts this with the rigor supposedly demanded of the Misiones Pedagógicas.

Thus, the total amounted to 300,000 pesetas -annual grants of 100,000 renewed without state oversight- at a time when, for example, a university professor of law in Granada in 1930 earned a base annual salary of only 6,000 pesetas, later doubled to 12,000 under the Second Republic. Nor, the author insists, should we overlook the “small detail” (FGL dixit) that the Ministry headed by Fernando allegedly purchased every orchestra and box-seat ticket for the premiere of *Blood Wedding* at the luxurious Teatro Fontalba -despite the production being, according to the text, a complete commercial failure throughout its run. And yet the newly acquired- and “well-paid”... “friends of the soul” forming what the author mockingly calls “the FGL Front Organisation” at the municipal Teatro Español still staged a grand “tribute” to him “in reparation” (sic), something that “Mr. Gibson & Co.”

allegedly falsify as though it represented the pinnacle of a non-existent “FGL exaltation and glory,” which, the author insists, never existed at all.

A long list of further grievances follows, abruptly summarized by Bagaría once Fernando de los Ríos had lost political influence and the Popular Front had turned against FGL. This, the author claims, is precisely what Bagaría conveyed in his interview with FGL published on the front page of *El Sol* (10 June 1936), in ways supposedly implicating the obsessive manipulation later carried out by the Lorca family, material the author says he rewrites in the second edition of his book, now definitively titled *García Lorca: Fraud and Legend* (Málaga, 2029).

So be it, then: the author declares his intention to produce a strict second edition of that 2024 book, naming events exactly as they were and exposing in even greater detail what he calls the falsehood of the FGL myth. Indeed, he claims this process may begin immediately. Readers are directed to the already cited issue of *El Sol*, featuring Bagaría’s illustration of FGL as a naked cherub with a flower emerging from his “ample backside” above tiny wings, fluttering over what appears to be Azaña depicted as a petty Catholic monarch in the corner. Within the published conversation, Bagaría allegedly inserted a stray phrase that FGL “never, never, never” wrote or uttered, but which was instead entirely Bagaría’s own invention, produced in the service of his political militancy. Through the authority and influence of Bagaría’s public persona, the author argues, malicious and overused statements were falsely attributed to Lorca concerning “his Granada,” reduced to the phrase utterly alien to Lorca himself: “a poor, cowardly city,” “a ‘land of the chavico’ where the worst bourgeoisie in Spain thrives.” Words, the text insists, that Lorca never pronounced nor wrote in any form whatsoever.

Rather, following the political downfall of Fernando de los Ríos amid what the author describes as the brutal and manipulated triumph of the Popular Front, persecution of FGL supposedly became open and explicit. With *El Sol* and Bagaría’s “betrayals,” the campaign to destroy Lorca was now underway.

Fear now came to Lorca, according to the text, through *Heraldo de Madrid* in preparation for its 18 July 1936 edition, by which point mockery of FGL had allegedly crystallized in the slogan “Monkey Child, Mama’s Pride” (Pol, 2021; Valenzuela, 2022). Thus, FGL fled Madrid; and by the time public denunciations were raised “in the public interest,” Lorca had already escaped the “Red Terror” of the Popular Front, fleeing without fear of anyone or anything except the infinite specter of that terrible 1929, which awaited him once more “in his Granada.”

For after Calvo Sotelo was assassinated in the street -treacherously and vilely gunned down (Cosío, 2023)- on July 13, Lorca immediately boarded the next available train from Atocha the following night, July 14, arriving in Granada at dawn on the 15th (Anderson, 2024). *El Defensor de Granada* reported this arrival under the direction of its editor and Lorca’s close “friend of the soul,” Constantino Ruiz Carnero, who consistently celebrated every public appearance by FGL. The text compares this to the earlier orchestrated praise surrounding Mariana Pineda in Granada and the tribute held at the Alhambra Palace on 5 May 1929, publicly promoted in *El Defensor de Granada* (7 May 1929), just as Lorca was urgently fleeing to New York and Cuba on what was presented as a “study trip.” Upon his

return, *El Defensor de Granada* again reported on him on 8 May 1930.

More than that, the author claims that Lorca accepted without protest the brutal imprisonment of Constantino Ruiz Carnero, who would eventually be executed by firing squad on 8 August (Vigueras, 2026). Meanwhile, Lorca supposedly continued enjoying the “celebration that was his Granada,” merely escaping the intense summer heat by frequenting roadside inns -such as the famous *Venta Eritaña*- as well as bars, cafés, and terraces, unconcerned by whoever might accompany him. According to the text, he lived without fear of anyone or anything.

