

Painted Tonsures and Potato-sellers
Priests, Passing and Survival in the Asturian Revolution

Matthew Kerry

York University

Dimas Camporro, incumbent of a small parish in the Asturian coalfields of northern Spain, survived the revolutionary insurrection of October 1934 which unleashed the greatest outburst of anticlerical bloodletting in Spain for a century and prefigured the wave of anticlerical violence of the Spanish Civil War less than two years later. For Dimas '[t]he [revolutionary] fortnight was a sea of calm ... An oasis in the desert. And who would expect this is in Cocañín ... in La Hueria', in the heart of the coal valleys.¹ Survival was disconcerting in the context of a violent revolutionary insurrection during which thirty-three members of the clergy were killed or died in unclear circumstances. Perplexity was evident at the respectful and decent way in which Camporro had been treated, not least as iconoclastic violence had targeted places of worship over previous months in Cocañín. In separate incidents a bomb exploded at the sacristy window and religious images were burnt.² This article analyses religious personnel's experiences of survival of the insurrection through the lens of 'passing': clerical attempts at disguising themselves through dress and bodily performances. It both foregrounds the overlooked experience of survival, providing a more complete vision of clerical experience, and demonstrates how passing enables us to rethink clerical agency in the face of violent anticlericalism. Passing also sheds new light on the revolution, clerical identities and sociocultural divisions in the coalfields during the 1930s.

The Asturian revolutionary insurrection was the bloodiest and most protracted uprising during the Second Republic (1931-1936).³ Planned by the Socialist leadership in Madrid, it was projected as a national movement in response to the entry of the rightist CEDA party—with its ambiguous 'accidental' relationship towards the Republic—into government for the first time. Only in Asturias did the order to rebel elicit a massive response. The Asturian coalfields were a hotbed of left-wing politics (socialism, anarchism and communism, in addition to Republicanism) and strike action during the Republic. This agitation—caused by a coal industry in crisis, and the failure of the unions to defend working class interests—is cited as a key factor in the 'radicalisation'

of the Asturian working class that resulted in the 1934 insurrection along with other factors: local left-wing unity, the shadow of the international rise of fascism, youthful rebelliousness and the radical rhetoric of the influential provincial socialist newspaper.⁴ The victory of the right in the national elections of 1933 was also important, fuelling Republican and Socialist fears of ‘losing’ the Republic.

The insurrection, though poorly organised and armed, lasted for two weeks, during which revolutionary forces fought government forces in the streets of the provincial capital and in the mountains towards León. Behind the lines, revolutionary committees formed at a local level by trade unions and political parties organised the ‘Revolution’ by reorganising work and healthcare, banning money, redistributing food and creating revolutionary patrols. Without wider support the insurrection was doomed to fail. A negotiated surrender ended a chaotic second week and the army entered the coalfields on 19 October. While many fled, those who remained faced a fierce repression. Approximately 2,000 died during the insurrection itself, the majority in the fighting. Over forty individuals died in unclear circumstances or were killed by revolutionaries during the insurrection, including rightists and industrialists, but the majority—thirty-three—were priests, male seminarians or religious.⁵ The revolutionary process also entailed arresting those considered a threat to the new order: rightists, members of the bourgeoisie and clerics. Searching the church for arms and detaining the priest was ‘to do something revolutionary’.⁶

In Spain anticlericalism has a long history. Traditionally a feature of popular protest, in the nineteenth century struggles between clericals and anticlericals became over the ‘definition of the nation itself’.⁷ Secularism and anticlericalism were a hallmark of emergent Republican and anarchist political cultures, who were followed by the socialist movement, which became explicitly anticlerical during the second decade of the twentieth century.⁸ These developments took place in a context in which the Restoration monarchy (1875-1931) reaffirmed the Church’s place in the Spanish state and society—its role extending to welfare and education. Catholicism and the political right were closely linked and while there was a plurality of positions in the Church, conservatism predominated and social Catholicism was weak. While scholars frequently note that the Church was thinly spread in industrial areas, with its strength lying in rural towns of small landowners, the Church certainly had a visible presence in the Asturian coalfields, as discussed below.⁹ The politico-cultural division over religion became more acute during the Republic. For the Republican-Socialist coalition who governed Spain between 1931 and 1933, the Second Republic was a modernising, reforming and secularising project, while defence of the Catholic Church would prove an effective rallying call for

the political right, which was galvanised by protest against the secularising articles of the Republican Constitution in autumn 1931.¹⁰ Despite the protests that unfolded over, for example, the secularization of education or removal of crucifixes from classrooms, the anticlerical bloodletting of October 1934, itself vastly overshadowed by the violence of the Civil War, was a significant shift.¹¹

Despite the level of anticlerical violence in October 1934, it has not received detailed analysis from scholars, even as the historiography of secularism and anticlericalism in modern Spain—previously ‘much neglected’—has developed considerably over the last twenty years.¹² Recent studies have examined the role of secular and anticlerical ideas in leftist political cultures, the characteristics and dynamics of conflict, and the relationship between Catholicism and secularism/anticlericalism, in an approach highlighting that long-term secular-religious struggles culminated in the 1930s.¹³ A principal focus has been on the anticlerical violence of the Spanish Civil War, which is unsurprising given that 6,770 members of the clergy were killed during the war—the vast majority during the first three months.¹⁴ While attention has recently turned to members of the clergy who dissented from the Church’s designation of the Spanish Civil War as a ‘Crusade’, little has been written on survival.¹⁵ Anthropological approaches have proved to be fruitful in enabling scholars to demonstrate that violence expressed a meaning and a particular logic, rather than the irrational outburst of an uncontrolled mob.¹⁶ More recent studies have moved towards engaging with the gendered dimension of violence as male bodies were the main target, often in sexually degrading ways.¹⁷ As this article demonstrates, survival can be approached in a similar way; the lack of use of violence also has social meaning. Moreover, violence does not tell the whole story of clerical experience in the Civil War or in the 1934 insurrection.

This article explores attempts by the clergy and religious to survive the 1934 revolutionary insurrection using the concept of ‘passing’, which was fundamentally a performative process based on interpreting and imitating visual codes. I emphasise the importance of passing as an interactive process in which the revolutionaries’ role and expectations were vital, before discussing three key aspects for understanding passing: dressing, gesturing and passwords, and performing. Acting, dressing and performing as the revolutionary ‘other’ was an emotionally charged experience in which the sociocultural gulf between the leftist working class and members of the clergy became very evident. The group dynamic of revolutions involves the need to delineate group boundaries and regulate involvement in the revolutionary process. Revolutionaries ‘managed’ non-revolutionaries (and possible threats to the revolution), at times by adopting a pedagogical role in which they demonstrated to religious personnel how they should behave in order to survive. Survival—and

violence—was therefore highly contingent. Moreover, rather than a dichotomy of (active) revolutionaries versus (passive) religious victims, examining episodes of passing demonstrates the need to take seriously the efforts of religious personnel to shape the outcome of these encounters.

Passing

On the morning of 5 October 1934, as leftist militias lay siege to the headquarters and barracks of the security forces throughout the mining valleys, religious personnel were forced to evaluate their position in a hostile situation. As shots and explosions rang out, the priests of Sama and Ciaño spoke via telephone in the early hours to discuss their plans. The former decided to leave his home and died in unclear circumstances as a fire-fight raged in the centre of Sama.¹⁸ The parish priest of nearby Lada fled on hearing the news.¹⁹ In this climate of fear, stress and tension many opted to try to reach their families or flee to places perceived to be safer. Escaping required, nonetheless, negotiating the streets and roads controlled by revolutionary committees and patrols. Religious personnel used strategies of subterfuge, donning non-religious garments and performing revolutionary gestures in order to survive the new revolutionary context.

