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Public Enemy or National Hero?: The Spanish Gypsy and the Rise of Flamenquismo, 1898-1922

Abstract

The views of Lorca and Falla on Gypsies and flamenco as elements that resist change and epitomise tradition are well known to scholars of flamenco, historians of Spanish literature and music, and Hispanists at large. From different disciplines and perspectives, a range of scholars have converged in the view that Lorca and Falla focused on the Gypsy in order to condemn and arrest what they saw as evidence of an unrelenting cultural modernisation. Related to this, Lorca and Falla interpreted the rise of cuplé, zarzuela and the commercialisation of flamenco in the context of the cafés cantantes as signs of aesthetic corruption and degeneration. Yet, as this article will show, the views articulated by Lorca and Falla, to a great extent, were produced in the context of, and responded to a tradition of denigrating Gypsies and flamenco in Spanish culture. A substantial part of this earlier cultural production on Gypsies drew on a pseudo-scientific rhetoric in order to simulate solutions to—but, in reality, to appease anxieties about—the decadence of the Spanish ‘race’. As Charnon-Deutsch has argued, the creation and scapegoating of a Gypsy anti-hero or public enemy—in other words, a common Other—since at least the early nineteenth century proved to be an efficient way of conjuring up a counter-model against which to define the ‘common Spaniard’ in order to foster nationalist sentiment and stimulate national cohesion.


opinion about them, as, since the late eighteenth century, no law had been able refer to them specifically. The restitution of the Gypsy to a positive cultural image, indeed to that of hero, by Falla and Lorca thus had specific overtones in relation to a longstanding practice of scapegoating the Gypsy as well as to the context of Spain’s internal political skirmishes and social struggles. The Gypsy was prominent in the discourse of \textit{flamenquismo}, which—as will be explained—helped to articulate and negotiate a series of tensions emerging from the immigration of working-class Andalusians in Madrid during the nineteenth century. These tensions, plus the rejection by intellectuals belonging to the so-called Generation of ‘98 of Andalusia-oriented portrayals of Spain made by foreign artists and intellectuals, set the stage on which Lorca and Falla put forward a reinvigorated image of the Andalusian Gypsy.

**Keywords:** Gypsies, flamenco, scapegoating, degeneration, Lorca, Falla

The sentiment of crisis that affected Spanish intellectuals and newspaper readers in the wake of the so-called 1898 \textit{desastre} is often explained in macro-cultural terms, through which its impact in perceptions of national identity and the morale of Spanish society at large is viewed. Yet, it is when we look at local or minor events that we are able to understand how certain myths of national magnitude originated. This is particularly useful if we are to unravel the process that led to the scapegoating of Gypsies at the end of the nineteenth century, followed by the subsequent restoration of the Gypsy to a positive and heroic cultural figure by Lorca and Falla. An example of this is the death of bullfighter Francisco Piñero Gavira in 1898, aged twenty-four and at the height of his fame. His death did not just cause a commotion in the world of bullfighting, but the strange and seedy circumstances that surrounded it elicited journalistic reactions in which concern for national security and morale was prominent. Had Gavira died in the bullring, his death could have gained heroic overtones; but he was shot dead at night, on the streets of Madrid, during a brawl with a policeman who was in a relationship with Gavira’s former mistress. The backdrop to this crime was Madrid’s deviant nightlife, already a focus for scandal and subject to widespread criticism in the press. In this case the
unpleasant circumstances surrounding Gavira’s murder stood in the way of his being acclaimed as a type of tragic hero, although they did bring him into the public spotlight.

Most obituaries of Gavira, although they extolled his bullfighting skills, construed his death as resulting from a youth wasted in debauchery. An article published in La Ilustración Ibérica refused to regard his murder in isolation and used it as a prism to assess the ills of Spanish society, blaming it on ‘flamenquismo’ which—its author argued—represented ‘una plaga de la sociedad actual’:

En cuanto un joven […] llega a Madrid y no tiene cuidado con las malas compañías ó una gran fuerza de voluntad para resistir los influjos perniciosos, se aflamenca, y está irremisiblemente perdido. El flamenquismo se respira en la atmósfera madrileña como los miasmas de la peste bubónica en Bombay y los de la fiebre en las regiones insanas de América.3

Striking as it might seem that the death of a bullfighter at the hands of a policeman should be blamed on a social ‘plague’ termed ‘flamenquismo’, this word was common currency in newspaper articles of the time. But, what exactly was flamenquismo? The exact origins of the term are hard to trace. Newspaper readers would often find it associated with Madrid’s underworld of ‘degeneration’, but it was also to be found in novels, and was a characteristic depicted, among others, by Galdós in Fortunata y Jacinta (1887) and Baroja in La lucha por la vida (1904). Thus, after a killing in Barcelona in 1894, the daily L’Arch de Sant Martí published an article blaming ‘flamenquismo, costumbre que nos viene de Madrid’.4 The use of flamenquismo had arguably emerged in the early 1880s, when it was used to refer to the culture of bullfighting and flamenco that existed at the end of the eighteenth century—a meaning that would be recovered in the 1910s, as will be discussed later.5

---


But flamenquismo or, to be more precise, the social phenomena behind it, did not only attract the attention of journalists. The latter just acted as mediators between a larger public of readers, and the criminologists and doctors who devoted their time to analysing the social and psychological causes of crime in Madrid and other Spanish cities. Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of the fragment quoted above is the use of scientific and medical language. Madrid is described as a sick body that has been inoculated by foreign, extraneous elements coming from ‘insalubrious lands’; it is a site of corruption that retaliates by contaminating new incomers. Organic metaphors of this kind were pervasive in Spanish culture and, as Laura Otis comments, ‘must be viewed in the context of nineteenth-century European desires for national identity and epistemological unity’. The image of the sick body cited above, while it prefigured more specifically the oft-cited work of the regeneracionista Joaquín Costa, Oligarquía y caciquismo (1902) in which Spain featured as a sick body needing the intervention of an ‘iron surgeon’, was an example of this general context rather than necessarily being a specific source for Costa’s work. In La ilustración ibérica, however, the sick body metaphor does not indicate political and moral decadence, but refers more strictly to crime, which is understood as ‘una forma de vida patológica susceptible de difundirse por todo el cuerpo social y corromperlo’.

Journalists like the author of the article just discussed, and other intellectuals who will be referenced in this article, applied the framework of pathologisation created by flamenquismo discourse to scapegoat certain individuals and groups. In their writings, they attacked Gypsies most conspicuously and cast them as Spain’s foremost public enemies or anti-heroes. Although it is debatable whether the work of these intellectuals did help to eradicate social problems, they thought of themselves as contributing to the regeneration of society. Their eloquence and command of narrative strategies, in addition

---

6 Laura Otis, Organic Memory: History and the Body in the Late Nineteenth & Early Twentieth Centuries (Lincoln & London: University of Nebraska Press, 1994), 4.

7 Joaquín Costa, Oligarquía y Caciquismo (Madrid: Imprenta de los Hijos de M. G. Hernández, 1902), 86.

8 Ricardo Campos, ‘La clasificación de lo difuso: el concepto de “mala vida” en la literatura criminológica de cambio de siglo’, Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies, 10.4 (2009), 399-422 (p. 400). Here, and elsewhere, accents and spelling are as in the original quoted.
to their confident use of pseudo-scientific discourse, helped to convince their readers that they were capable of identifying and diagnosing Spain’s social evils.

