

Casticismo before and after 1939

William Craig Krause
Hollins University

I

I would like to discuss what the term *casticismo* meant to Federico Moreno Torroba (1891-1982), whose *discurso* before the Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando in 1935 reveals much about his own views of *casticismo* and nationalism, and also may serve as a window into the views of many of his contemporaries who held both similar and dissimilar views. We will see that at that time, his perspective was one of many hues on the palate of musical nationalism but that in post-war Spain, it became, as much as by default as by design, the favored musical aesthetic.

I will begin by briefly reviewing the origins of the term itself, proceeding to a contextualization of the environment in which Torroba delivered his discourse, and then focusing on the discourse itself. I will conclude with observations about the role of *casticismo* in Franco's "New Spain."

II

Casticismo is a subset within the broader term of nationalism in that we may use it to denote the nineteenth- and twentieth-century phenomenon that was widespread in Europe, the New World, and beyond. Nationalism has had a variety of manifestations. Some have been dedicated to the pursuit of traditionalism and folklorism, while others have been progressive, even avant-garde. In contrast, *casticismo* has a specific etymology and cultural/historical bias.

Casticismo, in its more narrow definition, refers to something emanating from Castile, the region some may refer to as the heart of Spain. Used more broadly, it may be less regionally specific and refer to the Spanish nation as a whole. In the New World we see within the colonial caste system the distinction between the *mestizo* and *castizo*, the distinction between those of mixed blood and those of primarily Spanish blood. Intellectuals of the Generation of 98, such as Miguel de Unamuno (1864-1936), searched for a concise definition of the word but found consensus difficult. What was its nature, when unraveled from waves of immigrants who settled in Spain over the millennia?

By the end of the nineteenth century, there were two major currents of thought on the subject that paralleled political developments of the time. Traditionalists believed that by resurrecting the past heroes of Spanish history and literature, they might somehow recover the glories of the *Siglo de Oro*. This group tended to be conservative and suspicious of foreign influences. For them, it was the overwhelming influence of France and Italy during the past two centuries that had contributed to the decay of authentic Spanish culture. Others felt that Spain's salvation lay in embracing contemporary Europe. These writers studied major European philosophies and political systems and sought ways to apply them

to the Spanish situation. Within the debate there existed a baffling paradox, expressed by Miguel de Unamuno in his *Essays and Soliloquies* (1906):

. . . the most curious and surprising thing is that those who are held to be most Spanish, most true-blooded and of the old stock, most authentically Spanish, are those who are the most Europeanizing, the most exotic, those whose soul contains the most alien strains. . . [they] are the ones whose roots intermingle the most closely with the roots of those who created the Spanish soul.¹

It would appear that attempts to distill the truly Spanish from the confluence of millennia of migration were ultimately futile. Yet, Unamuno devoted much energy to recapturing the essence of what it meant to be Spanish. In his group of essays collectively entitled *En torno al casticismo* (1895), Unamuno held that the old Castilian spirit survived beneath the “dead, reactionary traditionalism of his own day, mistakenly thought to be castizo.”² The recent succession of regimes had done more to perpetuate the negative aspects of the Spanish character than to preserve its glory. They had taken Spain out of the international arena and deprived the country of its place among the great nations of the world. The salvation of Spain would be found, according to Unamuno, in the living “eternal tradition” of the common people. True *casticismo*, then, is fidelity to this noble heritage, which persists despite decadence. While its ancestors had come from Africa, Asia and Europe, the Spaniard was a unique cultural entity.³

III

Progressives of the Generation of 27 also participated in the discussion of the true nature of *casticismo*, but their approach was more comprehensive and less sentimental. This generation most often looked to Manuel de Falla and critic Adolfo Salazar, who were deeply interested in the musical developments taking place in Europe, particularly in Paris. Falla’s pioneering journey through impressionism, neo-classicism, and “vanguard nationalism” served as models for the Generation of 27. Vanguard nationalism, as described by Emilio Casares,⁴ stripped the philosophical and sentimental elements from national music and instead approached it with anti-Romantic objectivity. These composers admired de Falla because he had succeeded in embracing the avant-garde techniques of Debussy and Stravinsky without losing his own identity. Some composers of the Generation of 27 were open to even more radical techniques, as witnessed by Gerhard’s adoption of serialism.

¹ Miguel de Unamuno, *Essays and Soliloquies*, trans. Crawford Fritch (New York: Knopf, 1925), 67.