The notion of ‘passing’ mainly derives from Goffman and his work on how individuals negotiated stigma in social situations through managing the ‘social information’ they project. Passing can be defined as ‘cultural performances in which individuals perceived to have a somewhat threatening identity present themselves or are categorized by others as persons they are not’.²⁰ Passing is a performance of an identity considered not to be the ‘true’ identity of a particular individual and requires the individual to recode him or herself, particularly on an aesthetic or behavioural level. As a deliberate performance, passing requires thought and reflection; it is—to use Goffman’s terms—when ‘normals’ and the stigmatized encounter one another that ‘the causes and effects of stigma must be directly confronted’.²¹ Passing thus involves engagement with the ‘other’s’ identity, and associated symbols and visual codes. Perceiving these experiences through the lens of passing foregrounds visual, bodily and performative aspects, and posits that social information is ‘embodied’—encoded in symbols and gestures.²² There is a long tradition of studying gestures as meaningful communication, including as an ‘utterance’, though this is more recent in historical studies.²³ Gestures—actions that ‘manifest deliberate expressiveness’—thus form an integral part of social relationships, and serve both to express and (potentially) transform such relationships.²⁴ Decoding the meaning of such gestures in their particular context can ‘illuminate the political and

social tensions of [a particular] period'.²⁵ The act of passing in the Asturian October thus required clergy and religious to reflect on how their identities were visually and behaviourally codified.

Passing has frequently been studied with regards to race, though it has also been applied 'discursively' to sexuality, class, gender and ethnicity.²⁶ Scholars have also used terms such as impersonation to describe similar practices. A number of studies have examined how individuals presented and reinvented themselves as Soviet citizens in the wake of the Russian Revolution.²⁷ Such performances were much more protracted in time, in contrast to the two-week Asturian revolutionary insurrection in which members of the clergy attempted to escape from the area controlled by the revolutionaries. Living in—and engaging with—the new Soviet state was very different to a turbulent and unfinished revolutionary process. There was still, however, the need to survive.

The description of Dimas Camporro's experiences in La Hueria forms part of a volume documenting the insurrection produced by the parish priest of Tuilla, which was one of a wave of accounts published after the insurrection by eyewitnesses, journalists, sympathizers and critics from across the ideological spectrum. Such accounts formed part of the propaganda struggle of claims and counter-claims to define the insurrection in a context of social and political polarization.²⁸ The detailed, intimate first-person narratives of survival are a rich source for understanding the experiences of religious personnel during the insurrection, even if they do pose interpretative and methodological problems. Firstly, Catholic narratives produced by the protagonists themselves or sympathizers were written in accordance with martyrological schema. Such accounts were shaped by the aftermath of the events and deploy traditional hagiographical tropes, narrating the 'odysseys' and tribulations faced by religious personnel. Secondly, their descriptions of violence—frequently couched in terms of barbarism and savagery—are more indicative of animosity towards the left rather than offering actual insight. Anticlerical violence is portrayed as present from the beginning of the Republic and inevitably funnelling towards the insurrection.²⁹ A volume published in 1977 documenting the experience of religious personnel in both 1934 and the Civil War collapsed the Republic, revolution and the Civil War—into one. The emphasis was on persecution; documented cases of survival were given a cursory mention in the final pages, which is indicative of how they fail to fit the persecutory schema.³⁰ Martyrologists were simply not interested. Thirdly, clerical experience has to be reconstructed from retrospective testimonies as there are no documentary records from the insurrection itself. Evidence is difficult to obtain, due to the destruction of parish archives and the difficulties in accessing military archives. Here the accounts produced by the clergy

and religious have been supplemented with archival records and press reports. The bodily practices explored in this article are thus mediated through textual sources produced afterwards. Despite these problems and the fragmentary record at historians' disposal, these accounts do provide valuable insight into the insurrection through their attempts to rationalize the disconcerting experience of survival and are the closest historians can get to the experience of the insurrection itself.

The community of religious personnel in the coalfields on the outbreak of the insurrection was formed by a combination of secular and regular clergy, non-ordained brothers and female religious. There were nineteen priests in the municipal district of Langreo alone, one of the most populous areas of the coalfields with approximately 40,000 residents.³¹ In addition, Dominicans and de la Salle brothers staffed schools and a community of Passionists lived in Mieres, while two Jesuits travelling to Gijón were caught up in the insurrection when their train was stopped.³² This diverse combination of religious personnel had varying relationships and degrees of contact with local residents. Some priests were from the locality they served, while others originated from nearby valleys or other areas of Asturias. None of the religious brothers who staffed the de la Salle school in Turón were Asturian: half were from the heartlands of Spanish Catholicism on the north-central plains (León and Burgos).³³ There were similarly differences in origin and social role. A parish priest had a more visible role in the community, compared to the more isolated Passionists in Mieres. As one Passionist wrote, '[w]e were a mystery to them ... Shut away in our convent, most of us were not known—not even our faces—to the thousands and thousands of inhabitants of Mieres'. They only left the convent to visit the sick.³⁴ This was in contrast to the de la Salle brothers and Dominicans, who taught the children of the mine workers and whose schools were frequently criticized by leftist groups and councillors.

Clerical Bodies and Leftist Expectations

Goffman emphasized that 'the decoding capacity of the audience must be specified before one can speak of degree of visibility [of the stigma]', even though he focused principally on the passer.³⁵ In Asturias, where clerical status was stigmatised during the revolution, passing was an interactive process dependent on the 'decoding capacity' of revolutionary patrols and committees. Other scholars have analysed the role played by other participants in the interaction. Renfrow emphasises that their assumptions can facilitate passing through 'reactive passing': when 'individuals cross social boundaries in response to others' incorrect assumptions about their identities'.³⁶ In an encounter of

a priest and a revolutionary patrol in the street, the latter could offer a visual or oral clue that could enable the passing of the former. Interpreting the passing process thus needs to take into account how the priestly body was understood at the time. Yet the Asturian revolutionary context was further complicated by contingency. While Goffman declares that it is society that categorises people, defining what is ‘ordinary’ and ‘natural’, the precise reaction to the ‘stigma’ in the Asturian context was unclear, even if anticlerical attitudes were widespread.³⁷

How the clerical body was perceived by the revolutionaries was hence a crucial part of successful passing. There was an image of the priest projected in left-wing newspaper sketches which emphasized a particular physical appearance. Priests’ bodies, identified by a soutane, were short and fat or tall and thin in contrast to the (idealized) muscular proletarian. Such a representation reflected the stereotype of the priesthood’s laziness and greed.³⁸ This particular image of the priest created an *expectation* of the assemblage of elements of what constituted the body of the priest, including girth and often glasses, which priests had to negotiate when passing.

In fact, mistakes occurred when passing priests did not match this stereotype, Revolutionaries charged with arresting two priests in Oviedo only correctly detained one of them. They incorrectly believed that an individual was too young and ‘elegant’ to be a priest, preferring to arrest another man ‘because he was a bit older than the rest, and more heavily-built’, as they believed him to be a priest in disguise.³⁹ This inadvertent—not even ‘reactive’—passing demonstrates that the revolutionaries had a clear mental image of a priest’s expected appearance. This was not limited to the revolutionaries; the *vicario* of the Passionists was told by someone aiding him to escape that he had the ‘face of a friar’.⁴⁰ Visual indicators were key. Despite the efforts of religious personnel to manage their ‘social information’ via behaviour and dress and shape the outcome of an encounter, a good performance was ineffectual if a revolutionary patrol was determined to make an arrest.