This, we are reminded, was also the account given by Rodríguez Rampún, the municipal architect of Granada, who himself fled through the Vega countryside, across orchards toward nearby Santa Fe, then onward to Alhama and finally Málaga. Yet Lorca, from his family estate at Huerta de San Vicente, never once attempted such an escape route. It never even occurred to him, the text argues, because he felt safe and protected “in his Granada,” with no need to hide in the supposed home of Luis Rosales — a story dismissed here as a colossal fabrication invented by the Lorca family after their return from New York during the 1950s and 1960s, and one the author promises to examine in the forthcoming second edition of *García Lorca: Fraud and Legend* (2029).

Thus, Lorca did not flee, nor, the author insists, would he ever flee. Quite the opposite, as supposedly evidenced by the writings of his final “friend of the soul,” the “grown child” Eduardo Rodríguez Valdivieso, to whom Lorca dedicated at least portions of the *Six Letters to Eduardo Rodríguez Valdivieso*, later edited and prepared as a tribute by Juan de Loxa (*FGL Birthplace Museum*, 2013).

Nothing and no one disturbed Lorca “in his Granada.” There, the author claims, he understood himself to be a secure participant in the “National War” of the “New Spain.” Until, toward the end of August (specifically, the author proposes, on the evening and night of August 27, 1936, extending into the early morning hours) vengeance could finally be carried out by the family supposedly connected to the “original and miserable crime” of March 27, 1929. The author speculates that on that same date in 1936 the family fulfilled its revenge according to what is described as a sacrilegious Cuban ritual tied to the unforgettable foundational crime committed during Holy Wednesday of March 1929.

Everything else, the text concludes, has been forcibly falsified into “story & absurdum,” erased beneath the crude mythology invented by “FGL & family” beginning in 1951 and expanding throughout the 1960s and afterward. Meanwhile, Lorca’s body, according to this account, was allegedly returned to his father, Federico García Rodríguez, under documentation signed by both families and preserved privately. Readers are directed to Addenda 2 of the author’s 2024 research and critical study, as well as the volume projected for publication in 2029.

The state-sponsored commercial revival of *Yerma* during the Franco dictatorship in 1960 is presented as no coincidence, nor the fact that it became a staple of the Spanish repertory stage, performed by some of the most prominent actresses of National Catholic Spain (Higuera, 1999; Weitzner, 1962). As Canfora writes: “A linear history was written, without folds or contradictions, concealing everything that

disrupted the desired linearity. [...] For the sake of the necessary myth that had to be consolidated and carved into both collective and individual consciousness” (Canfora, 2013, p. 14). Likewise, a censorship report from 1951 states: “I assume its approval, since it has been decided not to obstruct Lorca’s productions.”

Indeed, the FICs (Censorship Information Files, or Individual Censorship Records) leave no room for doubt and emphatically classify Lorca’s “commercial premiere” in Madrid, December 1960, in highly favorable terms. Yerma marks the end of the period of autarkic censorship and opens the way to an expanding social marketplace and to mass cultural consumption. “FGL changed the lives of many Spaniards.”¹ So be it, then: the highest expression of its ideological dominance -both of class and of State- from which its FICs disseminated the harshest fake narratives surrounding Lorca.

With the illogical logic of The Maltese Falcon.

There was, in fact, normality and free circulation of the ideological commodity known as Lorca in Spain during the 1940s. We have focused, however, on editorial production and on the chain of transmission and propaganda operated by the ideological apparatuses of class and State, even when these remained in the hands of the Falangist censorship FICs unified under the Sindicato Español Universitario (SEU) and certain of its comrades from what Morente (2018) calls “triumphant fascism.”

This was a situation of ideological dominance -running parallel to the world of the copla song tradition- in which we find yet another piece of evidence concerning FGL that has been knowingly erased: namely, that theatrical performances constituted a fundamental component of that same propagandistic chain, diversifying within its own public framework while reaching the very same social buyers and consumers, whether readers or theatergoers.

What emerged was a convergence and diversification of readers and spectators within the theater itself. And Lorca remained always -Present! (Spanish fascist salutation related to Franco)- in spaces of representation and socialization controlled organically by the Falange and the SEU, within their “perfect architecture” of propaganda and ideological production apparatuses, conceived as instruments of combat and victory (even amid internal struggles and eventual defeat following the Unification process beginning in April 1937).

