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Dalí’s attitude toward Picasso began with admiration, which later became competition, and finally a behavior that, still preserving some features of the former two, also included provocative and exhibitionist harassment, simulated or expressed rivalry, and recognition. As we shall see, this attitude reached its climax at the great international exhibitions. On the other hand, the painter from Málaga always stayed away from these provocations and kept a completely opposite, yet watchful and serene behavior toward the impetuous painter from Figueres.

Paris 1937, New York 1939 and Madrid 1951: these three occasions in these three major cities—where confrontation between these two great Spanish painters was well-known—are good examples of the climaxes in their confrontation. These international events show their relative divergences, postures, commitments and ways of conceiving art, as well as their positions in relation to Spain. After examining the origins of their relationship, which began in 1926, these three spaces and times shall guide our analysis and discussion of this suggestive relationship.

Young Dalí: From his admiration of Picasso to his artistic promotion in Madrid, Paris and New York

The cultural centers of Madrid, Paris and New York were particularly important in Picasso’s and Dalí’s artistic influence, as well as scenes of their agreements and disagreements. On the one hand, Picasso had already lived in Madrid at the beginning of the 20th century, while Paris had then become the main scene of his artistic development, and New York played a relevant role in his promotion. On the other hand, Dalí arrived in Madrid in the early 1920s and its atmosphere allowed him to get to Paris by the end of this decade, although New York would later become his main advertising and art promotion center. Finally, the work by both artists competed again in Madrid as Spanish Francoist Administration always intended to gain the support of Spanish figures of international relevance.
This artistic and promotional route began for Dalí in 1922 upon his arrival in Madrid at the age of 18. He moved to Madrid to enroll at the Royal Academy of Fine Arts of San Fernando, and stayed in the Residencia de Estudiantes, where he became close friends with poet Federico García Lorca, filmmaker Luis Buñuel, and writer José Moreno Villa, who helped him pave the way to success. Dalí’s intimate relationships with Lorca and Buñuel are well-known, as they belonged to the same generation and shared appealing artistic projects, yet his relationship with Picasso is not so well-known. In spite of being 17 years older than Dalí (he belongs to the 1914 Generation, like Picasso himself), Moreno Villa played a distinctive supportive and mentoring role for all of them. Therefore, this was an essential relationship for the promotion of Dalí’s early works, and is closely connected with his early compulsion to meet Picasso. Although, as in many other cases, Dalí’s initial impulses were overshadowed by his later behavior, their relationship is interesting to us because Moreno Villa was an expert in art from a practical viewpoint and an art critic.

Indeed, as shown in the study on the relationship between Dalí and Moreno Villa (Cabañas Bravo, 1990: 171-89), the former was mainly immersed in Cubist approaches and fascinated by its founding master between his arrival in Madrid in 1922 and his first visit to Paris in 1926, when he went to meet Picasso in recognition of his talent and artistic status. Indeed, he would later mention “the influence [Picasso] had over me” (Dali, 1975: 108). Moreno Villa himself —with whom Dalí lived in the Residencia de Estudiantes and whose fame as an art critic grew daily— took a small picture by Dalí to the Museo del Prado for his students to compare his meticulous style with that of the Flemish painters. They had also painted together since 1924 in Julio Moisés’ Free Painting Academy, written letters to each other, and exchanged drawings and creative experiences with abundant references to Picasso, cubism and a new return to classicism. However, above all, Moreno Villa was one of the first in Madrid to talk about Dalí’s art. He did so at the Exhibition of the Society of Iberian Artists, inaugurated on May 8, 1925 in the Buen Retiro Park. Even after the inauguration of Dalí’s first individual exhibition in the Dalmau Gallery in Barcelona in October, and after having written numerous letters to each other (Cabañas Bravo, 1990: 185-8), Moreno Villa continued praising and encouraging Dalí in his new articles, highlighting his know-how, his taste for cubism, geometry and classicism, and his admiration for Picasso (Moreno Villa 1925d: 1; 1926:
Thus, it is not strange that Dalí remembered Moreno Villa in his trip to Paris and Brussels between April 11 and 28, meant to pay a twofold tribute to current and classical painting styles. That is, on the one hand, his classicism and the powerful geometric construction of his works aroused his desire to contemplate old paintings by the Flemish and Dutch painters, which took him to visit Brussels in the last days of his stay. On the other hand, Dalí also wanted to appreciate Parisian vanguard painting, represented by cubism, which also included a visit to the leader of cubism: Pablo Picasso. Dalí—who travelled with his sister and aunt—was welcomed in Paris by Luis Buñuel, who had settled in Paris the previous year and accompanied them in their visit to Brussels. Dalí had precise directions and was very well artistically recommended in several presentation letters. Two of them—which he finally did not need to use—had been provided by Barcelona gallery owner Dalmau, and were addressed to two highly reputed promoters of the cubist and surrealist movements—namely, Max Jacob, poet and friend of Picasso’s (who had visited the Residencia de Estudiantes in February), and André Breton, leader of a young trend that was to take over shortly. Besides, he also carried a letter by Lorca for painter Manuel Ángeles Ortiz, who was a close friend of the poet’s and finally introduced him to Picasso. Dalí would refer to the occasion rather ambiguously and with imprecise chronology, yet giving it great relevance and significance (Dalí, 1944: 288-9 and 1975: 107-8). For such an anticipated occasion, Dalí also carried two works to show to Picasso: *Noia de Figueres (Girl from Figueres)* and *Depart. Homenatge al Noticiari Fox (Depart. “Homage to Fox Newsreel”).*

According to Dalí’s account, Picasso stared at them for a long time speechless and then showed Dalí his studio for around two hours. Dalí himself explained that the way their eyes met when he was leaving let Picasso know that this tour through his studio had been very important to him, up to the point allowing him to grasp the idea that would guide his later production (Cabañas Bravo, 1990: 190-1).

Moreno Villa, on the other hand, kept promoting Dalí’s works and was the first who introduced him into New York spheres. He did so in his 1927 visit to marry Florence Loucheim—“red-haired Jacinta”, as he called her in the verses and articles where he narrated his Kafkaesque 3-month stay that included a failed wedding. On his way to New York via Barcelona, Dalmau gave him a wedding present on behalf of his friend Dalí: the small picture *Venus and Cupids* (1925), from Dalí’s last exhibition at the Dalmau Gallery.
Then, on March 17 the critic gave a speech at the Philosophy Hall of the University of Columbia titled *Modern Art in Spain*, in which he said to have presented “Dalí’s still incipient works for the first time in America”. This speech was repeated the following day by Florence in a girls school (Moreno Villa, 1944/1976: 130, 136-7; Cabañas Bravo, 1990: 195-6; Huergo, 2001: 79).

Dalí was back in Paris in 1929 and, after being introduced by Buñuel, quickly fitted in the surrealist troupe led by André Breton. His fame started to grow quickly and his friends in Madrid were progressively left behind. Dalí and Moreno Villa also grew apart soon, as occurred with some other friends from the Residencia de Estudiantes such as Buñuel, Pepín Bello, Rafael Alberti and Rafael Sánchez Ventura. The reasons for this growing apart included his marriage to Gala that year and his future concessions to rightwing politics. Besides, Moreno Villa himself recalled the revealing anecdote of his wedding present: when Dalí and Gala visited him at the Residencia de Estudiantes some years later, the couple took the small picture with them under the pretext that the price of Dalí’s works was rocketing (Cabañas Bravo, 1990: 196-7).

The aforementioned precedents, together with new factors, undoubtedly paved the way for Dalí’s enthusiastic breaking into the United States. These factors include, firstly, the positive reports about Dalí sent since 1927 by Margaret Palmer, who worked for the Carnegie Institute, as well as by critics such as Moreno Villa, who later opened the doors of international exhibitions for him. Secondly, the fact that some of his works such as *Persistence of Memory* had already had a notorious impact in the United States. This work was in both the surrealist exhibition inaugurated in January 1932 in Julien Levy’s New York gallery, and the Chicago World Fair (from May to November 1933, and from June to October 1934). Finally, after these successful events, Dalí himself arrived in New York in November 1934. He was invited by Levy to take part in his third individual exhibition in United States (Pérez Segura 2012: 154-83; Robledo 2011: 105-20). Nevertheless, the Spanish Civil War came soon and changed the scene completely.

Within this new framework, Moreno Villa kept relating Picasso’s and Dalí’s figures in his new stay in the United States, which began on February 17, 1937. This cultural propaganda mission to support the Spanish Republic included giving speeches and exhibiting war drawings from February to May at different universities and Hispanic cultural centers in Washington, New York, Princeton, New Brunswick and Baltimore.
One of his most incisive and significant speeches had this illustrative title: *The Crisis of Painting and the Relationship between the Painter and War and Revolution*. Supporting the idea that both recent and historic aesthetic stances were then under revision, this speech mainly compared Picasso’s and Dalí’s stances in relation to art and war. Thus, Picasso was attributed the creation of neutrality as evasion and liberation of the struggle; Moreno Villa considered cubism’s illusion of reality and drama no longer valid for wartime. However, he was even harsher with Dalí and his surrealist art, as he compared them “with our warlike and tragic state of mind”. He thus claimed that he did not know why Dalí had passed from belonging to the French surrealist group, “who declared themselves in the service of the communist revolution”, to separating from it, abandoning “politics or revolutionary objectives”, and working “to sell his products as a mere industrialist”. He did not intend to draw a “contemptuous curtain” on Dalí’s works, yet to condemn his mercantilism and, above all, stress that, in the light of war, Dalí’s world appeared “as an evident sign of decomposition and moral relaxation, as the highest type of a decadent society”, a collection of “every old and modern aberration conceived by man”. For this reason, Moreno Villa claimed:

I am sure that nobody in Spain currently appreciates Dalí’s imaginative world: either among those loyal to the Republic or among the rebels. It is not because there is no sign of love to the people or no sign of love to aristocracy, yet because his work lacks all sign of love to anything. Dalí is plain sensationalism based on audacity, brazenness and aberration. Artistic spheres shall not ask for sensationalism for a long time, but for real and positive drive upwards (Huergo, 2001: 96-9; Moreno Villa, 2001: 433-7).