Despite its lack of rigour, however, this pseudo-scientific stance used in journalism and literature of the late nineteenth century was accompanied and supported by the emergence of a genuinely serious and scientific concern for the study of crime in Spain. An interest in broad issues of degeneration developed within the rising discipline of criminology, its presence in Spain fostered by a series of institutional developments such as the foundation of the Escuela de criminología (1903). Criminology in Spain was open to the influence of European criminologists such as Cesare Lombroso, his disciple Enrico Ferri, and Max Nordau. Lombroso grounded his research on a purportedly scientific study of the mental and physical condition of the ‘criminal’. He defined the criminal as the product of innate and biological factors rather than environmental ones, and claimed that it was possible to identify one through his or her physical traits. He applied phrenology and other supposedly scientific methods to establish biological prototypes of the ‘criminal man’ and woman, and he concluded that criminals represented an atavistic element, a remnant of primitive stages in the evolution of humankind. His theories on the criminal exerted a notable influence in late nineteenth-century Spain although—as in France—they would come to be mixed with more general ideas on degeneration.

The strand of French thinking on degeneration that Spanish criminologists followed was derived from the work of Bénédict A. Morel. His theory of the family tree argued for degeneration as a cumulative process that manifested in effects displayed in various conditions that were morbid but different and mutable rather than fixed. Such conditions would lead gradually to the decadence of a given ‘race’ (or, as specified in his works, the

---


French ‘race’). In addition to Lombroso and Morel, Spanish anthropologists also assimilated the ideas of the Austrian writer, social critic and journalist Max Nordau, whose main work of 1892, *Degeneration*, was translated into Spanish in 1894, only two years after its original publication. Although Nordau declared himself a follower of Lombroso, he did not treat the criminal as the bearer of a pathology or innate condition, but as the outcome of a process of degeneration brought about through exposure to certain social, hygienic, psychological, and physical factors, in other words, to a broad range of environmental conditions.

The 1898 article from *La ilustración ibérica* cited earlier did not apply Lombroso’s or Nordau’s theories faithfully, but it did make use of the power of pseudo-scientific discourse. This article did not mention Gypsies, but its association between *flamenquismo* and the use of scientific language to discriminate between different social groups would become one of the most effective and widespread means of scapegoating the Gypsies from the 1910s on. Before this could happen, however, the term would have to lose its almost exclusive associations with Madrid in the 1880s and become gradually identified with Andalusia, where Gypsies were believed to be more abundant. There had not been, and there still is no census of Gypsy population in Andalusia and elsewhere in Spain, not least because of the lack of official documentation on their whereabouts, but links between Gypsies and Andalusia were made in European art and literature throughout the nineteenth century. As Lou Charnon-Deutsch argues, for the purpose of the following analysis of perceptions of Gypsies, it matters less whether or not there is a real basis for those links to be made than the fact that they were made.

That *flamenquismo* was initially connected to Madrid rather than to Andalusia is not as striking as it might seem. From the 1840s on, Spain’s capital city had been the

---


destination of growing numbers of Andalusian working-class immigrants who, once in the capital, struggled to make a living and joined the ranks of homeless. As a partial consequence of this phenomenon, Madrid became the locale where the culture of public flamenco performances most grew during the second half of the nineteenth century. A city rife with poverty, lack of hygiene and crime, Madrid became an easy prey for critics alert to see degeneration, and who used the term *flamenquismo* as a general label for the cultural and moral expressions of that ‘degenerated’ underworld. Early twentieth-century Madrid was thus the scenario where what had been a centuries-long criminalisation of the Gypsy was now rounded out and completed. This focus on Madrid would eventually have a positive effect for those would be champions of the Gypsies in the 1920s, in that, by temporarily diverting attention away from Andalusia, it made this region suitable for the reinstatement of a regenerated, and eventually a heroic Gypsy.

A ‘competition’ between Madrid and Andalusia to act as essences of national identity, therefore, was what underpinned the formation of denigrating portrayals of the Gypsy on the one hand and heroic portrayals of the Gypsy on the other. That tension would be played out in the writings of the Generation of ’98, who, contrary to early nineteenth-century Romantic glamorization of Andalusia, would promote Castile for an iconic emblem of Spain’s national identity. Yet many discussions of Madrid’s ‘degeneration’ stemmed from that same Generation of ’98, thus showing the generation’s contradictory nature.

A polemical republican campaigner and cultural critic who assimilated the influence of the Generation of ’98 although not their pro-Castile stance, Eugenio Noel (1885-1936), would go on to become the most outspoken and influential propagandist of anti-*flamenquismo* in the 1910s. His work shows the clear influence of a criminologist of Lombrosian tendencies, Rafael Salillas, who in 1898 had published *El delincuente*...
español: *Hampa (antropología picaresca)* (usually referred to as *Hampa*), a book scapegoating the Gypsies and flamenco.\(^{19}\) The work of Salillas and Noel ultimately casts the Gypsy as a criminal who threatens public security, and as a hindrance to the expansion and growth of modernity. This image gained relevance at a critical moment in which Spain’s process of modernisation was still incipient, uneven and unstable. Neither Salillas nor Noel focused on Madrid, but their work needs to be understood in close connection with the development of *flamenquismo* in that city from the 1880s onwards. Salillas served as the basis for the first book-length consistent attack on Madrid’s culture of ‘degeneration’, namely, *La mala vida en Madrid* (1901) by his pupils Constancio Bernaldo del Quirós and José María Llanas de Aguilaniedo.\(^{20}\) Noel’s work drew directly on attacks on Madrid’s *flamenquismo*—as will be shown below.

**Rafael Salillas**

Publishing his study *Hampa* in the year in which Gavira was murdered (1898), the prominent criminologist Salillas would exert an enduring influence on understandings of crime and the Gypsies in the decades to follow, both within and beyond the academic field. In *Hampa*, he gave free rein to a bigoted and criminalised portrayal of the Spanish Gypsy that, to some extent, was reminiscent of previous studies on Gypsies such as that of Sales Mayo.\(^{21}\) Striking within it was the use of medical metaphors and a pseudo-scientific rhetoric. Although Salillas is today known for his work as a criminologist, he had first graduated in medicine, and it was only after he was appointed to the Dirección General de Establecimientos Penales that he started studying penal law.\(^{22}\) He went on to occupy significant posts in the penal organs of the Spanish administrative system and founded the Escuela de Criminología in 1903. Salillas’ ideas on Gypsies had impact

\(^{19}\) Rafael Salillas, *El delincuente español: Hampa (antropología picaresca)* (Madrid: Victoriano Suárez, 1898).


\(^{22}\) María Dolores Fernández Rodríguez, *El pensamiento penitenciario y criminológico de Rafael Salillas* (Santiago de Compostela: Secretariado de Publicaciones de la Universidad, 1976), 75-86.
because of his prominent position in various professional circles and cultural institutions—including the Institución Libre de Enseñanza and the Ateneo de Madrid—and an extensive list of publications that covered a wide range of criminological and literary topics.23

At several points in *Hampa*, Salillas cites Lombroso, specifically in relation to his work on organised crime.24 Salillas in turn, three years later, would be the dedicatee of the volume *La mala vida en Madrid* by Bernaldo de Quirós and Llanas de Aguilaniedo mentioned above. This chain of tributes indicates the extent to which Salillas’ criminalisation of the Gypsy formed part of a network, or rather, a genealogy, of shared knowledge. In *Criminal Man*, Lombroso had argued that ‘Bedouins and Gypsies can be considered ‘organised criminals’; and that ‘criminals resemble savages and the coloured races’ in physical and psychological aspects.25 In the introduction to *Hampa*, Salillas indicated that he followed Lombroso in aspects that were broader than just his view of the Gypsies, and this included Lombroso’s study of the nature of crime. Commenting on crime, Salillas referred to ‘la misma evolución natural’.26 Like Lombroso, Salillas set aside environmental factors in his analysis of ‘criminal man’ and focused on evolutionist and biological arguments. In addition to being interested in Lombroso, Salillas was also attracted to the theories of degeneration put forward by Nordau, and found an eclectic synthesis between the main tenets of the two writers: ‘Degeneración y atavismo, son términos equivalentes, porque en ambos casos existe un salto atrás, que hace del delincuente un salvaje, según la concepción lombrosina’.27 Perhaps this eclecticism is responsible for the fact that, unlike Lombroso, Salillas believed that some criminals could be ‘cured’. Those who could not be ‘cured’, however, deserved the harshest treatment, and Salillas wrote in positive terms about the Gypsy Round-Up of 1749 in which ten