Thus the Falange and the SEU -“only the SEU is an organization [sic] capable of producing theater”- developed through the TEUs (Spanish University Theater) of Madrid and of each provincial district. Hence, for example: “Comrade Camilo José Cela, Secretary of the National Delegation of P. [Press]

¹ The national-popular FGL cause ultimately reaches its culmination through the FICs and their “admiring Lorquistas” in the sacralization of Lorca — in his transformation from commodity into fetish: Lorca fetishism (Fortes, 2024, Addenda 3). Let the following slogan stand here as evidence, the very phrase with which *El País* publicized the anomaly (sic) of publishing FGL’s Complete Works in fragmented, “fractalized” form. For the occasion, the newspaper celebrated their regrouping into thematic volumes through Galaxia Gutenberg/Círculo de Lectores, while strategically allowing the FIC responsible for the entire enterprise — business and ideology alike — to speak “on the eve of the year dedicated to the centenary of FGL,” in 1997. And thus, in the ideological MADOC of *El País*: “the critic [García Posada, who ‘edits the writer’s work’] spared no praise for Lorca, whose ‘truth of earth and blood and desire has been translated into many languages of the world’ [urbi et orbi]” (*El País*, 20 December 1997). Indeed, amid irrationalisms of this kind, we now understand perfectly well how “FGL has changed the lives of many Spaniards”; that is to say: “FGL and the formation of the national spirit,” reformulated today under titles such as: “FGL in

P. [Propaganda] P. [Publications] for the Madrid University District, introduced *The Youthful Deeds of El Cid* [performed by the Valencia University Theater] at the Teatro Español [sic] on the night of the 1st [of 1941]" (Haz, no. 9 [7 January 1941]: 11).

Together with Tomás Borrás, this effort formed part of the state-funded organization of the National Theater -"at the service of the people's culture" and dedicated to the "dignification [sic] of the Spanish stage," to "opening a worthy and clean stage"- under the direction of Comrade Luis Escobar.²

Already in *La Hora* (1948–1950), and likewise in the Art Theaters, Chamber and Experimental Theaters, and even the TAG (Teatro de Agitación Social, directed by Alfonso Sastre); in the Studio Theaters and Experimental Theater groups, including those in Barcelona, there were groups of *seuistas* -Spanish fascists affiliated with the SEU- committed to "cleansing and dignifying the stage" through productions of Lorca or through staged readings, "devoutly and excellently performed" before a "dense and numerous audience" that "applauded with satisfaction and fervor [sic] at the close of every act and during a particularly successful curtain call of [...]" and so forth. Such was the atmosphere surrounding the single performance -meaning a one-night-only staging, with "many left outside"- of *The House of Bernarda Alba* in Madrid on March 20, 1950, when "*La Carátula*" premiered *The House of Bernarda Alba* in Madrid and in Spain [sic]. "We already knew of its success in London and of its lesser triumph in Paris [sic]." At the same time, "Madrid's critics -with the exception of Casas Acevedo, who quickly commented on it in *El Alcázar*- have practically ignored this premiere" (*Correo Literario*, no. 1 [1 June 1950]: 11).³

Information published in *Correo Literario* allows us to uncover the legend constructed ad hoc -and riddled with glaring contradictions- by one of those former *seuistas* (Spanish fascist union SEU members) who, writing in *Ínsula* as late as 1986, invents an ahistorical and parallel reality to be added to the theological summa of the Lorca *uchronia*. The figure in question is J. M^a. de Quinto who, together with José Gordón, directed the Teatro de Ensayo *La Carátula* during "the memorable session" of "a single night," namely the performance of *The House of Bernarda Alba* in "a venue" / "the beautiful hall" / "the theater of the Parque Móvil de Ministerios, where the great dignitaries of the Francoist bureaucracy kept their official vehicles" (Fortes, 2024).

Although his essay "On the True Premiere in Spain [sic] of *The House of Bernarda Alba*" (*Ínsula*, 476–

the Construction of Spanish Collective Identity" (Vilches de Frutos, 2008).

² Comrade Luis Escobar was appointed director of the Falange Theater in 1937, under the General Directorate of Press and Propaganda, headed by Ridruejo. In 1940, he was appointed director of the National Theater, under the General Directorate of Fine Arts, within the Ministry of National Education. In March 1940, he was also appointed General Commissioner of Theaters, with the creation of the National Board of Theaters and Concerts, whose jurisdiction would extend to the limits of that assigned to the Department of Theater, Music, and Dance, under the General Directorate of Propaganda of the Ministry of the Interior. Our comrade also experienced his turn in the process of de-Francoization (as we know, the period between 1960 and 1968).

