

Memory and Sustainability: Merging Epistemics in the Maquis Revival

Pablo Sánchez León
Carlos Agüero Iglesia¹

Introduction: Non-experts As Suppliers of Knowledge About the Past

Since the beginning of the twenty-first century, the anti-Francoist guerrilla of the 1940s is back on the Spanish cultural radar. After a long period of general disregard, the last few years have witnessed the publication of local studies and general overviews (Marin Silvestre; Yusta Rodrigo; Serrano) along with the production and dissemination of novels, documentaries and movies on the topic.² Although the guerrilla is unique to Spain, this renewed interest should not be dissociated from a general resurgence in many other countries of narratives about traumatic episodes of the twentieth century (Hodgkins and Radstone; Bell). Studying the revival of the maquis may thus be a useful way of contextually reflecting on a larger worldwide trend affecting both academic and political cultures.

Interpreting the scope and character of this overall social “memory wave” is beyond the ambition of this article, which instead limits itself to assessing some of the phenomenon’s effects by studying a particular case study. A growing concern for public opinion in the era of globalization, the revival of the recent past brings to the fore relevant issues situated at the crossroads between the epistemological and the political, theory and practice. In particular, patterns of memory and instituted representations about the past are increasingly regarded as essential for identity building and the framing of agency (Kihlistrom, Beer and Klein; Ben-Amos and Weissberg). Here we want to focus on another effect of the memory wave: the blurring of the division between experts and non-experts as suppliers of

Armed Resistance: Cultural Representations of the Anti-Francoist *Guerrilla*
Hispanic Issues On Line (2012)

knowledge about relevant aspects of the social phenomenon of remembrance.

Our point of departure is the acknowledgement of opposing reactions and attitudes among experts in the face of increasingly widespread efforts to “recover historical memory.” A quick look at literature on the matter makes clear that whereas Latin American academics usually acknowledge the synergetic interactions between social struggles for memory and the development of citizenship awareness, their European counterparts seem, in general, to be expressing more caution about the public role recently attained by the discourse on memory of the recent past.³ This diversity reflects differences in the relations between the social demand of memory narratives for the wider public and the available discursive supply from experts and non-experts: in eastern European countries, for example, right-wing oriented intellectuals have taken the lead in the elaboration of revisionist interpretations of the recent past and, along with other opinion makers, seem to be shaping the political uses of memory for wider public opinion.⁴ In Latin America, by contrast, the social demand for “transitional justice” has fuelled the proliferation of critical narratives about the national past, thus allowing for the development of a common basis of discourse from which both Human Rights activists and experts can draw in order to shape political and academic agendas.⁵ Beyond their different ideological orientation, these examples underline the relevance of the interactions between experts and non-experts as suppliers of discourse about the traumatic past.

Spain exhibits a singular pattern in these developments. On one hand the grassroots wave calls for a so-called “recovery of historical memory;” overwhelmingly pro-Human Rights and left-wing oriented; this wave has acquired the shape and scope of a proper *social movement* (Peinado; Gálvez). On the other, intellectuals have found themselves divided from the outset on the whole issue of the memory revival: although a few experts have offered important theoretical contributions (Cruz; Mate), many others, and in particular the bulk of historians—some of which are renowned public opinion makers (Faber)—have reacted with reluctance and disdain (if not open neglect) to the social demand for new discourses on the traumatic past (Labanyi).⁶ As a result of this reluctant position towards the movement on the side of relevant intellectuals, there is very limited communication and interaction between expert and non-expert authors.⁷

Given this context, our aim is to show that, by profiting from their civic involvement in the “labors of memory” (Jelin, *State*), certain non-expert agents are becoming independent suppliers, not just of information about hidden experiences of the recent past but of knowledge at the crossroads between the political and the epistemological, offering innovative, even radical approaches to memory that reach further than average academic products. The cultural “business” of the maquis provides a good case study for this hypothesis.

This article focuses on the activities by a particular civil society organization involved in the “politics of memory” about the maquis: *La Gavilla Verde*. We have not chosen this association at random but due to the fact that *La Gavilla Verde* has fostered the bulk of the public events relating to the recovery of the memory of the republican *guerrilleros*. Going over the activities promoted by this non-governmental organization (NGO), we found ourselves confronted by a singular discourse on memory that transcends the conventional perspective on memory offered by experts.