After his arrival in Mexico under the same “culture militiaman” mission on May 10, 1937 Moreno Villa kept on insisting on examining the artistic crisis suffered after the outbreak of the Civil War and comparing Picasso’s and Dalí’s works. Thus, his words when interviewed on June 1 by Cardoza & Aragón (1937: 3) caused some sort of surprise. He insisted on the idea that Picasso’s cubism seemed a “neutral art” to him then, an art that had avoided human drama and depth and therefore degenerated into mere decoration. On the other hand, he also stressed that Dalí, of whom he kept drawings and sketches from
his stage in Madrid for a book (which he finally never wrote), had “enough genius” to have given “a new impulse to European painting” instead of being “the creator of an immoral work from the viewpoint of the war and tragedy that Spaniards are currently going through”. Given that these paths were also frequented by himself, Moreno Villa alluded to these ideas again on a speech given on occasion of an exhibition of his drawings on July 8 in the Palace of Fine Arts, where he explained that these hard criteria were the consequence of new times (Huergo, 2001: 99; Moreno Villa, 2001: 439-47).

Although his vision had somewhat softened in relation to Picasso in 1944, it had only worsened in relation to Dalí. Moreno Villa’s autobiography included revealing descriptions of the brilliant times that they had spent together in Madrid:

In the beginning —he wrote— [Dalí] would follow Picasso. Then, he followed surrealism and his natural morbid curiosity led him to incredibleness, due to his marriage to Paul Éluard’s former wife. Today he lives in the United States amazing the snobbish with his oddities and clowning; as jesters did in the Court of the Habsburgs. As a painter, he is a pompier to me (Moreno Villa, 1944/1976: 111-2).

Moreno Villa’s opinion on Dalí had not changed much more five years later, when he subscribed Breton’s nickname for Salvador Dali: anagram Avida Dollars. However, in spite of his aforementioned emotionless first vision, Picasso usually appeared in his writings on contemporary art as a truly classic painter who had overcome realism, being qualified as the “crushing winner” (Moreno Villa, 1951/1976: 55 and 61-2).

Paris 1937

Given Dalí’s early admiration for Picasso —which we have intended to show through the assessment of his old friend and promoter Moreno Villa, as well as how their friendship cracked due to their opposite postures after the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War— one may wonder what happened during the war for Dalí’s world of relationships and postures in Spanish and French circles to change so drastically. Disagreement and shock after this Spanish drama —together with the hard experience through which his family had gone— had a profound impact on Dalí. However, little can be understood from
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these changes in a personality so given to radicalism and extremism without the revealing analysis of his political evolution. In this sense, we must highlight a study on this issue by Javier Tusell (1999: 279-305) titled *Politics in Salvador Dalí*. We are interested in recalling his characterization of some stretches in Dalí’s political evolution up to the outbreak of the war, which marks the beginning of his difficult relationship with the Spanish Republican Administration, as well as with Picasso.

It should be borne in mind that politics had not interested young Dalí much. In the 1920s he had only been arrested for entering Cadaqués port waving a Catalanian flag, which would simply relate him to the radical pro-Catalonia and federalist environment in which he lived. Nevertheless, after his visit to Paris in 1929 and his admission into the surrealist group in 1930, he began to use politics provocatively, with some approaches to the communist party, in which surrealists were interested. The proclamation of the Second Spanish Republic in 1931 provided him with new opportunities to provoke, such as the conference that he offered in September in the Cultural Center in Barcelona, in which he approached a still very weak Trotskyist and Catalanian communism. At the same time, he became interested in Lenin and, since his accession to power in 1933, he also became fascinated by the figure —yet not the ideas— of Hitler. However, the use of these icons in his paintings gave rise to all kind of speculations and caused him numerous problems and censorship among his surrealist colleagues. Indeed, Breton led and staged a trial of Dalí in January and February 1934 for praising Hitlerian fascism that led to his expulsion from the surrealist group. However, it is also true that Breton and Dalí kept good relationships and frequently collaborated in the magazine *Minotaure* —in spite of the fact that the former paid more attention to communist orthodoxy and the latter to the subversive aspects of the surrealist movement. Not even Dalí’s visit to New York in 1934, loaded with success and new aspirations, affected his relationship with Breton, who —in spite of nicknaming him Avida Dollars in 1935— still kept receiving his collaborations for *Minotaure* in 1936 and entrusted him the scenography of the London International Surrealist Exhibition, held in summer in the New Burlington Galleries.

The escalation of violence and political rivalry in Spain must however have worried Dalí much more. In 1934, coinciding with the revolutionary process preceding the Civil War, Dalí and Gala suffered a serious attempt on their lives in an Ampurdán village on their way to France. The painter later commented that his picture *Soft
Construction with Boiled Beans (Premonition of Civil War)—which he had begun after coming back from Paris in October 1936 and subtitled Civil War Premonition in one of his classically opportunistic moves—was the result of the disgusting show that he had witnessed in 1934 revolutionary Spain. The outbreak of the Civil War caught him in London and, according to his patron Edward James, Dalí seems to have showed himself distinctly in favor of the Spanish Republic and against “Franco the Bandit”. The summary execution of Lorca at the beginning of the conflict must have startled him, as well as all the violence that devastated Spain, which he would later capture in his new works—see, for instance, Autumnal cannibalism, an oil painting from late 1936, coinciding with the serious and devouring harassment that he was suffering in Madrid (Tusell, 1999: 280-98). Both works were exhibited in New York in December 1936 and caused great impact among the American public (Jeffett, 2014: 93).

The needy Republican Government turned to several measures to attract international attention, and soon retook the invitation to take part in the great World Exposition that was then being prepared for Paris in 1937 under the title Exposition Internationale des Artes et Techniques dans la Vie Moderne. The Government intended to promote a Spanish pavilion designed as a true propaganda weapon to support the Republican cause. Picasso’s collaboration was considered very early and Dalí’s was not ruled out early either. Besides, both artists must have kept a cordial relationship. Indeed, a postcard sent by Dalí and Gala to Picasso from Italy on August 19, 1936, a month after the outbreak of the war (Madeline, 2003: 97), shows that they could be said to have shared their concern about that bloodstained, chaotic and violent Spain about which they were constantly informed and which had prevented Dalí and Gala from reaching Port Lligat (Jeffett, 2014: 88). On the other hand, Edward James himself also referred to these initial contacts with Dalí for his participation in the Spanish pavilion in Paris. He said to have been told by Dalí himself that it was “the proposal of an arriviste, but he later declared that both factions looked rather creepy to him”. As Javier Tusell (1999: 296-9) suggests, Dalí “might have attempted to get it and failed, perhaps because he had already been at odds with communist political orthodoxy”. Anyway, we shall soon see that the proposal was indeed made by communist painter and General Director of Fine Arts Josep Renau.

Picasso’s relationship with the Spanish Republican Administration, on the contrary, did not start on the right foot. However, after the outbreak of the war, it soon
became much more fluid and lasting than Dalí’s due to the former’s declared support for the Republican side. At least since June 1932, the Madrid Museum of Modern Art had intended through its director, critic Juan de la Encina, to take to Madrid the large monographic Picasso exhibition that was then being held in Paris. This initiative was even dealt with in Paris in September by vicedirector Timoteo Pérez Rubio, yet without the approval of the Board of the Museum, which only showed itself willing to collaborate with other cultural institutions. Nonetheless, Juan de la Encina let the Board know that the exhibition could be held in the Museum in the autumn of 1933, since the Ministry of National Education and Fine Arts was to meet security and transport costs (Tusell, 1999: 232-3). Nevertheless, the first official contacts between the Spanish Second Republic and Picasso to organize a tribute exhibition in Madrid set off in September 1933. Indeed, Director of Fine Arts Ricardo de Orueta, who was also from Málaga, contacted the Spanish Ambassador in Paris Salvador de Madariaga with this purpose, but failed to put the project into motion as the ambassador stressed the painter’s lack of interest in the initiatives of Spanish diplomacy.4

Nevertheless, Picasso visited Spain in 1934 and met Ernesto Giménez Caballero in San Sebastián, with whom he talked about a Picasso exhibition in Madrid organized by the Spanish Republic. Indeed, the Republic had sent a representative the year before to communicate Picasso their willingness to organize it, as well as their inability to guarantee the safety of his paintings, although Guardia Civil was humorously suggested to keep an eye on the railway during their transport. According to the writer, Picasso told this anecdote among a group of fascists that included José Antonio Primo de Rivera, who assured him that someday they would pay for canvas insurance and that Guardia Civil would be there, but only to receive Picasso (Tusell, 1981: 36). Anyway, the General Board of Fine Arts, suppressed in September 1935, had to wait for conservative governments to pass (from September 1933 to February 1936) and the arrival of new popular front governments to retake similar initiatives (Cabañas Bravo, 2014: 56-64). Fortunately, good sense guided the next important initiative for a Picasso exhibition, so it neither came specifically and directly from official representatives, nor consisted of an individual exhibition to be held in Madrid.

It was then a great exhibition organized by the active Society of Iberian Artists, some of whose initiatives were occasionally supported by the Republican
Administration. In 1936 different collaborators proposed a large arrival of Spanish art to Paris, giving special relevance to Picasso. In spite of his initial reluctance, he ended up agreeing with the selection of his works and his inclusion in this collective exhibition of Spanish art. Although it was initially to be titled *From Zuloaga to Picasso* to stress its chronological and aesthetic limits, Manuel Abril (organizer), Luis Blanco Soler and Timoteo Pérez Rubio finally decided to title it *L’Art Espagnol Contemporain*. It was held between February 12 and April 5, 1936 in the Galerie Nationale du Jeu de Paume with this extensive and complex collection: 407 works by 144 artists, among whom painters Picasso, Miró, Juan Gris, Dalí, María Blanchard, Maruja Mallo, Moreno Villa, Sorolla, José María Sert, Solana, Vázquez Díaz and Zuloaga stood out, as well as sculptors Gargallo, Julio González, Hugué, Mateo Hernández and Rebull. The Spanish Republic intended this collaboration with the Society of Iberian Artists to show the diverse reality of its achievements and its artistic contribution, yet highlighting a series of artists such as Picasso, Blanchard, Solana, Vázquez Díaz, Gargallo, Mateo Hernández and Hugué, who got much wider representation, even in special rooms. Besides, Picasso’s presence (11 works) and significance were highlighted in the catalogue texts, written by the aforementioned critic and Director Juan de la Encina, and Hispanist Jean Cassou. The latter also praised Dalí, of whom only one work was exhibited. The exhibition was an unquestionable success since 30,000 visitors went to it, and the French state purchased 12 works (Pérez Segura, 2002: 225-64).