---


thousand Gypsies from seventy five villages in Spain had been separated into single-sex groups and put into prison.28

Although Salillas claimed to be connected to a prestigious international scientific network through his pioneering knowledge of Lombroso’s theories, Hampa is, to a great extent, the product of literary analysis. Salillas’ vast knowledge of Golden Age literature29 manifests in his attempt to trace the etiology of ‘hampa’—a term by which he refers to organised forms of crime. He claims that the opening of La Gitanilla, where Cervantes states that ‘los gitanos y gitanas solamente nacieron en el mundo para ser ladrones’, is the most accurate depiction of Gypsies.30 The picaresque novel most cited in Hampa, however, is Guzmán de Alfarache (1599, 1604), by Mateo Alemán, to whom Hampa is dedicated. The literary genre of picaresque novels, therefore, represents the only evidence behind Salillas’ statements in Hampa about Gypsies in Spain both past and present. In this respect, Salillas’ approach to his subject did not differ much from that of European writers and artists such as Théophile Gautier (1811-1872), George Borrow (1803-1881) or Gustave Doré (1832-1883), who, although they all had a first-hand knowledge of Spain, preferred to rely on novels, poems and fiction as the basis for their ‘imagined’ and ‘exotic’ Spain(s).31 As a consequence of relying on literature, Hampa is plagued with dubious assumptions. The fact that, by the time Hampa was published, most Spanish and European Gypsies had already chosen a settled life,32 for instance, did not deter Salillas from evoking the myth of nomadism:

---


29 Fernández Rodríguez, Pensamiento Penitenciario, 75.

30 Salillas, Hampa, 286.

31 Charnon-Deutsch, The Spanish Gypsy, 57-64, 94-103.

En el análisis de la hampa, se descubre pronto que su carácter distintivo equivale á una de las formas de la movilidad nómada [...] Para comprobarlo, se nos ofrece como objeto de estudio una singular representación superviviente de los pueblos nómadas en el pueblo gitano.33

The nomad stereotype was deeply ingrained in Spanish publications on Gypsies that Salillas read and assimilated uncritically.34 Indeed, Salillas identifies nomadism as the ultimate cause of all the degenerate features that he associates with the Gypsy. He argues that the Gypsy’s alleged nomadism prompts him to behave ‘parasitically’, stealing and deceiving through false flattery or eliciting charitable compassion.35 Significantly, Salillas chooses not to analyse the causes of nomadism, which he regards as being an innate characteristic of Gypsies and one that suggests they are a primitive people.36 In Salillas, nomadism is synonymous with criminal life. He attributes the Gypsy’s alleged vagrancy to ‘la incorregibilidad de tendencias del gitano’,37 a verdict that reads like Lombroso’s assessment of delinquent behaviour as one that is innate rather than acquired. Seen in this way, nomadism does not function as a descriptive element, but as a prescriptive one: Gypsies are nomads, otherwise they are not Gypsies. Salillas’ views on nomadism would influence Bernaldo del Quirós and Llanas de Aguilaniedo, the authors of La mala vida en Madrid, who referred to ‘Las estirpes vagabundas’, of which ‘primera, entre todas, es la de los gitanos’, and who argued that ‘todo vagabundo contiene en sí la tela de un malhechor’.38

33 Salillas, Hampa, x.

34 See, for example Manuel Gil Maestre, La criminalidad en Barcelona y en las grandes poblaciones (Barcelona: Tipografía de Leodegario Obradors, 1886), 56; Blanca de los Ríos, ‘La gitana’, in Las mujeres españolas, americanas y lusitanas pintadas por sí mismas, ed. Faustina Sáez de Melgar (Barcelona: Juan Pons, 1881), 509-607 (p. 595).

35 Salillas, Hampa, 122.

36 Salillas, Hampa, 184-185.

37 Salillas, Hampa, 167.

38 Salillas, Hampa, 138, 62.
A reliance on dubious aetiologies is also noticeable in Salillas’ understanding of flamenco, which he linked to the Gypsies. He traces the term ‘flamenco’ back to the Spanish soldier fighting in Early Modern Flanders. Thus he conflated the two existing definitions of ‘flamenco’, namely, a musical style and a term referring to people from Flanders. But Salillas had no intention of ascribing any heroic attributes to the Gypsy in so doing. It is true that he described the Spanish soldier as ‘valeroso, presumido, derrochador, bullanguero y, como hoy se dice, juelguista [sic.]’; but these qualities, which resonate with attributes associated with flamenco music (‘bullangero, juerga’), belong to the ‘periodo decadente del soldado de Flandes’, when—according to Salillas—he started losing battles and began to join the hampa. Thus by means of a linguistic play on words, Salillas criminalises the origins of flamenco music. In this instance, the Gypsy is not Salillas’ primary target, but this is only because ‘el zíngaro no tiene una música propia’ and ‘sus canciones participan de la influencia de los pueblos á que el zíngaro se adapta’. In addition to denying Gypsies any musical creativity, Salillas denigrates their alleged musical proficiency, which he recognises but condemns:

el sentimiento musical es compatible con las mayores decadencias del espíritu, desde que se sabe que hay imbéciles y que hay idiotas músicos, ese rasgo saliente de la psiquis zíngara, más que á excelencia, se puede atribuir á poquedad mental.

In sum, in Hampa Salillas singles out the Gypsy as the culprit of Spain’s ills and the centre of its criminal life. According to Salillas, the Gypsy has played degenerate music, and at the same time, has not invented anything. Interestingly, while Salillas establishes a clear-cut difference between hampa and the Gypsies (that is, between organised crime and those he identifies as prime agents of it), the spotlight in fact falls on the latter for

39 Salillas, Hampa, 54.

40 Salillas, Hampa, 182-183.

41 Salillas, Hampa, 306; Hungarian composer and folklorist Béla Bartók would put forward a very similar argument in several papers dating from 1911 on, in which he denied the Gypsies any creativity in the process of preservation and transmission of what he understood as Hungarian folklore. Julie Brown, ‘Bartók, the Gypsies and Hybridity in Music’, in Western Music and its Others. Difference, Representation and Appropriation in Music, ed. Georgina Born and David Hesmondhalgh (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 119-142 (pp. 121-127).

42 Salillas, Hampa, 293-294.
most of the book, as he claims that no documents on *hampa*, as a form of organised crime, have survived. Since he documents his study of Gypsies solely by drawing examples from picaresque literature, it would appear that *Hampa* is an unfounded attack on Gypsies camouflaged behind the appearance of an essay on Early Modern criminal societies.

**Eugenio Noel**

There is evidence that Salillas’s ideas exerted a notable influence on the novelist and essayist Eugenio Noel (1885-1936)—the pseudonym of Eugenio Muñoz Díaz—whose firm determination to ‘predicar contra el flamenquismo’ led him to travel all around Spain as well as to write a number of essays and novels on the topic, including *La novela de un toro* (1913) and *Pan y toros* (1913).⁴³ He was particularly well regarded in republican circles because, although no particular political affiliation can be ascribed to him, he defended the republican system in various writings and conferences, but most especially in *República y flamenquismo* (1912).⁴⁴ Noel understood *flamenquismo* as a ‘degenerate’ conglomerate of social and cultural components from Andalusia such as bullfighting, flamenco, Gypsies, and the figure that tied them all together, namely, the *señorito* or landowner. He targeted all these elements in his book-length essay *Señoritos chulos, fenómenos, gitanos y flamencos* (1916), where he expanded on the arguments he had formerly presented in his earlier monographs, namely, *El flamenquismo y las corridas de toros* (1912) and *República y flamenquismo* (1912).⁴⁵ Behind its hyperbolic rhetoric, *República y flamenquismo* offers a critique of Spanish society which, to some extent, anticipates Ortega’s *España invertebrada* (1921). It does so by presenting *flamenquismo* as the surrogate subcultural element that had managed to unify Spain in the absence of more serious factors that might guarantee social cohesion—an idea that was equally anticipated in *El flamenquismo*.⁴⁶

---

⁴³ For a list of his trips and lectures see Eugenio Noel, *El flamenquismo y las corridas de toros* (Bilbao: Sabino Ruiz, 1912), 9.


