

Chapter 4

Franco and the Spanish Monarchy: A Discourse Analysis of the Tourist Guides Published by the Patrimonio Nacional (1959–1987)

BART MADDENS and KRISTINE VANDEN BERGHE

Introduction

In Spain, there is one royal tourist attraction that eclipses all others in grandeur and historical importance. It is El Escorial, Philip II's huge monastery retreat in the foothills of the Guadarrama mountains about 13 kilometres from Madrid. The highlight of a visit to El Escorial is the Royal Pantheon, a splendidly decorated but at the same time somewhat gloomy vault directly below the main altar of the church. The vault contains the remains of monarchs and of queens who were mothers of monarchs, from Charles V to modern times. At least, this is what is stated on the official website of the Patrimonio Nacional (PN), the official body that administers the royal tourism sites.¹ That is also what the visitors are told by the official guides. Yet it is not quite correct. The Royal Pantheon also harbours the tomb of don Juan de Borbón, the father of the present king Juan Carlos I, even though he never reigned as a king. When confronted with this anomaly, the official guides are only slightly embarrassed and have their answer ready: when don Juan died, in 1993, it was the explicit wish of King Juan Carlos that he would be buried in the Royal Pantheon, next to his regal ancestors.

The person who withheld the throne from don Juan and is thus responsible for this 'missing link' in the hereditary succession of the Spanish monarchs is buried in a pantheon of his own, located a mere 13 kilometres from El Escorial. The Valle de los Caídos or Valley of the Fallen was built by General Francisco Franco Bahamonde, Caudillo of Spain, and originally conceived as a memorial to those who died on the nationalist side during the Civil War. The site contains a monastery and an imposing stone cross, 150 metres tall, towering over a vast subterranean basilica. This

church harbours the tombs of both Franco and José Antonio Primo de Rivera, the son of the former dictator Miguel Primo de Rivera and the founder of the Spanish Falangist movement. The Valley of the Fallen, though in itself a spectacular and awe-inspiring site, has become something of an embarrassment to the Spanish authorities and is not actively promoted as a tourist attraction, let alone a 'royal' tourist attraction. Surprisingly, however, the monument belongs to the properties administered by the aforementioned PN. It features among the convents and monasteries that 'having been founded by monarchs, continue to fulfil their spiritual purpose up to the present day under the patronage of the King of Spain', to quote again from the official website of the PN.² Franco undoubtedly would have been pleased to learn that he is thus implicitly recognised as a former Spanish monarch. For this is what he increasingly considered himself to be as he managed to consolidate his power after the Civil War. In many ways, and as will be argued below, the Valley of the Fallen can be considered as the Franquist pendant of the Escorial and as a supreme symbol of Franco's royal aspirations.

It is obvious from the above that the monarchy was a contentious issue in Spain, both during the Franquist era as in the transition period. Nevertheless, the monarchy and the numerous royal sites were potentially an important asset for the Spanish tourist industry, which started to boom at the end of the 1950s, during the heydays of Franquism (Figuerola Palomo, 1999; Poutet, 1995). The regime thus faced the delicate task of promoting royal tourism while at the same time coping somehow with the tense and highly ambiguous relationship between Franco and the Spanish monarchy. After Franco's death and the subsequent transition to democracy, the royal tourism sites had to be reconstructed and cleansed of their connotation with Franquism. In this chapter, we investigate how these problems were dealt with in the official guides published by the PN.

Historical Background: Franco and the Re(in)storation of the Monarchy

The complex relationship between Franco and the monarchy is to a certain extent a corollary of the heterogeneity of the coalition commanded by the Caudillo during and after the Civil War. Apart from the fascist and anti-royalist Falangist movement, the coalition also consisted of various contending monarchist factions. The orthodox monarchists favoured the restoration of the monarchy and the accession to the throne of Alfonso XIII, who had stepped down in 1931. After his death in 1941, they supported the claim to the throne of his son, don Juan de Borbón, who resided in Portugal. However, while don Juan had initially endorsed

Franco's insurgency, he antagonised the regime by taking a decidedly democratic stance towards the end of the Second World War, being convinced that the defeat of the Axis powers would also put an end to Franquism. The Carlist movement constituted a third component in Franco's coalition. The Carlists had made a decisive contribution to Franco's victory in the north of Spain and were thus a force to be reckoned with. While some Carlists eventually sided with the orthodox monarchists, others continued to back the official Carlist pretender, Javier de Borbón Parma and subsequently his son Carlos Hugo. However when the latter became increasingly hostile towards the regime, at the end of the 1960s, he lost the Carlist support and was expelled from Spain (Bernecker, 1998; de Vilallonga, 1998; Powell, 1996; Preston, 1995, 2005).

Franco had to walk a tightrope in order to maintain this tenuous coalition. But at the same time, the lack of consent with regard to the monarchy was an excellent excuse for the Caudillo to hold on to his powers as head of state. In 1947 the regime tried to obtain a firmer institutional base by promulgating the so-called Law of Succession to the Headship of State (*Ley de Sucesión en la Jefatura del Estado*), which was subsequently approved by popular referendum. This law formally established Spain as a kingdom, with Franco as acting head of state for life. Franco also obtained the right to name his successor, who had to be either a regent or a monarch (Badía, 1975). In 1948 don Juan and Franco agreed that Juan Carlos would be educated in Spain under the direct supervision of the Caudillo. This gave rise to a growing speculation that Juan Carlos might be designated as royal successor instead of his father, even though such a scenario was vehemently opposed by don Juan and his supporters, and initially also by Juan Carlos himself. It was only in 1969 that Franco finally put an end to this speculation and did indeed appoint Juan Carlos as designate monarch.

From the perspective of the regime, it was logical to ignore the dynastic principle, given that the Law of Succession did not envisage a 'restoration' but rather an 'instauration' of the monarchy, i.e. a foundation of a new monarchy. This was made abundantly clear by Franco when he proposed his successor to the Cortes:

I therefore consider it necessary to recall that the monarchy which we have established with the consent of the nation, owes nothing to the past: it was born from that decisive act of 18 July [1936, i.e. the date of the nationalist insurgency], which constitutes a transcendent historical fact that does not allow for pacts or conditions. (Cited in Badía, 1975: 80)

This view was also clearly echoed in Juan Carlos' own address to the Cortes on the occasion of his swearing-in ceremony as designate monarch: 'First of all, I would like to make clear that I receive from his excellency the Head of State and Generalísimo Franco the political legitimacy derived from 18 July 1936 [...]' (text reproduced in de Vilallonga, 1998: 296). Yet, on other occasions Juan Carlos tried to avoid taking sides in this dispute by referring to the 'reinstatement' of the monarchy. As an additional reminder that his legitimacy derived from the regime, the designate monarch had to adopt the title of 'Prince of Spain' and not 'Prince of Asturias', the traditional title of the dynastic heir to the throne (Powell, 1996: 36, 40; Preston, 2005: 240).

Franco's rejection of a mere restoration of the monarchy was also related to his personal views. While being a convinced monarchist himself, he had a profound disdain for the Borbón dynasty (Preston, 1995: 534, 675). In Franco's view, the accession to the throne of the French Borbóns, at the beginning of the 18th century, had heralded the decline of the monarchy. He thought of the Borbón monarchs as having been corrupted by liberal and democratic ideas, in sharp contrast to their medieval and Habsburg predecessors who had epitomised the traditional Spanish values so cherished by the regime. This disdain was also vented in Franco's correspondence with don Juan, as in the following letter sent in May 1942, in which he discusses the downfall of the Borbón monarchy:

The institution of the monarchy had lost its power and popular support, and the persons who represented this institution were not following in the steps of their glorious predecessors. [...] The monarchy which I have in mind is the monarchy of the Catholic Kings, of Carlos and Cisneros and Philip II. (Cited in de Vilallonga, 1998: 86–87)

In a way, Franco considered himself as the founder of this new Franquist monarchy that would hark back to the time of the great medieval kings and, later, the golden era of Carlos V, Philip II and the Catholic kings (Preston, 1995: 459, 488–490, 497). This was also reflected in his own monarchist leadership style. As early as 1938, Franco was elevated to the military rank of captain-general, which had always been reserved for the kings of Spain. In 1952, Franco ordered a new peseta coin to be minted with his bust and the text 'Francisco Franco Caudillo por la Gracia de Dios'. The Caudillo also bestowed titles of nobility, traditionally a royal prerogative (Preston, 1995: 309, 562, 573). In order to enhance his semi-regal status, he kept his public appearances to a minimum, at least until the 1950s (Ellwood, 1994: 189).