***La Gavilla Verde* and the Maquis: Civic Involvement Beyond Environmental Concerns**

Founded in 1997, *La Gavilla Verde* was not created for the purpose of promoting and divulging the exploits of the Spanish guerrilla of the 1940s; initially it was not even oriented toward issues relating to memory in general or the details of an unknown and traumatic episode of the past in particular. Members of *La Gavilla Verde* were originally environmentalists. As declared in its statutes, the main focus of the association was to “[p]romote sustainable and integrated Local Development.” (*Estatutos*). At the time, NGOs of similar orientation were being founded throughout the country, but *La Gavilla Verde* stands out still today as a singular experience of reorientation in purpose, widening its scope from mere ecological activism. Understanding how this transformation of aims took place is essential for fully grasping the originality of its approach to memory. This implies, in turn, observing the formation and development of the association in context, stressing the influence of opportunities and constraints over its specific evolution.

The first singularity in the history of this association derives from its place of birth. In contrast to the most prominent environmental NGOs in Spain, *La Gavilla Verde* was not founded in a big city but in a rather marginal rural place: Santa Cruz de Moya. Located at the southeast end of the Montes Universales—the spine-like ridge running north-south on the eastern side of the Iberian Peninsula—and close to the river Turia, Santa Cruz is a small village situated on the border between three provinces, each belonging to a different region or Comunidad Autónoma: Teruel (in Aragón), Cuenca (in Castilla-La Mancha) and Valencia. The story of *La Gavilla Verde* is deeply intertwined with that of Santa Cruz, a town that, in turn, affords a singular connection with the maquis and its discursive revival.

Much like other rural emplacements, the countryside around Santa Cruz de Moya hosted guerrilla activity back in the hard times of the Franco regime. True enough, this village in particular had a prominent place in legendary accounts as the site of a most dramatic drawback in the history of

the maquis: the dismantling—after a deadly ambush—of the headquarters of the Agrupación de Guerrilleros de Levante y Aragón (The Guerrilla of Levante and Aragón)—or AGLA—in the fall of 1947, where no less than twelve combatants were slaughtered by the Spanish military (Fernández Cava). Yet by the time of Franco's death and the transition to democracy, when the town's population had dropped to 30 percent of its 1940 numbers (La Gavilla Verde), this event was mainly part of a forgotten past, and certainly could not be the justification for collective action aimed at the revival of memory on the part of its inhabitants. In fact, as in the early 1940s—when Santa Cruz was chosen as a strategic place for guerrilla activity without previously contacting the inhabitants of the village—the initial impulse for the recovery of the recent past came from outside.

The first initiative reconnecting Santa Cruz with the *maquis* came from a volunteer organization devoted to aiding aging former combatants: Amical de Catalunya dels antics guerrillers espanyols a França (Friends of ex-guerrilla fighters in France), whose Ordinary General Assembly (celebrated on May 12th, 1985) decided “to create the Day of the Guerrilla Fighter for annual celebration,” and successively “to study the possibility of erecting the National Monument for the Guerrilla Fighter” (*Estatutos*). Santa Cruz was chosen as the appropriate location for this monument, which was finally erected in June 1991.⁸ Without attracting much attention from the media, from 1989 onwards on the first Sunday of every October, dozens of veteran guerrilleros gathered in the village together with cadres from political organizations and other sympathizers—a record of the first celebration appeared in *El País* on Monday, October 2nd, 1989 (“200 ex-maquis”).

A link was established between the monument as a “site of memory” and Santa Cruz. As one of its promoters declared at the inauguration of the statue:

We make the village of Santa Cruz the Moya depositary of this monument with confidence that they will look after it and make others respect it . . . because it is the symbol of the sacrifices that the Spanish people has had to endure in all historical times in order to defend peace, fight for its freedom and regain its democracy. (*Estatutos*)

In the shorter run, though, the annual gathering of old fighters and younger sympathizers could not, by itself, dramatically increase the cultural outlook of the local population. The creation of *La Gavilla Verde* owed, in fact, very little to direct influence from this incipient tradition; rather, it was a local response to depopulation and the lack of economic prospects and resources for the younger generations remaining in the village. Although independently born, the celebration and the NGO ended up having a closer relationship thanks to the convergence of changes both in the local and national context. Inside the village, after the first years of euphoria and

affluence of participants, already by the middle of the 1990s, celebrations started to wane: as recalled by Pedro Peinado—president of the association—initial promoters were abandoning the organizing activities, former guerrilleros were passing away and fewer people were showing up at the Day of the Guerrillero (see the interview with Pedro Peinado at contratiempohistoria.org/programas/070_contratiempo%2027-09-10.mp3). The members of the recently-created association reacted to this awareness of decline and committed to finding alternatives for the maintenance of the celebration. Although by then the activity could be considered part of the “local environment” and so falling within the aims of *La Gavilla Verde*, they were acting in the first place as citizens.⁹