³ First, it is important to recall the imperative of "the dignification of the Spanish stage," demands that FGL was already proclaiming against "the bourgeoisie and the middle class [who] have prostituted our theater, [and] will know how to rectify" (*Heraldo de Madrid*, April 14, 1934: 4; interview by Miguel Pérez Ferrero). And now, from Haz (9; January 7, 1941: 11), let us consider this press release about "A Cycle of New Art at the Lope de Vega Institute Theater. // The youth theater organization Arte Nuevo, directed by José Gordón, proposes to hold a new cycle of performances at the Lope de Vega Institute theater. They will begin with Azorín's trilogy "The Invisible" and will also present works by Ramón Gómez de la Serna, "Staircase," a drama in three acts, and by García Lorca, "When Five Years Pass" [sic]. The premiere program also includes other productions by Gordón, Medardo Fraile, Alfonso Sastre, Pérez Valiente, Julio Angulo, García Luengo and several other authors» (*ABC*, October 31, 1947, 15)

477, July–August 1986: 8 and 26; Fortes, 2024) indulges in ironic gestures and distortions that ultimately demonstrate, ad absurdum, the exact opposite of what he claims to remember and affirm. That is to say, the written facts rebel against his own writing. All the more so because there exists no documentary record whatsoever of any request for performance authorization -not even for “a single night”- submitted by De Quinto or Gordón. And precisely this absence appears in the very file where none of the FIC pseudo-researchers ever thought to look, largely because they are little or not at all accustomed to genuine historical research into censorship: namely, File 193/43, where the successive applications for staging authorization of the work in question, *The House of Bernarda Alba*, were officially “archived.”⁴

Thus, File 193/43 -opened by the “Vice-Secretariat for Popular Education / National Delegation of Propaganda / Theater Department / Performance Censorship Board”- originated precisely from a direct request submitted by the Secretary of the Entertainment Syndicate, Tomás Borrás. Yes: the Secretary of the Falangist Entertainment Syndicate, acting in the normal and logical exercise of his theatrical and union functions, signed and submitted a request -one that had to be submitted, sine qua non- for permission to stage *The House of Bernarda Alba* “during this season” and “at the Lara Theater.” The application is dated “11 September 1943,” and the resulting decision (“Outgoing no. 4311 / 24-11-43”) issued by the “Theatrical Censorship Guide” was simply: “prohibited for reasons of an ethical nature.” Sic. And it was not signed by any “Reverend,” nor by any “friend and chaplain // Fray Mauricio de Begoña” (chaplains who would not appear until after the 1945–49 conjuncture; and in this particular case the relevant date would have been “5 January 1949,” where such a signature would necessarily have appeared, had it existed, etc.); nor was it signed by “the National Delegate of Propaganda,” Comrade David Jato [sic]. Rather, the corresponding heading and signature space were organically subscribed “P.D. / The National Secretary” (with an illegible signature) and, additionally -in prior and mandatory form, sine qua non- by “The Head of the Cinematography and Theater Sectio”⁵».

That is to say: here we are operating within the organizational structure of a Falange in the process of Unification (even though Nazism formally surrendered in May 1945), together with its hierarchy of commands and leadership positions. And insofar as our subject is concerned, we find in play the “National Delegate of Propaganda,” the “National Secretary,” and the corresponding “Chief” responsible for propaganda and censorship, as well as the “Secretary of the Entertainment Syndicate,” whose request initiates the Censorship File in which the successive applications for

(Fortes, 2024).

⁴ Here is yet another derived and appended story within the endless Lorca story: the one constructed by Gordón when he “recalls” that “the theatrical censorship permit was granted to us by Don Agustín de Lucas, provincial delegate [sic] of the Vice-Secretariat for Popular Education.” Supposedly, then, authorization was granted through an anomalous function of the “provincial delegation” of the Vice-Secretariat for Popular Education — an institution that possessed absolutely no such authority. Thus, through what can only be described as deliberate ignorance, Gordón effectively shatters the entire administrative and state organizational structure, one which he in fact knew perfectly well. Then there is his “swap deal” with Pérez Serrabona, equally childish in tone, to the point of treating us as fools (Fortes, 2024).

⁵ Of course, I should remind our FIC pseudo-researchers of an unresolved issue that continues to raise serious questions. Namely: the typed copy of *The House of Bernarda Alba* that Tomás Borrás was required to submit for censorship review. Which version exactly are we dealing with? When and how did such a copy reach his hands and enter his sphere of authority within the central administrative hierarchies of both the Falange and the State — hierarchies in whose internal “Unification” struggles Tomás Borrás was steadily losing influence, to the point that he would not become part of the National Board of Theaters and Concerts, “created” on 13 March 1940 — and so on (Fortes, 2024).

staging The House of Bernarda Alba would later be archived. All of them were good comrades of Gordón and De Quinto, serving within whichever Secretariat / Vice-Secretariat / Delegation / Department / Syndicate still corresponded to them inside the hegemonic chain of command and governance of a Falange being unified with the “National Traditionalists” within the structures of the new autarkic State. That is what eventually made it possible for them to gain access to the Parque Móvil de Ministerios -not in 1943, no, but certainly by 1950- because by then everything already lay in the hands of the traitors (those unified traditionalists; and now, yes indeed), the “great dignitaries of the Francoist bureaucracy.”