The Caudillo may also have tinkered with the idea of establishing a Franco dynasty, even though the Law of the Succession appeared to

preclude such a move as it stipulated that the first king of the new 'Franquist' monarchy had to be a male of royal lineage ('de estirpe regia'). Yet the remote possibility of a Franco dynasty suddenly threatened to become a reality when, in 1972, Franco's eldest granddaughter Carmen Martínez Bordiú married Alfonso de Borbón-Dampierre, the son of don Juan's elder brother Jaime de Borbón-Dampierre. The latter, being deaf, had renounced his right to the throne in 1933 (Powell, 1996: 2). Technically it was still possible to replace Juan Carlos as Franco's successor, and it appears that particularly Franco's wife Doña Carmen had attempted to achieve this with the support of the regime's hardliners, but to no avail (Nourry, 1986: 221–226; Preston, 2005: 252–271).

The Valley of the Fallen is the supreme architectural expression of Franco's kingly pretensions. In April 1940, shortly after the Civil War, Franco issued a decree which ordered that a monument should be built in remembrance of 'those who fell in our glorious Crusade'. This monument was envisaged as

a grandiose temple for our dead, where for centuries people will come to pray for those who fell for God and the Fatherland; an eternal place of pilgrimage, where the grandeur of the surrounding nature will provide a worthy setting to mark the field where the heroes and martyrs of the Crusade have found their last resting place. (Decree of 1 April 1940, text reproduced in Méndez, 1982: 314)

Earlier in 1940 Franco had personally chosen the location for the memorial, i.e. the valley of Cuelgamuros in the foothills of the Guadarrama mountains (Méndez, 1982: 15–16). The design and construction of the monument took 20 years and was closely monitored by Franco. Political prisoners delivered a large part of the manual labour used in the building (Sueiro, 1983).

It was no coincidence that the monument was constructed at so close a distance from El Escorial. Franco considered the Valley of the Fallen as a new Escorial, which had to symbolise the continuity between the golden age of the Habsburg dynasty and the newly installed Franquist regime (Domínguez, 2000: 8; Preston, 1995: 631). Hence there are many similarities between the two sites. Both offer a comparable panoramic vista towards Madrid. Both contain monasteries, which are oriented in the same direction and which have roughly similar floor plans. Also, the colossal and austere design of the Valley monument is strongly reminiscent of the architecture of El Escorial.

More importantly, the underground basilica can be considered as the Franquist pendant of the Royal Pantheon. In 1956, Franco ordered the

construction of two lead-lined tombs under the floor of the nearly completed church (Ellwood, 1994: 183). The existence of the tomb located behind the high altar was only disclosed when Franco died in 1975. The other tomb, located before the high altar, was intended for José Antonio Primo de Rivera. Significantly, in 1939 José Antonio's remains had been transferred from Alicante, where he was executed by the Republicans in 1936, to El Escorial. To the dismay of the monarchists, the founder of the Falangist movement was interred at the foot of the high altar of the church of El Escorial, located above the pantheon of the kings (Payne, 1999: 233, 308). But in 1959 his remains were once more exhumed and now transferred to the Valley of the Fallen. José Antonio was reburied in the basilica on 31 March 1959, the day before its official inauguration. The monarchists were pleased that Franco thus removed the fascist blemish from their sanctuary, but the Falangists resented the reburial, which – notwithstanding their anti-monarchism – they considered a 'degradation'. From Franco's perspective, however, a more worthy resting place than this new 'Royal' Pantheon was hardly imaginable (Crozier, 1967: 455; Payne, 1999: 429–430).

As shown above, the Valley of the Fallen was originally conceived as a monument in honour of those who fell on the nationalist side. Yet, during the 1950s, the official discourse about the Valley shifted gradually and the monument was more and more presented as a memorial for all those who fell in the Civil War, no matter on which side they fought (Sueiro, 1983: 185). In the decree of 23 August 1957, establishing the Foundation of the Holy Cross of the Valley of the Fallen, this notion of a monument for 'all the Spaniards' was given a religious legitimisation:

Because of the profound Christian character of the monument, the sacred duty of honouring our heroes and our martyrs has to go hand in hand with the sentiment of forgiveness which the evangelical message imposes. Moreover, the victory has led to an era of peace which has witnessed the development of a policy guided by the most sublime sense of unity and brotherhood amongst the Spaniards. Therefore, the monument is dedicated to all the Fallen, above whose sacrifice triumph the pacifying arms of the Cross. (Decree of 23 August 1957, text reproduced in Méndez, 1982: 316–318)

However, this nationalist magnanimity was highly ambiguous, as is already apparent from the above citation. Precisely because of its 'triumphant' religious nature, the Valley could hardly function as a conciliatory symbol. It also quickly became clear that the regime was reluctant to highlight this conciliating function and to make it visible on the site.

Table 4.1 Visitor rates of the royal sites administered by the PN 2000–2003 (ranked according to number of visitors in 2003)

	2000	2001	2002	2003
Palacio Real de Madrid	867.880	829.139	813.425	775.617
Real Monasterio de San Lorenzo de El Escorial	681.839	635.069	587.690	539.278
Valle de los Caídos	569.247	504.025	471.661	411.667
Palacio Real de la Granja de San Idelfonso	238.130	283.488	253.760	254.203
Palacio Real de Aranjuez	259.010	246.008	256.579	230.490
Palacio Real de la Almudaina de Palma de Mallorca	193.586	175.835	153.473	157.647
Palacio Real de Riofrío	115.778	101.578	97.182	92.185
Monasterio de las Huelgas	77.424	75.472	80.822	72.319
Monasterio de las Descalzas Reales	61.191	54.455	55.480	55.891
Palacio Real de El Pardo	43.799	39.780	45.226	43.903
Falúas Reales de Aranjuez	54.830	44.041	46.616	43.738
Real Monasterio de Santa Clara de Tordesillas	41.211	45.267	46.245	43.450
Real Casa del Labrador en Aranjuez	34.698	32.036	32.458	30.388
Real Monasterio de la Encarnación	21.537	19.124	18.262	17.888
Panteón de Hombres Ilustres	16.631	13.175	8.104	16.398
Casita del Infante o de Arriba	5.540	4.505	4.326	3.393
Casita del Príncipe o de Abajo	3.452	3.694	3.061	1.416
Total	3.285.783	3.106.691	2.974.370	2.789.871

Source: Patrimonio Nacional, Servicio de Coordinación de Museos

The original idea was to inscribe the names of all those buried in the basilica on the marble tablets next to the main entrance. This idea was eventually dropped, amongst other reasons because mentioning the names of the republican – often communist – combatants on Franco's sacred temple was a bridge too far (Sueiro, 1983: 185). The result is that as of today the only visible graves in the entire site are those of Franco and José Antonio. The inscription on the door leading to the ossuary at the back of the basilica – 'Fallen for God and for Spain. 1936–1939. R.I.P.' – hardly suffices to make the present-day tourist realise that he or she is actually visiting a military graveyard, let alone a memorial symbolising the post-Civil War conciliation amongst Spaniards.