The Spanish Civil War broke out shortly afterwards, and the issue of supporting Picasso was then approached in a different way by the new director of fine arts, with whom Dalí would soon be at odds. Indeed, with war in the background, socialist Largo Caballero formed a new Government in early September 1936. Jesús Hernández was appointed Minister of Public Education and Fine Arts, while young, impetuous, Valencian poster designer Josep Renau was appointed director of fine arts on September 9. The action of this 29-year-old promising, politically committed artist was mainly based on the concentration of administrative management and decision making in the three successive capital cities in the Republican side: Madrid, Valencia and Barcelona. He mainly looked for international projection in Paris, which he visited on several occasions. Thus, he undertook a remarkable task of reorganization, centralization and subordination of the services under his competence (mainly management, promotion, teaching, and culture and
art safeguard). Within a different framework, he even played a parallel, influential, creative and theoretical role. However, above all, Renau unfolded and developed a great activity in two wide action fields: Spanish cultural heritage protection, promotion and dissemination, and—in relation to the aforementioned warlike requirements—propaganda and socio-cultural activism (Cabañas Bravo, 2007a: 27-9).

The latter field—usually related to the former and art promotion abroad—soon took him to contact the Spanish artists living in Paris to ask them for their collaboration. These artists were given singular prominence in the Republican adventure that finally resulted in the Spanish pavilion for the 1937 *Exposition Internationale des Arts et Techniques dans la Vie Moderne*. Renau, who clearly understood the transcendence of the times and the obtained support and results, soon wanted to leave written record of his role among the promoters of this experience. In fact, he redrafted many times a writing that he finally titled *Fate and Troubles with Guernica and its Mother*, which put forward his evocative memories and experiences in relation to the commission and execution of the famous mural painting, as well as numerous references to his stays in Paris under the mission of achieving support from artists living there—with the only discordant example of Dalí, as we shall see later on—and the subsequent organization and installation of this Spanish representation.

However, Renau’s official businesses in Paris did not have this only aim, as another vital action also took place in relation to international awareness of the current Republican Government’s efforts to safeguard Spanish artistic heritage. Although it shall not be analyzed in depth here, it was recalled by Renau in another important book titled *Art in Danger 1936-1939* (Renau, 1980), which contributed abundant information on his action regarding the aforementioned pavilion, as both actions were interrelated. Besides, given the transcendence of his action in warlike times, Renau left multiple references in articles and interviews about these official missions in Paris, together with other actions mentioned in passing, such as his direction and management of Valencian magazine *Nueva Cultura* between 1925 and 1937 (Renau, 1977: xii-xxiv), when his mediation enabled the first publication of Dora Maar’s pictures showing different evolutionary states in the making of *Guernica*. However, regarding his memories, particularly those in the aforementioned manuscripts and books, it should be borne in mind that—in spite of
septuagenarian Renau’s willingness to place events correctly—his warnings about his own hesitations and lack of certainty are also frequent, as no documents are preserved.

It is however true that Picasso’s collaboration soon appeared in the list of tasks that the young Valencian publicist artist resolved to undertake even before visiting Paris. Indeed, immediately after taking over his post in Madrid, Renau suggested Jesús Fernández the appointment of Pablo Picasso as director of the Museo del Prado, an intention that the minister and journalist announced to the press on September 12, 1936 and put into effect by means of the corresponding decree signed by President Manuel Azaña. Renau commented that his proposal was preceded by an ‘exploring letter’ written by his Secretary Antonio del Toro and signed by himself. This letter was replied by Picasso himself with deeply moved acceptance, remaining at the Government’s service and stressing his understanding of the Republican cause in the ongoing war (Cabañas Bravo, 2007a: 167 and 2007b: 144-5; Renau, 1981b: 18).

Before mid September 1936, the French press had already informed about this offer to Picasso to direct the Museo del Prado, and Paul Éluard himself let Gala know in a letter on September 15 (Jeffett, 2014: 88). Communication with Picasso may have been channeled through Luis Araquistáin since his appointment as Spanish ambassador on September 19 (Tusell, 1981: 38), as he became an enthusiastic instigator of the Spanish participation in the 1937 World Exposition. In any case, Picasso’s enthusiastic acceptance was the first symptom of his support for the Republican faction. Regarding artistic creation, this symptom was confirmed when Picasso, on his own initiative, began to etch in the early days of January 1937 the two plaques known as Sueño y mentira de Franco (Franco’s Dream and Lie). These plaques, finished in mid June 1937, were a series of vignette-shaped small images satirizing Franco’s action and condemning his destruction of culture. However, Picasso never visited Madrid or Valencia to take over the post that he had accepted. Antonio del Toro argues that, on the one hand, “any declaration by Picasso was believed to have more repercussion from Paris than from Madrid, as the Museo del Prado was being bombed and its works were on their way to Valencia” (Renau, 1981a: 139, and 1981b: 18). On the other hand, Picasso himself had expressed to a Cuban journalist that not only was his position crystal clear in the work that he was then preparing for the Spanish pavilion and his etchings Sueño y Mentira de Franco, but that his visit to
Valencia was unnecessary in view of the extreme care that the Republic Government was paying to handle Spanish heritage, as they would soon be able to confirm in Paris.\textsuperscript{7} However, Renau soon travelled to Paris. According to Renau, he went there at the end of December 1936 with the aim of meeting Picasso as well as that of other Spanish painters living there, and sealing his collaboration for the Spanish pavilion. Indeed, this trip and the incentive of meeting Picasso are the starting points of Renau’s memories in the aforementioned 1981 manuscript:

Its first pages were written almost 45 years ago (at the end of December 1936) in the airport of Toulouse, during the long waiting for a plane, and under triply exceptional circumstances for me: it was the first time that I travelled abroad, the first time that I visited Paris and, what is more indescribable, the perspective of meeting Pablo Picasso personally, something that remained almost impossible until the very moment I shook his hand... (Renau, 1981a: 4, and 1981b: 8).

Although these memoirs of Renau’s also mention the time gap between the letter proposing Picasso as director of the Museo del Prado and the inauguration of the project for the Spanish pavilion (9 months),\textsuperscript{8} this official initiative was included in Renau’s plans for his first visit to Paris. It was therefore about completing an official mission within a clear context and with a specific objective, yet with some scarcely comforting antecedents in previous contacts between the Republican Administration and Picasso. Renau was fully aware of the international interest arisen by Civil War-immersed Spain and the need of both sides to find support for their actions abroad. Therefore, as a good publicist-artist and now official at the service of the General Board of Fine Arts, Renau soon thought of the important moral and propaganda role that could be played by internationally respected Spanish artists. The favor and complicity of internationally famous Spanish artists such as Picasso and other Paris residents transformed the 1937 World Exposition into a large showcase meant to support the Republican Government.

Thus, Renau himself has repeatedly described this stay in Paris as an official visit that took place in December 1936 and involved the specific mission of sealing the collaboration of the Spanish artists living there for the pavilion, bearing in mind that Picasso’s collaboration was his main aim. Their meetings finally ended up with their
collaboration and the commission that finally resulted in the famous mural painting known as *Guernica*. Thus, Renau described his mission in 1981 as follows:

The mission that took me to Paris was eminently political: inviting the numerous Spanish artists living there to *take part* in the Spanish people’s antifascist fight either through the proposal of some work especially conceived for the Spanish pavilion in the 1937 Exposition, or even contributing some old work. In the former case —were it a nonmovable work (e.g., a mural painting)— the invited artist could freely choose the location he considered most suitable for his collaboration; obviously, according to the architects’ plans for the pavilion. In the list of priorities for invited artists that I was given in Spain, Picasso was number one. And the great Spanish artist distinctly understood the deep reach of the message that I conveyed to him (Renau, 1981a: 23, and 1981b: 21-2).

His meeting with Picasso was full of anecdotes, which Renau put down in 1981. Before their first interview, Picasso called Max Aub (cultural attaché at the Spanish embassy) to get information about Renau and —as the painter then put it— to be able to offer this “intrepid lad” the best possible reception. On this first occasion the young director of fine arts —as recalled by himself— found himself absent-minded, yet —he added— “my second interview with Picasso removed all kind of concern and fear”, so that:

[...] I could go back to Spain with no worries and quite sure of the main thing: whatever Picasso would create for our pavilion, the resonance of his huge personality was unquestionably expected to generate sympathy and credibility for the up-in-arms Republican cause in important international spheres that had, until then, remained beyond our reach through common propaganda and information media (Renau, 1981a: 136).

Shortly after putting an end to his exile after Franco’s death, Renau also gave rather hasty interviews to the press, which was avid for knowledge on that period and the famous commission of *Guernica*. Renau sometimes expressed that “he was commissioned to give Miró a second place” (Arancibia, 1977). However, his much more pondered 1981
memoirs express that—like Picasso—Spanish artists living in Paris gave a positive response. There was one only exception though: the second of the prepared interviews, corresponding to Salvador Dalí, which turned out to be such a fiasco that it determined that he did not finally take part in the pavilion. In Renau’s words:

I completed the mission with only one incident, which was close to end in a diplomatic scandal. Even though I may alter the account of the facts, and to dispel all doubts on this important issue, I must state here something that nobody—or almost nobody—still knows: why Salvador Dalí did not take part in the Spanish pavilion for the 1937 World Exposition.

My plan consisted on visiting personally all the invited artists in strict priority order, as I had already done with Picasso. Dalí was second on my list. To prepare these interviews, the Spanish embassy had provided me with a small office, a telephone line and a typist-secretary. Shortly after my second interview with Picasso, while dictating to my secretary, Dalí unexpectedly burst into the office. He instantly and deliberately started shouting at me: “The Government is unaware of what is happening in Paris”; “Picasso is already finished and is a huge reactionary”; “the only communist Spanish painter [sic] in Paris is me”; “if you allow me into the first place...”