Let us read File 193/43. There we find “archived” all the relevant applications concerning performances of The House of Bernarda Alba by “theatrical companies”; that is to say, by “commercial theater companies” (for example, the Teatro Goya, January 1964; Gama Declamación F.E.S.T.A., 14 May 1966; etc.). This status -that of theatrical commerce and business- distinguishes them from “Chamber Theater / Experimental Theater groups” and the like, which were integrated into the political and union organs of the State and Party, and had not yet entered the sphere of theatrical commerce and business proper. More importantly still: if the “group” was based in Madrid, or intended to “perform” in Madrid, within theater weeks organized by the SEU or within the programming of the National Theater (etc.), it did not submit any application for authorization -and this was not the exception but the established and generalized norm- due to the proximity of the State’s governing hierarchies and the central apparatuses of the Falange and the SEU, whose leaders oversaw those events and their “performances.” These, in turn, adhered to the established norm applied to all Chamber / Experimental Theater performances: namely, that they “would possess a restricted character, meaning they would take place in a single chamber session intended for a minority audience.”

Yet our knowledge of these terms and principles exists only insofar as they were explicitly recorded in provincial applications submitted to Delegations of the Ministries, Civil Governments, National Delegations of Propaganda, Popular Education, Information and Tourism, and so forth. Consequently, the only censorship applications actually submitted -and therefore archived- were those of provincial “groups,” such as, for example, the Zaragoza company “La Tertulia Teatral,” which addressed its petition to the Civil Governor, “His Excellency Don Juan Junquera y F. Carvajal,” who in turn forwarded it to the Director General of Cinematography and Theater, Joaquín Argamasilla. And thus the same recurring pattern reappears: once permission had been requested, “the members of the group never again pursued any further action” regarding the staging itself. Likewise with the “Chamber Theater Group ‘El Paraíso’ of Valencia,” which requested and obtained authorization to perform The House of Bernarda Alba, but which “has not to date [26 May 1953] submitted to this Civil Government the certification of its founding charter nor the remaining documents required for registration in the Associations Registry, nor has it submitted for approval before this Civil Government the proposed composition of its Executive Committee”; and so forth.

Thus, once we arrive in Madrid and with De Quinto, the supposed “waiting” they allegedly staged for the Director General of Theater becomes grotesque; equally grotesque is this supposed “Director General of Theater” who supposedly “used the intermissions to inform the critics [from the newspapers’ theater sections] that the premiere was to be silenced.” Equally ghostlike and crude is the alleged “prohibition” before, during, and after the performance had already taken place, when in reality it was precisely the Press and Propaganda organs of the “Movement Press Chain” that extensively covered the premiere, as demonstrated by Juventud, Pueblo, El Alcázar, España, Índice de Artes y Letras, and even ABC, carrying the signature of the ever-loyal Marquerie, immediately on March 21 and 22.⁶

Even the FICs devoted to Lorca journalism compile a kind of inventory of staged readings and performances within this unified Falangist chain of transmission -the theatrical SEU in Madrid, Barcelona, and the provinces. These notices are taken from newspapers- specifically Destino, the National Syndicalist Press and Propaganda organ under the command and direction of the faction known as “the Catalans of Burgos”, and not from the “national” censorship apparatus itself, where the absence of applications for staged readings or performances shines conspicuously through its very emptiness.

In Barcelona, for example, we find the chain of Studio / Experimental / Rehearsal Theaters and their “single-performance events” -“one-session only,” “authorized” by “the Civil Governor and Government Delegate”- entrusted to “amateurs,” “little theater groups,” staged in “small-capacity halls,” diverse spaces far removed from profitable “commercial venues,” and moreover intended for one night only: whether The Puppet Play of Don Cristóbal (20 November 1946), Blood Wedding (18 December 1946), Yerma (26 May 1947), featuring former actresses from the Club Anfistora, itself a meeting place for the central elites of Republican modernity and a site of domestic experimentation for their private theater, which they called Art Theater, etc., some of whose productions were later transferred into the shared public sphere of the Teatro Español, a municipal and publicly subsidized theater... or The House of Bernarda Alba (13 March 1948), or any other work. Our Lorca would become magic and fairy tale, Hogwarts-like story and legend for such a postwar period “under [old] fascism.”⁷