Revolutionaries demonstrated a collective assertion of anticlerical identity, even if this did not necessarily reflect individual beliefs. Later accounts detailed incidents in which hegemonic anticlericalism was undermined, such as a revolutionary asking a female religious to pick up a religious image scattered when searching a convent for arms or a young man warning children not to damage anything in a parish church in the coalfields. The description of such gestures underlines that collective anticlerical expression was dominant—the revolutionary had spoken to the female religious with a ‘lowered voice’ while the children had been warned *after* the other revolutionaries had left.⁴¹ Performing anticlerical and iconoclastic acts was a way of demonstrating revolutionary mettle and served as social “glue” within the group.⁴²

Anticlerical violence and imprisonment targeted male religious personnel. Female religious did not suffer the same level of violence during the revolutionary insurrection or during the Civil War. In 1934, not only were female religious respected by the revolutionaries and escorted away from the front line, but they were also employed in hospitals and soup kitchens.⁴³ The difference in treatment was stark: while Dominican nuns managed to convince the revolutionaries to allow them to cook for those imprisoned, a socialist doctor in charge of the hospital in the same town threw out a chaplain on discovering that he was a priest.⁴⁴ Female religious were not considered to be a threat to the revolution, an attitude which was determined, undoubtedly, by their gender, as it was during the Civil War, when '[n]uns were protected by their sex ... [as] taboos against killing nuns were very strong' and women were seen as the victims of priests rather than possessing agency of their own.⁴⁵ Female religious in Asturias in October 1934 did not need to pass to avoid violence or imprisonment.

Dressing

Dressing formed an essential part of preparing to pass. Historically hierarchies have been regulated through dress codes and the soutane was a clear marker of clerical status: '[p]utting on "the garments of God"' is a major means of investing the physical body with religious aura'.⁴⁶ How this status was interpreted by wider society was dependent on the context. The priest's soutane could inspire respect and deference amongst Catholics or derision amongst anticlericals.⁴⁷ In October 1934, the soutane singled out religious personnel as a threat to the new revolutionary context. Two years later members of the clergy would be killed for the clothes they wore.⁴⁸ But dressing involved more than simply removing the soutane. Replacing it with 'civilian' clothing stimulated a sense of anxiety, betrayal, and alienation.

Changing clothes was a step taken by many, if not all, members of the clergy who had to pass through revolutionary-controlled areas. Seminarians, Passionist religious, Jesuits and parish priests all dressed in civilian clothes to facilitate their escape.⁴⁹ They dressed '*de paisano*', a term which means plain clothes, but also carries echoes of dressing like a '*paisano*': a countryman. Such a strategy appears to have been widespread, even if the documentary record only hints at these experiences. When Juan Puertes' body was disinterred after the insurrection, his corpse was clothed '*de paisano*', while days after the insurrection ended a newspaper wrote that '[w]e know thousands of details of how a number of priests have managed to survive. Many were in the hands of

revolutionaries, but dressed in civilian clothing and through feigning diverse trades and professions they have managed to be overlooked amongst the multitude'.⁵⁰ This tantalising report did not proffer any extra details.

The garments included jacket and trousers—but no collar or tie—in an attempt to mimic unremarkable proletarian clothing, while one of the Jesuits dressed in overalls (having always been proud to wear his soutane in public in previous years, at least according to the martyrology).⁵¹ The disguise depended on the availability of garments and what was believed to be 'passable', itself shaped by understandings of working class culture. While there was a cultural gulf between the clergy and local leftists, the extent to which there was a lack of knowledge or recognition of the 'other' is more difficult to ascertain. Faced with the need to escape, religious personnel attempted to imitate working class aesthetics and conform to the prevailing mood in the streets. Dressing required not just the removal of the soutane, but engagement with the new revolution through mimicking proletarian appearance.

The preference for proletarian style was repeated two years later during the Civil War. George Orwell was struck on his arrival in Barcelona by the scenes of the 'revolution', observing that '[p]ractically everyone wore rough working-class clothes, or blue overalls, or some variant of the militia uniform'.⁵² Such practices served to reinforce a particular revolutionary community codified through imitation of a particular style. Indeed, in Asturias in 1934 the *vicario*'s final touch to his outfit was a cap that he wore 'miner-style'. Importantly, however, he did not place the cap on his head himself. Rather, it was arranged on the *vicario*'s head by an individual who was to accompany him in his escape to a new refuge.⁵³ The *vicario* was capable of dressing himself, but the subtleties of proletarian style were judged to be beyond him.

Proletarian disguise could go beyond simply dressing to include disguising visible parts of the body in a way to avoid detection. Hands were a quintessential symbol of worker status. One Passionist smeared his hands with coal dust in a clear attempt to present himself as an authentic worker.⁵⁴ Recognising how different jobs influenced the physical appearance of the bodies, he manipulated his body accordingly (though presumably he could not reproduce the calluses caused by physical labour). Like hands, faces were visible parts of the clothed body and it was such elements that were changed in order to fit the revolutionary context. Eufrazio, a Carmelite, reportedly grew a moustache.⁵⁵ But the clerical body was not a blank canvas over which new meanings could be simply overlaid. The tonsure was a giveaway of religious status and covering the head or even painting the scalp were methods employed to avoid detection by revolutionary patrols. Rafael del

Campo, coadjutor in La Felguera, painted his monastic tonsure with ink before escaping by car to his parents' house in Siero.⁵⁶

The process of dressing as a proletarian other was a difficult and alienating process. Removing the soutane did not simply mean removing an item of clothing, but the removal of status and, presumably, comfort and familiarity. More than simply cloth, it formed part of their identities. The Jesuit in overalls actually wore them over his soutane, though he did eventually leave his clerical garment behind.⁵⁷ Wearing the soutane underneath was probably not overly practical, but he found it difficult to remove the soutane, due perhaps to a feeling of comfort judged worth the risk of discovery or else a reluctance to remove markers of clerical status intrinsic to his sense of self and place in the social order. This was also plausibly the case with a Carmelite who, having injured himself while trying to escape, went to the hospital claiming to be a miner. He continued to carry a scapular—evidence of religious devotion (and protection) rather than clerical status—and was caught.⁵⁸ He was reluctant to remove all vestiges of religious identity, even in a matter of life and death. Becoming one of the anticlerical masses was necessary, yet difficult and alienating. The *vicario* of the Passionists reflected on this when dressing in uncusomary clothes:

I did not know how to put my cap on... And my hands? Tell me, how should one carry one's hands? Because to tell you truth I did not know where to put them such that they did not bother me.

In contrast, the rector 'knew how to carry his hands'.⁵⁹ The *vicario* felt alienated without the soutane, as though his body acted differently. This feeling is entirely logical given the difference in the form of the clothes, particularly as his self-awareness was sharpened by anxiety. Even if the clothes were passable, the body could undermine this as religious subjects felt that movement and bodily practices were so engrained that the soutane felt like part of their body. More than just the removal of status and power, this was removing how the body functioned: he even stopped feeling like a Passionist if he did not look like one. Without the soutane the body of a priest, whatever the caricatures, was simply a male body.