This ‘visit’ was a real pain. By that time I was rather impulsive and could not keep my blood cold. I suddenly got up to tell him that I was not used to being shouted at, that if he had something to complain about, he could do it right there—I said pointing out the telephone—with the Minister, the Head of Government and even the President of the Spanish Republic... I nervously looked for my address book (which was finally in a pocket of my raincoat, on a coat stand behind the desk). When I turned my head with the book on my hands, Dalí had disappeared... The secretary told me that he had turned pale. After some weeks—I cannot remember how many though—he took part in a virulent political speech organized in Paris by the POUM [Workers’ Party of Marxist Unification] and FAI [Iberian Anarchist Federation] against the Spanish Republican Government (Renau, 1981a: 23-4).
It is difficult to verify the exact date on which this sour meeting between Renau and Dalí took place. According to Renau’s account, he had already had two interviews with Picasso at that moment. The first one was in December 1936 and the second, if not in Renau’s first visit to Paris, could not have taken place until his second visit on May 29, 1937. On the other hand, as William Jeffett (2014: 93) points out, at the end of November 1936 Dalí had left Paris for New York, where he arrived on December 7, and did not come back to Paris until February, and then travelled to Austria, where he wrote and sent a postcard to Picasso on April 11. Renau’s frequent hesitations with exact dates had already been mentioned. Besides, we do know Renau was in Valencia preparing a great exhibition at the Colegio del Patriarca with the works of the House of Alba de Tormes safeguarded and taken from the House’s Palacio de Liria in Madrid. He is known to have stayed there at least until its inauguration on December 25, 1936, since he gave a speech, together with Minister Jesús Hernández, critic Juan de la Encina and sculptor Victorio Macho, and appeared in press articles and photos (Cabañas Bravo, 2007a: 131-7). For this reason, Renau must be considered to have visited Paris for the first time either before late December (i.e., at least in late November, although his tasks there may well have extended until December) or in the very last days of that year.

We tend to think that, all in all, his meeting with Dalí may well have taken place in Renau’s second visit to Paris, as we know he also visited Picasso, who gave him Dora Maar’s pictures for their publication in magazine *Nueva Cultura*. Anyway, regardless of the exact date, their aforementioned argument seems to have definitely broken Dalí’s connection with this initiative of the Spanish Republic. We do not know whether this fact immediately affected his relationship with Picasso, since Dalí seems to have seen *Guernica* in late May 1937 (Jeffett, 2014: 93) while Picasso was working on it in his studio at the Rue des Grands Augustins; however, it certainly did in the long run.

The case of Dalí is very singular, as he was very famous at the time, yet he was not the only great Spanish artist living in Paris who declined the Republican Government’s invitation. For instance, sculptor Mateo Hernández, greatly prestigious in French and Spanish spheres at the time, also did. The achieved participation was in any case related to the pavilion’s objectives and development, completed under difficult circumstances but enthusiastically by promoters such as Renau. Overall results, studied in
depth by Josefina Alix (1987), and Renau’s artistic and political prominence (Cabañas Bravo, 2007a: 167-215) show the completion of a huge propaganda effort aimed at displaying a progressive image of the Republican cultural policy. This can be observed in a quick review of the project, which truly began after new appointments in the new Government of Largo Caballero in September 1936. Araquistáin, the new Spanish ambassador in France, reactivated the almost completely forgotten official purpose of taking part in the 1937 World Exposition, although transforming the initial idea of a pavilion with commercial and touristic attractions into a state pavilion with new propaganda and cultural orientations and objectives. On December 17, 1936 the General Board of Fine Arts itself appointed architect Luis Lacasa as its official representative. Together with his colleague in the Catalonian Regional Government Josep Lluís Sert, they were the final authors of the building and those who took the first necessary steps. On February 3, 1937, President Azaña passed a decree to appoint José Gaos, then president of the University of Madrid, Spanish general commissioner for the Exposition. The following day, Lacasa was appointed director of pavilion works at Gaos’ command. All this allowed the construction of the building to advance, whose first stone was placed on February 27 in a ceremony, which included speeches by José Gaos, French General Commissioner Edmond Labbé, and Ambassador Luis Araquistáin.

This was the beginning of the process of construction of a new exhibition space that became a landmark due to its brilliant Spanish rationalist architecture, the effective presentation of its propaganda messages and socio-political condemnation, and its exceptional artistic content. The last issue—which praised from popular to vanguard artistic proposals— comprised from a meticulous sample of Spanish popular art and folklore to the innovative works of painters such as Picasso (Guernica) and Miró (Peasant), sculptors such as Julio González (Montserrat), Alberto (Spanish Village), and Calder (Mercury Fountain), as well as those of many other artists, attractions and the powerful attention calls achieved by Renau’s photomontages, which were taken for the first time to the façade of the building that housed them.

To complete this overall plan, a huge and urgent call to action was made, since the
Exposition was to be inaugurated on May 24. On March 1, an “inter-ministerial commission” representing the Propaganda, Public Education (which delegated to Renau) and Presidency Ministries was set up in Valencia and decided “to use the Exposition discreetly to propagandize our fight.” A month later the Ministry of the Presidency also granted an extraordinary 1,750,000 peseta credit for the works in the pavilion and appointed “a commission to visit Paris” consisting of Renau as director of fine arts and president, architect José Lino Vaamonde, and publicists-artists Gori Muñoz and Félix Alonso.

Renau arrived in Paris for his second visit on May 29 to lead the pavilion’s artistic representation and orientation. He scarcely spent around 15 days in Paris this time, as he had to return to Spain to prepare materials. He visited Paris twice more until the pavilion closing on November 25, 1937. During these stays Renau closely supervised pavilion development, devoting long hours both as a participating artist, and the mural photomontage and graphic director. He conceived this work as an effective propaganda weapon for the Republican cause and its achievements, which he developed by means of a reading-visual system connecting documentary and graphic images and texts, which he took for the first time to the pavilion’s façade. Besides, Renau also introduced the parallel fixed or rotary exhibition of remarkable, highly-effective posters (Cabañas, 2007a: 167215).

On the other hand, this stay in late May was brief yet very productive, and may have included the rash meeting with Dalí that finally prevented the latter from taking part in the project, as well as new interviews with Picasso in his studio while working on Guernica. Apart from this, Renau also brought back to Valencia from this visit famous pictures on the different evolutionary states of Guernica (began by Picasso on May 1) taken by Dora Maar, Picasso’s photographer and partner at the time. These pictures were taken at the Rue des Grands Augustins, where Picasso rented a spacious studio to work on the mural painting, according to Renau (1977: xxiii). They were personally given by Picasso himself for their publication in the magazine Nueva Cultura, being finally published in the June-July issue of this magazine together with the etching series Sueño y mentira de Franco, completed between January 1 and June 7. Thus, they came ahead of Christian Zervo’s publication in Paris magazine Cahiers d’Art at the end of that year, although Zervo was the sole agent allowed to reproduce Picasso’s works. Apart from its
relevance in the artistic world, this scoop on the Valencian magazine also meant a great propaganda achievement and an important stimulus for intellectuals. Besides, it proved and insisted on Picasso’s support for the Republican cause, and consolidated his friendship with Renau and contributed Spanish national archives with this important collection of pictures documenting his work on Guernica (Cabañas Bravo, 2007a: 183).

Renau’s subsequent visits to Paris were also useful. His third visit was the longest and involved supervision of the works sent to Paris by the General Board of Fine Arts, which had set off on July 7, being back in Valencia between August 15 and 20. Renau was the artist who could work most directly on the graphic part of the project and the representation of plastic arts, which allowed him to witness the official pavilion inauguration on July 12, preceded by a presentation for the press and a celebration of pavilion artists and workers attended by both Picasso and Miró on July 10. Finally, his fourth and last visit must have been in November 1937, allowing him to attend pavilion closure on November 25. Nevertheless, there was another reason behind this visit, as Renau gave a famous and important speech to a group of museologists gathered by the United Nations’ International Council of Museums on the role of the Spanish Republic to protect artistic heritage during the Spanish Civil War (Cabañas Bravo, 2014a: 79-82 and 187-200). This speech was not far in time from a new statement by Picasso in this sense, which was aired as soon as possible by Republican propaganda. It was a telegram that Picasso sent in December to the American Artists’ Congress held in New York to apologize for staying away and to assure, “as the director of the Museo del Prado, that the democratic Republican Government have taken all the necessary measures to protect Spain’s artistic heritage from this unfair and cruel war, being now in safe condition” (Álvarez Lopera, 1982: 140).

Juan Negrín’s ministerial reorganization in early April 1938 meant the communists’ removal from the ministry of Public Education and Renau’s resignation, which was accepted on April 22. He was subsequently appointed, with the rank of comisario de batallón, director of Graphic Propaganda of the General Commission of the Central General Staff of the Popular Army, thus, in close contact with the Propaganda Sub-secretary (the agile ‘SubPro’) of the Ministry of State, presided by communist architect Manuel Sánchez Arcas and comprising many of artists under this political sign.
This meant relaunching Renau’s creativity applied to war propaganda and its extension to a wide range of media. Renau remained in this post in Barcelona until late January 1939 and completed numerous works for the active, communist-related SubPro. His first creations in this stage include the famous series of black-and-white photomontages titled Los 13 puntos de Negrín (Thirteen Points by Negrín), also known as Los 13 puntos de la Victoria (The Thirteen Points for Victory). It was a huge contribution to fix the iconographic representation of these essential peace postulates announced by Republican President Negrín on April 30, 1938, which were transmitted on posters, leaflets, magazines, etc. However, this series had a supplementary aim, as it had been devised to be presented in the Spanish pavilion for the New York World’s Fair, which was to be inaugurated in May 1939 (Cabañas Bravo, 2007a: 218-24; Murga Castro, 2010: 228; Renau, 1980: 15). Negrín’s Government aimed at repeating the success achieved in Paris in 1937, as we shall analyze later on.