⁴⁵ Eugenio Noel, *Señoritos chulos, fenómenos, gitanos y flamencos* (Madrid: Renacimiento, 1916),

Following the order established in the title of Señoritos, the first chapter takes issue with the señoritos, who Noel regards as lazy and abusive, believing themselves beyond the reach of the law, being chulos (brazen youths) when they are young and despots (‘caciques’) when older.\textsuperscript{47} If Salillas’ view of the Gypsy is mediated by picaresque literature, Noel’s portrayal of the señorito owes a debt to Zorrilla’s bragging character Don Juan.\textsuperscript{48} Like Don Juan, señoritos are aristocrats, but they wish to be other than the class they have been born into, and ‘envidian al torero y al bandido’ and ‘adoptan sus maneras, emporcándolas’.\textsuperscript{49} The Spanish aristocracy’s imitation of bullfighters and bandits was far from a new phenomenon by the time Noel wrote. It had its roots as far back as eighteenth-century majismo, an aping of the lower classes that was later adopted by the Parisian aristocracy in the early nineteenth century, but which was criticised by the afrancesados of the Enlightenment.\textsuperscript{50} There is more than mere imitation of the popular classes in Noel’s señorito, however, as this figure has dealings with ‘gitanos, hampones, chalanes, contratistas y mujeres’.\textsuperscript{51} Noel indicates here a situation of exploitation and organised crime, of which Gypsies are an integral part.

The title of the second chapter of Señoritos, ‘Fenómenos’, is a scornful reference to bullfighters, whose activity ‘apasiona, devora energías hábiles y millones de duros’.\textsuperscript{52} Noel builds on his earlier monograph República y flamenquismo, where he had declared that ‘los ideales de la democracia, de la República, del liberalismo, son absolutamente incompatibles con el flamenquismo y sus propagadores’.\textsuperscript{53} In a regeneracionista fashion,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{47} Noel, Señoritos, 38-40.
\item \textsuperscript{48} Noel, Señoritos, 61.
\item \textsuperscript{49} Noel, Señoritos, 72.
\item \textsuperscript{51} Noel, Señoritos, 74.
\item \textsuperscript{52} Noel, Señoritos, 123.
\item \textsuperscript{53} Noel, República, 25.
\end{itemize}
Noel claims that bullfighting diverts people’s attention from fundamental political realities, and describes the 1898 desastre as ‘el merecidísimo palizón que nos dieron los americanos’, stating that it is to be blamed on the ‘fracasos de los gobernantes, debidos á su ninguna preparación escolar’.\(^5^4\) Noel’s critique here is reminiscent of—but goes further than—that of Jovellanos, who had regarded bullfighting as a ‘diversión sangrienta y bárbara’ and celebrated the fact that ‘el Gobierno ha[ya] prohibido justamente este espectáculo’.\(^5^5\) More unusual, perhaps, is Noel’s criminalisation of bullfighting, which he describes as ‘una página de delincuencia, de pederastia, de matonismo, de bobaliconería y de vagancia’.\(^5^6\) Thus, Noel groups together a series of incriminating labels and applies them indiscriminately.

A similar attitude pervades the chapter ‘Los flamencos’, a noun with which Noel refers to Gypsies, who he casts as the scourge of Spanish society. He credits the Spanish Gypsy or ‘flamenco’ with having ‘inventado una nueva degeneración llamada flamenquismo’.\(^5^7\) Picking up on the nomad trope and—like Salillas—denying Gypsies their creativity, Noel describes them as a ‘pueblo errante [que] llevaba tras de sí, como impedimenta, su carácter fieramente definido, ladrón de todo, hasta de sentimientos, y como botín de guerra, el carácter de las regiones por donde pasó’.\(^5^8\) Noel characterises the Gypsy through a series of paradoxical, bestial contradictions.\(^5^9\) Having originated in the Gypsy—Noel argues—those contradictions have spread to the rest of the Spanish population, and are responsible for the fact that ‘lo mismo asesinamos un toro que un hombre; lo mismo decimos que sí, que decimos que no’.\(^6^0\) Noel interprets flamenquismo

\(^{54}\) Noel, Señoritos, 130, 133, 135.

\(^{55}\) Gaspar Melchor de Jovellanos, Memoria para el arreglo de la policía de los espectáculos y diversiones públicas y sobre su origen en España (Alicante: Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes, 1999 [1st ed. 1790]), 39.
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\(^{60}\) Noel, Flamenquismo, 42.
as being a degenerate component of the Spanish ‘race’, and claims that ‘el gitanismo ha
devorado el espíritu de provincias enteras, bromando á manera de hormigas termites el
genio mismo de la Raza’. What matters, ultimately, is the ‘raza’ of Spain, and not so
much Gypsies as such, who Noel abuses only to criticise the Spaniards’ alleged tolerance
towards them. Noel’s Gypsy is the Other among us, one that contributes to the
degeneration of the Spanish ‘race’ like other groups deemed ethnically ‘different’, such
as the ‘Arabs’.

Lombrosian influences are evident in Noel’s remarks on the Gypsy’s physical traits. Here he sees signs of criminal behaviour: ‘en la cara misma de los gitanos hay tal
cantidad de sal diluída, malicia tan picarescamente expresada, que habéis de pararos á
contemplarlos no seáis víctimas de alguna ilusión’. Noel’s criticism of the Gypsy’s
alleged ‘desprecio del dolor, su insensibilidad al sufrimiento [que] son también ya
característica nuestra’, is also reminiscent of Lombroso’s description of atavism as
including insensitivity to physical pain.

Noel shows further familiarity with the Lombroso school when he points out the lack
of discussion on flamenco in the work of two of Lombroso’s disciples, namely, in Enrico
Ferri’s Los delincuentes en el arte (1899) and what he refers to as Cesare Vigna’s
Trastornos de sensibilidad de los anormales ante la música. Ferri did not refer to
flamenco explicitly in Los delincuentes, but argued that the ‘prohibition of cruel

61 Noel, Señoritos, 224.
62 Noel, República, 9.
63 Noel, Señoritos, 220.
64 Noel, Señoritos, 225; Lombroso, Criminal Man, 63. Noel attributed this idea to Gina Lombroso, however,
who had built on her father’s work. Gina Lombroso departed from her father in other aspects, however, such as the use
of ideas of degeneration. She identified signs of degeneration in the city’s population, such as lack of physical strength,
beauty or resistance to pain, as well as a greater propensity to contracting physical or mental illnesses. José Luis Peset,
‘Genio y degeneración en Gina Lombroso’, FRENIA, 1. 1 (2001), 121-128. In conjunction with other Italian
criminologists, she exposed women to different degrees of electroshock-induced pain in order to prove that they were
less sensitive. Mary Gibson, ‘On the Insensitivity of Women: Science and the Woman Question in Liberal Italy, 1890-
65 Noel makes mistakes in the titles of several works which he cites, such as attributing Salillas’s Hampa to
Blasco Ibáñez. It could well be the situation in this case, as I have not been able to trace this work.
spectacles, and the suppression of gambling houses, are excellent penal substitutes”; he also urged the authorities to ‘abolish certain vulgar and sensual entertainments’. One might surmise in this an oblique reference to flamenco and bullfighting among the ‘sensual entertainments’ and ‘cruel spectacles’ to which Ferri refers. It seems therefore plausible that Ferri’s work could lie behind Noel’s attack on flamenquismo. Vigna took a more idealistic approach to the relationship between music and crime. Like Plato, he emphasised the educational and civilising potential of music, an art which he described as ‘un ausiliario prezioso dell’insegnamento, un istruimento poderosissimo di educazione civile e di morale perfezionamento’ (‘a precious educational tool, a very powerful instrument for civil instruction and moral improvement’). He also argued that music is ‘il mezzo più poderoso’ (the most powerful means) for dealing with ‘certi casi di malattia morale’ (certain cases of moral disease). This belief in music’s ability to treat moral ‘diseases’ draws on Lombroso, while implicitly departs from the latter’s conception of the criminal condition as one that has no ‘cure’.