At the national level, the year 2000—marked by the re-election of the conservative party for national government and a crisis in the main opposition party—witnessed a shift in political discourse away from the consensus that had been rooted since the transition period, including the dissemination of a right-wing revisionist narrative on the Civil War (Moa, *Los orígenes* and *Los mitos*); for their part, oppositional newspapers started to open their pages to new issues excluded from conventional political agendas, some of them relating to the recovery of traumatic events of the recent past. In the fall of 2000, the exhumation of a series of human remains from civilians massacred in the rearguard during the 1936–1939 War became the most watched-for news in the Internet edition of *El País* after receiving coverage throughout that summer (Macías y Silva 88). The phrase “recuperación de la memoria histórica” (recuperation of historical memory) was coined, and started to echo among wider audiences. Right around the same time, in Santa Cruz, *La Gavilla Verde* linked, for the first time, the celebration of the Day of the Guerrillero to the organization of the “Jornadas El Maquis en Santa Cruz de Moya. Crónica Rural de la Guerrilla Española. Memoria Viva” (Conference on the Maquis in Santa Cruz de Moya. Rural Chronicle of the Spanish Guerrilla. Living Memory) (*La Gavilla Verde*). Interestingly enough, these two events took place independently of each other, thus signalling the rise of a new sensibility functioning as the demand side of an emerging regime of memory in Spain (Ferrándiz Martín).

In both instances, the commitment to the struggle for memory was to prove lasting and intense on the part of the organizations involved. In the case of the maquis revival, the balance sheet points overwhelmingly in favor of the initiatives undertaken by *La Gavilla Verde*. The original core of these is the annual conference (or Jornadas) that have been organized for over a decade now. The relevance of this initiative is first found in its intellectual ambition. Since the beginning, the Jornadas were not justified as an homage or testimony but as an “act of knowledge” (*La Gavilla Verde*). This wording could be understood to mean, at that time, the divulcation of information about a traumatic past the details of which were lost or forgotten; actually, the First Jornadas focused on testimonials from neighbors and ex-maquis,

although there was already an interest in treating certain issues that involved theoretical reflection, such as the role of “enlaces” or interlopers and “puntos de apoyo” or supporters from surrounding rural localities.

This self-limiting vision was soon overcome, though. The Second Jornadas devoted a panel to connections between memory of the maquis and fiction literature, establishing enduring synergies between these two fields.¹⁰ This edition was also path-breaking in treating the issue of “legislation and memory” six years before the passing of the Ley de Memoria Histórica (Law of Historical Memory) in 2007. In 2003, the Fourth Jornadas included a panel on “university and memory” that again pioneered the creation of the first *cátedras de memoria* (chairs of memory studies) in some public universities.¹¹ The Sixth Jornadas, in turn, devoted efforts to the subject of “memory in the classroom,” one of the first initiatives in education about values and teaching about recovery of memory for secondary school students. Last but not least, the Ninth Jornadas, organized in October 2008, featured a special session on trauma and intergenerational transmission (“psychological effects on citizens of the war, postwar, dictatorship and the transition” [*La Gavilla Verde*]).

Yet the main originality of the Jornadas lies in the bridge they provide between citizenship and historical knowledge. The annual meetings in Santa Cruz function as a space for communication, one where experts and non-experts can exchange perspectives around the maquis. Since the beginning these meetings have benefited from strong support from the regional state university, but their structure and management do not follow typical academic standards—the contents of the event are not decided by an academic commission of expert historians. Although the organization invites special lectures offered by prominent authors on certain issues, invited participants are not usually professional historians or academic experts: the real protagonists are memory-carriers, both former guerrilleros and civilians, who are in charge of a regular section called “the guerrilleros speak.” There is also a fostering of feedback between the lecturers and the audience—attendants are invited to undertake their own research and present conclusions in subsequent Jornadas. A network is created and expanded where citizens can empower themselves as producers of interpretations about the past, thus overcoming an inherited status as passive consumers of the narratives supplied by professional historians. In short, *La Gavilla Verde* seems to be an example of the distinction between diffusion of information versus democratization of knowledge about the past (Sánchez León).

Sierra y Libertad: From Local (Rural) Knowledge to the Merging of Epistemic Cultures

Initiatives (like the Jornadas) place members of *La Gavilla Verde* among “memory entrepreneurs,” a term coined by experts for distinguishing mere volunteers from leading organizers involved in the demand and diffusion of policies about the recovery of the traumatic recent past in pluralist societies (Jelin, “¿Quiénes?”). And yet, this label does not fully cover the scope acquired with time by the activities sponsored by this NGO.