Contact between Renau and Picasso did not however cut off during post-war exile. The former was interned in the Argelès-sur-Mer concentration camp, out of where he was taken by Margaret Palmer, as reported by herself in her reports (Pérez Segura, 2007: 226 and 237) and by his brother Juan’s memoirs (Renau, 2011: 54). Having settled in Toulouse before his exile in Mexico, Renau commented on this contact in 1981: When I left the horrific Argelès-sur-Mer concentration camp in 1939, Picasso sent me 1,500 francs each of the three months that I stayed in Toulouse. Then I learnt that other Spanish intellectual refugees had also received his aid. Thus, Picasso must have amply returned the famous 150,000 francs he had been paid by the Republican Government for the execution of a still completely unknown work (Renau, 1981a: 143, and 1981b: 22).

On the other side of the Atlantic, we have already analyzed through Moreno Villa how two famous painters such as Picasso and Dalí could have met abroad for the first time in February 1937, before the inauguration of the Spanish pavilion, and how they changed their mind and qualified their postures through time. However, although the aforementioned episodes placed both painters in different factions, it seems that Dalí was still in close contact and exhibiting with the surrealist group in early 1938. Nevertheless, in February 1938 a former Francoist ambassador wrote a letter asking for Dalí’s political affiliation to his counterpart in Paris, Quiñones de León, who pointed out that, at the beginning of the war, Dalí had held an extreme anti-Francoist position and still kept
friends in the popular front, so he did not think that Dalí had changed his mind and joined the Francoist faction. However, since January 1939 Dalí’s connections with the surrealist group certainly began to deteriorate spectacularly, so that in May that year his relationships with the surrealist movement were completely broken (Tusell, 1999: 299-301).

**New York 1939**

A letter to Buñuel after the Civil War (Gibson, 1998: 499-503), in which Dalí identified him with the losing side and reproached him for having continued with them, also provided a clear explanation for the reasons behind his new anti-Marxism and complete abandonment of every left-wing political position. Even his change from radical left-wing politics to the most traditional and Catholic right-wing side was due to the hardship his family had endured during the war. The family house had been looted, and his sister had been imprisoned and tortured by Republican secret services. Perhaps also raped, she had gone insane, refused to eat or utter a single word, and wetted and soiled herself. Meanwhile, his father—who was no reactionary before—had become a fanatical Francoist. However, even before the letter, Dalí had already sent unambiguous signals of his new political position in a short stay in Spain before travelling to the United States where he contacted intellectuals such as Eugenio Montes, Dionisio Ridruejo and Rafael Sánchez Mazas (Tusell, 1999: 301-2).

There is no doubt then, as several historians point out (Gibson, 1998: 499-503; Tusell, 1999: 298-302 and Jeffett, 2014: 100, among others), that the most important reason for Dalí’s radical political shift was the brutality of the Spanish civil war generally and more specifically his family’s harsh experience of it. However, Dalí still had to confront Picasso publically —this is because both were famous Spanish painters but diverged on which faction they supported in the civil war. A significant opportunity came again with an international exposition: this time, on the other side of the Atlantic.

Indeed, two years after the Paris Exposition, a new edition of the World’s Fair took place in New York—a suitable metaphor for the transfer of the cultural capital from the Old to the New World following a war that drastically changed the artistic scenario. The United States took the opportunity of the 150-year commemoration of the Government of George Washington to stage *The World of Tomorrow*, whose
configuration began on June 15, 1936. Five months later, the Second Spanish Republic received the first invitation signed by President Roosevelt to take part with a pavilion, practically at the same time its Paris counterpart was being closed. In spite of the great success of that total artistic effort that had drawn international attention on the Republican cause, it was not until September 1, 1938 that Spanish Ambassador in Washington Fernando de los Ríos let the Exposition committee know Negrín Government’s decision to take part in the event. In the middle of an offensive by the rebel faction, the Republic was going through hard times, yet decided to make a last effort to convince foreign nations of the need to revoke the Non-Intervention Pact and actively fight fascism. At this stage, experience had already proven the importance of propaganda, a key factor in the new project, which followed Paris project’s concept of highlighting the Republic’s achievements and merits by means of photomontages and art works in traditional media [Figure 1].

Unfortunately, the Republican pavilion was never inaugurated. The end of the installation of the Spanish contribution was expected for April 1939, since the World Exposition was to open its doors on April 30, so that in fact it coincided with Franco’s victory proclamation (Murga Castro, 2011: 222). The United States’ recognition of the dictator’s regime on April 2 entailed offering the Republican pavilion to the Francoist Government on the following day and the subsequent cancellation of all previous Republican preparations, which ended up as an incomplete project that —had it finally been inaugurated— would have become another landmark in Spanish contemporary art.

The new Spanish pavilion for the 1939 New York World’s Fair was therefore conceived as the last Republican SOS call, but in a much less warmongering tone than its Paris predecessor. With this purpose, a team of architects, intellectuals and artists was led by commissioners Roberto Fernández Balbuena and Jesús Martí. The project, as the previous one in Paris, combined tradition and vanguard through the inclusion of elements
of Spanish popular culture and contemporary creation. It was meant to become, above all, a huge propaganda weapon for the Spanish Second Republic. Thus, several artists were commissioned for works in honor of American commitment to support Spanish democracy. Joaquim Sunyer worked on a huge canvas on the Erica Reed cargo ship,\textsuperscript{15} and Luis Quintanilla was the author of the famous five frescoes then titled \textit{The Actual Moment in Spain}, which — apart from condemning the impact of war on civil population — also portrayed members of the Lincoln Brigade and American Red Cross nurses.\textsuperscript{16} He also worked for the Joan Rebull project, who was commissioned to produce a huge sculpture to decorate the pavilion’s façade.

To support these art pieces, commissioners also reused some of the works from the Spanish pavilion in Paris, whose shipping was coordinated from Madrid, Paris and New York.\textsuperscript{17} Thus, a key piece in the Paris pavilion was recovered by Sert and Lacasa: Alexander Calder’s \textit{Mercury Fountain}, the only work by a foreign artist, which emphasized the natural richness of the Iberian Peninsula and provided American support for the Spanish cause. Collections of regional costumes — meanwhile preserved in the Musée de l’Homme — and the ceramics contributed by couple Isabel Oyarzábal and Ceferino Palencia for the Paris Exposition were also included in this exhibition discourse.

In this line, the presence of photography was again a key factor that found its prime example in Renau’s photomontages. For this occasion Renau suggested the aforementioned series \textit{13 puntos de Negrín}, which described Republican President Negrín’s three minimum conditions for negotiations to put an end to the Spanish Civil War (Renau, 1980: 15). Unlike the Paris pavilion, photomontages were now to be exhibited indoors following the specifications of the Board of Design of the New York’s Fair, which homogenized the exterior aspect of all buildings in the Hall of Nations and allowed little variation in façade configuration. However, Renau’s intervention was not the only presence of photography in the project, since the aim was taking advantage of the New York’s Fair as a platform to spread advances in the Spanish Second Republic and, more precisely, artistic-heritage safeguard some months before the Figueres Agreement was signed. Both Balbuena and Martí had previous experience in this field — the former had been a delegate of the General Board of Fine Arts in Madrid (December 1936) and president of the Delegated Board of Artistic Heritage (January 1937), among other
positions, while the latter had designed and adapted buildings to protect heritage as a delegate and adviser of the General Board of Fine Arts in collaboration with José Lino Vaamonde (Cabañas Bravo, 2010a: 28-37). Therefore, both were aware of the Republic’s efforts to organize a pioneering task at world level that powerfully attracted foreign attention, so it was normal that this issue became one of the main objectives in the exhibition discourse. For example, it was confirmed by the demands of Timoteo Pérez Rubio, president of the Central Board of Artistic Heritage, to his delegate in Madrid, Ángel Ferrant, on October 24, 1938 to extend the print run of the photographs documenting heritage protection by Rioja, Moreno, Hauser and Menet, which had already appeared in JDTAM leaflets at the beginning of the year, “with the aim of obtaining effective propaganda at the New York World’s Fair” (Argerich 2003: 145, no. 48).

Indeed, organizers went a step further in their search for creating a buzz in the international media and considered the possibility of exhibiting in New York those works whose evacuation was documented in the photographs prior to the organization of the famous exhibition at the United Nations Office in Geneva (according to the Figueres Agreement). It was so conceived by De los Ríos, who wrote to Álvarez del Vayo on September 13, 1938 suggesting to him the advantages of “sending to America twenty, thirty or forty prime-order canvases by artists such as El Greco, Velázquez and Goya for Americans to transport and hold for a year or four months after the end of the war as Spain’s proof of friendship and confidence in the United States”. The ambassador kept on stressing the important influence that this loan would get for the Spanish Republic:

Numerous and powerful public figures, […] are interested. Before knowing whether we were going to take part or not in the 1939 World’s Fair in May, it was difficult to justify taking paintings, tapestries, etc. abroad. However, today, with the contract signed in virtue of the Government’s wise resolution, the road is open. When the president of the World’s Fair […] asked me what I thought it could be the main attraction of our pavilion, I told them I had no information on the Government’s plans, yet I harbored the illusion that Spain revealed its artistic greatness and the genius with which it fights its present tragedy. For the former, I wanted to exhibit for the first time abroad some part of the countless jewels safeguarded thanks to the Republican Government’s sensitivity and the people’s
heroism: works by El Greco, Velázquez and Goya. [...] The Board of the World’s Fair—which includes outstanding figures of the industry, admirals, State staff, etc.—told me that if we were to do that, this would be the main axis of the World’s Fair. We did not deal with this then, but we did later on with some of them: would we be allowed to charge visitors 50 cents or 1 dollar to prepare rooms as necessary? Given our heritage treasure, this would mean hundreds of thousand dollars for the Spanish Government. Tickets can be justified—if necessary—saying “for homeless children, women and elderly people.” The echo of a select exhibition—presented with exquisite taste, and unfolding a sample of Spanish artistic richness and a synthetic perspective of the constructive efforts developed nowadays amidst the tragedy that we are currently living—would be huge, immense. Preparing it means selecting the best trained, the finest, the most versed and able, leaving audacious villains and idiots aside. The moment is solemn for Spain and we have the impression that many things of which the president and you have thought in relation to Spain may depend on this. [...] Architects, archaeologists, first order painters of those who are still with us, artists of solid merit, etc. Think of all this, because the better the exhibition is, the more politically fertile the problem shall be. What advantage can we take of this if it is allowed? In my opinion, many and varied advantages:

a) The people who long for contemplating those canvases may be interested in the ‘Relief’ of refugees, even putting it as a condition, and perhaps using it for loan purposes; and

b) Exhibiting to the American world for the first time something that is unique: the Spanish artistic heritage, highlighting the efforts made to safeguard it from terrorist action.