Based mainly on Lombroso and, to a lesser extent, on Ferri and Vigna, Noel blames the Gypsy for all the atavistic aspects he observes in the Spaniards. Like Salillas, Noel assimilated Lombroso eclectically, combining together theories of atavism and degeneration. The source of Noel’s rhetoric of degeneration possibly lies in the Generation of ’98’s decrying of Spain’s straying from its alleged imperial fate, which they coupled with a construction of Castile as the essence of Spanish identity. Accordingly, a good portion of Señoritos chulos is devoted to casting Andalusia—the region with the largest Gypsy population—as the main hindrance to Spain’s social,
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economic, political and cultural development.\textsuperscript{71} Noel’s critical reading of Andalusia, however, is not accompanied by an endorsement of Castile such as is found in Unamuno’s \textit{En torno al casticismo} (1895), Azorín’s \textit{Castilla} (1912) or Machado’s \textit{Campos de Castilla} (1912).\textsuperscript{72} In line with \textit{La mala vida en Madrid} or with Baroja’s novelistic trilogy \textit{La lucha por la vida} (1904), Noel implied that Spain’s regeneration should begin at its very centre, the city of Madrid: ‘Madrid es una ciudad vieja, fea, abandonada y sucia; intelectualmente estéril; moralmente, el ano de Europa’.\textsuperscript{73} Other works would follow this line of argument, most famously Valle-Inclán’s \textit{Luces de Bohemia} (1924), which shares in Noel’s pessimism and sarcasm.

Noel enhances his attack on Gypsies with a fully-fledged lampoon on flamenco. The title of the heading ‘Piel de España’ indicates the superficial yet notorious presence that Noel assigned to this music in his construction of Spanish identity. According to Noel, flamenco is a ‘submúsica’ that moves around the ‘burdeles, presidios, tabernas y lenocinios’, wallowing in ‘podredumbre’.\textsuperscript{74} Furthermore, despite the masculinity implied in the reference to the ‘burdeles’, Noel disparages flamenco as an ‘arte insexuado’, thus sharing the anxieties of \textit{regeneracionistas} over the loss of masculinity in Spanish society.\textsuperscript{75} He scornfully divides flamenco into ‘“cante jondo” con sus derivados y “baile corneao” con sus consecuencias’, thus establishing, once again, a parallelism between flamenco and bullfighting.\textsuperscript{76} Noel’s criticism turns most acrid when he deems ‘lo flamenco y lo gitano’ to be an ‘enfermedad’ which has ‘invasido con sus úlceras y sus
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colores el espíritu español’. Following previous works in sociology and criminology, and in line with attacks on flamenquismo such as the one contained in the obituary of Gavira shown above, Noel describes flamenco as the germ of Spain’s degeneration, one that has extended from Andalucía to the rest of Spain as a disease that works its way through the national body, sickening and corrupting all its limbs.

Attacks on flamenco, bullfighting and the popular semi-criminal underworld of chulos and majos ultimately derive from Enlightenment thinkers like Jovellanos and Moratín. Noel revived and brought together those various targets of Enlightenment criticism, and he placed them at the centre of a life-long project that he took on with a missionary sense of commitment. His violent rhetoric and his unrelenting blows aimed at the powerful entertainment industry or the ‘ocio mercantilizado de masas’ that he termed flamenquismo ultimately threatened the economic interests of an élite who, in turn, retaliated with threatening letters, which Noel took pleasure in quoting.

Noel’s radicalism helped to polarise opinions. His defence of republicanism as a system and his opposition to the reigning monarchy meant that he and his ideas were welcome in the Juventudes republicanas and analogous circles. His stance on republicanism, however, contributed without doubt to his posthumous neglect during the Franco dictatorship. Post-Franco critics of flamenco and bullfighting, however, have not restored Noel’s ideas to anywhere near their original place. If he is largely forgotten by cultural critics, journalists, bullfighters, flamenco practitioners and aficionados, the imprint of his rhetoric can nonetheless be traced in flamenco scholarship of the 1990s. Claiming to expose the contradictions present in the romanticisation of the Gypsy and flamenco carried out by Spanish flamencología since Lorca and Falla, Timothy Mitchell
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has used a criminalising rhetoric that is self-avowedly inspired in Noel, describing flamenco as the product of an ‘ethnic drinking subculture’ and a ‘deliberate regression’. The survival of Noel’s rhetoric and ideas, however, has a more solid basis than Mitchell would like to think. Vindictive and unfounded as Noel’s critique of flamenco might seem, it was grounded in its time on recent developments in anthropology, such as that of Cesare and Gina Lombroso, Ferri and Vigna. Noel’s hyperbolic and exacerbated rhetoric does not mask but, rather lays bare the violence that underpinned modern anthropology in its attempt to establish a (pseudo) scientific basis for the exclusion of certain ethnic and racial groups in the interest of the white, male middle-classes.

**Flamenquismo in Madrid and elsewhere**

In addition to the steady rise of crime and poverty during the second half of the nineteenth century, and to the *regeneracionistas’* focus on Castile, there was a third element that contributed to the association between flamenco and Madrid’s urban degeneration that is implied in the term *flamenquismo*, namely, the conditions in which the culture of flamenco developed in this city. These conditions played a key role in shaping public perceptions of Gypsies in Madrid and elsewhere, since flamenco performances were the space where Gypsies could negotiate their identity and their relationship with their audiences. In Andalusia, flamenco had reportedly emerged in the intimacy of the family context, and gradually moved to taverns and cafés, but without losing its ties to family structures. In Madrid, by contrast, the element of family was mostly—though not totally—absent, and flamenco developed mainly in the context of the *café cantante* as well as in the so-called *juerga*. The object of manifold romanticised and exaggerated accounts, a *juerga* was a private party sponsored by a wealthy *señorito*, the Andalusian landowner who provided the inspiration for Noel in his *Señoritos chulos*, discussed above. A *juerga* would start at night and carry on until the early morning in a back room or *reservado* booked in a café. The *señorito* would bring along his friends and
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fellow businessmen, hire a cantaor or singer and a tocaor or guitarist, and pay for a supply of prostitutes and abundant alcohol. The private nature of the juerga has hindered a balanced assessment of claims about its deviant nature. Historical testimonies of juergas written or transmitted orally by guests or practitioners abound in scenes of debauchery and crime. Given their high doses of sensationalism, however, and possible self-promotion, one should regard these memoirs with a certain wariness.

