Manuscript version: Author’s Accepted Manuscript
The version presented in WRAP is the author’s accepted manuscript and may differ from the published version or Version of Record.

Persistent WRAP URL:
http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/109730

How to cite:
Please refer to published version for the most recent bibliographic citation information. If a published version is known of, the repository item page linked to above, will contain details on accessing it.

Copyright and reuse:
The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions.

Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher’s statement:
Please refer to the repository item page, publisher’s statement section, for further information.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk.

warwick.ac.uk/lib-publications
Carlos Barral and the Struggle for Holocaust Consciousness in Franco’s Spain

Samuel O’Donoghue

This article uncovers the role of the Spanish publisher Carlos Barral in promoting knowledge of the Holocaust through a number of publishing ventures beginning in the late 1950s. Based on research in the Archivo General de la Administración, it sets Barral’s endeavors in the context of the Franco regime’s resistance to the public airing of Nazi crimes in Spain. The article begins with an overview of the historical factors that help explain why Franco’s regime was reluctant to tolerate an uninhibited public awareness of the extermination of the European Jews. The article then proceeds to examine how and why Carlos Barral made it his duty promote knowledge of the horrors the regime was eager to hide.
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Franco’s regime had good reason to be embarrassed by the Holocaust. Anti-Semitism was ingrained in Spanish right-wing ideology and played a significant role in Nationalist propaganda during the Spanish Civil War. The regime’s tacit support for the Axis powers during the Second World War amplified the pervasive reach of Nazi ideas. Hitler had been envisaged by some in Spain as a reincarnation of the venerated Catholic Monarchs, Ferdinand and Isabella. So the recognition that the Nazis would be remembered not as the saviors of Christendom but as the perpetrators of the most monstrous genocide the world had ever seen was slow and painful. Franco’s regime
resisted public awareness of the extermination of the European Jews over the decades it remained in power. The enormity of the atrocities carried out by the Nazis, the erstwhile ideological confreres of the Spanish Nationalists, was a cause of inescapable chagrin for the radical right in Spain, and the Spanish Republicans among the victims who perished in the Nazi camps added further to the skeletons in Franco’s closet.¹ But the regime’s hostility to the public airing of Nazi crimes was not, as has been assumed until now, unopposed during the years of the dictatorship. This article tells the story of a Spanish intellectual who was profoundly involved in the struggle for public awareness of the Holocaust in the midst of the regime’s imposed blackout. Based on research in the Archivo General de la Administración, the article uncovers Carlos Barral’s role in promoting knowledge of the Holocaust through a number of publishing ventures beginning in the late 1950s. In the context of Alejandro Baer’s recent sociological analysis of Spain’s belated assimilation of a globalized and transnational awareness of the Holocaust in the years since the country’s transition to democracy, an account of Barral’s role in fostering an incipient interest in the Holocaust—together with an appraisal of the resistance he came up against—helps to fill in the missing years of Holocaust commemoration in Franco’s Spain.² These were years in which the atrocities perpetrated by the Third Reich were not universally overlooked or forgotten, but a time during which Barral in particular championed a consciousness of the Holocaust among an educated readership and defied the silence imposed by an ideologically tainted regime.

The first part of this article gives an overview of the historical factors that help explain why Franco’s regime was reluctant to tolerate an uninhibited public awareness of the disturbing underbelly of National Socialism. It explores the regime’s behavior before and during the Second World War, illustrating how the pretense of Spanish
neutrality in the sphere of international diplomacy was belied by public declarations of sympathy with the Nazi cause and Spanish collaboration with the German war effort. The second part outlines how the Spanish press framed news of the liberation of the camps from April 1945, showing how the attenuation of the horrors discovered by the advancing Allied forces was a necessary precaution for a regime that had venerated the Nazis right up until the end of the conflict. The Franco regime’s dominion over public awareness of the scale of Nazi atrocities was to go unchallenged until the end of the 1950s. The third part of this article takes up the story of the moment the regime’s authority over public perceptions of Nazi Germany was subject to its first test: in 1959 Carlos Barral submitted his own translation of a historical work on the Final Solution for approval by Franco’s censors. It was to be the first of a number of works on the Holocaust that Barral successfully published, as he made it his duty to promote knowledge of the Nazi atrocities Franco’s regime had been eager to hide. Following on from Barral’s early editorial achievements, the fourth part of the article traces the increasing resistance the publisher came up against as he began to promote the stories of the Spanish Republicans who had been deported to Nazi camps. Publicizing details of the Holocaust had at first appeared to Barral a subtle means of discrediting Francoism by association, but the publisher’s subsequent endeavor to draw a more explicit connection between the Spanish past and the Third Reich was frustrated. The fifth and final part of the study reflects on Barral’s legacy against the backdrop of stubborn anti-Semitic attitudes and ignorance of the Holocaust that persisted in Spain toward the final years of Franco’s dictatorship and the early years of democracy. In its account of Barral’s editorial activity from the late 1950s to the mid-1960s, this study serves specifically to illuminate a hitherto unexplored aspect of Spanish cultural history.
same time, it functions more generally as a case study exploring the contribution of publishers to public awareness of the Holocaust.  

The Second World War through Spanish Eyes

The compulsion to censor the Holocaust when details of its enormity began to emerge with the first reports of the liberation of the Nazi camps in April 1945 can be explained, in part, by the regime’s own ideological flirtation with anti-Semitism. Traditional Catholic anti-Judaism had long been part of the intellectual make-up of the Spanish clergy. Moreover, the radical right wing that had delivered Franco to power, especially the Falange, was permeated by anti-Semitism, even of the biological racist kind in vogue in Germany. Isabelle Rohr’s study of attitudes towards Jews on the Spanish radical right illustrates the prominence of antipathy towards the religious group in two of the ultraconservative myths that came to constitute the ideological baggage and political culture of Franco’s regime. These myths were forged in the late nineteenth century in response to the crisis provoked by the loss of Spain’s colonies and were influenced by anti-Semitic ideas imported from the French clerical right and The Protocols of the Elders of Zion. The first of these intertwined strands of Nationalist mythology was the myth of the reconquista, a yearned-for golden age of Christian sanctity and unsullied hispanidad, which had been rendered possible by the banishment of the Moorish infidel and the expulsion of the Jews. The second was the myth of the Judeo-Masonic conspiracy that envisaged liberalism and socialism as plots forged by the Jews and Freemasons to destroy Catholic Spain. The Judeo-Masonic conspiracy depicted socialists and liberals as the descendants of Jewish conversos who were enacting revenge for their forced apostasy in league with international Masonic and Bolshevik conspirators; the Nationalists were the ideological heirs and biological
descendants of the Catholic Monarchs; and Franco the savior who would eliminate the Jewish threat in a modern-day *reconquista* and thereby restore the prelapsarian purity of Ferdinand and Isabella’s kingdom.⁵

The various right-wing enemies of Spain’s Second Republic, with their divergent aims and interests, rallied around the idea that there was a secret Judeo-Masonic-Bolshevik plot to achieve world domination. In their diagnosis of Spain’s ills the various groups found common ground in the hermeneutic of the conspiracy theory, which helped to unify their opposition to the Republic.⁶ Gonzalo Álvarez Chillida explains that the myth of the Jewish conspiracy was a convenient justification for the war that allowed the uprising to be framed as a religious crusade against the nefarious Sovietization of Catholic Spain.⁷ The threat of revolution that reared its head in 1934 mobilized conservatives to embrace a grand theory that could synthesize their various enemies and the perceived threats facing the country as manifestations of a Jewish plot.