Among those “first order painters of those who are still with us” mentioned by De los Ríos, one stood out: he whose intervention in the 1937 Exposition had become an icon much more significant than the Spanish Civil War and a symbol of the terrible impact of war conflicts on population—Pablo Picasso; and Guernica. Since the closing of the Paris Exposition, the famous painting had taken a long tour across Europe to get support for the Republican cause. Coinciding with the scheduled opening of the Spanish pavilion,
Guernica arrived in New York from Le Havre aboard the Normandie on May 1, 1939 escorted by President Juan Negrín himself, only one day before the opening of the World’s Fair. This voyage was possible thanks to the collaboration of the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign (SRRC), AAC, Peter Rhodes, member of the aforementioned committee, Juan Larrea and Picasso himself (Chipp, 1988: 160).

Some research suggests that its arrival could be related to the MoMA exhibition Art in our Time [Figure 2],

which had been inaugurated by Director Alfred H. Barr on May 8 (Van Hensbergen, 2005: 129-30) to celebrate the 10th anniversary of this New York museum and included other works by Picasso. However, Renau left a record of Sidney Janis’ petition for this work to become part of the SRRC campaign in different locations across America (Renau, 1981: 16-8), insisting with further detail on the Herschel B. Chipp process (1981: 116-8). Indeed, a letter to Margaret Palmer dated January 3, 1939 tells us that Picasso had already foreseen that his most celebrated icon would be exhibited at the Republican pavilion in New York (Pérez Segura, 2007: 216, and 2012: 124).

The presence of this work in the event provided vital support for the propaganda strategy of Spanish organizers. Indeed, Fernando de los Ríos had drawn the attention of the Ministers of Propaganda and State on May 1, 1937 on the impression made by ‘savage action’ in Guernica on the American press two years before the canvas reached the United States. As this was not finally possible, its presentation did not take place in MoMA but in a nearby location: the Valentine Gallery [Figure 3],

where a relevant inauguration was organized on May 5 and was attended by authorities of the Spanish Republican Government —led by Negrín himself— as well as other American
outstanding political, social and cultural figures such as Eleanor Roosevelt, Harold Ickes, Rockefeller, Guggenheim, Whitney, Paley and artists such as Jackson Pollock, Georgia O’Keeffe, Willem de Kooning and Dorothea Tanning, among others. “Hundred people attended this private inauguration and paid a $5 ticket. The exhibition was visited by around 2,000 people in three weeks — quite a large figure for the time, especially during the opening week of the New York World’s Fair” (Chipp, 1981: 188). Regarding the exhibition, AAC organized two symposia: one of them in front of the canvas and another in MoMA, the latter being directed by Walter Pach, who gave a speech, as well as Arshile Gorky, Leo Katz, Malcolm Cowley, Jerome Klein and Peter Blume. Afterwards, Sidney Janis prepared a Guernica tour whose first and last stages were Los Angeles on August 10 and Chicago on November 15, 1939, respectively. This tour was part of the huge retrospective exhibition Picasso, Forty Years of his Art [Figure 4],

organized by Alfred Barr for MoMA, where Picasso wanted Guernica to be kept during the Second World War and from where Barr loaned it to different American exhibition centers (Chipp, 1981: 118-22), while its influence grew larger and larger (JiménezBlanco, 2010: 59-77). It was evident that Republican authorities intended to repeat the experience of the 1937 Paris pavilion when they began the process in which the arrival of Guernica to a high-spirited New York, escorted by President Negrín himself, was incorporated. Their last card was the attraction generated by Picasso’s mural canvas.

Nevertheless, while Republican Government representatives and the involved artists were working on the New York pavilion project, there was again a striking absence: that of Salvador Dalí, who was about to reach America and start a new decadelong stage, yet was still a scarcely-known painter for the American public and critic. In this sense, unlike Picasso, his representation in the aforementioned MoMA exhibition was limited to two works owned by MoMA itself: La persistence de la mémoire (The Persistence of Memory) and L'Angélus de Gala (The Angelus of Gala). Again, for the second time, the Republican Government made no commission to Dalí for the Spanish pavilion. In
response, Dalí presented at the New York World’s Fair a whole pavilion of his works under the title *Dream of Venus.*

The original idea had come from architect Ian Woodner, who had suggested that gallery owner Julien Levy in 1938 built a Surrealist House at the heart of the World Fair, whose design was finally entrusted to Salvador Dalí. Levy’s businesses and contacts finally led to the creation of the Dalí World’s Fair Corporation, integrated by Dalí himself, Woodner and Levy, as well as William Morris, Edward James, I. D. Wolf, W. M. Gardner and Philip Wittenberg (Aguer & Fanés, 1999: 59, 84). Dalí signed a rather unfortunate contract with Edward James (Schaffner, 2002) for the design of this pavilion in which the only condition was that siren-dressed women had to appear in an aquatic show. His proposal finally consisted of a particular recreation of the feminine world divided into a ‘dry section’ and a ‘wet section’. It was a space full of visual metaphors and Freudian obsessions reflected in a true stage in which scenography and performance shaped a total art work. Unlike the purest rationalism of the International Style followed in the architecture of most pavilions, which was indeed far from the futurist ode in the World’s Fair’s motto (*The World of Tomorrow*), the space devised by Dalí was closer to a funfair seen through the lens of surrealism.

The building stood as an amorphous organic mass ending in coral-like protuberances, fragments of feminine mannequins, crustaceans and visual quotes from Botticelli’s *The Birth of Venus* and Leonardo da Vinci’s *St. John the Baptist*. Scantily dressed models poked out of some openings on the façade attracting the public’s attention and inviting them to penetrate the mysterious pavilion. In its first part, corresponding to the ‘wet section’, the dream vision of the goddess of love was supplemented by the promised models diving almost naked in a large fishbowl full of sea weeds and creatures.

In the second section, the ‘dry one’, the goddess of love was sleeping and surrounded by Dalí’s current imagery: soft watches, fire giraffes, umbrellas, bone remains, a pianomannequin and drawer-shaped human bodies. These elements were used in the press to attract the public some weeks before its inauguration (“Dalí Surrealistic Show…”, 1939: 36).

This intervention by Dalí clearly pointed out a new way to understand art in relation to mass culture that would finally determine the artist’s American stage. As explained by Félix Fanés, although it is difficult to determine the exact moment Dalí
became interested in this procedure, his experimentations with filming, photography and publicity had already drawn a differentiating line, and also responded to a new kind of spectator: from individual to collective (Aguer & Fanés, 1999: 12, 115-7). The configuration of the Dalí pavilion—which coincided with the first of his great ballet scenography projects: *Bacchanale*—had much to do with this. Although both were completed within months, Dalí had been working on the dance piece since he met Serge Denham, manager of the Russian Ballet of Monte Carlo on July 6, 1936 in London. Throughout these years, the painter had worked with choreographer Léonide Massine on a piece meant to submerge into Wagner’s universe and the concept of *amour fou* that he had initially considered calling *Le Mont de Venus*. Its characters, atmospheres, melodies and historical circumstances intertwined through a Freudian lens in most of Dalí’s scenographic productions, which finally led to *Mad Tristan* in 1944—a true exploration of ‘crazy love’. Nevertheless, the company’s unstable financial conditions, together with the difficult times produced by the rise of fascism, the Spanish Civil War and the imminent outbreak of the Second World War, delayed its debut in Paris. Finally, it was taken to the American stage shortly after the opening of *Dream of Venus*.

Dalí’s work at the World’s Fair in May 1939 hindered the completion of the preparations for *Bacchanale*, so it was not presented in Paris and failed to be integrated into the tour that the Russian Ballet of Monte Carlo had organized with London Covent Garden for September that year. It was not until November 9, 1939 that the first Dalí ballet debuted at the New York Metropolitan Opera House. In spite of all this, both productions—ballet and pavilion—are closely related, as they shared common obsessions and perspectives with very similar aims. Ballet characters and scenography included the fish-headed and Venus-legged siren, umbrellas and the drawer anatomy, among other Dalinian quotes. Plays that flit between reality and fiction, the eternal and the ephemeral, low and high culture are recurrent elements in Dalí’s mind.

Ballet became a new obsession for Dalí, who understood it as the true total art work where he could play with music, movement and literature. Besides, the result was performed live for the public, which made it a unique and unrepeatable ephemeral work. Scenography brought another attractive medium to explore in the theatre and at the World’s Fair. It allowed increased spreading of his works—an advantage that Dalí knew how to take precisely upon his arrival to America, where he wanted to make himself
known on a large scale. This stage resource was rather common among other vanguard artists, especially in wartime, and did not only offer collaborative spaces for experimentation but also worked as a life preserver in the exploration of new locations (Murga Castro, 2012).

In this sense, one of the pioneering artists that took an interest in dancing scenography was Picasso himself, who became part of the painting staff of Sergei Diaghilev’s Ballets Russes in 1916. The following year Picasso debuted with the first of half dozen ballets for which he designed costumes and curtains: Parade. Therefore, we can talk about a coherent period as a ballet scenographer in Picasso’s career between 1916 and 1924 (plus some later punctual collaborations for theatre and dance). Dalí also flirted with the stage between 1939 and 1961 in almost 30 projects; his years in America being the most prolific ones. Indeed, Picasso’s and Dalí’s scenographic facet was even compared in a 20th century Spanish ballet landmark: El sombrero de tres picos, based on the homonymous novel by Pedro Antonio de Alarcón. The Ballets Russes’ absolute debut performance of this famous music work written by Manuel de Falla took place in the Alhambra Theatre in London in 1919. Picasso’s costumes and scenography were widely acclaimed by the public and critics, and became a reference for the collaboration of plastic artists in dance shows. It cannot be by chance that Dalí completed his own scenographic version of Alarcón’s masterpiece for Ana María Spanish Ballets thirty years later (Carter, 1999). At this time, Dalí had already come back to Spain, yet he did not give up on taking on Picasso with a proposed production premiering in numerous American and Spanish theatres. However, the overall show did not receive the best reviews.