Anxiety was fuelled by a feeling that they would be discovered—and this extended to those who aided the religious personnel in their flight; the *vicario*'s companion told him to remove his glasses, 'if not, you'll give me away'.⁶⁰ Civilian clothes engendered a feeling of precariousness, especially if the clothes belonged to someone else and did not fit properly. Miguel del Rosario stated

that ‘the disguise gave me away; even let down the trousers were too short for me and the untucked part looked new and the rest worn’.⁶¹ There was a heightened sense of awareness of themselves as markedly different from their surroundings. The *vicario* felt ‘naked’ in his trousers: his jacket needed to be ‘longer, to cover myself’. He pulled the jacket down only for it to reveal his tieless neck.⁶² His desire to cover himself indicates an anxiety that his male form—as a male religious—could betray him, and also a sense of vulnerability, in that he felt surrounded and threatened by revolutionary masses (and their penetrating gaze). Wearing trousers no longer afforded the *vicario* the safety and protection of the habit, and forced him to think on masculine sexual identity. Indeed, celibacy was a challenge to normative heterosexuality in Spanish society, representing ‘an affront to how Spanish men were supposed to live their lives’ and this was reflected in the marked sexual, gendered character of violence used against religious personnel during the Civil War.⁶³

Policing bodies was the responsibility of revolutionary patrols who routinely asked individuals to uncover their heads to prove that they were not priests. In separate incidents, Ignacio, the Passionist who had dirtied his hands, and Eufasio, the scapular-carrying Carmelite, were asked to uncover their heads. Ignacio had no tonsure and successfully claimed to be a worker, while Eufasio’s scapular had raised suspicions about his self-identification as a miner.⁶⁴ In marked contrast, when a parish priest in Oviedo was arrested by revolutionaries, he was marched through the streets wrapped with a red sash.⁶⁵ Far from being allowed to blend in with his surroundings, his body was branded with the red of the revolution. It was un-passable, a revolutionary trophy.

Gestures and Passwords

On 13 November 1934, nearly a month after the insurrection had ended, an individual was arrested in Oviedo for greeting a friend in the street with a raised arm. He was told to open his hand or, better still, keep his hands in his pockets.⁶⁶ The raised, closed fist was interpreted by the authorities as a gesture of support for the revolutionary insurrection—and consequently of defiance towards the state’s armed forces. The clenched fist had appeared first in Germany in the 1880s and was adopted by the paramilitary wing of the German Communist Party, the KPD, though ‘[i]n contrast to the Hitler salute, it never became an everyday greeting [even as] it served to reinforce the militant, proletarian-revolutionary self-identity of the communist movement and to demarcate the KPD from the social democrats, lower-middle class, and Nazis’. The clenched fist actually became internationally recognized through its prevalence during the Spanish Civil War.⁶⁷ While the clenched

fist could lead to arrest after the Asturian October, performing the correct gestures was an integral part of successful passing during the revolutionary fortnight. Gaining passage through revolutionary-controlled areas was not just a question of wearing the right clothes. Once dressed and attempting to escape, a more active interaction with revolutionary patrols was required.

The revolutionary insurrection developed its own gestural codes as a way of regulating who formed part of the revolution. When individuals or groups met in the street, clenched fists were raised and ‘*salud*, comrade’ or ‘UHP’ (*Uníos, hermanos proletarios*—unite, proletarian brothers) was said.⁶⁸ The phrase and gesture formed part of a wider repertoire of practices that reinforced a nascent revolutionary community through a process of mutual identification and collective expression of left-wing working class power, such as singing *The Internationale* or invoking the Russian Revolution through graffiti scrawled on walls.⁶⁹ As the rector of the Passionists remarked darkly in his introduction to the accounts of the Passionist religious:

Under the sign of hate: the hammer and sickle, daubed everywhere, and hearing the incessantly resonating fateful cry, like an augur of death: UHP, and seeing how clenched fists were raised in gestures of defiance, the honourable people of Mieres endured the two weeks of revolution, drowning in terror ...⁷⁰

Hyperbole aside, the revolution was an intense visual experience and symbols and gestures were central to how witnesses negotiated and remembered the insurrection. Access to revolutionary space was regulated via the raising of a clenched fist and utterance of ‘UHP’. Individuals required knowledge of the password and gesture to give the required performance to revolutionary patrols—‘[e]verywhere the password UHP was demanded’; without it an individual was ‘arrested and identified straightaway’ a communist later reported—even if the proliferation of the gesture meant that it was more an affirmation of identity than an effective security measure.⁷¹ Stating the password and performing the gesture served to show knowledge of the revolution, and functioned as a symbol for mutual recognition, assurance and an appeal for inclusion—or to avoid being singled out as a threat. Failure to perform the gesture and password invited suspicion; the fact that it occurred on several occasions is evidence of the cultural distance between the religious community and the revolutionaries.

Yet, the inability to perform the gesture and password correctly did not automatically lead to arrest. Revolutionaries were prepared to explain the new codes of conduct, in order to draw

individuals into the revolution. The insurrection was not simply a case of imposing one social or political group on another; rather, the nascent revolutionary community was a collective subject under construction, which meant that local inhabitants would be pulled into forming part of the insurrection. Miguel del Rosario, a Passionist who was stopped and arrested by a revolutionary patrol, admitted to his religious status to the local revolutionary committee, who appreciated his honesty, not least as they already knew his identity. In his account, Miguel alleges that some wanted to kill him, but they issued him with a safe-conduct and, importantly, showed him how to salute—‘they advised that I should be careful to salute as they had told me to, otherwise, I would have problems’—though he neglected to heed the advice and was later imprisoned after saluting ‘like a Christian’.⁷² In Oviedo, revolutionaries were also initially benevolent to a priest who greeted them with the fascist salute accompanied by ‘*salud*, comrades’ (indeed *salud*—literally, ‘health’—would be a common salutation during the Civil War). While someone did shout ‘shoot him, he’s a fascist’, Salgado replied, ‘isn’t this the socialist greeting?’ and the socialist salute was explained to him. He mimicked the gesture only to be recognized by a woman in the street who revealed his identity.⁷³ It is difficult to see why Salgado would wilfully provoke revolutionaries in the highly dangerous context of the invasion of the city by armed militias known for their anticlericalism. Rather, it suggests a lack of political knowledge by some members of the clergy and the distance which separated the different sectors in society and their respective cultures and politics.

At the same time, as with the reluctance to relinquish the soutane or scapular, some religious attempted to avoid fully imitating the markers of revolutionary identity. Natalio, a Passionist, greeted revolutionaries with ‘*salud*, comrades’ and a raised fist, or at least a version of it—he actually took a ‘little packet [of food a similar shape to dynamite] in my right hand and, holding it between the index finger and thumb, I lifted my arm in order to return the greeting’.⁷⁴ Natalio wanted to be *passable*; he did not want to actually brandish a stick of dynamite. It was thus plausibly a small act of resistance within the act of passing itself. Similarly, while it is very difficult to analyse the role of language in these accounts produced in the insurrection’s aftermath, it is likely that cursing God was also a step too far. Blaspheming was a key element of anticlerical expression and a priest was allegedly killed for refusing to blaspheme.⁷⁵ Putting on civilian clothes and saluting was one thing, but to vocally attack one’s beliefs was another level entirely.

Even if revolutionaries were far from intransigent, a lack of knowledge could also be dangerous. Without a successful performance of the password and pass-gesture (or something resembling them), an individual’s revolutionary credentials were open to question. One gesture on

its own was not enough, as Ignacio de la Dolorosa discovered. Revolutionaries asked him to produce identity papers when he only raised his fist and did not say the password. Ignacio presented his official papers, eventually confessed to his identity and was imprisoned.⁷⁶ An attempt at survival through deception quickly gave way to a shift in strategy to honesty in the hope of a compassionate response.

Such episodes serve to underline the importance of contingency in survival and success at passing in that the reaction of the revolutionary patrol or committee was crucial, and often varied. Even so, passing as a public performance could involve more than just the religious personnel and a patrol. Shouts by a passer-by revealing the religious status of an individual could completely undermine the attempt at passing, not least as denunciation of enemies was a way to prove one's revolutionary mettle. The intimacy of small communities—in contrast to the larger urban space of the provincial capital—could also hinder passing. The face of the parish priest would be known to the local inhabitants. Passing, in this way, could be doomed to failure from the beginning. One revolutionary in Mieres recalled that the rightists were 'the first ones to raise their clenched fists and shout viva to the revolution', which he described as 'suspicious'.⁷⁷ He knew exactly who the rightists were, but did not frame their attempt to conform as passing; rather, it was a potential threat to the revolution.