The myth of the Catholic Monarchs that helped to drum up reactionary political forces at home also shaped interpretations of international developments: the Nazis’ rise to power in the 1930s and their persecution of German Jews were described by ultraconservative Spanish thinkers using parallels with the 1492 edict of expulsion.⁸ Hitler’s policies were perceived as necessary in much the same way as Ferdinand and Isabella’s defense of national interests in medieval Spain had protected the country from the growing dominance of Jewish power.⁹ The radical right’s admiration for the Nazis’ Jewish policies was perpetuated following Franco’s rise to power.

Anti-Semitic policies in Germany and Italy were well received by the Nationalist press. In its coverage of *Kristallnacht*, for example, the horrors of the persecution were played down and the events were characterized as a just punishment for perceived Jewish crimes. The Nationalist press regarded the outraged coverage of the events by
news outlets in other countries as evidence of the Jewish control over the media. The 4000 Jews living in Spain at the outbreak of the Second World War faced a crackdown on worship: the synagogues in Barcelona and Madrid were closed and Jewish rituals and customs were prohibited. The press, which was controlled by the Axis-oriented Falange, continued to propagate anti-Semitic material. The news from Berlin columns in *ABC, La Vanguardia, Madrid* and *Informaciones* were overseen by the German embassy. Germanophilia and anti-Semitism were the order of the day: coverage of the war was unashamedly biased in favor of the Nazis; Great Britain, the United States and Russia were perceived as the agents of Jewish domination. Nazi propaganda enjoyed a prodigious circulation in Spain during the Second World War. The combined result of Nazi influence and direct control over the Spanish press was a dutiful chronicle of repressive Nazi measures taken against the Jews, often embellished with fervent praise and never with a hint of reproach. Álvarez Chillida observes that although expropriations, dismissals, pogroms, expulsions, the imposition of the yellow star, the creation of ghettos and firing squads in Romania were all mentioned, there was never any reference to genocide. The faithful reproduction of Hitler’s and other Nazi leaders’ speeches in the Spanish press contained frequent prognostications of the demise of the Jewish race, although there is little sign of an awareness that such warnings are to be interpreted as anything other than the hyperbole of bellicose rhetoric.

While the Spanish press was unguarded in its display of sympathy for the Germans, Franco’s regime was careful to project an illusion of neutrality to the Allies. In the run up to the Second World War, Franco had promised secretly to back Hitler with a policy of benevolent neutrality. Later, as Europe was plunged into conflict, the Spanish government’s tacit support of the Nazis was formalized as a policy of non-belligerence. The ambiguity of Spain’s official position enabled it to assist its natural
associates in the Axis while protecting its economic interests with the Allies. Spain contributed materially to Germany’s war effort: it resupplied German submarines from Spanish ports; assisted German sabotage operations against Gibraltar; transported German military supplies covertly in the Mediterranean; exported vital supplies of wolfram for German military production; and sent volunteers to fight in the Blue Division on the eastern front. For much of the war Franco even entertained joining the conflict on the Axis side. Despite his growing awareness of the Nazis’ brutal and murderous practices, Franco abandoned some 140,000 Republican refugees to their fate in Nazi-controlled France. His failure to intervene on behalf of the 7000 Spaniards who were deported to Mauthausen, 64% of whom eventually died, revealed a degree of complicity with Nazi brutality.

Another related reason for the regime’s reticence to a full public hearing of National-Socialist crimes, in addition to its own shady dalliance with anti-Semitism and its thinly veiled collaboration with the Nazis, was its less than accommodating attitude towards Jewish refugees during the Second World War. The regime’s treatment of Jewish refugees, particularly the Sephardic Jews of Spanish origin and nationality, is one of the more polemical aspects of the regime’s behavior during the Second World War. Much ink has been spilled both by apologists and detractors who have sought to establish the truth of the regime’s self-fashioned image as savior of the Jews. The myth of Franco as savior of the Jews gathered momentum in the aftermath of the war as part of the regime’s efforts to cleanse its tainted image in the hope of surviving the shifting geopolitical sands that brought a hegemony of democratic powers to the fore. However, a number of recent studies by Bernd Rother, Isabelle Rohr and Stanley Payne leave little doubt that the regime’s refugee policy was dictated more by expediency than humanitarian sensitivity: any attempts to save Jews above and beyond the duties
imposed by the contingencies of international diplomacy were either the initiative of diplomats—often acting in defiance of the regime or at least under the veil of its ignorance—or a shameless hedging of geopolitical bets as the regime attempted to ingratiate itself with the Allies to preserve its own position in the event of an Axis defeat.²¹

**The Attenuation of Nazi Atrocities in the Media**

It is easy to see how Franco’s regime might reel when faced with the sheer scale of Nazi atrocities. The magnitude of the persecution of the Jews had been intuited throughout the war: Franco’s regime shared the Allies’ inchoate awareness of the Nazis’ exterminatory policy, which was confirmed towards the end of the conflict by the international coverage of the liberation of the camps. The geopolitical paradigm shift that was sealed by the war’s unhappy outcome and the opprobrium showered on the regime’s ideological brothers-in-arms gave the regime ample cause for anxiety.

As early as 1943 the Franco regime had begun to disentangle itself from the Nazi fascist ideology to which elements of the Falange had been particularly receptive. An emphasis on traditional Catholic qualities helped the regime to distinguish itself implicitly from Nazi Germany. But its propaganda remained broadly faithful to the Nazis right up until the end. Panegyrics to Hitler were published on the occasion of his death. Although from April 1945 reports of the horrors discovered in the liberated concentration camps began to filter timidly into the Spanish press, there was still widespread reluctance to admit to the scale of the horror in the liberated camps.²² On April 21, 1945 *Ya* gave a descriptive inventory of the photographic evidence that was mounting in the British press but suggested the horrors might be attributed to the chaos of the war’s culminating weeks. On April 29 the magazine *Mundo* and on May 4, 1945
endeavored to relativize the abhorrent discoveries in the camps: Mundo suggested the Nazi soldiers had been brutalized by the ferociousness of their crusade against the communists; ABC likened Buchenwald to the Soviet massacre of the Poles at Katyn and to the murder of Mussolini. Álvarez Chillida observes that the initial reluctance to mention the Jewish victims was eventually overcome in ABC by May 17 as reports of the gassing of 40,000 Jews a week at Birkenau finally reached the Spanish public.²³

Following Franco’s shake-up of the government and the relegation of Falangist influence in favor of Catholic ministers, the press began to give fuller coverage to the camps, reporting on the numbers suspected of being killed, the grotesque details of medical experiments and sadism, and the prominence of the Jews among the victims.²⁴ But in its coverage of the Nuremberg trials the Spanish press criticized the Allies for their desire apparently to put the whole German nation on trial, arguing that part of the responsibility for the war atrocities lay with the Allies because of their failure to act more decisively to prevent them.²⁵ Álvarez Chillida also makes the caveat that despite the growing coverage of the camps, photographic images were still not given their due and, moreover, some opinion columns and editorials still endeavored to relativize the Nazis’ crimes through comparison with supposedly comparable ones perpetrated by the Soviets. Álvarez Chillida highlights that the censorship of images of the extermination was uncompromising. The historian notes the attenuation of the atrocity conveyed by the footage selected for inclusion in a No-Do on the liberation of Buchenwald. Stanley Kramer’s Judgment at Nuremberg was shown in 1962 in Spain but with the graphic footage of the concentration camps removed.²⁶ The Spanish public had been insistently sold a Weltanschauung that depicted the Second World War as an apocalyptic showdown between the Jewish-controlled Masonic democracies and the communists, on one hand, and the heroic Axis powers on the other; such a deep-rooted ideological
identification and complicity with the Nazi cause meant that the regime was obliged to hide the atrocities perpetrated by the Nazis: “following the conflict, the crimes of Nazism and particularly the images of the Jewish Holocaust were largely hidden for decades.” However, not everyone in Franco’s Spain was willing to accept without question the new era of secrecy. It might have taken a new generation, but by the late 1950s there was an intellectual with the will and the means to give the Spanish reading public details of the atrocities it had been spared from hearing.