Red Harvest

The Lorca legend. That is what matters to them, and what they systematically de-research. The legend, together with its ghostly Lorca wandering across the stages of the SEU and its various offshoots in the capital of the State and throughout the provinces. Yet these are facts, verifiable facts

⁶ In the report on the premiere published by Índice de Artes y Letras (28 April 1950, p. 16), the real situation of Lorca in Spain is once again openly flaunted — with absolutely no censorship whatsoever; sic. That is: “The work, excellent, does not require us to describe it in detail, since it is already more than sufficiently familiar to our readers through the Argentine editions [sic]... The audience, crowded tightly into the hall, applauded with satisfaction and fervor [sic] at the end of every act and during Antonio Herrero’s highly successful curtain call. The curtain was raised many times at the end of the performance in response to the repeated applause of those in attendance, especially intense at the moment when the actors left the stage empty as a tribute to the poet” (Fortes, 2024).

⁷ As advertised in its printed playbill, the “Experimental Theater / (247 seats) / will inaugurate its evenings of artistic performance with / 3 subscription sessions / during which the tragic poem in three acts and six scenes Yerma by Federico García Lorca will be performed // In these sessions, which will take place on the 26th, 28th, and 30th of May of the current year,

within the investigation of the mandatory censorship apparatus, and facts that can even be demonstrated in order to expose the double game imposed by the Lorca family. Indeed, it evades responsibility and maintains silence regarding the Falangist machinery that glorified Lorca, whatever the particular transmission chain or propaganda outlet involved, while simultaneously tightening its control over copyright and securing immediate agreements with whichever theatrical company happened to be operating at the time, receiving payment and exercising control over the commercial business of Lorca “performances,” all under the supervision and protection of its legal agent “in Spain,” the attorney Pérez Serrabona.⁸

Thus, at the very height of the political and ideological dominance of our triumphant autarkic fascism, we find the necessary State “authorization” to “perform” Blood Wedding “in Madrid and the provinces” by the “Carmen Muñoz Gar [sic] theatrical company,” according to the application submitted to the Vice-Secretariat [Subsecretariat] of Popular Education / National Delegation of Propaganda / Directorate General of Cinematography and Theater / Department [Section] of Theater / Performance Censorship Board, dated 7 September 1948.

Let us read the censorship process and its resolution: “AUTHORIZED” — these Blood Wedding performances (File 450/48).⁹

The first reader/censor assigned in the ordinary course of duty, Adolfo Carril, established the “Possibility of its performance” as follows: “apart from whatever general regulations may exist concerning the author [sic], I consider that the work may be authorized with the deletions indicated, subject to approval after the dress rehearsal” (9 September 1948).

The second reading and censorship review was carried out by Gumersindo Montes Agudo, who openly defended FGL: “We believe it is already time for Lorca’s theater, of universal projection [sic], to be authorized in Spain [...]”; and he concluded his report with the laconic judgment: “authorize” (18 September 1948).

The third reader and censor on duty, Francisco Ortiz Muñoz, ratified the “second reading by Montes” (15 September 1948) and signed as “Head of the Section.” Yet here he awkwardly hints at opposition, though without daring to state it openly (despite being fully capable of doing so, given his position and institutional authority). Instead, he attempts to impose his opinion without the detailed report or formal assessment required of him -both mandatory procedures- resorting instead to the clumsy subterfuge of sheltering behind another Ministry and another “Directorate General,” in this case that of “Security” (sic). Through these irregularities he attempts to leave the staging of Blood Wedding “suspended”:

the role of Yerma will be brought to the stage by / Ana Mariscal / followed by the following cast [...]” (Fortes, 2024).

⁸ José Manuel Pérez Serrabona is the officially designated “representative in Spain” for the “author: Federico García Lorca”; and not because this appears in the self-serving recollections of Gordón and De Quinto, but because it is certified by the State document formalizing the censorship request submitted on 8 May 1951 (for example) for the performance of *The Shoemaker’s Prodigious Wife* at Barcelona’s Teatro Poliorama, in a “single session” scheduled to take place on “18 May 1951”, although this itself constitutes an obvious error (Fortes, 2024).

⁹ Let us consult File No. 450/48, where the applications and corresponding censorship resolutions are archived, all of which ultimately conclude with the decision to AUTHORIZE Blood Wedding (Fortes, 2024).