Performing

Passing took place in public space, usually roads and urban centres. Those who identified themselves as potential targets of the revolutionaries avoided these areas as much as possible. Many clergy and rightists hid in basements or the houses of family members, acquaintances or sympathizers, while others fled to or via rural areas—often at night—to avoid contact with revolutionary patrols, as these areas were seen as safer for the clergy. The Passionists left their convent in Mieres in twos and threes to facilitate their escape.⁷⁸ Several of those who fled attempted to reach family homes in pueblos and villages in other areas of the mining valleys, or further afield, judging that the possibility of aid and refuge was worth the increased risk of recognition. Noval Suárez found shelter at a house on which an image of the Sacred Heart was displayed.⁷⁹ The clergy could navigate using visible symbols to facilitate their escape and take advantage of the Catholic defined by its own symbols, practices and gestures. And the symbol of the Sacred Heart was more than just a signifier of Catholic faith; it had a profoundly political meaning associated with the political right. Images of the

Sacred Heart had ‘proliferated’ across Spain afterward King Alfonso XIII had consecrated the country to the sacred heart in 1919.⁸⁰ A home with a Sacred Heart was a relatively safe bet for shelter in a leftist revolution.

For those unable to escape to rural areas, survival could require more than just a momentary salute and the raising of a clenched fist. A more extended performance could be required in order to hide their religious identity. Such performances lasted for differing amounts of time depending on the each individual’s experiences. Different survival strategies were pursued by religious personnel during the revolutionary insurrection. While some attempted to hide amongst the multitude, others subverted what was expected of the clergy. What underpinned these approaches was how religious personnel presented themselves as not posing a threat to the revolution, even as they employed different strategies.

One tactic was to present oneself as outside the revolution through a much more indirect engagement with the revolution itself. Two Passionists successfully passed themselves off as potato sellers from Castile when they were stopped by a revolutionary patrol in Llanuces (Quirós).⁸¹ This strategy both explained why they were attempting to reach Castile and a potentially suspicious characteristic—their Castilian accents. They did not try to pass as revolutionaries, rather they recognized their difference and also staked a claim to be rightfully in the revolutionary-controlled area. In a similar way, two Jesuits, arrested for arousing suspicions, allegedly tried to pass themselves off as travellers.⁸² As travellers, they were external to the insurrection, neither allied to it nor an enemy. Successful passing therefore required the creation of a convincing narrative that explained why individuals unknown to local inhabitants were in areas controlled by revolutionaries. The Jesuits were unsuccessful. According to the martyrological account, not even flourishing their train tickets convinced the revolutionaries that they were travellers. They were arrested and later killed.⁸³ We can only speculate as to why the Passionists walked free while the Jesuits were detained. The sources available can only hint at possible explanations. The Jesuits were captured late at night two days into the insurrection on the outskirts of Mieres, one of the centres of revolutionary power. Llanuces was on the periphery of revolutionary influence where plausibly the presence of two ‘potato sellers’ was less threatening.

The desire to present oneself as unthreatening could also entail a more direct engagement with the insurrection itself. Juan de la Cruz, the Passionist who had blackened his hands with coal dust, claimed to be a worker and was kept as a cleaner at the town hall where the revolutionary committee was based. He presented himself as having an intellectual disability (‘I did what I could to

appear completely dumb [*tonto de remate*'] to avoid being sent to the front to fight.⁸⁴ Juan de la Cruz thus survived the insurrection in the very heart of local revolutionary power by encouraging the revolutionaries to consider themselves more intellectually capable than he was. Performing as if he were 'dumb' suggested to the revolutionaries that deceiving them was beyond him. In a similar manner, Rafael del Campo, a coadjutor, presented himself as being physically incapacitated through illness. He managed to escape by car to Siero, pass through checkpoints and was even provided with a vehicle when his car broke down.⁸⁵ Such performances presented the individuals as neither a threat nor a useful resource in the revolutionary insurrection, and were an invitation to show compassion or leave them alone.

Hospitals in particular were used as a haven by members of the clergy and male religious—and also rightists—to survive the insurrection. The priest of the Sagrada Familia school in Ciaño-Santa Ana endured the insurrection in the school, which had been turned into a hospital, by lying low 'mixed up amongst the orphans, widows and wounded'.⁸⁶ Hospitals were an ideal refuge for a combination of reasons. Firstly, healthcare was needed during a violent revolution. Secondly, working in a hospital demonstrated tacit (and more morally acceptable) support for the insurrection while being isolated from the violence of the front, though there was still the risk of bombing. Finally, working in a hospital was both more acceptable and an easier role for religious personnel to perform.

Antonio Lombardía Alonso, a canon penitentiary, was more radical in his survival strategy. Subverting what was expected of a priest, he dressed as a wine-seller and sold wine in shirt-sleeves on San Antonio Street in Oviedo, not far from the seat of the main revolutionary committee and the same street where two other priests were arrested and later killed.⁸⁷ Antonio acted in a manner diametrically opposed to what the priesthood represented, yet in a role which (presumably) exuded a semblance of normality. As fighting raged around him, he sold wine. Members of the Catholic Youth in La Felguera were even more proactive in their engagement with the revolutionary process. They ostensibly collaborated in anticlerical violence in order to save the ciborium from the parish church, as also occurred during the Civil War: right-wingers participated in iconoclasm in order to survive.⁸⁸ Ostensible collaboration with the revolutionaries was one way of trying to avoid detection, though clearly a dangerous one.

Passing was not just a matter of dress or behaving in a particular way, but also a question of attitude. Confidence, if religious personnel were able to muster it, could facilitate passing. A demonstration of authority in the face of a revolutionary patrol could also work in a context in

which new relations of power were being created and competing authorities existed. The ‘imperious’ attitude employed by Father Abella when he happened across a revolutionary patrol meant that they actually followed his orders and his identity was not discovered.⁸⁹ Showing confidence or conforming to what was expected preyed on the potential uncertainty of the encounter. Eloy de San Pablo de la Cruz and Fidel de la Presentación presented their identity papers to a militia patrol. Questions were asked, but it appeared that the militiamen were illiterate as the priests were allowed to continue.⁹⁰ Not all patrols had the necessary resources to discover an incidence of passing.

The danger was that revolutionaries valued honesty, which meant that the deceptive process of passing was risky. Conversely, priests who confessed to their clerical status could aid their survival.⁹¹ Evidence suggests that attempts to pass often broke down relatively quickly, leading to confessions. This could indicate religious personnel’s lack of confidence in their ability to provide a convincing explanation or performance. The emphasis on honesty inadvertently heightened the dangers of passing for clerics and religious, who could not have been aware of this at the time. For the revolutionaries, lying and deception indicated a security risk. As moments of uncertainty in which a new order was being forged, there was a need to fix boundaries. Revolutionary vigilance and policing was an inherent part of securing the revolution. Fitzpatrick notes that in Russia revolutionaries ‘tend[ed] to be obsessed with authenticity and transparency’ and such “‘vigilance” in identifying or exposing such enemies of the revolutionary was one of the cardinal virtues of a Communist’ in Russia after the Bolshevik seizure of power.⁹² This was a much more developed form of what occurred in Asturias in 1934, where the insurrection never went beyond a brief attempt at forging a new revolutionary community, even if denouncing and unmasking did exist as a way to define the revolutionary community. Passing undermined the revolutionary order and was a threat to the new authorities, even as religious personnel turned to passing in a desperate attempt to survive.