**Barral’s Struggle for Public Awareness of the Holocaust**

In the latter part of the 1950s, while he set about transforming a family graphic arts business specializing in educational textbooks and manuals into a publisher at the leading edge of intellectual life, Carlos Barral was busy juggling his own poetic vocation with the practice of translation. His journals of the period attest to a feverish activity as translator. Many publishers in the decades following the Spanish Civil War looked to translations as a route out of the cultural insularity and autarkic mediocrity of Franco’s Spain. Barral was no exception. With the help of Joan Petit, Víctor Seix, Jaime Salinas and the sporadic collaboration of an intimate social circle of celebrated writers and intellectuals in the Generación del ’50, Barral set about revitalizing the domestic literary scene particularly by promoting the latest trends in Latin American and European fiction. One of the translations Barral was working on during this period has the distinction of being the first historical work on the subject of the Holocaust to be published in Spain. In collaboration with his close friend Gabriel Ferrater, Barral translated Léon Poliakov and Josef Wulf’s *Das Dritte Reich und die Juden* (The Third Reich and the Jews), which was originally published in Berlin in 1955. The translators were no doubt encouraged—and indeed aided—in their enterprise by Gallimard’s 1959
French edition of the same work. Barral’s prologue, part of which was printed on the
back of the book’s dust jacket, gives an insight into the self-intuited momentousness of
the Spanish translation of a historical work on the Holocaust and is worth quoting at
length:

    The Spanish translation of this book is the result of moral resolve. To bring it to
fruition we had to violate the inhibiting instinct provoked by the testimony of
unimaginable cruelty and we had to overcome the fear that in the eyes of some
people it might be seen as an unjust accusation against the generation of
Germans who witnessed the monstrous crimes to which these documents testify.
But our fears were outweighed in our conscience by the conviction that the
documentation of the cold facts of the historical catastrophe that befell the
European Jews contains a universally valuable warning of the effects of
whatever apology of hate—in pseudoscientific guise or otherwise—that might
be unleashed in the future.32

There is more going on in Barral’s prologue than first meets the eye. Barral begins with
a delicate concession to mollify his implied reader’s indignation at the indictment of
Nazi Germany. Germanophilia was still rampant in Spain, perhaps even more so among
the well-to-do middle classes who were often those who had most to gain from the new
Francoist order and, of course, constituted the principal market for Seix Barral’s
expensive hard-back books. The idea that the Nazis, the venerated heroes and
ideological brothers of a decade and a half earlier, were capable of the heinous acts
documented in Poliakov and Wulf’s book is bound, Barral intuits, to be met with
disbelief by a worryingly large segment of the Spanish population. Barral uses the verb
“asistir” (witness) to distance the esteemed Germanic people from the atrocities; he
forestalls any offense to latent Germanophilic sentiments in his readers by obscuring
German agency in the extermination of the European Jews, emphasizing their role as witnesses not perpetrators. There is, furthermore, another important purpose that can be discerned in the prologue but that remains unspoken, for Barral is not simply presenting a history of events in faraway lands; he is suggesting that there is a moral lesson here applicable to anyone who cares to pick the book up. Nazi Germany is, in a sense, a simple pretext; the implied object of Barral’s discourse, lurking in the background, waiting to be read between the lines by his perceptive contemporaries, is Franco’s Spain. Barral writes of a warning, an apology of hate and pseudoscientific theories, yet his gaze is directed, as much as towards Germany’s past, at Spain’s present. Biological racism had been used by Nationalist ideologues to account for the receptiveness of certain segments of the Spanish population to communist ideas. It was speculated that a combination of Moorish and Jewish blood had preconditioned some Spaniards to be more responsive to degenerate ideologies. Certain ultraconservative Spanish intellectuals had been sympathetic to eugenics, and “by the end of the Civil War,” Rohr observes, “the line separating Nationalist Spain’s Catholic antisemitism from Germany’s racism had become thinner.” Barral’s mention of pseudoscience calls to mind the psychiatrist Antonio Vallejo-Nágera’s obsession with identifying a “red gene.”

The subtle enjoinder for Spanish readers to reflect on their own country as they read about Germany becomes clearer in the second paragraph of Barral’s prologue:

It is improbable that the sociological circumstances that made the National-Socialist Weltanschauung possible will be repeated anywhere else in the world. But these documents and studies warn of the precariousness of the moral customs of any human grouping, which could yet again succumb to a barrage of endless propaganda. It is dizzying to think how few and insignificant factors can generate a savage racist mentality in a civilized people and how such a flimsy
doctrine—those puerile biological myths, from Gobineau to Rosenberg—is enough to poison or anesthetize the cultured classes, the inheritors of an age-old humanism.\textsuperscript{35}

While professing faith in the unlikelihood of another Holocaust, Barral counsels against complacency. Even the most civilized heirs to humanistic culture—even you, mon semblable, mon frère—could be taken in by such an onslaught of propaganda.

Uppermost in Barral’s mind is no doubt the fervent embrace of anti-Semitism that had gripped his own country in living memory. But Nazi Germany and Franco’s Spain share more than a penchant for biological racism. Barral’s memoirs of his childhood in 1940s Spain exhibit a tendency to draw striking analogies between life under National Catholicism and features of National Socialism. For example, he describes the Jesuit priests in his school as “those kapo priests from the lager” and compares a particularly strict enforcer of discipline from his schoolboy days to the infamous Adolf Eichmann and the head of the Gestapo, Heinrich Müller.\textsuperscript{36} The rather tasteless likening of priests to prisoner-guards in a concentration camp is designed both to shock and entertain. The chain of velar stops in the Spanish—“curas kapos de K.L.”—gives the phrase a humorous ring, but Barral’s use of comedy and hyperbole should not tempt us to overlook an important point. The likening of priests to kapos brings to mind the anti-Judaic tradition in the Spanish clergy that intensified the receptiveness of the Spanish right to Nazi anti-Semitism. Barral sees the fascist yearning for order and discipline embodied in the despotic Jesuit instructors of his childhood. These “fascist educators” are the epitome of what Barral calls “fascism as a mentality”; they are the upholders of a “discipline that had to be enforced for metaphysical reasons.”\textsuperscript{37} As the Second World War raged in Europe, Barral’s formative years were spent under the tutelage of disciplinarians who were particularly susceptible
to the influence of National Socialism: in their attitudes and behaviors, the priests “became Germanized.”

Barral describes the oppressive ambiance of his childhood years with interspersed reminiscences of National Socialism, taking aim at the pervasiveness of state propaganda in civic life. His mention of a “barrage of endless propaganda” in his prologue to the translation of Poliakov and Wulf is intended to rouse a self-conscious and critical gaze in his readers; Barral subtly appeals to his readers’ familiarity with the instruments of authoritarian control, enjoining them to read the history of the Third Reich through the prism of their own experience.