"I suppose [sic] its authorization /// Restricted to persons over 18 years of age // Deletions: [none specified]. // Processing of this Work remains suspended because the author has been vetoed by the Directorate General of Security."

A perfect oxymoron of a non-report masquerading as censorship, feeding our legend of fake news: "Processing of this Work remains suspended because the author has been vetoed by the Directorate General of Security." Yet in reality the higher-ranking authority -the Director General himself- had already rendered such jealous objections obsolete from the very beginning. Exercising his executive authority as Chief, he signed the work's actual "authorization" (which was nothing "supposed" at all, but quite the opposite) on that very same day, 20 September 1948, when the definitive resolution authorizing Blood Wedding was formally issued. Consequently, the fourth reader/censor on duty, José María Ortiz (then rising meritoriously toward the rank of Section Chief), merely bureaucratized an authorization already granted, since the final resolution had been issued and dispatched two days earlier: "this Directorate General has resolved to AUTHORIZE Blood Wedding, to be performed by the Carmen Muñoz Gar company" (20 September 1948) (Fortes, 2024).

Yet File 450/48 -"AUTHORIZE Blood Wedding"- possesses even greater significance, because it reveals the degree of irrationality to which the ghostly Lorca mythology dares to descend in its fake news narratives, with its arrogant contempt for history and for documented facts. Such attitudes dominate the discourse of our ethnologists (never true Hispanists), in their endless search, scavenging, and harvesting of whatever residues and distortions may serve their own Lorca-style Red Harvest.¹⁰

The crude paraphernalia of this particular ethnologist never advances beyond the framework of the General Secondary Education Law (1953). Those are the parameters within which he operates, inside the uchronia of the very Autos-da-fé he constructs for himself, reversing words and things, facts and history alike. What emerges is a construct -a kind of breviary- of notions and opinions, each more unreal and inquisitorial than the last.

A falsetto song -his Farewell to Eternal Spain- which moreover carries the arrogance of never publishing a single one of the alleged "censorship documents" he repeatedly invokes. When in fact he has clearly never even had File 450/48 before him, since one is required to identify such files by their original assigned number, not by later administrative classifications (AGA storage box, archive warehouse number, file bundle numbering, etc.). Thus, he simply never read File 450/48. Otherwise he would have encountered the verifiable "Censorship Guide" which, through its corresponding form and "special conditions ['established on the reverse side']," was explicitly addressed to the "Director of the Company"; namely:

¹⁰ Nevertheless, we do have Olga Glondys's *The Cultural Cold War and the Spanish Republican Exile* (Madrid, CSIC, 2012). Here, at least, we find an exception — one that breaks with the dominance of that ethnological approach (as opposed to genuine Hispanism) and with its network of clientelist agents (our university-office bureaucrats; such as the ingenious author of the foreword to the book I cite) (Fortes, 2024).

“Having examined the application submitted by Mr. Eduardo Muñoz, dated 7 September 1948 // Considering [...] This Directorate General has resolved to AUTHORIZE the work entitled BLOOD WEDDING, original by Federico García Lorca [...] to be performed by the Carmen Muñoz Gar company under the conditions established on the reverse side. // This is communicated to you for your information and corresponding purposes. // Madrid, 20 September 1948 // The Director General / [signed].”

Consequently, not a single one of his invented assertions -“a severe treatment,” a “repeated and tiresome motive for rejection,” “it was badly received that [FGL] dealt exclusively with female sexuality. For many censors this was the ultimate excess,” “a sacrilege,” “Resolution: prohibited for reasons of an ethical nature,” and so forth- appears anywhere in the original file from 11 September 1943, addressed to Tomás Borrás concerning the premiere “during this season” by the “enterprise or company” of Madrid’s Teatro Lara. That file does, however, include the letter (bearing the El Mensajero Seráfico letterhead; 5 January 1949) from Fray Mauricio de Begoña, addressed (“Yours faithfully, friend and chaplain”) to the then “Head of the Service,” José María Ortiz.¹¹