More than a quarter of a century after the death of Franco, the number of yearly visitors to the Valley of the Fallen still amounts to more than 400,000. Of all the royal sites administered by the PN, Franco's mausoleum is the third most visited, as can be seen from Table 4.1. El Escorial ranks second, while the most popular site is the Royal Palace in

Madrid, probably due to its central location. The number of visitors to the royal sites in general has substantially decreased since 2000, but this decline is higher than average in the case of the Valley of the Fallen. Perhaps, as the generations that have revered the Caudillo are passing away and the authorities are not actively promoting the site, the Valley of the Fallen will gradually fade away as a tourist site. But as of today, it is still one of the top 'royal' attractions in Spain.

Corpus: The Guides of the Patrimonio Nacional

Since the time of Alfonso X, the royal monasteries and palaces in Spain were administered by the 'Patrimonio Real' or Royal Heritage (Huelgas, 1971: 48). When the Second Republic was declared, in 1931, all properties that constituted the patrimony of the Crown fell to the state (Pedralbes, 1974: 82) and the Royal Heritage was abolished. When Franco came to power, he founded the 'Patrimonio Nacional' or National Heritage, charged with the administration and preservation of the Spanish royal sites, which remained state property.

The royal monasteries constituted a first category of royal sites, consisting of the monasteries of Las Huelgas in Burgos, of Santa Clara in Tordesillas, and of Las Descalzas Reales in Madrid. Secondly, the PN administered the various royal palaces, the most important being the palace monastery of El Escorial and the royal palace or Palacio de Oriente in the centre of Madrid. El Pardo and La Zarzuela were two smaller palaces on the outskirts of the capital, which the Spanish monarchs have used as hunting lodges since the Middle Ages. In addition, the PN was in charge of the Alcázar in Sevilla, which served as a palace for the Habsburg monarchs. There are also two Borbón palaces, i.e. the Palace of La Granja, near Segovia, which was built by the first Borbón monarch, Philip V, and has become known as the 'Versailles of Spain', and the Palace of Riofrío. The list also includes the more recent Palace of Pedralbes in Barcelona, which was built as a residence for Alfonso XIII. Finally, a couple of museums with an affiliation to the monarchy were administered by the PN, i.e. the Museum of Carruajes and the Royal Museum of Arms, both in Madrid. From 1950 onwards, the PN started to publish a series of guides, each of them devoted to one of the sites mentioned above.

Yet, the PN did not restrict itself to these royal tourism sites in the strict sense. Significantly, one of the first guides published by the PN was devoted to the Valley of the Fallen. The guide was strangely out of tune with the rest of the series, which dealt with sites whose royal character was beyond doubt. That the PN applied a rather broad definition of 'royalty' is also apparent from the fact that, in the guide about the

Monastery of Las Huelgas in Burgos, a separate section is devoted to the 'Palacio de la Isla' or Palace of the Isle (Huelgas, 1971: 46–49). This palace does not have an affiliation with the Spanish dynastic tradition,³ but served for a time as Franco's headquarters during the Civil War. Another intruder in the series is the Moncloa Palace, a modern palace whose construction was ordered by Franco. In that case, however, the publication could be justified on the grounds that the new palace was constructed on the ruins of an old royal palace with the same name.

The guides published by the PN during the Franquist era were small booklets, of about 80 pages at most, and usually shorter. They did not have a commercial aim, but rather intended to give as much information as possible to the tourist reader, as can be seen from the density of the text and the detailed character of the descriptions.⁴ The guides were originally published in Spanish, although the captions under the photographs were sometimes translated. Some of the guides were also published in French and English, among other languages. The guides were constantly re-edited and adapted, to the extent that the number of editions sometimes amounted to more than 15.

In what follows, we will investigate how the monarchy and Franco were presented in the various editions of those guides, as they were successively published from 1959 to 1987.⁵ A first part of the analysis focuses on the concept of 'Spanishness', which may be assumed to play a key role given that the guides aim at introducing the tourist to the heritage of the Spanish nation. Next, we will investigate how the notion of Spanishness relates to the monarchy in the guides. A final and principal object of investigation is the image of Franco in the guides and the way the relationship between Franco and the monarchy is dealt with, both during Franco's lifetime and the post-Franquist era.

Analysis

Spanishness

Even though it is never made explicit in the guides what the qualifier 'Spanish' means in connection with architecture or decoration, the authors repeatedly contrast it with a 'non-Spanish' variant. For instance, with regard to the monastery of Las Huelgas in Burgos, it is said that the foreign style was adapted to Spanish soil:

The style of the church is characteristic of the Cistercian order and thus of foreign origin. Yet, as the church was built in Spain, this style had to be adapted to the Spanish tradition [*lo español*], which implied that elements were added that are typical of the twelfth century Romance churches in Castilla, such as the tower and the porticos. (1971: 11)

Whatever architectural style is dealt with in the guides, or whatever the subject – churches, gardens (e.g. La Granja, 1961: 14) or palaces – time and again the 'typically Spanish' is juxtaposed to the 'non-Spanish', thus suggesting that there exists some homogeneous national style.

These two traits of the discourse about architecture and decoration – i.e. the suggestion of peculiarity and homogeneity – can also be found in the more scarce passages about the Spanish people. It is in the guide about the Valley of the Fallen (1959) that the Spanish people are defined most explicitly as an inclusive community of persons who live together in peace and harmony. In the introduction to this guide, no less than ten references to Spain can be found, using the words 'Spanish', 'nation' or 'fatherland'. The author observes that the monument was built in the geographical centre of the country, 'because of its national character and its dedication to the man of Spain' (1959: 6, 7).

But at the same time the discourse remains highly ambiguous. The carefully constructed image of inclusiveness is contradicted in another passage, which discusses the huge cross rising above the site:

If the robust horizontality of the arms of the monumental Cross equally protects all Spaniards, its slender perpendicular line rises as a beacon of religiosity, founded on the ideal of the best, who unanimously answer to the name of Spain. (1959: 7)

The reference to 'the best' in this quote suggests the existence of a hierarchy amongst the Spaniards, based on their quality. The best are those who have safeguarded the 'religiosity' of the country. The implication is that those who are not religious belong to an inferior class of Spaniards. In yet another passage of this guide, these lesser Spaniards lose their status of Spanishness and are excluded from the national community: 'This monument has ignored this secularising current linked to agnosticism, which is incompatible with the simpleness and deep religiosity of the Spanish people' (1959: 6). Whether or not the non-religious Spaniards deserve to be called 'Spaniards', there can be no doubt that the genuine Spaniards are profoundly religious and simple at the same time. This notion of simpleness is linked to other qualities such as severity and austereness. Together, these three notions form a positively laden semantic paradigm that is applied both to the architecture and the way of life (San Ildefonso, 1961: 13).

Finally, as already suggested by the very nature of the collection, the monarchy occupies a central role in the construction of a Spanish nation. A particularly explicit association between Spain and the monarchy can be found in the guide about the Pedralbes Palace in Barcelona. The inhabitants of Barcelona are described as always having been eager to welcome

the monarchs in their city, whatever effort or cost this took. The guide evokes the enthusiasm among the population to which the construction of the palace gave rise: 'The construction caused a certain enthusiasm, in spite of the difficult circumstances in the city. A lot of inhabitants surged to visit the site where the royal palace was to be built' (1974: 40). And a bit further on it is repeated: 'Even though the times were bad, still the monarch and his family were received with enthusiasm in the city of Barcelona' (1974: 69).

Spanishness and the monarchy

It can already be seen from their label and contents – national and royal – that the guides aim at making both Spanish and international tourists acquainted with those aspects of Spain that are linked to the monarchy. Spain appears in the PN guides as a territory that is densely covered with royal sites of great value. It is presented as a nation whose history coincides with the vicissitudes of the royal dynasties, and in particular with their initiatives concerning the construction of palaces and monasteries. Yet, the authors of the guides faced the problem of how this link between the nation and the monarchy could be extended to the present, at a time when Spain was effectively a monarchy without a monarch. They could either evade the problem by adopting a purely historical approach and presenting the monarchy as an institution belonging to the past, or they could somehow attempt to come to terms with the complex relationship between state and monarchy.