Surprisingly, Barral’s edition of Poliakov and Wulf encountered no opposition from the regime’s censors. Presented for pre-publication approval for a print run of 4,000 copies on September 14, 1959, the manuscript was duly given the go-ahead only ten days later. The cover price of 250 pesetas, a hefty sum in the 1960s, some five times the price of Alianza’s paperbacks that first appeared later in the decade, no doubt had some bearing on the insouciance with which the Sección de Inspección de Libros (Inspectorate of Books) acceded to Seix Barral’s petition. Poliakov and Wulf’s work contains moderately graphic photographs: heaps of prosthetic limbs, spectacles and shaving brushes from the storage deposits at Auschwitz are set alongside the now iconic image of the young boy in the Warsaw ghetto from the Stroop report; dead bodies lining the pavements of ruined streets are juxtaposed with defenseless women and children in the firing line of nonchalant Nazi soldiers, exhibits of decorations made from tattooed skin and pictures of the infamous medical experiments. Admittedly we do not yet find the more shocking images of mass executions and mountains of denuded dead that were to emerge a few years later. However, given the regime’s resistance to open discussion of the extermination of the European Jews, in general, and to the circulation of the more grisly visual evidence of the destruction, in particular, Barral’s edition of Poliakov and
Wulf is striking for the muted reaction it elicited among the censors. The authorization of second and third editions on October 11 and November 8, 1960 illustrates nevertheless the veritable appetite for information on the Holocaust among Spanish readers. This was an incipient historical curiosity that Barral was to nurture over the coming years.

Barral’s prologue to the Poliakov and Wulf translation gives a glimpse of the publisher’s motives for promoting an awareness of the Holocaust. The language he uses to describe Nazi propaganda—an “endless barrage,” a “savage racist mentality,” a “flimsy doctrine” whose “puerile myths” are able to poison and anesthetize even the most civilized minds—recalls his attitude to the triumphalism and inanity of National-Catholic rhetoric. Barral’s *Memorias* (Memoirs) reveal an ardent distaste for the pervasive and vulgar rhetoric of the Francoist state, which Barral deems responsible for cultivating an insular gaze in society, circumscribed to petty national concerns glorified by the baroque hyperbole of fascist discourse. The conflict that shook the world during his school years was, to Barral’s mind, barely felt in Franco’s Spain, and when its muffled echoes were dimly heard, they were distorted by the regime’s mulish fanaticism:

The lethargy of our collective existence as a flock of adolescent sheep is almost impossible to imagine now. I cannot recall, for example, that any of the momentous events of the world war had the slightest resonance in the halls or sinister playgrounds, or that they were the subject of discussion among the gatherings in hallways. As was expected and to the benefit of Christian civilization, the Germans were winning the war. And so the story went until much later, until long after El Alamein and Stalingrad, because soon the secret
weapons would come and then everyone would see. … The war was not something you could have an opinion on, there was no reason to think about it.\textsuperscript{42} Barral’s promotion of Holocaust awareness is, in a sense, an act of penitence. Shaped by a desire to leave a mark on his generation—“those cerulean forty-somethings who had busied themselves from childhood to adulthood without giving a thought to anything, with neither the time nor opportunity to observe or be astonished, as if they had been stuck in the tunnel of their all-consuming, tedious disciplines”—the testimony of the extermination of European Jews constitutes an attempt to rouse his coevals from their calcified indifference.\textsuperscript{43} Through his series of testimonial works Barral will imbue the Second World War with the power to leave a belated impression on a solipsistic, unfeeling and ignorant generation, which for too long had been shielded by a complicit regime.

Poliakov and Wulf’s history was but one of the titles released by the Seix Barral publishing house in its “Testimonio” (Testimony) series from the early 1960s. Just two months after \textit{El tercer reich y los judíos} had been submitted and approved, a translation of André Schwarz-Bart’s \textit{Le dernier des justes (The Last of the Just)}, a fictionalized tale of the perennial persecution suffered by Jews that culminates in the deportation and annihilation of the novel’s protagonist in Auschwitz, was submitted to the Book Inspectorate on November 18, 1959.\textsuperscript{44} In his report dated December 3, 1959, the censor P. Álvarez Turienzo found few grievous objections. An ecclesiastic like so many of Franco’s censors, his demands for a number of suppressions—or in the typical parlance of the cultural police, the passages that would need to be “deleted or at least softened”—pertained principally to the ecumenical sphere.\textsuperscript{45} References to an early pope were to be excised, for example, as well as a mildly disrespectful caricature of Christian doctrine. The censor makes no attempt to hide his general disdain for the novel, though, and the
report gives a valuable insight into the deeply ingrained anti-Judaism that continued to pervade the regime and its servants:

A kind of history of Judaism in novel-form structured principally around the life of the contemporary Jew Ernie Levy, the central character in the story. The development is pro-Judaic, and the persecutors that the Israelite has had throughout history, including Christians, are shown in a bad light. Typical example of a certain pacifist literature that considers humanity’s greatest sin to be incomprehension and intolerance. The book doubtlessly has pages written with verve and intelligence. But these kinds of narrative end up becoming a bit tiresome as they give the impression of promoting a self-interested propaganda.\(^46\)

Álvarez Turienzo diagnoses the novel’s pro-Judaic stance as if an anti-Judaic alternative were a defensible ideological position. He seems surprised that the persecutors of Jews get such bad press and appears to think intolerance is, if not virtuous, at least understandable and certainly not entirely reprehensible. The censor finds the novel too preachy, the pacifist agenda heavy handed; this is not one for the ardent crusaders of the Movimiento Nacional, but there is not enough to justify an outright rejection.

**Republican Testimony of Nazi Camps and the Threat of Anti-Fascism**

The regime’s censors found few objections to Barral’s early endeavors to publish historical and fictional works on the Holocaust. First Wulf and Poliakov, then Schwarz-Bart passed without a hitch. But when Barral began to promote a closer link between the uncovering of National-Socialist crimes and anti-fascist sentiment more generally, the censors’ indifference assumed a hostile complexion. Books on the subject of the Holocaust would be tolerated, it seemed, but only in so far as any perceived parallels
between Nazism and Francoism were quarantined. The censors understandably feared
the assimilation of the Spanish Republican cause and the struggle against Nazism. Their
unwillingness to see Spain’s defeated portrayed in the same heroic light as the victims
of Nazism came to the fore when Barral proposed a translation of Piero Malvezzi and
Giovanni Pirelli’s collection of testimonies—mainly letters—written by victims who
had been murdered by the Nazis.⁴⁷ Cartas de condenados a muerte de la resistencia
europea (Letters by Members of the European Resistance Sentenced to Death) was
presented to the Book Inspectorate on November 7, 1959. The reader’s report issued
just over a week later advised against publication on the grounds that Malvezzi and
Pirelli’s collection glorified communists. The reader pointed out that many of the letters
were written by individuals who had fought in national liberation fronts in various
European countries and that the majority had been members of communist
organizations. But most unforgivable of all was their role in the International Brigades
that had fought against the Nationalist forces in the Spanish Civil War: “In the prologue
Spain is highlighted as fascist compared with the democratic freedom enjoyed in
Europe at the time … and the combatants who fought in the Spanish red army are quoted. … It is a documentary of nationalist political agitation for freedom and of
communist propaganda.”⁴⁸ The Inspectorate’s decision to block publication was perhaps
to be expected. But the letter sent in response by the publishing house illustrates the
strength of sentiment underlying Carlos Barral’s recent foray into the dissemination of
Second World War testimony. To request a second reading of a censored manuscript
was, by Barral’s own admission, a time-consuming and often thankless business.⁴⁹ But
for the publisher and his editorial team, objective history and the right of the Spanish
people to know about the horrors experienced in Nazi-occupied Europe were worthy of
a spirited defense:
Said book is an absolutely objective collection of historical documents that testify to the disconformity of the European masses with Nazi policy and Hitler’s aggression. [It has] historical value [and] includes the final opinions of victims of all classes, mentalities, nationalities and convictions, from Helmuth [James Graf] von Moltke and F[ather Alfred] Delp[,] S. J., the Provincial of Bavaria, to Russian members of the resistance shaped unavoidably by a background of communism and dehumanization and that nevertheless revive basic moral values in the face of injustice and death. … This anthology of letters is an all-too-human testimony of the strength and survival of religiosity, love and family and of fundamental human generosity in all societies, whatever their official ideology and complexion. … It is not a speculative work of fantasy, but a collection of pure documents that, as such, cannot contain any kind of mistake regarding the historical event they depict.⁵⁰