Juergas were not exclusive to Madrid, although they were reportedly more scandalous there. Neither were juergas the only format of flamenco performances in the capital. From the mid-nineteenth century onwards, whether in Andalusia or Madrid, these events co-existed with commercial spectacles in which an energetic and fiery female dancer became the centre of attention. She was the most visible part of the cuadro, which also would include a cantaor and a tocaor. The tablao, where this type of performances took place during the day, offered flamenco practitioners and their audiences the opportunity to observe and interact with one another. The cafés cantante, where tablaos were established, could accommodate up to 1000 customers of all social backgrounds. These cafés experienced a great expansion in Spain from the 1850s on, and they continue to be spaces where flamenco is mainly performed, followed by theatres. At the cafés cantante, the working classes could afford to pay 35 cents for a coffee while they enjoyed a flamenco performance or a semi-erotic spectacle. Social differences could be observed in the café, however, the best seats being only accessible to the wealthiest. Foreign visitors and tourists in search for a relaxing atmosphere or—on the contrary—seeking to witness an exciting spectacle, were regular among the audience. These ‘outsiders’ included European travellers such as poet Théophile Gautier or composer Mikhail
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Glinka, among many others. Thanks to the varied social composition of the audience, the *tablao* was arguably the space where Gypsies could negotiate their identity publicly and undermine negative biases held against them. The *tablao* could therefore act as a two-way window where Gypsies and *payos* or non-Gypsies could observe one another. Despite its potential positive influence on generalised perceptions of the Gypsy, the *tablao* would not receive the approval of Lorca and Falla, who claimed that in this space flamenco negotiated its forms with audiences and became ‘commercialised’ and thus corrupted as will be discussed later.

Crimes in cafés were frequent, but the many newspaper articles reporting them show that they were not necessarily inherent in *juergas*. Again, one has to handle the sources with care, as the press often lent itself to supporting public campaigns aimed at groups that were perceived as a threat to the social order. Journalistic reports of ‘flamenco crimes’ do not limit themselves to stating the facts, but often show an exacerbated tone aimed at creating a particular state of opinion. Egmond has rightly asked, in relation to the Gypsies, whether we should regard ‘information about their illegal activities as a construct fabricated by fearful authorities’. At other times, however, the press defended flamenco and the *cafés cantante*—as will be discussed below—given the high economic stakes that were involved in the café and entertainment business.

Contrary to what Noel and other critics of *flamenquismo* would have the reader believe, there is evidence for the view that the origin of violence in a *cafés cantante* was not the music, although it was the most conspicuous and memorable component of the café nightlife, but rather the physical atmosphere. Álvarez describes how ‘l’atmosphère d’alcool fermenté et la puanteur de la taverne se mêlangeaient avec le parfum nauséabond et pénétrant que dégageaient la plupart des femmes’ (the atmosphere of fermented alcohol and the stench of the tavern mixed up with the nauseous and penetrating perfume)
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exuded by most women). From the end of the nineteenth century, criminologists and hygienists had argued that stench could increase crime rates in the least hygienic areas of the city. La mala vida en Madrid offered detailed and gruesome descriptions of the filth and stench in Madrid’s marginal and criminal barrios, describing the ‘enrarecimiento del oxígeno’ and the ‘masa hedionda de carne sucia y enferma’. The main trigger for crime at the café cantante, however, was alcohol intake. Basing his study on a chronicle from the late nineteenth century, Sierra Álvarez describes nightlife in the Andalusian city of Linares, referring to mining workers who started their night drinking heavily at a café cantante, where they danced flamenco with the ‘gitanas’, who went ‘de mesa en mesa, hablando, bebiendo y rompiendo, en medio de las bromas de su género’. They would finish the night at a brothel, and would be armed, since ‘son raros los mineros que no llevan continuamente una pistola de dos cañones, revólver ó una navaja ó cuchillo’. It is unclear how far the chronicle on which this testimony is based is reliable and whether it might contain exaggerations.

The cases of Linares and Madrid both show that the combination of alcoholism and sexual arousal could be perceived as causing crime rates to soar. A similar scenario had prompted an increased concern about alcoholism and crime in Europe at the end of the eighteenth century, the difference being that by the middle of the nineteenth century moral approaches were superseded by medical and scientific ones. The Madrid authorities were particularly concerned with the problem of crime and its causes as, by
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1880, Madrid had the greatest number of large *cafés cantante* in Spain, namely 16, followed by Seville with 12 and Barcelona with 9: it also had as many as 85 smaller cafés. Unlike the situation of small *pueblos* in Andalusia, however, it was hard to monitor the movements and activities of the ‘underworld’ in a big city like Madrid, where the connections between flamenco and crime were thus able to grow more freely. A few examples provide a telling insight into this situation. In February 1901, the 23-year-old flamenco singer Vicente Gómez, known as Peteneras, killed his former partner’s lover in the tavern that the latter owned in Madrid. *El Heraldo de Madrid* highlighted Peteneras’ brutality, as he stabbed his victim right in the heart using a *navaja cabritera*, a knife originally used for skinning cattle.\(^99\)

The tavern thus appeared as the scenario where alcohol intake and a macho culture were liable to unleash violent instincts. Crimes in Madrid’s drinking establishments were indeed common, and were not restricted to flamenco circles. *La mala vida en Madrid* argued that ‘la locura y el alcohol enajenan en breve á matoides y degenerados’.\(^100\) An article published in *El País* on 24 November 1902 titled ‘Riña sangrienta’ recounts the fatal stabbing of a bartender by two noisy, drunken customers after the victim had ordered them to keep quiet.\(^101\) Three days later, *El Imparcial* reported a shooting in a *café cantante*, started by a customer enraged at being ordered to stop tipping the female singers and dancers.\(^102\) On that occasion nobody was hurt.

In response to violent episodes of this kind, and in an attempt to curtail crime in Madrid, in 1900 the mayor Antonio Barroso launched a polemical campaign against the
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While a substantial portion of the press supported Barroso’s decision to ban the ‘cante y baile de flamenco’, its defenders argued against his decision because they were conscious of the economic riches that could be derived from this sector. More recently, Jorge Uría has argued that, between 1900 and 1920, taverns represented, after the food industry, the second most profitable activity in Madrid. Barroso yielded to criticism and lifted the ban, but limited the playing of music till midnight and the opening of cafés till two. This curfew expressly targeted the juergas, thus putting an end to late night-time, intimate performances in the reservados and restricting the presence of flamenco to the main halls of the cafés where it would be seen only by a larger and public audience. It took a few years for the stakeholders in the café business to retaliate. The Sindicato de Cafés, Alcoholes y Ultramarinos organised a demonstration on the streets of Madrid in 1904 that ended with violent altercations and massive street disturbances. In 1908, the mayor decreed the closure of cafés cantantes, which lasted for a year, and in March 1909 a Royal Order forbade the reservados and ‘alternar con clientes’. These measures were insufficient in the light of the varied clientèle that frequented cafés cantante, making it difficult to control who went in and out and, consequently, to forestall outbreaks of violence.

Disorders in cafés contributed to the scapegoating of flamenco and its central ethnic component, the Gypsy. The proliferation of violence in cafés, however, does not in itself explain why Gypsies in particular were scapegoated. It is necessary therefore to take a closer look at café nightlife and the reactions that it provoked. The Café de Fornos illustrates this: it was constantly in the news not just for hosting the busiest flamenco bill in Madrid, but because it was frequently the scenario of violent episodes. Fornos had a
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record of attracting well-known customers that included writers such as Galdós, ministers and prominent politicians. Its clientèle was varied, however, and customers came in and out all day—and, before the 1900 curfew—all night as well. An article published in *La Dinastía* in 1901 under the heading ‘Tribunales’ details the trial in which Matilde Prada, a waitress in Fornos, was accused of assaulting one of the customers ‘rompiéndole, ó poco menos, el hueso occipital, de cuya herida manó bastante sangre’.108 Interestingly, the article described Fornos as a place attended by ‘las gentes del cobre’, a term for Gypsies that referred to their traditional occupation as tinkers.109 Gypsies were not Fornos’ main clientèle, however, neither were they solely to blame for the violence seen there. To cite one example, a dispute took place between a lawyer and an army officer at Fornos in 1901 that ended with the officer firing his gun but failing to hit his target.110 But when Gypsies were involved in violence newspapers were quick to point out that racial difference was involved, as demonstrated by the headline ‘Bronca flamenca’, published by *La Dinastía* on 26 April 1901.