In general, the guides opt for the historicising approach. But at the same time they reconstruct the history of the Spanish monarchy from a Franquist perspective, as is particularly apparent from the dissonant and critical remarks that disrupt the generally laudatory discourse in specific passages. This is the case, for instance, in the following passage in the guide about La Granja:

The fact that at a distance of a mere 15 kilometres from the grand palace another was built (which had to be of equal proportions and richness) was absurd and reveals the obsessive mania of the Spanish kings for large constructions. (1961: 75)

Even though this quote explicitly describes the Spanish kings as megalomaniac, in the surrounding text it is suggested that this is a foreign trait. The author first makes a comparison with Louis XIV of France: 'This is characteristic of the same "enlightened despotism" that was also apparent in Louis XIV decision to build the lavish Chateau de Merly close to Versailles' (1961: 75). Further, he attributes the responsibility for building

the palace to Isabel de Farnesio, the widow of Philip V and an 'ambitious foreigner' (1961: 75). In this way, the aforementioned megalomania is described as a foreign vice, though imitated by some Spanish monarchs.

It is also significant that this deprecatory comment appears in a section dedicated to the Borbón dynasty. The aforementioned hierarchy between the 'best' and the 'lesser' Spaniards is also manifest amongst the royals. The Habsburg monarchs are without exception qualified in an unreservedly positive way. The qualifiers used to describe their realisations in the field of architecture and the arts coincide with those used to portray the 'genuine' Spaniards. The most frequently used adjectives in this respect are 'severe' and 'austere', which had a positive connotation in Franquist discourse. These contrast with adjectives like 'pleasant' and 'sumptuous' employed to characterise the artistic taste of the Borbóns. A good example of the way the latter adjectives are used to differentiate between the two dynasties can be found in the guide about the Royal Palace in Madrid:

When the Habsburg dynasty came to an end with the death of Carlos II in 1700, the Spanish crown was passed on to the Borbón dynasty, as a result of which Philip now took residence in the austere Palace of Madrid, which did not fit his French taste for more pleasant, classicist and sumptuous architecture. (1959: 10)

The transition from one dynasty to another thus implied that Spain got a bit less Spanish. This decline is also highlighted in the tourist guide concerning the Alcázar in Sevilla (1970). The laudatory discourse about Spain, its history and accomplishments, is suddenly interrupted by the following deprecatory comment, attributed to an anonymous person:

Someone has said that between the red curls of the sweet Margarita, the future of Spain was squandered. Since then Spain was in the hands of foreign dynasties, and has never managed to return to the fortuitous course of its initial destiny. (1970: 121)

A bit further, it is the author himself who expresses his depreciation for the Borbón dynasty, whose ascension to the throne is now implicitly compared to an invasion: 'In accordance with the French taste which invades Spain at the arrival of the Borbón dynasty, the ancient defensive wall was covered with a decoration of paintings and bas-reliefs' (1970: 123). In much the same way as the 'secularising current' is considered a threat to the profound religiosity and simpleness of the Spanish people, the Borbón's French taste for luxury and pleasure is now described as corrupting the authentic and austere nature of the Spanish monuments.

At the same time, it has to be emphasised that this differentiation between the Habsburg and the Borbón dynasties in the guides is generally subtle and inconspicuous. The reader and tourist who was unaware of the Franquist dislike for the Borbóns will hardly have noticed this distinction, or will have registered it on a more intuitive level.

That the distinction between the dynasties is not central to the discourse is also due to the notion of the monarchy as an abstract institution, symbolising continuity and permanence. In the guides, the notion of monarchy is contiguous to greatness, permanence and immobility. The monarchy appears as an instance that is beyond the vicissitudes of history and that belongs to an ahistorical time. This vision of the monarchy is also projected on the royal sites, which are assessed all the more positively by the authors to the extent that they are more 'authentic'. The affiliation of a monument with royalty implies a certain timelessness, which is manifest from the fact that it has survived history and remained unchanged. Conversely, a royal building is irreparably damaged when it is adapted or changed somehow. 'Unfortunately, the old tradition of maintaining our admirable royal palaces was broken in the middle of the last century' (Pedralbes, 1974: 9). In yet another guide, the notions of tradition and respect for the national heritage are extended from the architectural heritage to the institution of monarchy itself: 'Both in the Alcázar of Sevilla as in other palaces of Spain, the monarchist tradition has given rise to a meticulous respect for the buildings which were once royal property' (El Alcázar de Sevilla, 1970: 44).

Franco and the monarchy

The PN guides portray Franco as the guardian angel of the royal heritage. It is often emphasised that the Caudillo is concerned about the sites and takes care of their preservation and restoration. Franco particularly takes pains to repair the damage inflicted on the buildings during the second republic (Museo de Carruajes, 1969: 24) and the 'war of liberation', a term used by various authors to refer to the Civil War. The Civil War damage is attributed to either the international brigades (El Pardo, 1968: 42), the 'red troops' or the republicans (Moncloa, 1972: 18; Pedralbes, 1974: 87). In this way, the republicans are put on a par with the foreign invaders who have damaged the royal heritage in earlier times, such as during the war of independence and the invasion by Napoleon (Escorial, 1970: 210; Moncloa, 1972: 16). The guide about El Escorial (1970: 211) also mentions that Franco decided to create the PN so as to repair the damage inflicted by the enemies of Spain during the Civil War. Moreover, Franco is said to have personally contributed to some restoration efforts through the

Francisco Franco Fund (Moncloa, 1972: 36; Pedralbes, 1974: 119). In these passages, Franco appears as the supreme caretaker or administrator of the royal heritage. As such, while being closely associated with the monarchy, he is nevertheless implicitly presented as an external and in a sense subordinate instance, being merely responsible for the preservation of the palaces built by his royal superiors.

Hence, the guides contain an intriguing paradox: the patron and founder of the PN, who is thus at the origin of this discourse about the perennial and immanent nature of the Spanish monarchy and the need for the preservation and restoration of the timeless royal palaces, is the same person who has – from a monarchist point of view – usurped the function of head of state and withheld the throne from the legitimate dynastic heir, don Juan de Borbón. Yet this paradox is reduced to the extent that the caretaker image of Franco is complemented by a somewhat different discourse that locates the Caudillo more closely to and in a sense even within the monarchy. A good illustration of this switch from a mere caretaker to a quasi-royal status can be found in the guide about the Moncloa Palace. The author emphasises that Franco did not restrict himself to merely restoring the palace to its original state, but also created something new and better:

Immediately after the War, His Excellency the Head of State, Don Francisco Franco, decided against the mere reconstruction of the small palace, but ordered the construction of a new and larger building, a real palace [...]. The construction of the new palace was finished in 1953 and in comparison with it, the earlier smaller palace pales into insignificance. (1972: 35)

This contrast between the 'reconstruction' and the 'construction' of the palace, the former being rejected and the latter ordered by Franco, is strongly reminiscent of the difference between the monarchists' and the Caudillo's view on the monarchy. While the monarchists favoured a restoration of the monarchy, Franco, as discussed earlier, planned and implemented an instauration of a new monarchy, thereby also enhancing his own historical role as founder of a new monarchy and not merely caretaker head of state.