After the celebration of the first Jornadas, members of the association began networking with organizations in Spain and other countries with similar interests in unearthing the experiences of freedom fighters in rural areas. The result of this communication has been the development of a challenging project: *Sierra y Libertad*. The project—actually a whole space for initiatives by different NGOs and associations of the region—is unique in its mixture of aims and concerns.

The core of *Sierra y Libertad* is the organization of a series of routes in the countryside around Santa Cruz: “Senderos de la memoria.” Walking routes are very much on the rise in Spain, partly as an alternative to traditional leisure and beach tourism and partly as a response to growing environmental awareness (FEDME). The initiative by *La Gavilla Verde* does not match the features of “environmental tourism,” though, not even from the wider-looking sustainability standards (Boo, 1990; Honey, 1999). The design of these particular walks is not justified by mere environmental reasons, but through an explicit interest in reinserting the recovery of the experiences of freedom fighters in the natural environment where they occurred. This places them actually closer to “memory tourism,” also on the rise as part of the revival of interest in the recent past in many countries (*Les Cahiers Espaces*). In the case of Spain, though, the majority of memory tours focus on visiting trenches and battle camps from the Civil War and providing for in-place information on military maneuver. In relative terms, “Senderos de la memoria” stands out for its peculiar blend of politics and leisure, cultural and environmental concerns.

This can only be a result not just of some level of theoretical reflection, but of knowledge production across fields. From this viewpoint, members of *La Gavilla Verde* should not be regarded just as memory entrepreneurs but as *mergers* between spheres of knowledge, in this case environmentalism, sustainable economics, and memory. This original merging will not be easily found in state-of-the-art overviews of sustainability or cultural transmission (Diamond; De Landa); neither should it be confused with conventional interdisciplinary approaches—in order to fully grasp its logic, the process of knowledge production has to be understood not as moved by pure scholarly concerns but by value-oriented rationality taking place within wider knowledge cultures or *epistemics* (Knorr Cetina). Actually, members of *La Gavilla Verde* are successfully merging epistemics while keeping their status as non-expert activists. On the other hand, their exchange of knowledge

between memory and sustainability is founded on a local practice, one which is not academic but thoroughly rural. Yet, this combination of rural background with political and epistemological concerns allows the breeding of its own knowledge taxonomies.

Illuminating proof of this can be found in the details of the campaign “No a las minas” (No to mines), launched by the association against the concessions of mine exploitation to private interests in the area. Epistemic merging stands out in the discursive repertoire of this protest. In order to defend an alternative usage of the landscape and natural resources, the organization produced a complete list of the valuable resources of the area which treated both environmentally-sensitive elements and memory items on equal terms. Thus, apart from natural resources, under the headline “Historical resources” the organization has produced an archive with pre-Roman archaeological sites and medieval castles and “castillejos” (hamlets) along with the whole set of *lieux de mémoire* from after the Civil War—including five camps from the maquis and other places related to the activity of the guerrillas—and the Monumento al Guerrillero (Monument to the Guerrilla-fighter).

This classification expresses the principles of the project *Sierra y Libertad*, which states that “[t]he duality guerrilla/rural environment is irreplaceable . . . It is a patrimonial heritage of the *sierras* and has their communities as partners in this heritage” (*La Gavilla Verde*). It is also behind the in-process elaboration of a specific database with information on activities and members of the maquis and another one on missing activists. Yet its time span and scope are starting to point beyond the initial focus. This is clear from the addition of a category of “Human Resources” in the taxonomy: the listing of resources of this type includes now not only *aldeas* (small villages) surrounding Santa Cruz and the so-called *rentos* (scattered houses), but all kinds of traditional economic activities—from salt to esparto grass production—that were present in the area and of which there is not even always a material record.

Here memory is no longer circumscribed to the maquis—it reaches far beyond, embracing a whole social and cultural world: the traditional way of life of the Spanish countryside. To be sure, this widening of interests reinforces the image of *La Gavilla Verde* as an organization committed to memory as a means of recovering human experience from a bygone past; yet it could also be interpreted as indicating that the association is leaving behind not only the initial focus on the maquis but even its profile as merger of epistemics, assuming a more conventional approach to knowledge with the aid of cultural anthropology. But a conclusion like this would fail to take into account that this interest on a wider rural background is still based on a combination of politics and knowledge in context.