The case of Fornos demonstrates that Gypsies were the victims of unfair and discriminatory attitudes. That responses by Salillas, Noel and journalists to the disorders emerging from such a hybrid atmosphere should focus on the Gypsy can only respond to prejudice. This shows that the production of heroes and anti-heroes relied in this period on the masking of certain realities as well as on the focus on specific aspects of personality and behaviour at the expense of others. This was especially the case in a context in which the absence of legislation on Gypsies made their persecution depend on the effective use of propaganda and the manipulation of discourse—as has been argued above. As far as *flamenquismo* is concerned, anti-Gypsy biases partly stemmed from a generalised tendency to identify flamenco with Gypsies, even of some of the most
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renowned figures in the world of flamenco were non-Gypsies, such as Antonio Chacón.  

René Girard’s thoughts on the process leading to situations of scapegoating offer relevant insights into the psychological origins of these discriminatory attitudes. Although ‘the borderline between rational discrimination and arbitrary persecution is sometimes difficult to trace’—Girard has argued—‘the crowd’s choice of victims’ focuses on ‘a class that is particularly susceptible to persecution’, such as ‘ethnic and religious minorities’, who ‘polarize the majorities against themselves’. In Spain, this polarisation stretched back to the fifteenth century, shortly after Gypsies started to arrive at the Iberian Peninsula. At that time, Gypsies had started to be regarded with suspicion, due to their reluctance to abide by state laws and the prevailing social mores—a reluctance that was observed in their stays in other countries.  

Centuries of repression followed, with measures being implemented in Spain that ranged from attempts to exterminate Gypsies, such as the Great Round-Up of 1749, to strategies of forcible assimilation. In 1783, Charles III decreed that Gypsies should be considered Spanish citizens to all extent and purposes, forbidding them to speak any language other than Spanish or to display or perform any distinctive cultural elements or perform any of their rituals. From that moment until the passing of Civil Guard code of 1943, which
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stipulated that Gypsies should be closely scrutinized and policed, no laws were passed specifically against them in Spain, except for some regulatory measures on horse trading.\textsuperscript{116} Before 1943, therefore, control of the Gypsies depended on orders given directly to the police which had no legal basis, and on the creation of a negative state of opinion against them through the efficient use of propaganda. \textit{Flamenquismo} fulfilled this role, fuelled by the scandals in cafés and the fears raised by immigration and poverty as described above. In addition, Gypsies were considered to be a hindrance to modernisation, a project that Madrid’s middle-classes engaged in with particular zeal since the \textit{ensanche} of the city started to be built in the 1860s.\textsuperscript{117} This middle-class fear of Gypsies carried on in the early twentieth century and, in the 1920s, newspapers started to publish illustrated articles with snapshots of Madrid’s rundown neighbourhoods, the ‘barrios negros’, describing their ‘marginal’ population composed of ‘Gypsies’ and other groups.\textsuperscript{118} The Gypsies’ disregard for accumulating material goods presented a challenge to the prevailing work ethic.\textsuperscript{119} It is not a coincidence, then, that defences of Gypsies and flamenco came from intellectuals who shared in a nostalgic criticism of modernity and its cultural by-products. This was the case, most notably, of Lorca and Falla.

\textbf{Lorca and Falla}

In this climate of anti-Gypsy hatred, defences of the Gypsies were scarce but did nevertheless exist, and some of them were expressed by celebrated intellectuals, such as Ramón Pérez de Ayala and Valle-Inclán. It was not until the 1920s, however, that the defence of Gypsies was elevated to the status of a major artistic and intellectual project in the work of Lorca and Falla. The latter two will be discussed here as examples of anti-bourgeois intellectuals who saw in the Gypsy an almost heroic embodiment of anti-modern values and a repository of traditions that had allegedly fallen in danger of
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extinction. Their work gains new light when set against the backdrop of the
criminalisation of the Gypsy and flamenco in the writings of Salillas and Noel, in that
their activity amounts to the heroic re-construction of the Gypsy, moving him to culture
from criminology. In their attempt to enshrine the Gypsy as an emblem of Spain, Lorca
and Falla brought him back to an Andalusia that, thanks to the association of
flamenquismo with Madrid, was now more suited than earlier to accommodate a
regenerated Gypsy. Images of the Gypsy thus wavered between the evil and the heroic
depending on what position intellectuals, journalist and social commentators took on vis-
à-vis issues such as economic and cultural modernisation, or the weight of Andalusia and
Madrid in the making of national identity.

The interest of Lorca and Falla in the Gypsies goes back to their early works. The
first reference to Gypsies in Falla’s oeuvre appears in his opera La vida breve (1904), the
result of his collaboration with the experienced zarzuela librettist Carlos Fernández Shaw.
Salud, a Gypsy from Granada, dies of ‘love-sickness’ at the feet of her former lover Paco
on his wedding day, after he has relinquished her for a woman of his class and ‘race’. The
use of romantic stereotypes such as death caused by love sickness helps to surround the
Gypsy with a halo of fatalism, just as Bizet’s Carmen had done before. On his return
from Paris, where he had been from 1907 to 1914, Falla started work on his ‘gitanería-
ballet’ El amor brujo. Here he cast Gypsies in the mould of avant-garde primitivism, a
mode he had admired in Parisian productions of the Ballets Russes, a company with
which he would collaborate in El amor brujo. In his search for primitive Gypsy music
Falla consulted examples of ritual music from the Far East, consistent with his view
stated in his writing on the cante jondo, as he believed that Gypsies came from India.\textsuperscript{120}
His concern for authenticity, however, did not deter him from using transcriptions of
‘Oriental’ music heard at the 1900 Exposition Universelle of Paris.\textsuperscript{121} This willingness to
emulate European perspectives on Gypsies, flamenco and, more generally, Spanish
music, has led to the controversial claim that Falla represents a case of auto-exoticism, by


which is meant that he gave up ‘authenticity’ for the sake of international success. In 1919, Falla began work on the puppet-theatre opera *El retablo de Maese Pedro* and abandoned Gypsy themes altogether. In the light of this trajectory, Falla’s career has been described as a movement from an initial Andalusian primitivism to a more complex Castilian-based modernism.

Gypsies are present in Lorca’s output from his first two books of poetry onwards, namely, the *Poema del cante jondo* (1921) and *Canciones* (1922), where he used the *saeta, seguiriya gitana, soleá, petenera* and other poetic forms that had been handed down as part of the flamenco legacy. Lorca drew on *Cantes flamencos* (1898), a compilation published by Antonio Machado y Álvarez, alias ‘Demófilo’, father of the poets Antonio and Manuel. Like Falla, Lorca casts the Gypsy and flamenco in a modernist mould that helps to disassociate Gypsies from the bigoted attacks to which they had been subjected. In Lorca’s poetry, this modernist mould consists in the use of disrupted metric patterns as well as surrealistic and symbolist images, and the subversion of the meaning commonly attached to religious and cultural icons associated with Spain. Lorca took those modernist techniques further in the *Romancero gitano* (1928), adding a strong symbolist flavour through the use of synaesthetic techniques. In the *Romancero*, Lorca coupled two seemingly disparate elements, namely, the epic tradition of the *romancero* and the theme of Gypsies, presenting the latter through the prism of a controversial epic heroism. The effect of detachment produced by the use of modernist techniques has led to claims that Lorca used Gypsies as mere literary motifs. Lorca himself declared that his ‘gitanismo es un tema literario’ during an undated interview with Giménez Caballero and a letter to Jorge Guillén. Contrary to this view, some have argued that Lorca identified with the Gypsies’ perceived marginality on account of

---


his ‘deviant’ sexuality. While neither of these two theses should be ruled out, the strongest argument against the idea that Lorca’s Gypsies are purely aesthetic products can be found in the critique of civilisation and modernity with which Lorca imbues them. Nowhere is this clearer than in the flamenco competition that he and Falla organised in Granada in 1922.