In keeping with these quasi-royal aspirations of the Caudillo, the guides somehow manage to portray Franco as part and parcel of the monarchist tradition in Spain. This is brought about by evoking a contiguity between Franco and the Spanish monarchs, both on the textual and the iconographical level. For instance, the guide about the Convent of Las Huelgas and the Palace of the Isle places Franco in a lineage of Caudillos that goes

back to El Cid, who, from a Franquist perspective, was one of the first Spanish kings:

It appears that Burgos was destined to be the cradle of historical feats brought about by Caudillos of extraordinary greatness. Fernán González, Rodrigo Díaz, the one from Vivar [i.e. El Cid], and now Francisco Franco ... Because it was in the Palace of the Isle that he resided and worked during the whole Crusade of Liberation, as another Fernán González. While the latter founded the Spanish nation, Francisco Franco saved it from destruction, strengthened and consolidated it for centuries to come. (1971: 46)

In the guides, Franco is time and again juxtaposed to the kings and queens who determined Spain's destiny. His name appears together with the names of Carlos II (El Escorial, 1970: 207), Philip III (El Pardo, 1968: 32) and Carlos IV (Pedralbes, 1974: 119). In the last mentioned guide, the link is made as follows: 'During the recent restoration of the salon, care was taken to respect the style of Carlos IV, which is also the style of the furniture of the Generalissimo's Foundation' (Pedralbes, 1974: 119). This passage illustrates that the links are often highly tenuous and the logical connection to the author's main argument rather shaky. Apparently, Franco's name is dropped merely for the sake of associating the Caudillo with the Spanish dynasty. A similar effect is created on an iconographical level. A lot of guides contain photos related to Franco. The guide about Pedralbes has both a photo of the Caudillo (1974: 28–29) and of a bust of his (1974: 90). And the guide about El Pardo shows how the gardens of the palace are embellished with Franco's seal and coat of arms (1968: 92–93). Franco's seal with the fascist Joker and Arrows emblem – originally the symbol of the Catholic kings in the 15th century – also appears on the back flap of various guides.

These discursive and iconographical associations between Franco and the monarchy are obviously facilitated in the cases of the royal palaces that are directly linked to Franco, i.e. Franco's own residence El Pardo (1968: 6), the Moncloa Palace, which served as the official residence of his guests of honour (1972: 13), and the Palace of Pedralbes, in which Franco resided when he was staying in Barcelona (1974: 146). A peculiar case is the aforementioned Palace of the Isle in Burgos, which owes its 'royal' status solely to the fact that it served as Franco's residence during the Civil War. As stated in the guide, it was from this palace that Franco 'devised and planned his magical sieges of the international communistised [*comunistizadas*] troops' (Huelgas, 1971: 47). Finally, in a guide about the Alcázar of Sevilla (1970: 129), there is a reference to the annexes of the head of state.

It is apparent from the descriptions of Franco's private and official apartments in the guides that the Caudillo liked to surround himself with royal objects. The guide about El Pardo, for instance, contains a detailed description of Franco's private rooms. They are described as being richly adorned with 18th-century tapestries from the collections of the royal manufactory of Santa Bárbara, with old portraits of princesses and kings (1968: 74). Also, his office is embellished with tapestries that were given to Philip III (1968: 57).

While these detailed descriptions of the luxury in which Franco lives enhance his quasi-royal status, they are at the same time difficult to reconcile with other passages in which Franco is portrayed as an austere person, i.e. as a genuine Spaniard. This is for example the case in the guide about the Convent of Las Huelgas and the Palace of the Isle in Burgos:

The building was hardly fit to house the activities of not only the commanding general but also his chiefs of staff. However, it was located at a distance from the hustle of the town and, being an austere person, Franco did not need anything more than a silent corner where he could study the plans and manipulate the mechanisms of war. (1971: 47)

With regard to this palace, the guide also predicts that

it will be a destination for patriotic pilgrimages. And the traveller will contemplate how the Caudillo Franco had no interest in ostentation and luxury; how he was content with a room no larger than a tent; how the genius does not require a setting which matches his sublime aims. (1971: 47–48).

Traces of this rhetoric can also be found in the descriptions of the Palace of El Pardo, the later residence of Franco, which is characterised as 'simple' (1968: 43, 44, 76). But the aforementioned detailed descriptions and photos of Franco's residences and offices are in blatant contradiction with this image of simplicity and austerity, as they are indicative of the very luxury and ostentation that is scorned elsewhere in the guides. Some passages relating to Franco attempted to remove this tension by avoiding words like 'luxury' or 'sumptuousness' and referring to the notion of 'dignity' instead. For instance, the 1974 guide about the Pedralbes Palace mentions the decision of the Barcelona authorities to refurbish the Palace, which served both as a museum and as a residence for Franco at the time. The author explains that this refurbishment implied a replacement of the rather poor materials originally used by more expensive materials. The city authorities, he adds, made these changes so as to give a more

dignified character to the building and to transform it into a worthy residence for the Caudillo:

In 1964, the city authorities, who wanted to revalorise the Palace, initiated a major restoration, which continued in 1966. Thus starts a new episode in the history of the Palace. The plaster was replaced by marble and the poor architectural quality of the mansion was gradually improved due to addition of new salons and annexes worthy of the building's destination. (1974: 97)

In one instance, the two images of Franco as caretaker and Franco as quasi-monarch appear almost next to one another. This is the case in the 1968 guide about El Pardo. First, it is suggested to the tourist that Franco the caretaker devotes himself to the conservation of the royal heritage: 'In order to assure its conservation, the Head of State chose the Palace as his official residence' (1968: 42). But on the next page, Franco does not appear anymore as the one who preserves, but as the one who adds lustre to the Palace: 'Having been transformed into the official residence of His Excellency the Head of State, the Palace of El Pardo has obtained an extraordinary significance in the contemporary history of Spain' (1968: 43).

The Valley of the Fallen

The association between Franco and the monarchy is nowhere as prominent as in the PN guides about the National Monument of the Holy Cross of the Valley of the Fallen, as it is officially called (1959, 1960, 1977, 1980 among others).

To start with, the guides make it abundantly clear that the idea to construct the monument originates from Franco: 'Not only did the Head of State devise the plan to build the monument, it was also he who chose its location' (1959: 9); 'The plan, as it was from the outset in its completeness conceived in the mind of Spain's Caudillo, involved the construction of a large church and [...] a monumental cross' (1959: 10). Thus, a close link is established between the monument, the annex monastery and its spiritual founder, in much the same way as in the guide about El Escorial: 'The construction of the monastery was a personal idea of the King Philip II, who thereby wanted to commemorate the victory in the battle of Saint Quintin' (1970: 9). While the guide about El Escorial contains no mention of the Valley of the Fallen, the guide about the latter monument refers repeatedly to the Palace of Philip II. In this way, Franco is implicitly presented as a contemporaneous Philip II. For instance, it is said of Franco's monument that it shares 'the dominion over the valley with the

marvel of the Escorial' (1959: 7) and that 'it is officially part of the administrative entity of San Lorenzo de El Escorial' (1959: 8). Also, El Escorial serves as the geographical point of reference in the guides. Finally, the style of the building that houses the Centre of Social Studies, an annex of the monastery, is compared to the style of Herrero, the architect of El Escorial (1970: 190–191). This architectural style is characterised in the guide to El Escorial as 'probably the most Spanish', and the Centre of Social Studies is 'a faithful copy of Herrero's constructions' (1959: 63).

Yet, there are also important differences between the Valley and El Escorial, which are inadvertently highlighted by the parallelism drawn in the guide. Most importantly, the Valley is not really a Royal Pantheon. This deficiency is recognised, but at the same time remedied by means of a clever rhetorical ploy. Franco's monument may not contain the tombs of the most elevated, it is yet a cenotaph in honour of the 'best':

It remains significant that, while the monastery of El Escorial – destined to be the successor of the great royal pantheons of San Isidoro, Guadalupe, Leyre, San Juan de la Peña y Poblet – shelters those located at the top of the social hierarchy, the Monument of Santa Cruz del Valle de los Caídos is an authentic cenotaph dedicated to those men who managed to embody the most pure values of a people. (1959: 7)

Yet, however much this text highlights a difference between the Valley of the Fallen and the royal monasteries mentioned, it at the same time associates Franco's monument with these relics of a glorious past.