The supplicatory letter sent from the publisher’s office in January of the following year offered to eliminate the more overtly political, communist-authored letters from Malvezzi and Pirelli’s collection. Other concessions proposed by Seix Barral included the addition of a preface by the Catholic writer Lorenzo Gómis aimed at highlighting “the religious, human and moral values awakened in individuals of whatever intellectual and moral makeup by the proximity of an unjust and violent death.”⁵¹ The advertised apolitical quality of the book would be further safeguarded, needless to say, by the suppression of any references to the Spanish Civil War in the biographical portraits of the victims whose testimonies were compiled in the collection. But the deal sweeteners failed to dent the censors’ intransigence. A second reading of the manuscript completed on February 13, 1960 reiterated the motives for the refusal of permission:
The tone of the book is laid bare by the fragments that the same Spanish editor has crossed out prior to presenting the book for censorship: almost all the figures whose correspondence is collected here are communists and many of them have fought in Spain. The Italian publisher who has come up with the idea of publishing these letters written by people sentenced to death by the Germans during the recent war is also a communist. Among the condemned, the odd priest, or young Catholic, or bourgeois type occasionally crops up to try and give the book an aura of political objectivity. But in general the letters published here were written by communists, some of whom proclaim … the imminent victory of Marxism. This book could be published only if it were accompanied by another anthology of letters from those condemned to death behind the Iron Curtain.52

It was not just Seix Barral that had trouble with the censors when attempting to publish books offering a less than favorable assessment of Nazi Germany. Santiago Alberti’s Barcelona-based publishing house, in its quest to revive Catalan-language literature, had endeavored to publish Joaquim Amat-Piniella’s K.L. Reich in 1955.53 Amat-Piniella’s testimony of Mauthausen was particularly polemical because its subject matter was closer to home.54 This was not a history book, a translation of a Prix Goncourt published in France, or an anthology of epistolary testimonies deemed threatening simply because they had been written by the regime’s sworn enemies, the communists. Amat-Piniella’s novel was a testimony written by a Spaniard who had experienced for himself life in one of those Nazi camps that remained in the Spanish imaginary largely as mysterious and impenetrable as they had been since the first cryptic press reports of April 1945. A Catalan patriot who had fought with the Republicans in the civil war and subsequently been imprisoned in Mauthausen, Amat-Piniella wrote poetry in the camp and soon after
its liberation embarked on a novel depicting his experience there, his spiritual resistance
to the inhumanity he encountered and his perspective on the internal conflicts within the
Republican clandestine organization and camp resistance.\textsuperscript{55}

Amat-Piniella’s account of Mauthausen was not the first though. A fellow
Republican in exile in France who, like Amat-Piniella, was deported to Mauthausen,
Carlos Rodríguez del Risco had already published, in the immediate post-war period, a
first-hand account of the camp in an unlikely venue: the official organ of the Falange,
\textit{Arriba}.\textsuperscript{56} But Rodríguez del Risco’s account of Mauthausen, which was serialized
between April 26 and June 1, 1946, was a work of propaganda. It was a conversion
narrative: the former Republican delinquent realizes the error of his ways; the
concentration camp cures him of any remnants of his “red” condition and he returns to
Franco’s Spain a new man.\textsuperscript{57} Rodríguez del Risco’s account made the historical
experience of the camps usable for Franco’s Spain in ways that the experience did not
otherwise lend itself readily: his account indulged in the traditional Falangist pastime of
anti-Semitism and promoted the cause of Holocaust denial, attributing the horrors of the
camps to state of a entropy, exacerbated by the prisoners themselves, and that ensued
without the venerated Führer’s knowledge.\textsuperscript{58} Public awareness of the thousands of
Spanish Republicans who were caught up in the concentration camp system and, albeit
tangentially, in the machinery of the Holocaust raised the unthinkable prospect of a
popular recognition of their plight. It risked casting Republicans in a heroic light that
was anathema to the regime’s divisive and exclusive commemoration of the Nationalist
sacrifice in the civil war. Amat-Piniella’s novel, although depoliticized by the author’s
self-censorship and hardly brimming with praise for the clandestine political
organization within the camp with its deep ideological divides between anarchists and
communists, did not debase its testimonial value with an ideological kowtow to
Franco’s regime. Its tragic gaze on Mauthausen had little exploitable value and came perilously close to vindicating Republican historical memory. Franco’s censors intuited as much when, after Amat-Piniella’s extended reworkings over the decade since the novel’s original composition as he searched for an interested publisher, K.L. Reich was presented to the censors in 1955:

The author of this book, a former prisoner in a German concentration camp, narrates in raw but objective fashion the functioning of the Nazi camps, with all the cruelties of the SS and the Russian, Polish and Czech crimes and revenge attacks in the final days of captivity, when the Allied troops were advancing and the leaders of the camp garrisons were fleeing, until finally the North American occupying forces put an end to the anarchy that had been unleashed.

The censor, Manuel Sancho, goes over ground that should be largely familiar by now. His reference to the American troops in the Second World War as occupying forces shows clearly where his sympathies lie. And as we saw with the early press reports on the camps, great emphasis is placed on the disorder that reigned immediately prior to the liberation, as if the later collapse of discipline and control in some way accounts for or overshadows the earlier horrors. The censor found nothing eminently censurable in the novel, though, and recommended it for publication. The details surrounding the subsequent decision to overrule the recommendation are unclear. In the Archivo General there is no trace of the Inspectorate’s reasoning that might have led to permission for the publication of Amat-Piniella’s novel to be rescinded. The fact that the manuscript was written in Catalan might have something to do with it, or perhaps some higher official simply decided that National-Socialist brutality—and the story of the Spanish Republicans on whom it was meted out—was still too politically delicate in 1955.
Barral became interested in Amat-Piniella’s story at some point in the following years and decided to lend his influential backing to the project. *K.L. Reich* fit perfectly with Barral’s editorial vision and seemed a natural progression following his successful editions of Wulf and Poliakov and of Schwarz-Bart and his thwarted translation of Malvezzi and Pinelli’s *Cartas de condenados*. The provocative subtitle used for the novel, *Miles de españoles en los campos de Hitler* (Thousands of Spaniards in Hitler’s camps), gives a sense that publishing the testimony of Spanish political prisoners in the Nazi camps was the next logical step in repairing the severed connection between Spain and contemporary Europe by calling Spaniards’ attention to the momentous events in living memory that had left not the faintest impression on the insular and self-satisfied political and social order. Submitted for pre-publication approval towards the beginning of 1961, *K.L. Reich* provoked a hostile reaction in the censor tasked with vetting it, Jose de Pablo Muñoz:

> It describes horrific, disgraceful[,] inhuman suffering, giving an exaggerated representation of Nazism and the SS. It is a completely negative work, dark and bitter, and does nothing more than exude hate for said political system. Its description of the German camps looks identical to those of the Russian camps. Nevertheless, as it deals with things in the past and in a foreign country, it can be published.\(^\text{62}\)

The regime’s bond with Nazi Germany, hastily wiped from the record by the post-war doublethink, seems sufficiently distant by 1961 that criticism of the former ideological ally no longer need reflect badly on the Spanish government in the present. But old habits die hard: the morally relativistic comparison of Nazi and Soviet camps is mustered in defense of wounded historical pride; Amat-Piniella’s portrayal of atrocities is passed off as contempt for National-Socialist politics; the censor stoops to the depths
of accusing the author of plagiarism. As he casts aspersions on the novelist’s unfair trial of Nazi Germany, the censor throws doubt on the veracity of Amat-Piniella’s depiction. The cultural police’s unfavorable reception aside, though, Barral’s achievement of getting Amat-Piniella published was an unqualified triumph, especially in light of the earlier fiasco of Malvezzi and Pinelli’s *Cartas de condenados*.

A similar endeavor to reconnect Spanish society with the Republican political prisoners who had languished in Nazi camps and whose story was only beginning to be told did not achieve the same success just two months later. From the end of the 1950s Barral was busy forging international connections in the publishing world. The aim of enhancing the prestige of Spanish letters abroad and of foreign letters in Spain—the quest to inject an impoverished intellectual atmosphere with some much needed “oxygen”—coalesced in a series of cosmopolitan literary gatherings organized in Mallorca.\(^63\) The backing of prestigious publishers Claude Gallimard and Giulio Einaudi was instrumental in the success of Barral’s international gatherings that culminated in the Formentor literary prizes.\(^64\) In his *Memorias* Barral reveals his efforts in petitioning the influential Italian publisher Einaudi to assist with the creation of the international literary prize. Einaudi was opposed to lending his name to a purely commercial operation that might be used to create marketable authors simply for their profit-making potential. Einaudi’s support for Barral’s enterprise was dependent on the humanistic purity of the Spanish publisher’s motives. The Italian publisher was willing to believe in the existence of an authentic cultural opposition to Franco’s regime, but he needed assurances that Barral was driven by concerns less prosaic than the purely venal.\(^65\) The attempt to publish Malvezzi and Pinelli’s *Cartas de condenados*, which had been released by Einaudi in 1954, was no doubt in part a manifestation of Barral’s endeavor to prove his worth. *Cartas de condenados* was submitted to the censors roughly during
the period that Barral began to court the major European editors as he set about
cultivating the connections that were to make a success of Formentor. It was during this
time that Barral hosted Einaudi during the Italian publisher’s visit to Spain and sought
to demonstrate his credentials as a cultural adversary of Francoism. Indeed, it is
Barral’s urge to prove himself that perhaps explains the publishing house’s insistence in
getting Malvezzi and Pinelli’s collection of testimonies past the censors. The new anti-
fascist editorial direction assumed by Barral in his “Testimonio” series was an
opportunity to exhibit tangible victories in his struggle against the constrained freedom
of expression that was a cause of much embarrassment for Barral in his role as
unofficial ambassador of Spanish culture.

With the award of the Formentor prize in May 1963 to Jorge Semprún’s Le
grand voyage (The Long Voyage), another possible embarrassment was on the horizon
for Barral. The Formentor prize conferred on winning novels the prestige of
simultaneous publication in multiple languages. But with Semprún’s reputation as a
Marxist agitator and sworn enemy of Francoism preceding him, Barral was to encounter
some difficulty in fulfilling his part of the deal by publishing the Spanish translation of
Semprún’s novel. The censor’s verdict was delivered in June 1963:

The author of this novel, first composed in French, is Spanish: Jorge Semprún.
The narrative is set at the time of the French resistance to Nazism. There is a
wealth of details concerning the conduct of the SS, and the protagonist, a “red”
Spaniard, narrates the events. The work as whole and at the crux of its plot does
not affect Spain or the Spanish regime. However, it has tendentious moments in
which the ideology of the lately famous author becomes apparent.

There ought to have been no reason why, on the face of it, Semprún’s novel should be
rejected outright. If Amat-Piniella, speaking from substantially the same position as a
Republican prisoner in a Nazi camp, had been allowed to publish his testimony, the grounds to expect a refusal of Semprún’s novel seemed scant. There is little in the report that suggests the novel would eventually be blocked. The reader highlighted a number of passages from *Le grand voyage* that he deemed would have to be excised for the book to be published: a reference to Franco and Semprún’s inversion of the vilified “red Spaniard” as a quality to celebrate rather than an object of shame were highlighted for removal. However, despite the recommendation for publication to proceed with the necessary excisions in the manuscript being implemented, the reader’s recommendation was overruled and publication was refused. The censorship record does not reveal how this decision was made. Likewise there is no evidence that Barral sought to overturn the decision, for example by requesting a second reading as he did with the *Cartas de condenados*. The publisher probably discovered the project was doomed after a telephone call, which is how these negotiations tended to be conducted, in parallel with the written correspondence conserved today in the archive. The publication of Semprún’s novel was part of Barral’s commitment to the Formentor circle. In the end the publisher had to present Semprún with an edition of his work containing only blank pages at the award ceremony. Although in *L’écriture ou la vie* (*Literature or Life*) Semprún recalls the award of a blank copy of *Le grand voyage* fondly as a poignant symbol of the eternally renewed duty of testifying to the horrors of Buchenwald, there is every reason to suspect that Barral would have found his failure to publish the Spanish translation uncomfortable. The strength of feeling that Barral came up against in the Inspectorate was evidently even more resolute than his determination to get the work published. The opportunity to expand Spanish awareness of Nazi atrocities and to publicize the experience endured by Spanish political prisoners in the infamous camps was yet again thwarted. The regime’s fear of the fine line separating testimony of the
genocide from anti-fascist sentiment asserted itself once again. The potential for displays of political resistance to Nazism to morph into and feed opposition to Francoism plagued the regime’s censors.