² John Butt, *Writers and Politics of Modern Spain* (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1978).

³ See Miguel de Unamuno, *En torno al casticismo* (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1957). Also useful in understanding the philosophical arguments presented here is José Ortega y Gasset’s *Invertebrate Spain* (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1937).

⁴ Emilio Casares, *La música en la Generación de 27: Homenaje a Lorca, 1915-1939* (Madrid: Mercantil-Asturias 1986), 20-35.

But this line of reasoning was blasphemous to other commentators. Among the most outspoken was Rogelio Villar, who warned in 1912 that, “An avalanche of vulgarity and barbarity that comes from the north is invading our art with ugliness.”⁵ He judged impressionism to be abundant in “crude sensuality” but lacking in emotion.⁶ For musicians such as Villar, impressionism was simply one more example of foreign ideas corrupting Spanish art.

A very instructive testament about the aims of the intellectuals of the Second Republic was presented by Salazar shortly after the Republic was declared, in April of 1931. In a series of articles in *El Sol*,⁷ Salazar argued that music should be granted equal footing with the other fine arts, and therefore eligible for financial assistance from the state. He proposed a ministry that would oversee nearly every facet of public musical life: opera and zarzuela, music conservatories, national and regional orchestras and choirs, folkloric festivals, and the creation of competitions and performance opportunities for lesser-known Spanish composers. The governing body was to be the *Junta Nacional de Música y Teatros Líricos*. Salazar’s proposals had a strong nationalist bias but were not specific to a particular region, historical era, or a “loaded” word such as *casticismo*. They did not favor specific compositional techniques or styles, but rather served to create a foundation, an infrastructure, that would allow Spanish music and musicians to flourish. This grand design was approved by the Republic’s governing bodies but was difficult to implement during the chaotic years of the Second Republic. Consequently, it was never meaningfully implemented and was doomed with the collapse of the Second Republic.⁸

Salazar was among the liberal intellectuals who formed the first government of the Second Republic and was one of the original members of the Junta Nacional de Música y Teatros Líricos. Torroba was by now a leading musician in Spain but was not part of this orbit. At this point, his reputation rested mainly on zarzuela, a genre that, in the view of many musical intellectuals, was set apart from “symphonic music,” a lighter form of entertainment that was, by definition, traditional. However, in 1933 the government took a conservative turn, and by 1935 Torroba was a member of the five-member Junta. Several of the original Junta members departed at this time.

Although the political winds had shifted, Torroba had much in common with the original Junta members. Torroba had flourished during the early years of the Second Republic. Despite the bias towards the zarzuela as a lesser genre held by some, the zarzuela was of interest to the early Republic’s cultural leaders. According to the legislation of 1931, among the responsibilities of the Junta was the cultivation of this “magnificent genre.” Torroba took full advantage of this official enthusiasm. As director of the Teatro Calderón since 1930, he was in a position to stress national music in a way consistent with the wishes of Salazar and his associates. The 1932 season put strong emphasis on Spanish composers with the staging of works by Tomas Bretón, Amadeo Vives, José María Usandizaga, and

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid., 256.

⁸ Tomás Marco, *Historia de la música española* (Madrid: Alianza Música, 1983), 156.

Emilio Arrieta. While the 1930 season had featured opera companies from Vienna and Russia performing works of Mozart and Rimsky-Korsakov, the only foreign operas staged at the Calderón in 1932 were Rossini's *Il barbiere di Siviglia* and Bizet's *Carmen*—works based on Spanish themes and likely to have been performed in translation.

Among the zarzuelas staged at the Calderón in 1932 was Torroba's most famous work, *Luisa Fernanda*. This *zarzuela grande* received over 200 consecutive performances after its premiere on March 26, 1932. Within a year of its premiere, it was already being performed in the Philippines. As early as July of 1932, the Teatro Colón in Buenos Aires had extended an invitation to Torroba to perform in Argentina. Consistent with the Republic's aspiration of exporting Spanish music, in 1934 Torroba accepted the offer and took his zarzuela troupe to Argentina, staging *Luisa Fernanda*, *María la Tempranica*, and Vives's *Doña Francisquita*. Torroba's zarzuelas marked the first performance of the genre at the Colón, heretofore exclusively an opera house.

Thus, it is evident that Torroba's professional aspirations resonated with those of the early Republic. However, his beliefs about the music he composed were grounded in something more specific and less transitory than legislation.