In Santa Cruz de Moya, the remains of rural sites and the memory of economic activities do not testify to the decline of traditional life as such—

they rather stand as witness of a depopulation that was openly imposed. Elsewhere in Spain this connection cannot be so easily established: the decline of rural areas is usually seen as the result of push-and-pull migration factors—low wages and shrinking labor opportunities in the countryside vis-à-vis rising urban employment and wages in the industrializing cities (Ródenas). Policies implemented from the second half of the 1950s are certainly invoked in this explanatory scheme, but dominant narratives do not stress the direct effect of political but rather of impersonal economic forces. This image does not fit the case of Santa Cruz de Moya. Records show that population decline started there one decade earlier: before 1960 the village had already lost twenty-five percent of its population; oral testimonies, for their part, confirm that the phenomenon was closely related to the repression of the maquis, which included systematic harassment of civilians, many of whom decided to leave the community or not return to it after serving jail terms accused of helping the guerrilla.¹²

The recovery of memory fostered by projects like *Sierra y Libertad* show that traditional life was uprooted by force from the landscape of Santa Cruz. This empirical contribution bears its own conclusions. In the first place, it highlights the relevance of the maquis as a meaningful nexus between dividing epochs, for it was as a sequel of its dismantling that a whole social world was quickly and thoroughly suppressed. Secondly, it redefines the disappearance of the guerrilla as not just the end of military resistance to the Dictatorship but of a cluster of collective resources that for centuries had stabilized an ecologic and cultural niche from where struggles for freedom could draw solidarity and support. Last but not least, it forces us to acknowledge that, from present day standards, the reconstruction of this whole social background remains elusive, especially if the justification for getting to know about it is political activism in local context.

It is no wonder that *La Gavilla Verde* is moving towards new fields of knowledge beyond memory and sustainability, for at this point a different merging of knowledge cultures is probably required.

Conclusion: Radical Knowledge About the Past and Its Limits

It can be reasonably argued that in the early twenty-first century, the movement for the recovery of memory in Spain is becoming a means for reopening the discussion on the costs of the transition to democracy. By sponsoring and organizing initiatives around the maquis, the enterprise of *La Gavilla Verde* plays an active part in this development. At the same time, however, moved by its own mixture of political and epistemological concerns developed through local experience, it is starting to point towards a deeper issue, the effects of which are still apparent in the rural landscape of

Spain: the costs of the “Great Transformation,” from the traditional to the modern, of Spanish society.

The organization’s account is not precisely straightforward, though; in fact, it runs through with paradoxes: indeed, it outlines the contours of a social fabric producing a traditional but highly politicized culture, at once rural and pro-democratic, illiterate and knowledgeable. This world is already lost: it was destroyed under Franco’s regime and its aftermath, but this may not be the main obstacle in the quest to retrieve a form of knowledge about this world. The real obstacle is the absence of a narrative vindicating it. This much is clear: a viewpoint combining traditional society and democratic values is completely absent from mainstream narratives of Spanish modernity. In fact, if there is one meta-narrative of modern Spanish historiography—starting from the Enlightenment and reaching after Franco—it is that modernization implies the overcoming of the cultural and institutional obstacles to development, and that these are overwhelmingly located in rural traditions and ways of life (Palafox and Fusi; Llera). Still today, in academic circles, modernity is neatly equated with the action of middle-class, literate urban minorities extending their values to the countryside through education; democracy in particular is not seen as breeding in villages but as disseminated from outer, urban environments.

This makes the perspective upheld by *La Gavilla Verde* stand out as radical and unusual. And yet it should not be confused with a narrative proper; it remains rather a set of empirical assertions, theoretical intuitions and moral standpoints lacking the coherence and complexity of an historical account. This constitutes the “Achilles Heel” of the endeavour of the revival of the maquis: for these rural activists, capable as they have been of successfully merging environmentalism and memory concerns, may not be well prepared for this task, at least on their own.

Since the beginning, the knowledge produced by members of this organization has stemmed from their civic commitment to democratic values. Yet the discourse on democracy, rights and citizenship is not free from the kind of ahistorical ideology that conspires against a demanding recovery of memory in terms of knowledge standards. The danger of producing a narrative, in the proper sense of the traumatic recent past, is not so much in romanticizing a bygone past but in naturalizing the values upheld by those freedom fighters and their rural supporters or contemporaries by equating them with their current conventional meaning. This risk is especially clear when a narrative is composed of testimonies from participants, whose memory accounts are necessarily shaped by present-day language. As the ex-maqui Rafael Olmedo declared already in the first celebration of the Día del Guerrillero: “we want an acknowledgement of what we were, a scouting party of democracy” (“200 ex-maquis”). There should be no denial of this claim, not even of its “truth” in the moral dimension: Spanish democracy owes a recognition to the maquis in

particular, although we should add—following the insights of projects like *Sierra y Libertad*—also to all peasants uprooted from their communities by the Dictatorship, not only in the process of repressing the guerrilla but in the name of *desarrollismo* (development) as well.