In some other passages the monument is presented to the tourist as a place of destination for objects that originate from royal sites. The crucifix above the main altar of the basilica – made of wood that was allegedly cut by Franco himself – was kept in the royal palace of El Pardo 'until its transfer and subsequent installation in the Valley of the Fallen' (1959: 56). Similarly, the remains of José Antonio Primo de Rivera were 'transferred there from the monastery of San Lorenzo de El Escorial' (1980: 34). Finally, the giant stone cylinders alongside the road to the Valley, the so-called Juanelos, are said to date back to the time of Charles V and to have been crafted for the construction of a building designed by the clock maker of the emperor, Juanelo Turriano (1980: 14).

By mentioning these transferrals, a subtle discursive link is woven between the royal sites or persons from which they originate and Franco's monument for which they are destined. The monument is described as a receptacle of objects derived from royal sites of the past and thus presented as a new link in an ancient chain.

This temporal perspective, which is mainly focused on the continuity with the past, is made particularly explicit in the following grandiloquently phrased text, taken from the first edition of the PN guide:

Multiple factors had to converge in the construction of the monument, if it was to be interpreted as a deliberate statement with regard to the cardinal and *permanent* questions mankind is faced with. If the very monument was to be a manifestation of a collective stand for life and faith, the stones used to erect it had to equal the grand dimensions of the ancient monuments *designed to withstand time and oblivion*. At the same time, the colossal and cyclopean dimensions of the construction must be seen as a very concrete answer to any questioning of the artistic and, in particular, architectural, abilities of our time. And even if it were only for that, it will *remain inscribed* on the list of noble endeavours. (1959: 6, our italics)

In this passage, the Valley of the Fallen is not in the first place presented as a new and contemporary monument that inspires awe because of the advanced techniques used in its construction and that may inspire present-day visitors. Instead the focus is on the past, in a double sense. The guide not only harks back to ancient times, but also evokes a past in the future, when the tourists of ages to come will marvel at this ancient relic of a glorious history. In this way, the guide highlights the transcendent and perennial nature of the monument, a trait that it shares with the other monuments and sites described in the collection of the PN. The Valley is thus placed among these other 'noble endeavours', royal sites that survive and transcend the vicissitudes of history.

After Franco: The transition

After Franco's death in 1975, the PN remained in charge of the preservation and management of the royal sites.⁶ It has continued publishing guides about the sites for which it is responsible but the rate at which they have been published in the investigated post-Franco era (from 1975 to 1987) shows considerable ups and downs. On the basis of both the frequency of publication and the contents of the guides, three different periods can be distinguished.

From 1975 to 1977, the guides were published as before and the text generally remained unaltered. For instance, the new edition of the guide about the Alcázar of Sevilla, published in 1977, is identical to the 1970 edition. The same is the case with the 1969 and 1977 guides about the Carruajes Museum and the 1961 and 1977 guides about the Descalzas Reales Monastery.⁷ During the next five years, from 1978 to 1982, it

appears that the publication of guides was largely stopped.⁸ Apart from one minor exception⁹ this long silence was only once interrupted: in 1980 a guide appeared about the Valley of the Fallen. These five years can be considered as a period of reflection about the course that the PN had to follow, and more specifically about the change of ideology imposed by the altered political context. This period ends in 1983, which marks the beginning of a period of intense production. The guides published from 1983 onwards differ so much from the earlier editions that it is legitimate to speak of a break with the earlier period.

Yet this break did not affect the manner in which the concepts of Spain and Spanishness are constructed. As was the case in the earlier guides, the notion of austerity continues to be central in the image of Spain and an intimate link is made between Spain and the monarchy. There is also hardly a significant change as concerns the discourse about the monarchy as such, apart from some minor adaptations. For instance, in the 1983 guide about the Palace of La Granja, the negative reference to the Borbón Queen Isabel de Farnesio is deleted, as is the association between the Juanelos and Charles V in the 1984 guide about the Valley of the Fallen. However, these adaptations pale into insignificance in comparison to the radical changes concerning the portrayal of Franco and Franquism.

This radical break is already apparent from the layout and the style of the guides. The grandiloquent and pompous passages in the earlier guides are rewritten in a more sober and detached style. The Gothic-like type font typical of the Franquist era is replaced with a more neutral and modern one. Also, the seal of Franco is removed from the back flap of the guides, while the photographs of the Caudillo, of his busts and of the seals in the palace gardens are systematically deleted and mostly substituted with others.

This removal is indicative of a more fundamental change. As a rule, all references to Franco are, as far as possible, deleted from the series of guides published from 1983 to 1987. The way this cleansing was brought about and the impact it has differ from guide to guide. The changes are most visible in the cases where the references to Franco were interwoven with other themes, such as the restoration of the PN estates, the damage inflicted upon them during the Civil War and the functioning of the PN itself which was – as mentioned earlier – closely monitored by Franco. These themes are also omitted, as a result of which the text becomes less self-referential in the sense that the authors refer less to their own role and the role of the institution for which they work. This shift is particularly apparent in the 1983 guide about El Escorial and the 1987 guide about the Descalzas Reales Monastery. In this way some of the contextual

information gets lost, but at the same time the new guides more closely mirror the traditional tourist guide genre.

Nevertheless, even in the above-cited examples, the earlier references to Franco and his role in the maintenance of the royal sites were only occasional, so that the cleansing of these passages about the PN was relatively straightforward and did not interfere with the main body of the text. But the author who had to adapt the guide to El Pardo, a site that was intimately associated with the person of Franco, faced a much harder task. Interestingly, one of the techniques applied by the author in charge of the cleansing was to recycle the arguments given in the earlier guides to emphasise the importance of the building, while using different characters. As indicated above, Franco was presented in the earlier guides as the person who has given lustre to the palace: 'Having been transformed into the official residence of His Excellency the Head of State, the Palace of El Pardo has obtained an extraordinary significance in the contemporary history of Spain' (1968: 43). In the 1985 edition, the extraordinary significance of the palace is again highlighted by referring to the residents, but the agents of lustre have changed: 'The Palace of El Pardo has currently regained its fame for bygone centuries as, from February 1983 onwards, it has been firmly established as the residence of the heads of state who visit our country' (1985: 36).

Still, a small but unavoidable parenthesis has to be made about the interval between the 'bygone centuries' and the current situation. 'A short corridor containing washrooms and a hairdresser's take us to the bedroom and dressing room belonging to the previous Head of State. The display cabinets in the latter room show some of the uniforms he wore' (1985: 74). It can be seen from this passage to what extent the very name of 'Franco' has become a taboo. The authors avoid using it and instead use depersonalised qualifications such as 'the last Head of State' (1985: 58) or the 'previous Head of State' (1985: 74).

In the case of the Palace of the Isle, the purging of the original text was practically impossible due to the fact that the building was exclusively associated with Franco and Franquism and had no substantive connection with the monarchy, apart from the symbolic link created in the earlier guides. Hence, the only option was to remove the building from the heritage administered by the PN and thus also from the guides. While the 1971 guide still contains some enthusiastically written pages about the Palace and its importance, the next edition we could find, published in 1987, keeps silent about the site.

From the monarchist perspective of the PN, it would undoubtedly have been logical to proceed in the same way with regard to the Valley of the

Fallen. Nevertheless, it was decided to keep the monument in the patrimony of the PN and thus to continue the publication of the guides to the Valley, the rewriting of which obviously was no small challenge. As mentioned above, the five-year long publication break of the PN was interrupted by the 1980 edition of the Valley of the Fallen guide. This guide – published five years after the death of Franco and two years after the endorsement of the new democratic constitution – is identical to the earlier ones and contains the same laudatory rhetoric about Franco. The only change is the addition of a detailed account concerning the burial ceremony in the basilica following the arrival of 'the funeral procession coming from the Royal Palace of Madrid' (1980: 35). In this way, the web of associations between the Valley of the Fallen and the royal sites continues to be woven. According to the guide, the ceremony started with the reading of a royal decree stating that Franco should be buried in the basilica. At the end of the ceremony, 'his majesty the King went from his seat to the grave in order to pay a pious tribute to the mortal remains of His Excellency the Generalissimo, and thereupon the grave was sealed' (1980: 37). Franco undoubtedly would have revelled in this description of his burial which, due to the many symbolic linkages with royalty, can be considered as the culmination of his rise to a quasi-royal figure.