References

- Anderson, A. A. (2024). Nueva luz sobre la temprana historia textual de *La casa de Bernarda Alba* (1936-1945). *Creneida*, 12, 482-506. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=9883057>
- Bagaria. (June 10, 1936). Federico García Lorca habla sobre la riqueza poética y vital mayor de España. Reivindicación intelectual del toreo. Las diferencias del canto gitano y del flamenco. El arte por el arte y el arte por el pueblo. *El Sol*. <https://apequevedo.es/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/Bagaria-entrevista-a-Lorca-El-Sol-Madrid-1917-10-6-1936-p.5.pdf>
- Canfora, L. (2013). *La historia falsa y otros escritos*. Capitán Swing Libros.
- Cánovas, A. (1890). *Discurso pronunciado por Antonio Cánovas del Castillo el día de noviembre de 1890 en el Ateneo Científico y Literario de Madrid*. Imprenta y Fundición de M. Tello. <https://www.bibliotecadigitaldeandalucia.es/catalogo/es/consulta/registro.do?id=8277>
- Cosio, S. (May 21, 2023). El asesinato de Calvo Sotelo y el mito de las dos Españas. *Ctxt*. <https://ctxt.es/es/20230501/Multimedia/42975/Silvia-Cosio-Punto-Ciego-podcast-semana-tragica-barcelona.htm>
- Dictamen y Guía de censura. (1951). Expediente n.º 158/51. Informe. Madrid, 22 de Mayo de 1951.

¹¹ It is impossible to ignore this absurdity, this assault on reason, written in the future perfect tense with premeditation and malice aforethought: “Therefore, both *Blood Wedding* and *The House of Bernarda Alba* represent a model anticipation of the great dissent of 1936, whose outcome is prophetically foreseen [sic]: although ‘neutral observers’ (the woodcutters) testify at the end of the play to the legitimacy of the revolt, the power of traditionalism is still so strong that rebelling against it means paying with blood. This applies to one of the protagonists of the drama, Leonardo, the only one who bears a real name [sic], and it will also be the case three years later for the same poet” (Neuschäfer, *Farewell to Eternal Spain. The Dialectic of Censorship. Novel, Theater and Cinema under Francoism*, Barcelona: Anthropos, 1994; Emilio Lledó, “Farewell to Eternal Spain”, *El País Babelia*, March 30, 1996, 15) (Fortes, 2024).

- Fortes, J. A. (2024). *Lorca: otra mirada. Fraude y leyenda*. Atopía Editorial.
- García, F. (2013). *Seis cartas a Eduardo Rodríguez Valdivieso*. Patronato Cultural Federico García Lorca.
- Glondys, O. (2012). *La Guerra Fría cultural y el exilio republicano español. Cuadernos del Congreso por la Libertad de la Cultura (1953-1965)*. Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC).
- Higuera, L. F. (1999). El primer estreno comercial de García Lorca en la posguerra española ("Yerma", Teatro Eslava, 1960). *Anales de la literatura española contemporánea, ALEC*, 24(3), 571-59.
- Ley de 26 de febrero de 1953 sobre Ordenación de la Enseñanza Media. *BOE*, 58, 1119-1130.
<https://www.boe.es/datos/pdfs/BOE//1953/058/A01119-01130.pdf>
- Morente, F. (2018). El Sindicato Español Universitario. Estudiantes fascistas, el ejemplo italiano y la lucha contra la democracia en España (1931-1936). *Spagna contemporanea*, 53, 41-62.
<https://www.spagnacontemporanea.it/index.php/spacon/article/view/115>
- Neuschäfer, H.-J. (1994). *Adiós a la España eterna. La dialéctica de la censura: novela, teatro y cine bajo el franquismo*. Anthropos.
- Pol, B. (February 11, 2021). *El verdadero Federico García Lorca*. El Buscador.
<https://www.periodicoelbuscador.com/opinion/author/el-verdadero-federico-garcia-lorca/20210211174740016613.html>
- Valenzuela, A. (January 11, 2022). La última caricatura de García Lorca, el humor que antecedió a la tragedia. *La Razón*.
<https://www.larazon.es/andalucia/20220111/yowprjm7a5f5hfhbarg4rxzjya.html>
- Vigueras, P. (March 8, 2026). 'Constantino Ruiz Carnero, un periodista asesinado por buscar la verdad y ser valiente para contarla (II)'. *El Independiente de Granada*.
<https://www.elindependientedegranada.es/ciudadania/constantino-ruiz-carnero-periodista-asesinado-buscar-verdad-ser-valiente-contarla-ii>
- Vilches, M. F. (2008). El teatro de Federico García Lorca en la construcción de la identidad colectiva española (1936-1986). *Anales de la Literatura Española Contemporánea*, 33(2), 65-110.
<http://hdl.handle.net/10261/66043>
- Villena, M. A. (December 20, 1997). García Posada dice que Lorca ha cambiado la vida de muchos españoles. *El País*. https://elpais.com/diario/1997/12/20/cultura/882572407_850215.html
- Weitzner, T. (September 9, 1962). García Lorca's: His Plays Are Being Revived in Spain. *The New*

York Times. <https://archive.nytimes.com/www.nytimes.com/books/99/09/12/specials/lorca-revived.html>