Yet another thing is to take assertions like that as a last word containing an objective truth in the realm of knowledge. All our modern referents, including democratic values, are radically historical; this implies that, in order to fully grasp the human experience of those freedom fighters who gave their lives before our time, the recognition a narrative should eagerly and rigorously contain is that of their otherness. Those freedom fighters, our ancestors, were not like us: even if they used terms such as democracy, they could not be equating it with exactly its current institutional shape or meaning. An account of their acts not founded on this sensibility would render their experience fake.

This is the emerging epistemological problem implicit in the evolution of the maquis revival. In order to overcome it, communication between experts and non-experts becomes crucial. Whereas civic activists depend too much on the accounts by witnesses, in the academic world there are reliable guides for moving beyond classical social theory and epistemology, in general and in particular dealing with knowledge about the past (Rorty; Jenkins; Wineburg). Here lies the challenge of the memory revival: taking advantage of a borderline reflection between identity and alterity which implies merging epistemics from the insights offered by participants and activists on one side and the approaches to knowledge critical of natural assumptions on the other.

And here is where the context marks the difference between Spain and other political and academic cultures. In Spain, the reluctance on the part of intellectuals to get involved in the movement for the recovery of historical memory has an added problem: the predominant attachment of professional historians to classical epistemics, the clearest expression of which is their stubborn disregard of the epistemics of memory.

This academic context has political consequences for the maquis revival. If alternative narratives are not elaborated in the near future, experiences like *La Gavilla Verde* will run into definite limits in their institutional recognition. Already today, the position occupied by the issue of the *guerrilla* fighters within the movement for the recovery of memory remains marginal (Recio). *La Gavilla Verde*, on its part, lacks the degree of social and media recognition of other civil organizations such as the Foro por la Memoria (Forum on Memory) or the ARMH (Asociación para la Recuperación de la Memoria Histórica) (Association for the Recovery of Historical Memory); it cannot compete with either other associations linked to political parties or agencies directly enacted by central or regional authorities.

Even if not easily acknowledged, part of this situation can be attributed to the lack of alternative narratives about the traumatic recent past. As long as it reaches a particularly uneasy issue such as the social cost of modernization, the revival of the maquis is doomed to attract limited attention. Yet what is marginal today maybe at the centre tomorrow once Spanish culture wakes up from the dream of *desarrollismo* that has made it so forgetful about the recent past, from the 1936–39 war onwards. There are already intellectual moves in this direction, coming out in a favorable economic, political, and cultural context (López and Rodríguez; VV.AA).

Notes

1. The authors of this article, members of the association *Contratiempo (Historia y Memoria)*, acknowledge the aid of our colleagues Noelia Adánez, Patricia Arroyo, Jesús Izquierdo, Saúl Martínez Bermejo, Esther Pascua and Nuria Valverde, members of the organization, for the elaboration of this text. Recognition is also needed for Pedro Peinado from *La Gavilla Verde* for providing us with information and documents for the research.
2. See among others Trapiello. See also the movies *Los Maquis en España* (2008); *La guerrilla de la memoria* (2001); *Silencio roto* (2001).
3. See, for example, the different emphasis of the works gathered by Vinyes, as well as a review of this text by Pablo Sánchez León in which this issue is emphasized in *Historia del Presente* (forthcoming).
4. One good example would be Hungary, see Kopeček.
5. The best example in this case would be Argentina, where one can find works by opinion makers and academics such as Beatriz Sarlo or Elizabeth Jelin (“¿Quiénes?”) along with the rewriting of national Narratives offered by mass-audience authors such as Felipe Pigna (*Los mitos*) and (*Lo pasado pensado*).
6. Revisionist literature is mostly Right-wing oriented. See Espinosa Maestre, and Reig Tapia.
7. This is not the case in other disciplines, where anthropologists, archaeologists, and law experts are working regularly hand-in-hand with volunteers from memory associations. One example is the anthropologist Francisco Etxebarria.
8. The monument is a sculpture designed by Javier Floren and built involving in its activity the students from the Escuela-Taller de Santa Cruz de Moya.
9. One of the original aims of the association was “fostering social welfare of the community by giving services to the population” (*Estatutos*), and another “fostering participation and integration of the population in its environment by means of social, cultural and free time activities” (*Estatutos*).
10. Already in the First Jornadas, in 2000, the organizers invited the novelist Dulce Chacón, who was soon after to be renowned for her novel *La voz dormida* (2002). After her passing away in 2003, *La Gavilla Verde* created a “Certamen Dulce Chacón” on literature and memory, see <www.lagavillaverde.org/centro_de_documentacion/dulce/certamenes/indice.htm>.
11. One of the first examples was the “Cátedra de Memoria Histórica” of Universidad Complutense de Madrid, which started its activity in 2005; see <www.ucm.es/info/memorias/>.