Much has been written about this competition and about the mark it has left on most subsequent understandings of flamenco up to the 1990s. What is not so frequently acknowledged, however, is its significant and pioneering contribution to understanding Gypsies as anti-modern constructs. This understanding of the Gypsies as a construction gains more point when we look at it against the backdrop of Salillas, Noel and, more generally, those journalists who, under the more or less direct influence of the Lombroso school and other forms of social Darwinism, used a pseudo-scientific rhetoric to portray the Gypsy as the foremost enemy of modernity, welfare, private property, public security and other benefits associated with progress. Falla and Lorca used the Gypsy precisely as an artefact to arrest time, to question modernity and progress which, they thought, had brought about cultural standardisation and homogenisation, and had corrupted modern flamenco. It is noticeable that, while Salillas and Noel saw the Gypsy as an agent of moral corruption and degeneration, Lorca and Falla saw the Gypsy as an antidote to the aesthetic corruption that they denounced in the café cantante. Lorca and Falla capitalised on the Gypsies’ alleged disregard for material concerns and personal comfort, as well as on perceptions of the Gypsy’s ‘marginal’ lifestyle, and did so in order to endorse a non-conformist attitude that challenged the self-legitimising ideologies of capitalism. The flamenco competition of 1922 was aimed at vindicating and restoring what Falla and Lorca identified—not without controversy—as the ancient song tradition of cante jondo which they saw in danger of extinction due to the commercial success of modern flamenco and other popular music genres. On the eve of the competition, Lorca gave a

---


lecture on flamenco where he expressed this idea rather dramatically: ‘¡Señores, el alma música del pueblo está en gravísimo peligro. El tesoro artístico de toda una raza, va camino del olvido!’ In this respect, both Falla and Lorca echoed Demófilo, who, in the late nineteenth century, had already made such claims.\(^1\) Where Demófilo blamed modern flamenco, Lorca took issue with ‘la avalancha grosera y estúpida de los *couplés*’, and lamented that

las canciones más emocionantes y profundas de nuestra misteriosa alma, estén tachadas de tabernarias y sucias; no es posible que el hilo que nos une con el Oriente impenetrable, quieran amarrarlo en el mástil de la guitarra juerguista; no es posible que la parte más diamantina de nuestro canto, quieran mancharla con el vino sombrío del chulo profesional.\(^2\)

Thus, Lorca sought to disassociate *cante jondo* from the criminal underworld of the tavern, *juergas*, prostitution and, in sum, the *flamenquismo* which Noel and Salillas construed as flamenco’s natural environment. Only by considering the work of these two intellectuals, plus the numerous journalistic articles that criminalised flamenco and the *café cantante*—some of which have been discussed above—is it possible to understand why Lorca and Falla went to such lengths to offer a ‘purified’ image of flamenco. Otherwise, their constructions of flamenco seem highly tendentious and manipulative, and easily become the target of scholarly criticism, such as in the work of Timothy Mitchell, who has taken issue with the idealisation of flamenco in the work of Lorca and Falla, arguing that it lacks a solid basis and that it overlooks or even neglects any element of social conflict.\(^3\)

There has been ample speculation as to how much ‘invention’ there is in the *cante jondo* tradition that Lorca and Falla claimed to have rescued. Unlike the advocates of a racially pure genealogy of flamenco, Falla situated Gypsies at the centre of a hybrid tradition where, following the inspirational figure of composer and nationalist ideologist


\(^{131}\) Mitchell, *Flamenco*, 165-179.
Felipe Pedrell (1841-1922), he also identified elements from Byzantine chant and Arab music. While advocating hybridisation, in the brochure that accompanied the competition, he nevertheless indulged in essentialist remarks such as the one where he claimed that the siguiriya gitana was the ‘tipo genuino’ from which all modern flamenco stemmed, and the one where ‘las más altas cualidades inherentes al canto primitivo de los pueblos orientales’ have survived. Although coming from the Orient, ‘la siguiriya y sus derivados’, according to Falla, had become the ‘canto peculiar de Andalucía’, thanks to a process of ‘acumulación de hechos históricos seculares’ which had endowed it with ‘un carácter íntimo, tan propio, tan nacional’. This fragment encapsulates the main purpose behind the competition, namely, to appropriate Cante jondo as something andaluz and Spanish (‘nacional’) and, at the same time, to pay tribute to its alleged Gypsy origins so as to elevate its cultural ‘pedigree’. The Gypsy, therefore, testifies to the primitive, anti-modern qualities of cante jondo given its perceived resistance to modernisation and its status as a repository of traditions. Falla and Lorca complemented this authentication of the Gypsy by stipulating in the competition’s regulations that ‘podrán tomar parte en este concurso todos los cantaores de ambos sexos, con exclusión de los profesionales que sean mayores de veintiún años’. The competition’s winner, el Tenazas, was a retired professional, but perhaps Lorca, Falla and members of the jury such as the renowned cantaores Antonio Chacón and La Niña de los Peines, regarded his style as a testimony of bygone days.

Conclusions

As flamenco spread to Madrid and Spain’s largest urban centres during the second half of the nineteenth century, newspapers and other publications progressively emphasised the associations between this music and an underworld of crime and debauchery that others had established before them. At the same time, several Spanish intellectuals who wrote under the influence of the Lombroso school of criminal sociology and anthropology, Salillas and Noel above all, offered a criminalised portrayal of the Gypsy and flamenco, a culture that they presented as the source of all Spain’s ills and that, they claimed, had spread from Andalusia to the rest of the national ‘body’. The realities behind anti-flamenquismo, however, show that crimes in taverns and cafés were

tied to a drinking culture that relied on a thriving and, therefore, protected alcohol industry, as well as to a macho culture characterised by the regular carrying of weapons, the defence of a centuries-long male honour-code, and the sexualisation of the female waitress. That the Gypsy was signalled out as a public enemy in an atmosphere where a number of social agents posed a threat to public security proves that the production of heroes and anti-heroes was, to a great extent, the product of prejudice and, related to it, the manipulation of discourse.

Defences of the Gypsy and flamenco came from bullfighting aficionados like Ramón Pérez de Ayala, Valle-Inclán and others, or would subsequently take the form of nostalgic reactions by intellectuals like Falla and Lorca, against the commercialisation and standardisation of this music and culture. No balanced or reasoned accounts of Gypsies and crime emerged in between these radically opposed, denigrating and idealising portrayals of the Gypsy. The problem, I would argue, stems from the insurmountable difficulties of defining and studying the Gypsy, since all approaches (biological, ethnic, cultural, behavioural) are flawed for different reasons and generate exclusion and violence. When journalists and intellectuals scapegoated the ‘Gypsy’, they rarely—if ever—specified what they referred to, and often appealed to vague notions that were mostly predicated on timeworn and unchecked stereotypes. The problem is aggravated by the fact that, in order to avoid legal persecution, self-proclaimed Gypsies have hardly produced any written records or appeared in censuses. This lack of information on Gypsies has not only hindered their serious study, but also led to an abundance of misrepresentations, and is the cause that portrayals of the Gypsy are often either vilifying or idealising. The ‘Gypsy’ has thus become a tabula rasa on which intellectuals have projected their fears and anxieties. In Spain, at the beginning of the twentieth century, the Gypsy was mostly seen as either a hindrance or an antidote against modernisation and, therefore, as a public enemy or a hero.
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