**Barral’s Holocaust-Publishing Legacy**

Despite the lack of success with Semprún’s *Le grand voyage*, Barral’s “Testimonio” series continued to promote historical works on the crimes of the Third Reich. Seix Barral had sought permission for a Spanish translation of Reimund Schnabel’s *Macht ohne Moral: Eine Dokumentation über die SS* (Power without morality: Documentation on the SS) in early 1963, before the Semprún debacle. The censors deemed the atrocities documented in Schnabel’s book to be sufficiently disconnected from Spain for permission to be granted. However, the planned edition did not materialize until 1966, after a second round of censorship reports arrived at the same conclusion. The delay between the initial presentation of the work and the final date of publication was due perhaps to setbacks in the commissioning of a translation. By the time the translation was eventually produced, the publishing house evidently saw fit to renew the authorization to proceed with the publication. Schnabel’s book was potentially the most contentious work on the Holocaust to be published yet in Spain. The book contains images of mass killings, piles of corpses, Russian women undressing in preparation for their execution, a beheading carried out by a grinning soldier, victims of hangings and the squalid conditions of the camps—all far more graphic than the photographs contained in Wulf and Poliakov’s book. The various censors who came into contact with Schnabel’s book were evidently shocked by the savagery documented therein, and the old qualms about the failure to give the Nazis a fair press still weighed on their decision:
A compilation of documents, testimonies, reports, witness statements and photographs relating to the history and conduct of the Nazi regime’s SS. [It deals with] the repressive and persecutory aspects of their policing activities in Germany, their political, ideological, racial and religious motivations, and the horrendous role they played in the concentration camps, in which the use of prisoners in clinical, sterilizing and chemical experiments stands out. …

Although the documentation seems authentic, the selection, given its subjective nature, appears to be partial, at least, seeing as it captures only the truly monstrous and reprehensible aspect of the SS. … As a historical testimony that demonstrates the inhuman extremes to which a regime deprived of any moral coordinates can lead, it is interesting.  

Latent philo-Germanic sentiment bubbles to the surface in Francisco Manot’s report from March 5, 1963. The reader accepts the veracity of the horrors documented in Schnabel’s book but accuses the author of bias against the SS. Manot rebukes Schnabel for his one-sided concern with the “monstrous” and “reprehensible” as if there were an amiable and gentle side to the SS that should form part of his appraisal as well. A second report from March 13, this one by a reader whose anonymity is protected by the illegibility of his signature, also thought that Schnabel’s negative treatment of the SS, while perhaps not unfounded, lacked context:

The work brings together a wide range of documents on the horrors and atrocities perpetrated by the SS for political, racial and religious reasons; on the concentration camps and the subhuman conditions in which the amassed individuals lived, on the scientific use of the amassed individuals—veritable “human guinea pigs”—for medical experiments, on the mass exterminations carried out by the SS, etc., etc. The work is a veritable show of brutality, cruelty
and terror. It represents a harsh lesson on what an irreligious system can become.

(It is a shame there are not as many publications of this kind on the communist cruelties and that there are no data on the Russian victors’ atrocities.)

The cruelties perpetrated by the SS are enumerated in a list that trails off with an elliptical “etc., etc.” which gives an impression almost of tedium. The use of this abbreviation following a reference to mass extermination betrays a distinct lack of sensitivity. And the specter of the bad old communists is raised yet again as an attenuating mechanism, a justification for, and contextual rationalization of Nazi crimes denoting a continued unwillingness to face their enormity. The references to the prisoners in Nazi camps as “concentrados” effectively suggests that the appalling conditions that prevailed there can be explained by the number of detainees housed in the cramped and squalid conditions. The issue of overcrowding is called forth as a way of eliding or at least diminishing agency for the atrocities. The reader charged with vetting Schnabel’s work on behalf of the Inspectorate even proposed a number of excisions in line with his ideological commitments. He wanted the book to be, as he puts it, “cleansed of all that might contribute to belief in the communist hero” and pointed out a number of pages that could be removed in their entirety. He also thought that some of the photographs included in the book were immoral because of their “excessive brutality.” But his suggestions for amendments appear subsequently to have been overruled. Superimposed on the reader’s typewritten report is a later handwritten inscription that reads “publishable without amendments.” A superior no doubt balked at the overly officious proposals because of the bureaucratic diligence that would have been required to oversee their implementation. Neither the subject matter nor the mode of its delivery in dry archival prose was particularly delicate after all. Moreover, the proposed print run of 4,000 copies was not exactly alarming in its
conceivable impact on Spanish society. The proposed edition was approved on April 6, 1963, although the translation failed to materialize. Two years later, on March 16, 1965, the publication request was renewed, triggering a further two reports, briefer in nature owing to the previous record. Both censorship reports produced in 1965 display reservations regarding the explicitness of the photographic images, but the wider social and cultural transformations in 1960s Spain were beginning to take their toll:

A long catalogue of cruelties, crimes and horrors, which are particularly prominent in the photographs of an extremely gruesome nature. Considering the fact that many of these documents are already known in our country and that there is no attack or allusion to Spain, the authorization granted by [prior record] no. 803-63 is hereby renewed.

The book bears no relationship to Spain, and having been authorized in West Germany there seems to be no reason for the content of the book not to be known in our land.\(^77\)

The publication of the photographs contained in Schnabel’s book would have been unthinkable a couple of decades earlier. The gulf between the blurry images reproduced in early newspaper reports on the camps and the high-quality photographs printed in the Spanish translation of Schnabel’s book cannot be explained simply by the more sophisticated mode of their reproduction in the book, by the increasing availability of the images, or by the growing permissiveness of Franco’s regime, although all of these factors help to explain the development in part. Carlos Barral’s own persistence in promoting an incipient awareness of the Holocaust and his powers of persuasion in overcoming the regime’s resistance made an inestimable contribution to the increasing ease with which historical information on the extermination of the European Jews
filtered into the public sphere. There were still sticking points. Political prisoners in Nazi camps with past links to the Republican cause in the Spanish Civil War encountered substantial obstacles in their endeavor to tell their story. Jorge Semprún’s *El largo viaje* made it into print only after Franco’s death. The faintest intimation of connections between Francoist Spain and Nazi Germany was forbidden, as was any scrutiny of Spain’s behavior during the Second World War. The punctilious suppression of even the most incidental references to Spain in histories of the Second World War and the Holocaust became more apparent later in the 1960s and in the first half of the 1970s as other publishers took up the gauntlet of Holocaust publishing. The Spanish translation of Gerald Reitlinger’s *The Final Solution* published by Grijalbo was obliged to renounce any allusion to Spain’s procrastination in offering diplomatic protection to Jews of Salonica.78 Hannah Arendt’s *Eichmann en Jerusalén (Eichmann in Jerusalem)* published by Lumen had to be sanitized in the few places in which “the Jewish question slightly touches the Spanish government.”79 Censors also objected to references to Franco and Spain and to Jesuit anti-Judaism in Arendt’s *Los orígenes del totalitarismo (The Origins of Totalitarianism)* proposed for publication by Sinera.80

But the censors’ lack of compromise in the areas in which Spanish politics were imbricated in the history of the destruction of the European Jews was counterbalanced by the more frequent occasions on which historical works on the Holocaust were given permission for publication. The regime was not quite as inflexible as has often been assumed. And partly thanks to Barral’s determination to disseminate Holocaust awareness in Spain, Spanish readers had, at least from the beginning of the 1960s, rigorously researched academic history at their disposal. Barral’s promotion of a Holocaust consciousness in Franco’s Spain was a significant educational and moral act of public enlightenment. The regime had no intention of spreading the word about the
Holocaust, for reasons that we saw in the first part of this article, and the pedagogical materials in Spanish schools failed for a long time to make adequate reference to the Nazi genocide.\textsuperscript{81} If it had not been for Barral’s initiative, the paucity of public knowledge about the extermination of the European Jews might have been that much more acute. Barral’s work was an important counterpoint to the regime’s latent anti-Semitism, which may, at least in its most glaring forms, have been quietly put to bed at the end of the Second World War, although by no means completely eradicated. Álvarez Chillida shows that anti-Semitism found other outlets after 1945, for example, in commentary on international affairs, particularly in criticism of Israel and in the wounded pride and sense of injustice expressed by many commentators on Israel’s supposed lack of loyalty following the benevolence shown by Spain to Jewish refugees during the Second World War.\textsuperscript{82} The practice of anti-Semitic literature continued to find fervent adherents in Mauricio Carlavilla, Félix Máñz and an equally avid promoter in the publisher Luis de Caralt.\textsuperscript{83} The old anti-Jewish myths continued vibrantly and out in the open among prominent Church leaders, at least until the reform of the Church’s relationship with the Jews by the Second Vatican Council in the 1960s, which made inroads in eradicating the vestiges of traditional Catholic anti-Judaism among the Spanish clergy.\textsuperscript{84} There was, moreover, a resurgence of anti-Semitism in the disenchanted Falangists, traditionalists and fundamentalist members of the clergy who were unhappy about the internationally oriented and liberal course the country was beginning to take from the 1960s onwards.\textsuperscript{85} In \textit{Arriba}, Eichmann’s trial was viewed as an injustice, a base act of revenge for crimes that only God had the right to judge. Nazi atrocities were yet again set in comparison with those of the communists, which is to say those of the Jews themselves who were regarded as the architects and orchestrators
of communism. In the same decade, Holocaust denial and the growth of neo-Nazism made some headway in Spain.