**Madrid 1951**

Already the two main references of Spanish art abroad, Picasso and Dalí kept their opposite positions in great artistic events in the following decades. Dalí had not only grown apart from the spheres of Spanish artists exiled in United States, but had returned to Spain in 1948, and the Francoist regime had turned him into a big star. Consequently, his opposition to Picasso, who was still critical of the Francoist dictatorship, found its best stage in the opposing attitudes both artists showed (mimicked by other artists) at the 1st Hispano-American Biennial of Art held in Madrid.
Again, they represented two very different ways to understand art and the artist’s action.

The success of the first edition of this Hispano-American Biennial of Art, a huge contest organized by the Instituto de Cultura Hispánica (ICH) with the close collaboration of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, undoubtedly made it the most significant and important art event in Spain under the Francoist regime (Cabañas Bravo, 1996b: xv-xvi). Nevertheless, its organization and celebration led to strong oppositions from the exiled Spanish artists. This was prompted by those living in Paris—led by Picasso—and quickly extended to South America in spite of Dalí’s opposition and call for action (Cabañas Bravo, 1996a: 21-91). However, in regard to dialogue between the Francoist regime and these highly reputed Spanish painters, the reader should bear in mind the relevance that the Biennial of Art had in trying to reconcile and return exiled Spanish painters to their motherland (Cabañas Bravo, 2005: 467-84; 2007d: 119-20, 229, 248-50, 330-45). Likewise, the intermediary role played by Biennial General Secretary Leopoldo Panero must also be commented (Cabañas Bravo, 2012: 183-208, and 2007d: 344-5).

However, the new biennial contest developed throughout the 1950s under the so-called “policy of Spanishness” was more aimed at obtaining diplomatic benefit than at a purely artistic and cultural objective, although the latter also bore great importance. It was held on three occasions and gathered artists from the community of Hispanic countries, including Portugal, Brazil, the Philippines, United States and Canada as honorary guests. It was characterized by a series of common formal, organizational and aesthetic elements such as its official framework, and its measured and eclectic orientation. All editions shared a similar regulation frame (with a classical contest division, and a rather peculiar selection system): supplementary exhibitions were held to support and highlight the contest section, and anthological exhibitions were held with promotional purposes after the closing of the Biennial of Art. Externally, a large group of
artists persistently kept a clear attitude of opposition and boycott, as the Biennial was called by a dictatorial regime.

Contest statutes themselves established its development in Spain, although this location was alternated with other Hispanic countries. The 1st Biennial of Art achieved great success in Madrid between October 1951 and February 1952, concluding with an anthological exhibition in Barcelona. The 2nd Biennial of Art was promoted as a Caribbean Biennial Contest and took place in Havana between May and September 1954, being supplemented with 9-month anthological exhibitions in Dominican Republic (Santo Domingo), Venezuela (Caracas and Mérida), and Colombia (Bucaramanga, Medellín, Cali, Popayán, Tunja and Bogotá). Finally, the 3rd Biennial of Art was back in Spain and took place in Barcelona between September 1955 and January 1956, concluding with anthological exhibitions in Zaragoza and Geneva.27

The most important edition, however, was the first one, due to its strong and significant impact on the orientation of the Spanish art policy, and its great success, which allowed contest continuity and increased its propaganda potential as an effective tool for the Spanishness policy. It was inaugurated in Madrid by General Franco amidst great solemnity and ostentation on the significant day of October 12, 1951: Columbus Day and commemoration year of the 5th Centenary of the birth of Isabella the Catholic and Christopher Columbus [Figure 6].

The new Minister of Education, Joaquín Ruiz Giménez, gave the inauguration speech and took the opportunity to demand the official admission of new artistic trends and the end of State protection of academic art. The exhibition—preceded by remarkable selection exhibitions—opened in Madrid for almost 5 months, until February 1952. Apart from significant artistic controversies and polemical exhibitory actions, more than half million visitors (an unprecedented figure at the time) had access to a huge set of contesting works in several buildings, as well as to interesting retrospective exhibitions. Thus, more than 2,000 works were exhibited in spaces specifically prepared for the occasion and numerous
generous prizes were awarded. The exhibition was peppered with controversies that came from the participating artists, the kind of art exhibited and the winning artists, who also contributed by shunning the privileges of academic art and its promotion (Cabañas Bravo, 1996b: 551-625). We shall see how Picasso and Dalí were not unaware of the remarkable resonance and great success of this event, which was soon to be taken to Barcelona in an anthological exhibition.

Leopoldo Panero had already begun to organize the 1st Biennial of Art much earlier. In November 1950 he announced some innovative provisional statutes that referred to the international importance of the “Spanish painter” Pablo Picasso and Spain’s need to undergo “detoxification” of academic panels of judges who had, “little by little, led our Utrillo, Picasso, Miró and Mateo Hernández to abandon us.” However, the protests of now displaced academic artists forced its orientation toward eclecticism. Panero assured that the list of direct invitations — sent on May 1951 to more than 150 highly reputed artists including exiles — included the names of Miró, Picasso and Dalí, who were clear references for the youth and encouraged the participation of foreign and exiled artists. However, their political posture differed widely (Cabañas Bravo, 1996b: 303-31): from Picasso’s combative rejection through Miró’s polite inhibition to Dalí’s enthusiastic adhesion.

Indeed, Picasso left the invitation unanswered and even led the signing of a manifesto in early September 1951 with other Spanish exiles in Paris such as Baltasar Lobo, Arturo Serrano Plaja and Antonio Aparicio (in the organizing committee) calling for Spanish and Latin American artists to boycott the Biennial of Art. They argued that it was called for by the Francoist regime to gain prestige in America, and proposed replication acts and exhibitions: a counter-Biennial in Paris and major Latin American cities. The manifesto initially had little impact on the participation of artists living in Spain and some invited countries, since the contesting selection had already been made when the manifesto was published in the Spanish press on October 1, yet it was soon used to show Picasso’s resentful attitude and political implications. Some days later, when Dali announced his outright opposition to the manifesto, Picasso’s attitude was described as “antipatriotic” and “communistoid”. The manifesto and its contest rejection proposal got greater impact by means of counter-Biennial exhibitions abroad. Several rejection actions were developed, among which one organized by the Free Art
Workshop on October 12 in the Caracas Cultural Center stood out, as it included anti-Francoist cultural activities, was supported by Picasso and was reopened on November 30 in the Galerie Henri Tronche in Paris. Nevertheless, the largest and most important exhibition gathered outstanding Mexican and exiled Spanish artists and was inaugurated with some delay on February 12, 1952 in the Pavilion Flor in the Bosque de Chapultepec (Mexico). Apart from this, we must also recall that the formula of protest writings and the counter-Biennial staged by Picasso was later used abroad to reprobate the following Biennial editions (Cabañas Bravo, 1996a: 11-149, and 1996b: 303-26 and 515-50).

On the other hand, it is interesting that the appearance of Dalí ironically triggered a call for Spanish and Latin American artists to take part in the Biennial of Art, in contrast to Picasso’s opposing and boycotting attitude. Indeed, Dalí had been included in the same list of invitations as Picasso. The press had already stated since early August that Dalí was in Barcelona and had decided to take part with his The Madonna of Portlligat, The Basket of Bread and other current productions on which he was then working and that would highlight the mysticism of Dalí such as Christ, based on the visions of St. John of the Cross. His participation—which Dalí expected to make him famous in his own country—and his preparation for the Biennial inauguration were greatly publicized to encourage prestigious Spanish and foreign artists to take part. However, on the inauguration eve, ICH Director Alfredo Sánchez Bella announced the agreement reached with Dalí, who would exhibit new works but would not attend the Biennial of Art until January 1952, near its closing, since he was obliged by contract to exhibit first in the Lefevre Gallery in London; the collection would then travel directly to Madrid.

It was also in early October that the Spanish press announced Picasso’s manifesto, an occasion of which Dalí took advantage to harass him and publicly define his opposite position. He did so by writing a telegram to the ICH director in which he announced his enthusiast adhesion to the Biennial of Art, his arrival for its closing and called Spanish and Latin American artists not to follow Picasso. The telegram—which spread like wildfire in the press—read:

Above all kind of politics, the real Spain is in Spain. Its spiritual empire culminated and shall culminate in painters with the genus of Picasso, even in spite of his current communism. In view of Picasso’s attempt to sabotage our Biennial
of Art, I beg Spanish and Latin American painters not to follow him. I make all necessary arrangements for my London exhibition to be shipped en bloc to Madrid with the aim of solemnly closing the Biennial, as previous arrangements have prevented me from attending its inauguration. I authorize the publication of this telegram in the press. Cordial regards —Salvador Dalí.

From that time on, as previously advanced, comments in the Spanish press constantly alluded to Dalí’s patriotic attitude — accordingly, official doors remained definitely open for him in Spain — in opposition to Picasso’s “antipatriotic” stance — about whom distrust grew. However, this was not the end of Dalí’s action, who insisted repeatedly on the contrast between his stance and Picasso’s. Panero himself — who knew how to attract Dalí’s figure as a response to Picasso’s rejection — also managed through critic Rafael Santos Torroella to encourage Dalí to give a conference on this issue within the Biennial of Art program. It was initially planned to take place at the stairs of the Palace of Libraries and Museums — which housed the Biennial headquarters — yet for security reasons it was finally moved to Teatro María Guerrero. Nevertheless, on the eve of Dalí’s arrival in Madrid, Panero himself called a press conference in the Museum of Modern Art to present him to masses of journalists, photographers, NO-DO newsreel producers, etc., who questioned him on the conference, the Biennial of Art, Picasso, etc., thus causing increased expectation
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The following day found Madrid taken by this controversial artistic environment caused by the Biennial of Art. Indeed, Dalí gave his multitudinous and extremely wellknown conference *Picasso i yo* in the Teatro María Guerrero [Figure 8],
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whose 1,000-seat capacity was alarmingly exceeded by 5,000 attendants including numerous journalists, photographers and policemen. Provocatively, Dalí started his conference with some words that became famous:

As always, the honor of maximum contrasts belongs to Spain. This time to two of the most antagonistic painters in contemporary painting: Picasso and me, at your service. Picasso is Spanish; so am I. Picasso is a genus; so am I. Picasso may be around 72, and I may be around 48. Picasso is known worldwide; so am I. Picasso is a communist; nor am I.