IV

Recognized as a successful critic, impresario, and composer, Torroba was formally installed as a member of the Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando on February 21, 1935. While there should be no doubt that Torroba had legitimately earned the recognition of the Academy, we cannot ignore the fact that both his election to the Academy and his appointment to the Junta de Música correspond to the conservative shift in the Republic at that time.⁹

On this occasion, when he delivered his discourse on the meaning of *casticismo*,¹⁰ he was speaking both as the academy's newest and youngest member and as a soon-to-be member of the Second Republic's Junta de Musica y Teatros Líricos. In his address we discover that Torroba's views were driven by the unresolved debate of the Generation of 98 and the nature of *casticismo*. He unabashedly equates nationalism with his definition of *casticismo*, a leap that would not have set well with the progressives who had established the Junta de Música less than four years earlier.

This document is Torroba's manifesto as a composer. He begins by clarifying the definition of *casticismo* and the importance of tradition in the health of a nation. *Casticismo*

⁹ Emilio Casares, "La música española hasta 1939, o la restauración musical," in *España en la música de Occidente: Actas del Congreso Internacional celebrado en Salamanca 29 de octubre – 5 de noviembre de 1985*, 2 vols, ed. Emilio Casares Rodicio, Ismael Fernández de la Cuesta, and José López-Calo (Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura, 1987), 319.

¹⁰ Federico Moreno Torroba, *Discursos leídos ante la Academia de Bellas Arte de San Fernando en la recepción pública del Señor Federico Moreno Torroba el día 21 de febrero, 1935* (Madrid: Saez, 1935).

for Torroba is “tradition purified through time and generations, representing a vigorous synthesis that endures despite all of the numerous changes, and that constitute the firm roots of a unique trunk.”¹¹ He continued by saying that tradition connects the past with the present and provides the foundation on which to build the future. Without such tradition, a nation is decadent and, for this reason, a nation must guard its tradition to affirm its national vitality. Without national identity, a nation loses its historical significance and has nothing to pass on to younger generations.

Torroba did recognize the role of foreign ideas, however:

This does not mean that in an exclusively national culture there is no room for all human aspects, because these traits are not necessarily readily identifiable. There is always some sort of synthesis. But it is only through the understanding and full realization of our own personality that we can universalize our personality. This is done by utilizing the sap of our own roots, taking foreign ideas only when they are general, fundamental to the human organism and spirit.¹²

Perhaps Torroba could not visualize how an international and progressive approach to composition could faithfully represent national identity. He believed that modern music, theater and dance were linked to the very origins of a people and that this tradition should not be forsaken. Yet, in his address he recognized the irony that Unamuno articulated: national identity could not be understood without acknowledging the heterogeneity of its populace.

Torroba believed neither the original inhabitants of the Peninsula, nor the successive invasions of Celts, Phoenicians, Carthaginians, Romans or Visigoths left a musical tradition that can honestly be said to proceed from them. Accordingly to Torroba, the only people who left an indelible, identifiable, deep impression on Spanish culture were the Arabs:

It is well documented that our popular music proceeds from theirs. This point is of capital importance: it is the Arab origins of our music that make it absolutely distinct from European music.

However, he also noted that:

Andalusian folklore is the most prominent. But in other regions there are lesser-known folk traditions that are at least equal and in some cases more virgin and

¹¹ Ibid., 12. “Lo castizo es lo tradicional depurado a través del tiempo y de las generaciones, representando una síntesis vigorosa que perdura, a pesar de todas las vicisitudes, constituyendo las firmes raíces de un tronco único.”

¹² Ibid., 14. “No quiere esto decir que en una cultura exclusivamente nacional no quepan todos los aspectos y modos humanos, pues no existe para ello una cerrada incompatibilidad; mas solamente será eficaz para la conquista en el aspecto de una personalidad universalizar nuestra personalidad, utilizar la savia de nuestras raíces, tomando de lo ajeno tal sólo lo que es, en un sentido general, fundamento del organismo y de espíritu de las cosas.”

therefore of exceptional interest. These remain without foreign adulterations that kill the sincere spontaneity of the truly popular.¹³

Conspicuous in its absence is specific reference to the impact of the music of Gypsies, Jews, or that of Catholic liturgical and devotional practice. Furthermore, there is an apparent contradiction between Torroba's unqualified embrace of the Arab legacy and his rejection of foreign compositional techniques.¹⁴ While he credits the Arabs for giving Spain a musical culture without peer, he looks askance at Italian and French influences in more recent times. He does not mention the influence Italian opera had on eighteenth and nineteenth-century zarzuela—a genre that in Torroba's time was considered *castizo* and that he himself championed.