But even the Valley of the Fallen guide is not immune from the new democratic wind blowing in the PN. The 1984 edition constitutes a clear break with the past. The earlier editions had always contained a schematic map, which also appeared in other guides, indicating the location of the major royal sites. This map also included the Valley of the Fallen, which was even located more or less in the centre of the royal network. The deletion of the map in the 1984 edition can be considered as the iconographical pendant of the radical change of content, involving the omission of all associations between the monarchy and Franquism, and a remarkable reticence with regard to the figure of Franco. The mentions of Franco's emotional and practical involvement in the project, as well as the account of his burial, are omitted from the text. The apparent obsession of the author to avoid the name of Franco and to de-ideologise the guide results in a reverse ideologised text. But the ideology is now hidden behind the smokescreen of an extremely historicised discourse that has as the effect that Franco appears as a half forgotten figure from long ago: 'Behind the altar is the grave of Francisco Franco Bahamonde, who was the Head of State of Spain and who died on 20 November 1975' (1984: 29). This apparent de-ideologisation also means that the explanation about the context of the monument disappears from the guide, as a result of which some passages become meaningless for those not familiar with the historical

circumstances of the monument. In the earlier guides, ample attention was given to Franco's vision of the Valley as a monument in remembrance of those who fell in the Civil War and as a symbol of reunification:

The fundamental aim of the erection of the monument of the Valley of the Fallen was to create a last resting place under the shelter of the Cross for all those who fell during the conflict which took place between the years 1936 and 1939, as it is stated in the preamble of the Law establishing this Foundation of the Valley of the Fallen, thereby executing the ideas of the Generalissimo. At the moment the Church harbours the remains of 50,000 persons who fought on both sides. (1980: 38)

In the 1984 edition, this passage is deleted with the exception of the last sentence. But the crucial reference to 'both sides' is now devoid of meaning for those not familiar with Spain's recent past and the historical roots of the monument.

Discussion

A present-day tourist visiting the city of Burgos with the 1971 PN guide would be quite at a loss. He might well be curious to take a look at the 'royal' Palace of the Isle, this famous 'destination for patriotic pilgrimages' as it is described in the guide. But the palace is literally wiped off the map. It is not mentioned on the official tourist map of Burgos,¹⁰ neither are there any signposts in the city indicating where this 'must see' historic site is to be found. Fortunately, the employee at the main tourist office of Burgos, next to the famous cathedral, knows of the place. But it is now closed to the public and cannot be visited. Upon further scrutiny, she discloses that there are plans to transform the building into a school. Our imaginary tourist might not be put off that easily and give it a try anyhow. He would find it impossible to get near the palace, but might try to peek over the massive wall surrounding the premises and thereby get a glimpse of a rather banal and somewhat derelict mansion: clearly a far cry from the 'royal' palace described in the guide.

The Palace of the Isle is a good – though admittedly fairly extreme – illustration of a tension inherent in the notion of a royal tourist site. On the one hand, such a site derives its attractiveness largely from its timeless nature, which epitomises the continuity and permanence intrinsic to the institution of monarchy. But at the same time, a royal site remains a construction that is contingent on the political and cultural context of the moment and is thus to a certain extent malleable. Both the choice of the sites considered 'royal' and the way these are discursively constructed in

the rhetorics of tourism will depend amongst other things on the prevailing ideological climate and the public and elite attitudes towards royalty. Hence, what is today portrayed as a royal site at which visitors will marvel for ages to come can tomorrow simply disappear from the tourist maps and guides.

Our analysis of the PN guides published during the Franquist era has shown that the construction of the royal tourist sites clearly reflected the regime's ambiguous relationship with the monarchy. Spain is consistently portrayed as a nation with a deep-seated monarchist tradition. This tradition, however, has been usurped by the 'decadent' Borbón dynasty which was at odds with the austere character of the genuine Spaniard. At the same time the figure of General Franco is subtly associated with the monarchy and somehow inserted in the royal imagery, both on the iconographical and textual levels. Most radically, two sites that hark back to the Civil War and bear no relation to the monarchy – i.e. the aforementioned Palace of the Isle in Burgos and the Valley of the Fallen – are discursively incorporated in the royal heritage. The regime is clearly seeking to enhance its legitimacy by linking Franco to the royal sites and the monarchist tradition. Yet there is some ambiguity in the way this association is brought about, as Franco is cast in two different roles vis-à-vis the monarchy. He sometimes appears as the supreme caretaker of the royal heritage, who takes pains to preserve the royal sites and thereby to serve the monarchy. In other instances, the Caudillo is presented as a monarch in his own right and a worthy successor of the glorious kings of the past. As a caretaker, he has ordered the restoration of the royal palace of El Pardo, as a quasi-monarch he has taken up abode there and in doing so has added lustre to the place.

It is precisely because of the immanent and ahistorical nature of the monarchy that being associated with it may add to the legitimacy of a dictator like Franco. Franco's semi-regal status assured that his rise to power was viewed not so much as the result of a chance concurrence of circumstances, which it obviously was, but rather as a preordained succession. By appropriating the monarchist imagery, Franco could create the impression that he had ascended the throne as the quasi-dynastic successor of the genuine Spanish kings of yore. But at the same time, it could also be argued that the aura of timelessness and immanence provides the monarchy with a certain immunity against contingent manipulations like the one attempted by Franco. However much the regime and the PN tried to insert the Palace of the Isle into the canon of 'Reales Sitios', it is highly doubtful whether the 'Palace' was really perceived as 'royal' by the tourists. Arguably, it did not rouse the same awe and admiration – the same sense of 'pastness' or 'a legendary thousand years somehow alive

and watching from the shadows' (Nairn, 1994: 124) – as the other site covered in the guide: the Monastery of Las Huelgas, which dates back to the 12th century and harbours the tombs of the first Castilian kings.

After Franco's death in 1975, during the first years of the transition, adapting the guides was apparently not a priority for the new democratic regime, as 'Franquist' PN guides continue to be published until the beginning of the 1980s. It is only during the 1980s that the guides are systematically cleansed and the textual and iconographical associations between Franco and the monarchy drastically omitted. In fact, the very person of Franco almost completely disappears from the guides. At most the former quasi-monarch is casually referred to as 'the former head of state', but the taboo-laden name of Franco is left unwritten. Yet, on closer view, the royal heritage remains in part a Franquist heritage. The Valley of the Fallen – the supreme symbolical expression of Franco's regal aspirations – remains administered by the PN and thus part and parcel of the network of Spanish royal sites.

But apart from that, the notion of Franco as a quasi-monarchical figure has clearly disappeared from the guides. Or has it? Even though our systematic research was limited to the PN guides published until 1987, we could not refrain from taking a quick look at some of the PN guides that are available at the moment. Of particular interest is the current guide about El Pardo, the royal palace near Madrid in which Franco resided and which is now used as a residence for foreign guests of honour. The text about El Pardo appears to have been extensively modified in comparison with the 1985 guide analysed above. In the first post-transition edition of the guide, the fact that 'the former Head of State' had lived here was merely presented as an insignificant footnote in the history of the palace. But this inhibition to name Franco has disappeared in the 2002 guide. It is now explicitly stated that the palace has served as 'Franco's' residence and that 'Franco' had also restored the building (El Pardo, 2002: 12). What is more, the author now explicitly points out which rooms served as Franco's office and he devotes a separate section in the guide – with a photo – to Franco's bedroom, in which some of his uniforms are put on display (El Pardo, 2002: 32, 42–43). Far from being concealed, the fact that El Pardo is also 'the Palace of Franco' is now clearly considered as something that will be of particular interest to the tourists and may even enhance the attractiveness of the site. In a sense, we have now come full circle and the Caudillo again adds lustre to the site, just as was the case in the Franquist period. But the reverse is also true: the royal palace adds lustre to the historical figure of the Caudillo and keeps providing him with a regal aura. Which was precisely what Franco intended.