12. The terms of this civil repression are eloquently evoked by neighbors of age in Santa Cruz. See the documentary *Maquis en Santa Cruz de Moya* (2009).

Works Cited

- “200 ex-maquis celebran el día del Guerrillero.” *El País*. 2 October 1989. Print.
- Bell, Duncan. *Memory, Trauma and World Politics: Reflections on the Relationship Between Past and Present*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006. Print.
- Ben-Amos, Dan. and Liliane Weissberg. *Cultural Memory and the Construction of Identity*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1999. Print.
- Boo, Elizabeth. *Ecotourism: The Potential and Pitfalls*. Washington DC: WWF, 1990. Print.
- Chacón, Dulce. *La voz dormida*. Madrid: Alfaguara, 2002. Print.
- Cruz, Manuel. *Las malas pasadas del pasado: Identidad, responsabilidad, historia*. Barcelona: Anagrama, 2005. Print.
- De Landa, Manuel. *A Thousand Years of Nonlinear History*. New York: Zone Books, 1997. Print.
- Diamond, Jared. *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed*. New York: Viking Penguin, 2005. Print.
- Espinosa Maestre, Francisco. *El fenómeno revisionista o los fantasmas de la derecha española*. Sevilla: Ediciones del Oeste, 2005. Print.
- Estatutos de la Asociación*. La Gavilla Verde. Unpublished document.
- Etzebarría, Francisco et al. “Antropología del pasado reciente: Una fosa común de la Guerra Civil Española en Priaranza del Bierzo (León).” *Antropología y biodiversidad*. Assumpció Malgosa, Ramón M. Nogués and María Pilar Aluja eds. 1 (2002): 431–446. Print.
- Faber, Sebastiaan. “The Debate about the Spanish Past and the Crisis of Academic Legitimacy: The Case of Santos Juliá.” *The Colorado Review of Hispanic Studies* 5 (2007): 165–90. Print.
- FEDME (Federación Española de Deportes de Montaña y Escalada). *Manual de senderos*. Madrid: Prames, 2004. Print.
- Fernández Cava, Salvador. “Una fecha decisiva para la Agrupación Guerrillera de Levante: Cerro Moreno, 7 de noviembre de 1949.” *Olcades*. 6 (2002): 5–20. Print.
- Ferrándiz Martín, Francisco. “Exhumaciones y políticas de la memoria en la España contemporánea.” *Hispania Nova*. 7 (2007): n.pag. Web. 13 Sept. 2011.
- Gálvez, Sergio. “El proceso de recuperación de la ‘memoria histórica’ en España: Una aproximación a los movimientos sociales por la memoria.” *International Journal of Iberian Studies*. 19.1 (2006): 25–51. Print.
- La Gavilla Verde*. Asociación La Gavilla Verde. Sierra y Libertad. Web. 16 Sept. 2012.
- La guerrilla de la memoria*. Dir. Javier Corcuera. Puy Oria and Montxo Armendáriz, 2002. Film.
- Hodgkins, K. and S. Radstone, eds. *Contested Pasts: The Politics of Memory*. New York: Routledge, 2003. Print.
- Honey, Martha. *Ecotourism and Sustainable Development: Who Owns Paradise?*. Washington DC: Island Press, 1999. Print.
- Jelin, Elizabeth. *State Repression and the Labors of Memory*. Trans. Judy Rein and Marcial Godoy-Anatívia. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003. Print.