In defense of Torroba's position, it should be pointed out that his remarks about Arab music were in reference to folk music, while his admonition concerning foreign influences was directed to his colleagues—modern composers of art music. In addition, the Moors, Jews, and Gypsies were all part of Spanish society before or during the *Siglo de Oro*—that age to which so much conservative nostalgia harkens, while Italian and French influences were much more recent and still at issue during Torroba's lifetime. All the same, we will find it difficult to reconcile Torroba's words with the historical record or even his own music.

The cultivation of folklore is related to Torroba's devotion to the zarzuela. Torroba held the zarzuela to be the logical consequence of Spain's lyrical tradition because it was derived from the *tonadilla* and popular song, and was thereby universally recognized as *castizo*. This belief, coupled with his life-long study of folk music, was the driving motivation for composing his zarzuelas. His zarzuelas went well beyond the music and customs of Castile, depicting life in Andalucía, Asturias, and Navarra. In these works, regional festivals, historic events, folk music and dance, and geographic landmarks may be used to evoke a particular setting.

Beyond specific genres, Torroba believed folklore to be essential in all contemporary music. Torroba clarifies this in his address to the Academia:

It would be a superfluous task to doubt the importance of folklore—or that which is *castizo*—in our contemporary music. It is the awakening of this sleeping richness

¹³ Ibid., 15-17. “De ella, bien demostrado está, procede toda nuestra música popular; Esta raigambre es de capital importancia, porque por ella nuestra música es total absolutamentey definidamente distinta de la música de los demás países europeos, y, tal y como la conserva nuestro pueblo en sus manifestaciones populares, es el mas rico ejemplo de tradición y posee la más recia personalidad que nunca, en ningún tiempo ni en nación ninguna, poseyó arte alguno...Pero sabido es que, no por más difundido, sea el folklore andaluz el más importante. En otras regiones le hay, al menos, igual, y en algunos menos conocido, más virgen y, por lo tanto, de inapreciable interés, pues se halla sin contaminarse con adulteraciones de elementos extraños ni resabios cultos que asesinan la espontánea sinceridad, la frescura, jugosidad de lo verdaderamente popular.”

¹⁴ Roger Alier and Xosé Aviñoa, *El libro de la zarzuela* (Madrid: Damien, 1982), 81-83.

that will ultimately take us to self-identity and restore us to our proper place in the world.

We know well that this course towards *casticismo* leads to what we call nationalism in music. And this road, in my opinion, is precisely the road to which we should rededicate ourselves.

This speaks of something important, more than important, extremely essential: this path of rediscovery is by definition nothing less than our own reawakening. So convinced am I of this, so disposed to sustain it, that I do not care if it is considered exaggerated or antiquated. It is born of the heat of my devotion to all that is truly castizo.

By raising our music to the highest levels of nationalism, we will find more legitimately the goal that every artist attempts in his creation: universality. This is done precisely this way, and by no other: by enclosing the work of art in the narrow circle of nationalism.

We must attain our own universality with that which is purely castizo if we want to call ourselves Spaniards. When what we are looking for abounds before us, it is unpardonable to look elsewhere out of an eagerness for the exotic.¹⁵

¹⁵ Ibid., 17-19. “Tarea superflua sería ponderar la importancia que el folkore, esto es, lo castizo, tiene en los días actuales para nuestra música, tan necesitada de alientos impulsores que la vivifiquen, sacándola aunque sea por la fuerza, del dulce sopor en que se halla aletargada, entíendase bien, no más que aletargada, porque aún le sobran, no obstante estar dormidos, espíritu y vitales energías para ocupar el preponderante puesto que le corresponde por derecho propio entre las demás del mundo.

Siguiendo el ejemplo de grandes músicos, debemos buscar en las canciones y danzas populares, en las leyendas, en todo lo tradicional, que tan abiertamente, de modo tan gracioso se nos ofrece, la materia temática que ellos supieron encontrar para sus creaciones insignes acompañadas siempre del aplauso.

Sabemos bien que este rumbo proa hacia lo castizo, que este sentido que a la música queremos dar, conduce directamente a lo que pudiera llamarse nacionalismo de la misma, y este camino, con este sano tendencia, es precisamente, en mi opinión el que debemos recorrer de nuevo sin apartarnos a ningún extremo, rectos siempre.