Notes

1. <http://www.patrimonionacional.es/en/escorial/escorial.htm>. On the English version of the website, 'Patrimonio Nacional' is translated as 'Royal Heritage'.
2. <http://www.patrimonionacional.es/en/presenta/presenta.htm>.
3. Apart from the fact that Doña María Cristina and Don Alfonso had once stayed in the house when passing through Burgos (Huelgas, 1971: 48).
4. The guides were often written by the person in charge of the preservation of the site. Some authors have only written one guide, others various. The names of the authors are mentioned in the appendix.
5. It was not possible to analyse all the editions of the guides. Instead, our investigation will be limited to the editions of the guides that are available at the National Library in Madrid. The fact that some editions are lacking in the National Library is probably due to the fact that they are often identical or almost identical to the previous editions.
6. The list of PN administered royal sites changed somewhat. As concerns the royal palaces, the Alcazar of Sevilla, the Pedralbes Palace in Barcelona and the Moncloa Palace were removed, while the royal palace of Almudaina de Palma de Mallorca was added. There was one additional religious site, namely the Royal Monastery of the Incarnation. Finally, there was a new category of 'other royal estates', which included a diversity of sites: the Pantheon of Illustrious Men, the Monastery of Santa Isabel, both in Madrid, the Convent of San Pascual in Madrid and Aranjuez and the College of las Doncellas Nobles in Toledo.
7. Except for the fact that in 1977 information was added about a recently restored part of the building.
8. This can be deduced from the fact that almost no guides from this period can be found in the Spanish National Library.
9. In 1982 an English edition of the Palacio Real in Madrid is published, probably a translation of a guide originally published in Spanish.
10. Franco and the Civil War also appear to constitute a blind spot in the 1994 Baedeker guide about Burgos, as Barke and Towner (1996: 358) notice with some surprise.

References

- Badía, J.F. (1975) *Teoría de la instauración monárquica en España*. Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos.
- Barke, M. and Towner, J. (1996) The tourist-historic city in Spain. In M. Barke, J. Towner and M.T. Newton (eds) *Tourism in Spain. Critical Issues* (pp. 343–371) Wallingford: CAB.
- Bernecker, W.L. (1998) Monarchy and democracy: The political role of King Juan Carlos in the Spanish *Transición*. *Journal of Contemporary History* 33 (1), 65–84.
- Crozier, B. (1967) *Franco. A Biographical History*. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode.
- de Vilallonga, J.L. (1998) *Franco y el Rey*. Barcelona: Plaza & Janés.
- Domínguez, A.M. (2000) Teatro de la posesión: Política de la melancolía en la España Franquista. *Arizona Journal of Hispanic Cultural Studies* 4, 43–60.
- Ellwood, S. (1994) *Franco*. London: Longman.

- Figuerola Palomo, M. (1999) La transformación del turismo en un fenómeno de masas. La planificación indicativa (1950–1974). In C. Pellejero Martínez (ed.) *Historia de la economía del turismo en España* (pp. 77–134). Madrid: Civitas.
- Méndez, D. (1982) *El Valle de los Caídos. Idea, proyecto y construcción*. Madrid: Fundación Francisco Franco.
- Nairn, T. (1994) *The Enchanted Glass. Britain and its Monarchy*. London: Vintage.
- Nourry, P. (1986) *Juan Carlos. Un roi pur les républicains*. Paris: Centurion.
- Payne, S.G. (1999) *Fascism in Spain 1923–1977*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Poutet, H. (1995) *Images touristiques de l'Espagne. De la propagande politique à la promotion touristique*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Powell, C. (1996) *Juan Carlos of Spain. Self-made Monarch*. Houndmills: Macmillan.
- Preston, P. (1995) *Franco. A Biography*. London: Fontana.
- Preston, P. (2005) *Juan Carlos. Steering Spain from Dictatorship to Democracy*. London: Harper Perennial.
- Sueiro, D. (1983) *El Valle de los Caídos. Los secretos de la cripta franquista. Tercera edición revisada*. Barcelona: Argos Vergara.

Corpus of guides published by the Patrimonio Nacional, Madrid

- Monumento Nacional de Santa Cruz del Valle de los Caídos. 1959, 1974, 1977, 1980, 1984.
- El Alcázar de Sevilla. Comentarios y notas de J. Romero y Murube. 1970, 1977.
- Palacio de El Pardo, Casita del Príncipe y Palacio de la Zarzuela. M. López Serrano. 1968.
- Real Sitio de El Pardo. M. López Serrano. Aumentada y corregida por F.A. Martín y L. Sánchez Fernández. 1985.
- El Escorial. El Monasterio y las casitas del príncipe y del infante. M. López Serrano. 1970, 1983.
- Palacio de la Moncloa. F. Fuertes de Villavicencio. 1972.
- Museo de Carruajes. I. Turmo. 1969, 1977.
- El Palacio de Pedralbes. J. Tarín Iglesias y J. Planas Parellada. 1974.
- Monasterio de las Huelgas y Palacio de la Isla de Burgos y Monasterio de Santa Clara de Tordesillas. J.L. Monteverde. 1971.
- Monasterio de las Huelgas de Burgos y Monasterio de Santa Clara de Tordesillas. J.L. Monteverde. 1987.
- Guía ilustrada de la Real Armería de Madrid. J. Cortés. 1950.
- Armería del Palacio Real de Madrid. G. Quintan Lacaci. 1987.
- El Palacio Real de Madrid. M. López Serrano. 1959, 1983.
- Palacios Reales de la Granja de San Ildefonso y Riofrío. J. Contreras y López de Ayala (marqués de Lozoya). 1961.
- Palacios Reales de la Granja de San Ildefonso, Riofrío y Museo de la Caza. J. Contreras y López de Ayala y A. Oliveras. 1983.
- Palacio Real de la Granja de San Ildefonso. J. Contreras López de Ayala y C. Herrero Carretero. 1985.
- Monasterio de las Descalzas Reales. P. Junquera de Vega y M.T. Ruiz Alarcón. 1961, 1977, 1987.
- Palacio Real de El Pardo. Flora López Marsa. 2002.

Chapter 5

'Eternally Will Austria Stand ...': Imperial Tourism in Austria between Timeless Predisposition and Political Statement

OLIVER HAID

When comparing the imagery of Austrian tourist places from the late 19th and early 20th centuries with posters and advertisements of the 1990s showing Austrian destinations in the London underground or elsewhere in the United Kingdom, Jill Steward found striking similarities: 'All the qualities which tourists publicly associate with Austria and its capital city Vienna – picturesqueness, gaiety, nostalgia and *gemütlich* charm, culture, scenery – were already apparent in the tourist publicity of Imperial Austria in the early 20th century.'¹

Apparently there is little change in Austrian tourism. Is this because the destinations and attractions are the same? When analysing power relations in terms of heredity, hybridity and heritage in three imperial Austrian cases, the Schönbrunn Palace in Vienna, the Lippizan stallions of the Spanish Riding School and the wedding album of Empress Elisabeth, Regina Bendix reported a very interesting statement from one of her Austrian interviewees, Dr Gerda Mraz, the head of the National Library Archives: 'Well, we have nothing else! The 1st Republic was so thoroughly chastened, critiqued, there is nothing to be proud of, there are not many years of history outside the empire, only 80!'² And Bendix adds: 'She laughs, she sees the schizophrenia in it, and she laughs about how her own archive has just become complicit in the imperial cult with a special exhibition on photos of the Empress Sisi and the co-sponsoring of the Sisi wedding gift exhibition and enactment.'³ Does this continuity of national images in tourism mean that everything is continuously reconstructed and re-enacted because history never goes by as long as the myth in it sells?