Conclusion

Dimas Camporro was hauled before the local revolutionary committee, but no allegations were made against him and the young priest was allowed to walk free. During the uprising he was neither imprisoned nor did he have to flee.⁹³ Many other clerics, however, employed ‘passing’ strategies, defined by bodily practices—dressing, gesturing and performing, to survive the threat of

revolutionary violence. Passing formed part of a wider number survival strategies, including flight or hiding oneself away.⁹⁴

Less than two years after the insurrection, the Civil War erupted. In Asturias, 157 religious personnel died in anticlerical acts, the majority in the summer of 1936, in line with the national trend of a furious anticlerical outburst at the beginning of the War.⁹⁵ The scale and chronology was different. Like in 1934, the fate of many religious personnel depended on the whim of revolutionary militia and local committees in the context of the fragmentation of the Republican state. There were escape routes; for example, rightists and clerics were evacuated out of Catalonia and many religious personnel did survive, despite the mass violence.⁹⁶ Further research should seek to uncover how and why clerics managed to survive the 'hot summer' of 1936. In 1936, as in 1934, the survival of religious personnel was highly contingent. Not all revolutionary patrols or committees acted in the same way. A priest could be detained, killed or simply allowed to continue his journey.

In 1934, as in 1936, religious personnel were targeted for their religious status: they were 'singled out to bear the sins of the old order'.⁹⁷ Explanations of anticlerical violence in 1936 emphasise that it emerged in a context of the interruption of state authority, was enacted out of a desire to purify space and as a mechanism for leftists to claim political involvement and construct their own counter-hegemonic revolutionary project.⁹⁸ Emphasising survival problematizes these explanations. Certainly in 1934 priests were targeted for being priests. But it was far from blanket persecution. Indeed, there appears to have been consensus on the need to exclude (male) religious personnel, but the use of violence was contested. Studying survival in addition to violence is vital to understanding wider clerical experience in these episodes of revolutionary upheaval. It serves to nuance the picture of violence, demonstrating the contingency both of survival and violence, and the unfolding, contested nature of the revolutionary process.

Examining survival is not to nuance the horror of the death of thousands, but rather to provide a fuller picture of clerical experience during these episodes of violent anticlericalism. The study of survival serves to foreground the actions of individual priests and underline their agency. A focus on passing demonstrates that the categories of assailant and victim should not overlook the efforts of those with a 'stigma' or 'discredited' identities (to follow Goffman) to manage and influence the outcome of social interaction. The lens of passing, therefore, allows for the analysis of how individuals have historically managed threatening situations through recoding their dress, behaviour and speech.

Passing was contingent, due to the threat of recognition or a poor performance, but also owing to the role played by revolutionaries. Patrols acted in different ways. At times they even adopted a pedagogical role by explaining how a priest should salute. Studying these dynamics opens up a new perspective on the revolutionary process itself in terms of how it was defined and what were its limits. Rather than simply a revolutionary ‘us’ versus a ‘them’ to be repressed, revolutionary patrols often attempted to manage political opponents at local level in different ways.

Finally, uncovering episodes of passing also sheds new light both on clerical identity and frictions, divisions and cultural differences in the communities of the Asturian coalfields. Passing as a broad process described through dressing, gesturing and performing brings clerical identities—often overlooked—into sharper relief, in addition to providing a greater understanding of wider society, clerical identities, and attitudes, as achieved by anthropologically-influenced studies of Civil War anticlerical violence. Without understanding the ‘oases in the desert’, it is impossible to fully comprehend the vicissitudes and conflicts that divided Spanish society in the 1930s.

¹ Senén Noval Suárez, *Langreo Rojo. Historia del martirio y persecución de los sacerdotes en el Arciprestazgo de Langreo, durante los sucesos revolucionarios del año 1934* (La Felguera, 1935), p. 111.

² Ibid., pp. 99-100.

³ The principal accounts of the background and development of the Asturian revolutionary insurrection are Adrian Shubert, *The Road to Revolution in Spain. The Coal Miners of Asturias 1860-1934* (Urbana/Chicago, 1987); David Ruiz, *Insurrección defensiva y revolución obrera: el octubre español de 1934* (Barcelona, 1988) and Paco Ignacio Taibo II, *Asturias, octubre 1934* (Barcelona, 2013) [1978].

⁴ Adrian Shubert, ‘Revolution in Self-Defence: The Radicalization of the Asturian Coal Miners, 1921-1934’, *Social History*, 7, No. 3 (1982), p. 269; Paco Ignacio Taibo II, ‘Las diferencias asturianas’, in Gabriel Jackson et al., *Octubre 1934. Cincuenta años para la reflexión* (Madrid, 1985), pp. 231-241; Ruiz, *Insurrección*, pp. 94-97. When explaining the *why* of October 1934, emphasis is on either radicalisation or socialist responsibility for organising the insurrection. E.g. Juan Avilés, ‘Los socialistas y la insurrección de octubre de 1934’, *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma, Serie V, Historia contemporánea*, 20 (2008), pp. 129-157. As Shubert noted, the two explanations are far from mutually exclusive and are in fact mutually dependent. Shubert, ‘Revolution’, pp. 265-267.

⁵ A summary in Bernardo Díaz Nosty, *La comuna asturiana. Revolución de octubre de 1934* (Bilbao, 1974), pp. 338-340.

⁶ José Canel [José Díaz Fernández], *Octubre rojo en Asturias* (Barcelona, 1984) [1935], pp. 145-146.

⁷ Joseba Louzao Villar, 'Catholicism Versus Laicism: Culture Wars and the Making of Catholic National Identity in Spain, 1898-1931', *European History Quarterly*, 43, No. 4 (2013), p. 658.

⁸ Julio de la Cueva, 'Movilización política e identidad anticlerical, 1898-1910', *Ayer*, 27 (1997), pp. 101-125. A summary of the development of anticlericalism prior to 1931 in Maria Thomas, *The Faith and the Fury. Popular Anticlerical Violence and Iconoclasm in Spain, 1931-1936* (Eastbourne/Portland, 2013), pp. 22-44.

⁹ The Church's isolation from the industrial working class in Frances Lannon, *Privilege, Persecution and Prophecy. The Catholic Church in Spain 1875-1975* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 93-95.

¹⁰ Paul Preston, *The Coming of the Spanish Civil War. Reform, Reaction and Revolution in the Second Republic* (London/New York, 1978), p. 35. For rallies in Salamanca, Mary Vincent, *Catholicism in the Second Spanish Republic. Religion and Politics in Salamanca, 1930-1936* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 180-183. See also William J. Callahan, *The Catholic Church in Spain, 1875-1998* (Washington, 2000), p. 310. The main study of the CEDA continues to be José Ramón Montero, *La CEDA: El catolicismo social y político en la II República*, 2 vols, (Madrid, 1977) but on the youth-wing see Sid Lowe, *Catholicism, War and the Foundation of Francoism* (Eastbourne/Portland, 2010).

¹¹ A recent summary of secularism during the Republic through a frame of 'tolerance' and 'intolerance' is Julio de la Cueva, 'El laicismo republicano: tolerancia e intolerancia religiosa en la Segunda República española', *Mélanges de la Casa de Velázquez*, 44, No. 1 (2014), pp. 89-109.