Se trata algo importante, más que importante, esencialísimo: hallar algo perdido, algo que es en definitiva nada menos que encontrarnos a nuestros mismos. Tan convencido estoy de ello, tan dispuesto a sostenerlo, que sin que signifique jactancia alguna, pues bien lejos está de mi ánimo, no me importa, al hacer esta afirmación el afrontar que se me tilde de exagerado o de anticuado en esta opinión, nacida al color de mi devoción por todo lo que españolamente sea recio abolenço castizo. Con ello, naturalizando nuestra música, llevando al grado sumo su nacionalización, conseguiremos más legítimamente el fin que todo artista se propone al crear su obra: que sea universal. Precisamente así, no de todo modo,

These statements are not paradoxical if we do not confuse universality with internationality. For Torroba, a universal work of art transcends time and locale, and communicates fundamental human emotions to a broad range of listeners. This communication can be accomplished in any number of styles and media and may impart emotions both abstract and concrete. Torroba's concern was that composers would dilute their message by superficially trying to be all things to all people, and, in attempting to be cosmopolitan, would neglect their own identity. A composer is able to convey emotions to a listener only when he speaks honestly, personally, and directly. Torroba believed that by abandoning one's musical heritage, a composer loses part one's self and thereby risks losing expressive power. Thus, a work may be composed in an international style and yet be void of universal content.

Although Torroba's statements at the Academia in 1935 seem to echo those of Villar, Torroba's rhetoric was more uncompromising and theoretical than his music. Furthermore, the polarization of the intellectual community during the Second Republic and the exuberance with which he championed his nationalist cause may have tainted his choice of words. Torroba did not view impressionism as a threat to Spanish national music as did Villar. In fact, in later years Torroba would state that Falla's *Noches en los jardines de España*, a strongly impressionist work, held "the essence of Spanish music."¹⁶

Torroba's conservative temperament and the times in which he lived could easily explain his adherence to neo-classicism and nationalism. He was not a revolutionary in any aspect of his life—personal, civic or creative—and he lived much of his life in a social climate that did not encourage artistic experimentation. But there is a further explanation for his style, which seemed anachronistic even to many of his post-war countrymen: Torroba did not pursue avant-garde idioms because he believed they were incapable of transmitting national character. His belief that music must have harmony, melody, and rhythm was tied to his convictions about national expression. The logic of his arguments and the evidence of his own music indicate that these three elements of music must not contradict one another. For Torroba, a twelve-tone *canarios* would be absurd.

Although he dismissed the avant-garde as anonymous—without identity—he was not entirely out of step when we compare him to composers such as Aaron Copland, who also found a strong dose of tonality, neo-classicism, and folklorism helpful in creating clearly national music. Torroba understood this and created a body of music that both the conservative and progressive listener heard as undeniably emanating from Spanish soil.

V

encerrándola en el estrecho círculo de su nacionalismo, podrá lograrse el amplísimo campo de la anhelada universalidad. Hay que conquistar nuestra universalidad con lo puramente español, si queremos que a españoles se nos reconozca. Y cuando lo que se trata hallar abunda a nuestro lado, es imperdonable el acudir, movidos por un afán de exotismo, a mendigar a otra parte.”

¹⁶ Federico Moreno Torroba, “La esencia de la música española está en los Jardines de España,” *El Día* (Montevideo), October 10, 1980.

Many of the Generation of 27 identified strongly with the liberal ideology of the Second Republic and went into exile with Franco's victory. Torroba was among the composers who filled the vacuum after their departure and went on to become an adherent of what Tomás Marco describes as *neocasticismo*, conservative or neo-classical nationalism rather than avant-garde. Prevailing social attitudes after the war were conducive to this exclusive brand of nationalism—the same nationalism that Torroba articulated in 1935. At that time, Torroba's vision was part of a larger panorama. After 1939, it was not necessary within Spain for such thinking to be held in contrast to progressive, more cosmopolitan views. So many adherents of those views were now gone.

This form of musical nationalism, *neocasticismo*, could be easily incorporated into Franco's broader vision of the New Spain—veneration of tradition and history, rejection of foreign elements, religious fervor, exaltation of folklore, and patriotism. At a musical level, certain traditional archetypes became prominent, among them the guitar, zarzuela, and traditional dance. These were precisely the areas on which Torroba had already staked his career. Thus, it is no surprise that Torroba did not feel, for artistic reasons, that it was necessary to leave Spain after 1939.