- _____. “¿Quiénes? ¿Cuándo? ¿Para qué? Actores y escenarios de las memorias.” *El Estado y la memoria: Gobiernos y ciudadanos a los traumas de la historia*. Ed. Ricard Vinyes. Barcelona: RBA Ediciones, 2009. Print.
- Jenkins, Keith. *Why History? Ethics and Postmodernity*. London: Routledge, 1999. Print.
- Kihlstrom, John F., Jennifer S. Beer and Stanley B. Klein. “Self and Identity as Memory.” *Handbook of Self and Identity*. Ed. M. Leary and J. Price Tangney. New York: The Guilford Press, 2003. Print.
- Knorr Cetina, Karin. *Epistemic Cultures: How the Sciences Make Knowledge*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999. Print.
- Kopeček, Michal, ed. *Pasts in the Making: Historical Revisionism in East Central Europe after 1989*. New York: Central European University Press, 2008. Print.
- Labanyi, Jo. “The Politics of Memory in Contemporary Spain.” *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies* 9.2 (2008): 119–25. Print.
- Les Cahiers Espaces*. 80 (2003). Print.
- Llera, Luis de. *La modernización cultural de España, 1898–1975*. Madrid: Actas, 1996. Print.
- López, Isidro and Emmanuel Rodríguez. *Fin de ciclo: Financiarización, territorio y sociedad de propietarios en la onda larga del capitalismo hispano (1959–2010)*. Madrid: Traficantes de Sueños, 2010. Print.
- Macía, Santiago and Emilio Silva. *Las fosas de Franco: Los republicanos que el dictador dejó en la cuneta*. Madrid: Temas de Hoy, 2003. Print.
- Los maquis en España*. Dir. Alfonso Domingo. Argonuata Producciones, 2008.
- Maquis en Santa Cruz de Moya*. Dir. Pedro Peinado and Domingo Ruiz. La Gavilla Verde. 2009. Film.
- Marin Silvestre, Dolores. *Clandestinos: El maquis contra el franquismo*. Barcelona: Plaza and Janés, 2002. Print.
- Mate, Reyes. *La herencia del olvido*. Madrid: Errata Naturae, 2009. Print.
- Moa, Pío. *Los orígenes de la guerra civil española*. Madrid: La Esfera de Los Libros, 1999. Print.
- _____. *Los mitos de la guerra civil española*. Madrid: La Esfera de Los Libros, 2003. Print.
- Palafox, Jordi and Juan Pablo Fusi. *España 1808–1996: El desafío de la modernidad*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1997. Print.
- Peinado, Arturo. “El movimiento social por la recuperación de la memoria histórica: Entre el pasado y el futuro.” *Hispania Nova*. 6 (2006): 723–44. Print.
- Pigna, Felipe. *Los mitos de la historia Argentina I*. Buenos Aires: Planeta, 2004. Print.
- _____. *Lo pasado pensado: Entrevistas con la historia argentina (1955–1983)*. Buenos Aires: Planeta, 2006. Print.
- Reig Tapia, Alberto. *Anti-Moa*. Madrid: Ediciones B, 2006. Print.
- Recio, Armando. “La guerrilla antifranquista en internet.” VIII Jornadas. *El Maquis en España*. 2008. Web. 13 Sept. 2011.
- Ródenas, Carmen. *Emigración y economía en España (1960–1990)*. Madrid: Civitas, 1994. Print.
- Rorty, Richard. *Objectivism, Relativism and Truth: Philosophical Papers I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991. Print.
- Sánchez León, Pablo. “El ciudadano, el historiador y la democratización del conocimiento acerca del pasado.” *El fin de los historiadores: Pensar históricamente en el siglo XXI*. Eds. Pablo Sánchez León and Jesús Izquierdo. Madrid: Siglo XXI, 2008. Print.
- Sarlo, Beatriz. *Tiempo pasado: Cultura de la memoria y giro subjetivo*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI, 2005. Print.

- Serrano, Secundino. *Maquis, historia de la guerra antifranquista*. Madrid: Temas de hoy, 2006. Print.
- Silencio roto*. Dir. Montxo Armendáriz. Oria Films, 2001. Film.
- Trapiello, Andrés. *La noche de los cuatro caminos: Una historia del maquis: Madrid, 1945*. Madrid: Aguilar, 2002. Print.
- Vinyes, Ricard. ed. *El estado y la memoria: Gobiernos y ciudadanos frente a los traumas de la memoria*. Madrid: RBA Ediciones, 2009. Print.
- VV.AA. *CT o la cultura de la transición: Crítica de 35 años de cultura española*. Barcelona: Debolsillo, 2012. Print.
- Wineburg, Sam. *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts: Charting the Future of Teaching the Past*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001. Print.
- Yusta Rodríguez, Mercedes. *Guerrilla y resistencia campesina: La resistencia armada contra el franquismo en Aragón (1939–1952)*. Zaragoza: Prensas Universitarias de Zaragoza, 2003. Print.

Sánchez León, Pablo and Carlos Agüero Iglesia. "Memory and Sustainability: Merging Epistemics in the Maquis Revival." *Armed Resistance: Cultural Representations of the Anti-Francoist Guerrilla*. Ed. Antonio Gómez López-Quñones and Carmen Moreno-Nuño. *Hispanic Issues On Line* (Fall 2012): 217–231. Web.