¹² Ruiz limits his analysis to two paragraphs while Shubert describes the killing of religious brothers in Turón as part of revolutionary 'excesses'. Less insightful but empirically informative is a short chapter by Taibo, which lists 'encounters' and incidents. Ruiz, *Insurrección*, p. 130; Adrian Shubert, 'The epic failure: the Asturian revolution of October 1934', in Paul Preston (ed.), *Revolution and War in Spain 1931-1939* (London, 1984), p. 132; Taibo, *Asturias*, pp. 375-381. On secularism and anticlericalism as much neglected, Julio de la Cueva, 'Religious Persecution, Anticlerical Tradition and Revolution: On Atrocities against the Clergy during the Spanish Civil War', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 33, No. 3 (1998), p. 355. Important early studies include Joan Connelly Ullman, *Tragic Week. A Study of Anticlericalism in Spain*, (Cambridge, MA, 1968); Manuel Delgado, *La ira sagrada. Anticlericalismo, iconoclastia y antiritualismo en la España contemporánea* (Barcelona, 1992); José Álvarez Junco, 'El anticlericalismo en el movimiento obrero', in Jackson *et al.*, *Octubre*, pp. 283-300; Richard Maddox, 'Revolutionary Anticlericalism and Hegemonic Processes in an Andalusian Town, August 1936', *American Ethnologist*, 22, No. 1 (1995), pp. 125-143; Bruce Lincoln, 'Revolutionary Exhumations in Spain, July 1936', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 27 (1985), pp. 240-260. A very different perspective in the work of

Vicente Cárcel Ortí, who depicts a Church persecuted during the Republic and Civil War, e.g. *La gran persecución* (Barcelona, 2000).

¹³ Key works include María Pilar Salomón Chéliz, *Anticlericalismo en Aragón. Protesta popular y movilización cívica (1900-1939)* (Zaragoza, 2002); edited collections by Julio de la Cueva and Feliciano Montero including *Laicismo y catolicismo. El conflicto político-religioso en la Segunda República* (Alcalá de Henares, 2009) and *Izquierda obrera y religión en España (1900-1939)* (Alcalá de Henares, 2012), also their *La secularización conflictiva* (Madrid, 2007); Manuel Suárez Cortina, *Entre cirios y garrotes: Política y religión en la España contemporánea* (Santander/Cuenca, 2014); Eduardo Sanabria, *Republicanism and Anticlerical Nationalism in Spain* (New York, 2009). There are numerous regional studies, but coverage is patchy, with Asturias a notable absence.

¹⁴ This figure slightly lowers Montero Moreno's original calculation. David Martín Rubio, 'La persecución religiosa en España. Una aportación sobre las cifras', *Hispania Sacra*, 53 (2001), pp. 63-89; Antonio Montero Moreno, *Historia de la persecución religiosa en España, 1936-1939* (Madrid, 1961). For a recent comparative overview, Julio de la Cueva, 'El asalto de los cielos: una perspectiva comparada para la violencia anticlerical española de 1936', *Ayer*, 88 (2012), pp. 51-74.

¹⁵ E.g. Feliciano Montero García, Antonio César Moreno Cantano and Marisa Tezanos Gandarillas (coords), *Otra iglesia. Clero disidente durante la Segunda República y la Guerra Civil* (Gijón, 2013). Brief comments on survival in José María Sánchez, *The Spanish Civil War as a Religious Tragedy* (Indiana, 1987), p. 57. A summary of those who 'did not suffer persecution in the red zone' during the Civil War in Asturias in Ángel Garralda García, *La persecución religiosa del clero en Asturias 1934, 1936 y 1937: Martirios y odiseas* (Avilés, 2009) [1977], pp. 807-818.

¹⁶ A concise summary in José Luis Ledesma, 'Enemigos seculares: la violencia anticlerical (1936-1939)' in Cueva and Montero, *Izquierda obrera*, pp. 219-244. Further on anticlerical violence, Julio de la Cueva, "'Si los curas y frailes lo supieran...'" La violencia anticlerical', in Santos Juliá *et al.* (eds), *Violencia y política en la España del siglo XX* (Madrid, 2000), pp. 191-233; José Luis Ledesma, *Los días de llamas de la revolución. Violencia y política en la retaguardia republicana de Zaragoza durante la guerra civil* (Zaragoza, 2003); Thomas, *Faith and Fury*.

¹⁷ See Mary Vincent, 'Made Flesh? Gender and Doctrine in Religious Violence in Twentieth-Century Spain', *Gender & History*, 25, No. 3 (2013), pp. 668-80 and "'The keys of the kingdom': religious violence in the Spanish civil war, July-August 1936', in Chris Ealham and Michael Richards (eds), *The Splintering of Spain. Cultural History and the Spanish Civil War, 1936-1939* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 68-90; Thomas, *Faith and the Fury*.

¹⁸ Noval Suárez, *Langreo Rojo*, p. 17.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 53.

-
- ²⁰ Daniel Renfrow, 'A Cartography of Passing in Everyday Life', *Symbolic Interaction*, 27, No. 4 (2004), pp. 485-486; Erving Goffman, *Stigma. Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity* (Harmondsworth, 1968) [1963], p. 92 ff.
- ²¹ Goffman, *Stigma*, p. 24.
- ²² Ibid., p. 59.
- ²³ See Adam Kendon, *Gestures: Visible Action as Utterance* (Cambridge, 2004); Michael Braddick, 'The Politics of Gesture', *Past and Present*, Supplement 4 (2009), pp. 9-35; Jan Bremmer and Herman Roodenburg, *A Cultural History of Gesture: From Antiquity to the Present Day* (Oxford, 1991).
- ²⁴ Kendon, *Gestures*, p. 15; Braddick, 'The Politics of Gesture', p. 10, p. 12.
- ²⁵ David Arnold, 'Salutation and Subversion: Gestural Politics in Nineteenth-Century India', *Past and Present*, Supplement 4 (2009), pp. 191-193.
- ²⁶ Elaine Ginsberg, 'Introduction: The Politics of Passing', in Elaine Ginsberg (ed.), *Passing and the Fictions of Identity* (Durham, N.C./London, 1996), pp. 2-3. Nella Larsen's novel *Passing* has received much attention, e.g. Judith Butler, 'Passing, Queering: Nella Larsen's Psychoanalytic Challenge', in *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of 'Sex'* (New York/Abingdon, 1993), pp. 167-185.
- ²⁷ E.g. Stephen Hopkins, 'The Soviet Politics of the Self in the 1930s', *Labour History Review*, 73, No. 3 (2008), pp. 336-347; Matthew Rendle, 'The Problems of "Becoming Soviet": Former Nobles in Soviet Society, 1917-1941', *European History Quarterly*, 38 (2008), pp. 7-33; Sheila Fitzpatrick, *Tear off the masks! Identity and imposture in twentieth-century Russia* (Princeton, 2005).
- ²⁸ Discussion of these accounts in Brian D. Bunk, *Ghosts of Passion. Martyrdom, Gender and the Origins of the Spanish Civil War* (Durham, N.C./London, 2007).
- ²⁹ E.g. *Episodios de la Revolución en Asturias. Los pasionistas de Mieres (Asturias) y la revolución de octubre de 1934. Episodios narrados por los mismos protagonistas* (Santander, 1935), p. 10. Such a portrayal would be reprised and developed by Francoism. See discussion of this view and the problems posed by martyrological accounts in Vincent, "The keys of the kingdom", pp. 72-75.
- ³⁰ Garralda García, *La persecución*.
- ³¹ Noval Suárez, *Langreo Rojo*, p. 12; Ministerio del Trabajo, *Censo de la población de España [1930]...Regiones de Asturias y León. Cuadernos III y X* (Madrid, 1942), p. 3.