By uncovering Carlos Barral’s hitherto unexamined endeavor to promote public awareness of the Holocaust, this article has sought to illuminate the part that the publishing industry was able to play in challenging the Franco regime’s censorship of Nazi atrocities. We have seen that the regime had good reason to fear Spaniards’ knowledge of the Nazi camps. Spain’s recent past was perilously entangled with the Second World War: the country had not merely collaborated with the Axis powers; some of its own citizens, those who were defeated in the civil war and forced into exile, had paid the ultimate price in Nazi camps for their struggle against fascism. Languishing under the strictures of censorship, the Spanish media was unable to spread the word; the duty of awakening his coevals from their ignorance and indifference fell to Barral. The publisher can be credited with significant breakthroughs: from the end of the 1950s he was responsible for the appearance of the first historical and fictional works on the Holocaust. But as Barral’s denunciation of Francoist complicity with Nazi crimes became more explicit through the attempted publication of Republican camp testimonies, he began to encounter greater resistance from the regime’s cultural police. Fearing that public awareness of the tribulations undergone by Republicans in their commitment to anti-fascism might undermine the divisive memory politics from which Franco’s regime derived its legitimacy, the censors permitted books on the subject of the Holocaust on the condition that Spanish connections to that turbulent episode of European history were silenced. Nevertheless, Barral’s achievements in pursuing the publication of testimonial works on the Nazi camps and in commissioning and producing translations of historical and fictional works on the Holocaust would be noteworthy even in a post-Second World War democracy. If we recall the inhospitable
context in which the publisher developed and nurtured the Spanish public’s curiosity about the Holocaust, then we can see that his endeavor is worth more than a passing mention. In Franco’s Spain, Barral’s efforts were an exceptional feat. It is time to give the Spanish publisher the recognition he deserves as a founder of Holocaust consciousness in the somber years of Francoist anxiety and ideological complicity.

Notes
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1. The phrase “the skeletons in Franco’s closet” refers here both to the Jewish victims of the Holocaust and to the Spanish Republican victims of Nazism, who invested the seemingly distant Nazi atrocities with a troublesome domestic dimension and reinforced the regime’s inclination to expunge both groups of victims from the public sphere in Spain. The contemporary movement to disinter the remains of Republican victims in unmarked graves in Spain has shined a spotlight on the literal skeletons that remained hidden throughout Franco’s rule. The skeletons to which I refer here are of a more metaphorical nature: the shameful atrocities perpetrated by a foreign power for which the Francoists had once openly shown their admiration; a sense of guilt rendered more acute by the number of Spaniards who had perished in Nazi camps.


3. The role of the publishing industry and the media in shaping public perceptions of the Holocaust in the aftermath of the Second World War has been studied sporadically in various national contexts. More sustained attention has been paid to the role of the press in publicizing details of Nazi atrocities both during and after the war.


15. Two of Hitler’s speeches reported in *ABC* in 1942 and 1943 issue proclamations of the demise of the Jewish race that are not merely embedded in the speeches but are used as caption headings by the editors. Readers of *ABC* on January 31, 1942 were treated to a grim prophesy culled from the Führer’s “magnificent” speech: “The war will end with the annihilation of Judaism,” *ABC* (Madrid), January 31, 1942, morning ed., 10. A year later the warning was repeated in the pages of *ABC*: “This struggle will end with the destruction of Jewry,” *ABC* (Madrid), February 25, 1943, morning ed., 4. All translations in this article are my own unless otherwise noted.

16. On the Franco regime’s policies of benevolent neutrality and non-belligerence, see Payne, *Franco and Hitler*, 44–86.

17. On Spanish military collaboration with the Nazis, see Payne, *Franco and Hitler*: on the resupply of German submarines, 56–57; on Gibraltar, 115–17, 194; on
Mediterranean supply-running, 118–19, 123; on wolfram exports, 238–50; and on the Blue Division, 146–54.

18. Payne notes that Spain’s official position of non-belligerence disguised a stance of pre-belligerence, in which Franco was simply biding his time for a more propitious moment to join the Axis side, *Franco and Hitler*, 128. See Payne’s account of the regime’s lobbying for generous terms to facilitate its entry into the war (81–86) and on Franco and Hitler’s meeting at Hendaye, which was conceived to iron out their differences over the terms of Spain’s entry (87–104).

19. For an account of the regime’s awareness of what was happening in Nazi-occupied territories, see Bernd Rother, *Franco y el Holocausto*, trans. Leticia Artiles Gracia and rev. Gonzalo Álvarez Chillida (Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2005), 125–29. Based on his investigation of reports by Spanish diplomats, Rother finds that as early as the end of 1941, the regime was aware of the Nazis’ euthanasia program and of the ghettoization of the Jews. The Blue Division relayed reports of the deportations and mass executions they had witnessed from mid-1942, and Spanish diplomats in Athens and Berlin confirmed rumors of the genocide of deported Jews in mid-1943.


30. The *Generación del ’50* describes the group of writers who had been children during the Spanish Civil War and began to publish during the 1950s under the revitalizing impetus of economic and intellectual liberalization. Many of the poets, novelists and intellectuals associated with the group were politically engaged and critical of Franco’s regime.


40. Censorship record on Léon Poliakof and Josef Wulf, *El tercer reich y los judíos*, September 16, 1959, Archivo General de la Administración, Alcalá de Henares, Spain (hereafter AGA), record number (número de expediente) 3938/59, catalogue number (signatura) (3)50 21/12517.


46. AGA, 5031/59.


50. AGA, 4836/59, emphasis in original.

51. AGA, 4836/59.

52. AGA, 4836/59.


54. Mauthausen is clearly identifiable in Amat-Piniella’s novel, although the camp is not named explicitly.


59. For an analysis of Amat-Piniella’s depiction of the deep ideological divides between the anarchists and communists see Marín-Dòmine, “Por una epistemología,” 146.
60. On the tortuous composition of *K.L. Reich*, see Marín-Dôme, “Por una epistemología,” 139.


68. On Semprún and the Formentor, see Barral, *Memorias*, 547. The novel for which Semprún was awarded the prize is *Le grand voyage* (Paris: Gallimard, 1963).


70. AGA, 3644/63.


74. AGA, 803/63.

75. AGA, 803/63, emphasis in original.

76. AGA, 803/63.
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