Franco's xenophobic views were manifested in a form of censorship that was designed, in part, to eliminate "foreign doctrines that have caused our death." "In the name of liberty, fraternity and equality and all such liberal trivia, our churches have been burned and our history destroyed."¹⁷ It was the nineteenth century and its political and cultural trappings that he sought to eliminate. The nineteenth century was for him, "the negation of the Spanish spirit."¹⁸

It is critically important to point out that such extreme rhetoric did not sit well even with a conservative such as Torroba whose own aesthetic, in large part, was rooted in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. He often cited *Carmen* and *La bohème* as his favorite operas, and emphasized Strauss and Ravel as influential composers in developing his own style. Furthermore, it is clear that Unamuno had a substantial impact on his thinking.

In later years, Torroba himself called Franco "a zero to the left" when it came to music. It may be that Franco's indifference made it possible for the regime to ignore the fact that much of what it held to be *castizo*—assumed to be products of the *Siglo de Oro* or Goya's world of *majos* and *majas*—was significantly impacted by nineteenth century aesthetics. This might be true in a broader sense as well. After all, how much of the contemporaneous zarzuela audience stopped to consider what aspects of what was

¹⁷ Francisco Franco, *Palabras del Caudillo* (Madrid: Ediciones de la Vicesecretaría de Educación Popular, 1953), 54, and cited in Arango, *Spain: From Repression to Renewal* (Boulder and London: Westview Press, 1985), 206.

¹⁸ Francisco Franco, speech delivered on June 21, 1950, and cited in Juan Pablo Fusi, *Un siglo de España, la cultura* (Madrid: Marcial Pons, Ediciones de Historia, 1999), 107.

considered quintessentially *castizo*, the *zarzuela grande*, derived from nineteenth-century opera?

Provocative rhetoric and state censorship notwithstanding, the Franco regime did not mimic the extremes of the authoritarian regimes of the age. We do not find in Francoism systematic, institutionalized parallels to the Nazi condemnation of “degenerate art” or the Stalinist purge of “bourgeois decadence” and “formalism.”¹⁹ *Casticismo* was not an invention or weapon of the regime but rather it represented “continuity with elements of the preceding period.”²⁰ What changed was that prior to 1939, such views were part of a larger, active musical landscape. After 1939, at an official level at least, such views had little competition for many years to come. We are left with, in a sense, *neocasticismo* by default.

Moving beyond the years immediately following the civil war, there are examples of the regime promoting traditional forms abroad and at home. Cases in point would be Torroba’s state financed performances in Mexico and Puerto Rico in 1946-47 and his participation in audio recordings of zarzuelas in the 1950s. However, during the 1950’s we approach a new juncture: These same archetypes— zarzuela, guitar, traditional dance, *andalucismo*—were increasingly recognized to have tremendous value in terms of public relations and commercialism abroad.

While at a political and economic level Spain was beginning to cast off internationally imposed isolation that was due to Franco’s sympathies during World War II, the international marketplace welcomed—and the regime was pleased to promote—an alternative, apolitical, image of Spain: a colorful world of beautiful music and exciting dance—a world both exotic and accessible. Viewed in this light, may we coin the term *casticismo commercial*?

Let me be clear. I do not introduce this term as a pejorative descriptor. I am the beneficiary of what it represents. Thousands of miles from Spain, I grew up in California. But I was listening to Andres Segovia play Torroba’s *Castillos de España*. I played that LP until the needle wore right through the vinyl! I marveled at the sight of spectacular flamenco dance. And more recently I have been smitten by zarzuela. In my early, most formative years, I was unaware of the historical process that preceded the entry of these art forms into my life. I enjoyed them in the moment, art for art’s sake. Many inspired composers and performers have traveled down the road of *casticismo* and I am grateful to them.

¹⁹ Tomás Marco, “Los años cuarenta,” in “Los años cuarenta,” in *España en la música de Occidente: Actas del Congreso Internacional celebrado en Salamanca 29 de octubre – 5 de noviembre de 1985*, 2 vols., ed. Emilio Casares Rodicio, Ismael Fernández de la Cuesta, and José López-Calo (Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura, 1987), 401.

²⁰ Álvaro Ferrary and Antonio Moreno Juste, “La vida cultural: Limitaciones, condicionantes y desarrollo. El Franquismo,” in *Historia contemporánea de España, siglo XX*, ed. Javier Paredes (Barcelona: Editorial Ariel, 1998), 857.