-
- ³² Official figures state that over 5,000 children were educated at schools owned by the mining companies and run by religious personnel in 1932-3. Ángel Mato Díaz, *La escuela primaria en Asturias (1923-1937). Los procesos de alfabetización y escolarización* (Oviedo, 1992), p. 205.
- ³³ Garralda García, *La persecución*, pp. 316-319. Some teachers at the de la Salle school in Turón, such as Claudio Bernabé Cano, had only just arrived for the start of the academic year. *Los mártires de Turón. Notas biográficas y reseña del martirio de los religiosos bárbaramente asesinados por los revolucionarios en Turón (Asturias) el 9 de octubre de 1934* (Madrid/Barcelona, 1934), p. 27.
- ³⁴ *Episodios*, p. 2.
- ³⁵ Goffman, *Stigma*, p. 68.
- ³⁶ Renfrow, 'A Cartography of Passing', p. 489.
- ³⁷ Goffman, *Stigma*, p. 11.
- ³⁸ E.g. cartoons in *La Tarde*, 11 July 1935; *Asturias*, 9, 23 November 1935.
- ³⁹ Asociación Católica Nacional de Propagandistas de Oviedo, *Asturias Roja (Octubre de 1934). Sacerdotes y religiosos perseguidos y martirizados* (Oviedo, n.d. [1935]), p. 99.
- ⁴⁰ *Episodios*, p. 46.
- ⁴¹ *Episodios*, p. 35; Noval Suárez, *Langreo Rojo*, p. 88.
- ⁴² For this in the Civil War, see Thomas, *Faith and The Fury*, pp. 125-126; Maddox, 'Revolutionary Anticlericalism', pp. 125-143.
- ⁴³ See the account of Aurelio de Llano Roza de Ampudia who visited convents in Oviedo: *Pequeños Anales de Quince Días. Revolución en Asturias Octubre de 1934* (Oviedo, 1935), p. 17, p. 26, p. 35, p. 50, pp. 61-62, pp. 81-82. See also ACNP, *Asturias Roja*, p. 88.
- ⁴⁴ ACNP, *Asturias Roja*, p. 76; Garralda García, *La persecución*, p. 370.
- ⁴⁵ Vincent, "'The keys of the kingdom'", p. 86.
- ⁴⁶ Marjorie Garber, *Vested Interests. Cross-dressing and Cultural Anxiety* (London, 1993), pp. 21-32; William Keenan, 'Of Mammon Clothed Divinely: The Profanization of Sacred Dress', *Body & Society*, 5, No. 1 (1999), p. 73.
- ⁴⁷ As Goffman notes, signs, such as clothing, can be stigmatised in some contexts but a source of pride in others. Goffman, *Stigma*, pp. 62-63.
- ⁴⁸ Vincent, "'The keys of the kingdom'", p. 85.

-
- ⁴⁹ See, for example, Noval Suárez, *Langreo Rojo*, p. 125, p. 127; ACNP, *Asturias Roja*, pp. 179-180.
- ⁵⁰ *La Voz de Asturias*, 30, 24 October 1934.
- ⁵¹ *Episodios*, p. 46; Francisco Martínez, *Dos jesuitas mártires en Asturias* (Burgos, 1936), pp. 36-37.
- ⁵² George Orwell, *Homage to Catalonia* (London, 1997) [1938], p. 6. Analysis of these accounts in Gerd Rainer-Horn, 'The Language of Symbols and the Barriers of Language: Foreigners' Perceptions of Social Revolution (Barcelona 1936-1937)', *History Workshop Journal*, 29, No. 1 (1990), pp. 42-64.
- ⁵³ *Episodios*, p. 46.
- ⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 115.
- ⁵⁵ ACNP, *Asturias Roja*, p. 44.
- ⁵⁶ Noval Suárez, *Langreo Rojo*, pp. 66-68.
- ⁵⁷ Martínez, *Dos jesuitas*, p. 40.
- ⁵⁸ As reported at the trial for the murder of Eufrasio. *El Noroeste*, 30 November 1935.
- ⁵⁹ *Episodios*, p. 46.
- ⁶⁰ *Ibid.*.
- ⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 64.
- ⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 46.
- ⁶³ Vincent, 'Made Flesh?', p. 671; Thomas, *Faith and the Fury*, pp. 103-104.
- ⁶⁴ *Episodios*, pp. 115-116; *El Noroeste*, 30 November 1935.
- ⁶⁵ Garralda García, *La persecución*, p. 259, p. 260.
- ⁶⁶ *Región*, 14 November 1934.
- ⁶⁷ Gottfried Korff, 'From Brotherly Handshake to Militant Clenched Fist: On Political Metaphors for the Worker's Hand', *International Labor and Working-Class History*, 42 (1992), p. 72, pp. 77-81.
- ⁶⁸ The second committee changed the password to 'PP' (*poder proletario*—proletarian power) according to Cabezas. Ruiz cites other passwords: 'Trabajadores Rojos Salud' ('*salud*, red workers'), 'FAI' (referencing an anarchist organisation) and 'Pablo Iglesias' (the founder of the Socialist Party). UHP was, however, the main password. Juan Antonio Cabezas, *Morir en Oviedo. Historia en directo (vivencias de un periodista)* (Madrid, 1984), p. 114; Ruiz, *Insurrección*, p. 98, n. 1.
- ⁶⁹ For *The Internationale*, e.g. Manuel Grossi, *La insurrección de Asturias*, (Madrid/Gijón, 1978) [1935], p. 29. For the graffiti, *La Ven de Catalunya*, 28 October 1934.

⁷⁰ *Episodios*, p. V.

⁷¹ Carlos Vega, 'Copia de un informe remitido al Comité Central del PCE por Carlos Vega relativo a los sucesos revolucionarios de octubre de 1934', Centro Documental de la Memoria Histórica, Político-Social Madrid, caja 721, expediente 3, p. 13.

⁷² *Episodios*, pp. 67-68.

⁷³ ACNP, *Asturias Roja*, p. 73.

⁷⁴ *Episodios*, p. 85.

⁷⁵ On blaspheming, Maddox, 'Revolutionary anticlericalism', p. 135. The death of Graciano González in Garralda García, *La persecución*, p. 161.

⁷⁶ *Episodios*, pp. 109-111.

⁷⁷ Grossi, *La insurrección*, pp. 50-51.

⁷⁸ *Episodios*, p. 17.

⁷⁹ Noval Suárez, *Langreo Rojo*, p. 126.

⁸⁰ Vincent, *Catholicism*, p. 62, pp. 92-5. See also work by Julio de la Cueva, e.g. 'Católicos en la calle: la movilización de los católicos españoles, 1899-1923', *Historia y política*, 3 (2000), pp. 55-80.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

⁸² Martínez, *Dos jesuitas*, p. 34.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 43.

⁸⁴ *Episodios*, pp. 116-119.

⁸⁵ Noval Suárez, *Langreo Rojo*, pp. 66-67.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 107-108.

⁸⁷ Garralda García, *La persecución*, pp. 374-375; ACNP, *Asturias Roja*, pp. 20-21.

⁸⁸ Garralda García, *La persecución*, pp. 545-546; Thomas, *Faith and the Fury*, pp. 94-95.

⁸⁹ Camín, *El Valle Negro*, p. 77.

⁹⁰ *Episodios*, p. 79.

⁹¹ Camín attributes the decision to kill Eufasio to him having ostensibly lied to the revolutionaries. Cam, *El Valle Negro*, pp. 183-185.

⁹² Fitzpatrick, *Tear off the masks!*, p. 3.

⁹³ Noval Suárez, *Langreo Rojo*, p. 110.

⁹⁴ A number of Spaniards famously hid themselves away after the Civil War, some only emerging in the 1970s. See Jesús Torbado and Manuel Leguineche, *Los topos* (Barcelona, 1977).

⁹⁵ Garralda García, *La persecución*, p. 30.

⁹⁶ Hilari Raguer, *Gunpowder and Incense. The Catholic Church and the Spanish Civil War* (London/New York, 2007), trans. Gerald Howson, pp. 146-151.

⁹⁷ Vincent, “The keys of the kingdom”, p. 72.

⁹⁸ E.g. Ledesma, ‘Enemigos seculares’; Thomas, *Faith and the Fury*.