After passionate applauses, Dalí continued with a striking exposition of his theories on Picasso’s communism and Spanishness in the origin of cubism and Picasso’s art, the separation between international Spanish painters and their country, the originality in Franco’s “ordering” action, and the mystical and realist conversion undergone by his art and himself. Finally, he confessed that the conference had been prepared in a hurry, and that the most important part of the diplomatic mission that had taken him to Madrid was to propose signing and sending Picasso the following telegram, which he read aloud to put an end to his intervention:

Pablo Picasso —Paris. Hispanic spirituality is today most antagonistic to Russian materialism. You do know that even music itself is being purged in Russia. We do believe in the human soul’s absolute and Catholic freedom. You must know then that, in spite of your current communism, we consider your anarchical genus inseparable from our spiritual empire and your work as glory of the Spanish painting. Bless you. Madrid on November 11, 1951 —Salvador Dalí.

The telegram was effectively signed by numerous intellectuals and political figures led (after Dalí) by Dionisio Ridruejo, Gonzalo Torrente Ballester, José Miguel de Guisasola, Manuel Romero de Castilla, etc. Numerous adhesion telegrams and letters were
also sent through the press, in spite of being a request to the painter of *Guernica* to reconcile and come back to Spain. Besides, it was effectively used to reinforce and attack arguments in a current virulent controversy in Spanish newspapers unleashed by the Director of the Museo del Prado Fernando Álvarez de Sotomayor, who had sent an open letter to newspaper *Madrid* in which vanguard artists were accused of madness.

On the other hand, two days after Dalí’s conference—in which Picasso was asked to “renounce to communism” and come back to Spain; one of the most notorious events in the cultural history of the time in Madrid—several intellectual and public figures (General Directors Antonio Gállego Burín, Jesús Suevos, Luis Antonio Bolín; together with Florentino Pérez Embiz, Alfredo Sánchez Bella, Laín Entralgo, Eugenio d’Ors, Eugenio Montes, Dionisio Ridruejo, Leopoldo Panero, Gregorio Marañón, Sánchez Cantón, Edgar Neville, Benjamín Palencia, Vázquez Díaz, Santos Torroella, González Robles, among more than 250 others, including adhesive telegrams by just as many such as Joaquín Ruiz Giménez, Serrano Suñer, etc.) offered Dalí a tribute banquet in the Palace Hotel that featured significant acknowledgment speeches by Eugenio Montes, Pedro Laín Entralgo and Dionisio Ridruejo (who justified his signing of the telegram in second place, just after Dalí) and praised his stance, thus embittering artistic controversy in Madrid. This banquet had great significance, since it was interpreted as a strong support for renovation by Spanish avant-garde intellectuals, politicians and journalists. Dalí—upon leaving Madrid to head for Port Lligat—even played the joke of bidding farewell to Madrid by paying for a mass service in the Church of the Holy Ghost in the Spanish National Research Council to ask God to enlighten Álvarez de Sotomayor and separate him from his intransigence. The mass was not finally said as it was considered irreverent by church authorities.

Furthermore, when the incidence of all this Dalí phenomenon had not dissipated yet, his exhibition arrived in time to close the Biennial of Art. The new Dalí exhibition, with his recent “mystical” stage, was inaugurated in the Palace of Libraries and Museums on January 22, 1952. It comprised a set of 32 works from the Lefevre Gallery in London that included nine famous paintings (apart from *The Madonna of Port Lligat* and *Christ of Saint John of the Cross*, it included *Bread*, *The Ear of Wheat*, *Yo, a la edad angélica*, *levantando con precaución la piel del agua para observar un perro dormido a la sombra del mar*, *Leda Atomica*, *Le Morceau de Liège (The Piece of Cork)* and *El espectro de la
libido), as well as a series of drawings and watercolors that illustrated the American edition of Don Quixote: Don Quixote, The Centaur, La carroza, Portrait of the Wife of the Painter, The Rhinoceros, etc. Leopoldo Panero was in charge of the exhibition and followed Dalí’s instructions to the letter. That is, Dalí’s new mystical stage —as pointed out by the painter himself— required all the walls in the hall to be covered in dark red velvet, the light of reflectors —lateral and seeking no bright— to converge onto the baby in The Madonna of Port Lligat and the head of Christ of Saint John of the Cross, which had to be flanked by The Ear of Wheat and Bread to achieve unity, and some other similar requirements. Memorable lines of visitors showed revitalized interest in the Biennial of Art in Madrid, which was definitely closed together with Dalí’s exhibition on February 24 (Cabañas Bravo, 1996b: 305-9, 318-26 and 503-14).

However, the great success achieved by this exhibition subsequently led to the important Anthological Exhibition of the 1st Hispano-American Biennial of Art, which was inaugurated by Panero on March 7 in the Museo del Parque de la Ciutadella in Barcelona, and closed on April 27, 1952. It was very successful, as it reached 80,000 new visitors. Dalí’s supplementary exhibition again contributed to this success after he had left Madrid with a new controversy regarding his plagiarism, and was then integrally moved to Barcelona amidst great expectation, which created long lines and kept his room full of visitors at all times —the opening hours and days had to be extended (Cabañas Bravo, 1996b: 627-49).

After his stay in Spain and the originated controversies, which —apart from articles in favor or against— also gave rise to two books supporting his posturing (Santos Torroella, 1952; and Utrillo, 1952), Dalí did not have to wait long to get a reaction from the groups of exiled Spanish artists, as he realized that his attitude in the Madrid episode and his provocative stance towards Picasso was a source of great scandal. Thus, he chose to exhibit together with Spanish artists exiled in New York and took part in an exhibition commissioned by architect Josep Lluís Sert whose organization had begun at the end of 1952 and whose income was meant to support the scholarships given by the Spanish Department of the Barnard College, belonging to Columbia University. It was inaugurated on January 20, 1953 in the Schaeffer Galleries in New York under the title Spanish Contemporary Paintings, and its catalogue was
prefaced by Juan Larrea [Figure 9]. Apart from Dalí himself, José de Creeft, Julio de Diego, Esteban Francés, Federico García Lorca, Juan Gris, José Guerrero, Joan Junyer, Miró, Picasso, Luis Quintanilla, José Vela Zanetti and Esteban Vicente also took part in it. Some participants such as Lorca and Juan Gris were paid tribute, while the international prestige of others such as Miró (6 works), Picasso (14 works) and Dalí —4 works including *Le sentiment du devenir (The Feeling of Becoming)* (1931) and *Debris of an automobile giving birth to a blind horse biting a telephone* (1938)— were solid enough to be highlighted. Finally, it included some other lesser known artists such as De Creeft, De Diego, Francés, Guerrero, Junyer, Quintanilla, Vela Zanetti and Vicente, who were still growing or making their way in New York. Anyway, the main aim was highlighting their relationship to Spain. Nevertheless, Dalí threatened to withdraw his four works and kicked up a publicity fuss with his protests—exiles would say— regarding the political tone of the exhibition and the importance given to the works by Picasso, Miró, Vela Zanetti and Vicente, who (Cabañas Bravo, 2007d: 280-82).

Picasso’s and Dalí’s stances clashed again, yet not so directly and without the same media repercussion as in Madrid in the following editions of the Biennial of Art. Thus, the 2nd Biennial of Art was inaugurated in Havana on May 18, 1954 [Figure 10], and again found Picasso’s opposition. In this case Picasso supported Cuban artists’ previous protest against the exhibition through both manifestos and parallel exhibitions, even though special arrangements had been made this time for “the Spanish School in Paris.” These arrangements led around 20 of them such as Óscar Domínguez and Pedro
Flores to take part. In spite of his earlier opposition to the 1st Biennial of Art, Flores was awarded the City of Havana Grand Prize (Cabañas Bravo, 1996a: 93-110; 2007d: 57-62, and 134-84; 2013: 37-55).

Likewise, we must also recall the 3rd Biennial of Art, inaugurated in Barcelona on September 24, 1955 [Figure 11].

In April it was announced that Dalí would take part in it with a complete set of jewels offered by Alemny & Ertman in order to compete with Picasso. Besides, in August it was announced that Dalí would also contribute *The Sacrament of the Last Supper (El Sacramento de la Última Cena)*, which he was then closed to finishing, and had even proposed giving a sophisticated conference. Then Dalí launched his new proposal of beginning a new and spectacular painting based on rhinoceros horns within the exhibition program. These issues had to be confirmed and qualified later on by Panero and Sánchez Bella. All this scheduled activity was commented and followed by the excited press, Dalí and even the exhibition catalogue, which highlighted his participation and reserved special rooms for his works. However, the painter finally left for the United States and nothing ever happened. The exhibition—without Dalí’s presence—closed on January 9, 1956, counting more than 106,000 visitors.

Unlike Dalí’s, Picasso’s works did appear in the 3rd Biennial of Art with scarce publicity as part of supplementary exhibitions out of competition. Fifty-seven works by Picasso were exhibited, including ceramics, old oil paintings such as *Portrait of the Painter Sebastià Junyer Vidal* (1903), and recent drawings such as *Portrait of Rosa Hugué* (1954). Most of them belonged to Spanish collectors. As with previous editions, the main aim was showing Spanish and Latin American vanguard background through the expected exhibition *Forerunners and Masters*, inaugurated on November 18 in the Palacio de la Virreina and including works by recently deceased painters such as Jesús Olasagasti and Pablo Roig, relevant Spanish figures such as Gargallo, Hugué, Nonell and Picasso, and works by other outstanding names in Uruguayan and Argentinean art (some of them closely related to Spain) such as Juan Manuel Blanes, Pedro Blanes Viale, Rafael
Barradas, Pedro Figari and Torres García, and Mexican art such as José Clemente Orozco. This *Forerunners and Masters* exhibition, clearly aimed at sketching Spain’s artistic background, was greatly successful in Barcelona, highlighting the contestants’ avant-garde forerunners. For this reason, it also created interest in its anthological exhibition in Europe. After closing and discarding other proposals due to a variety of reasons, a selection of the Barcelona exhibition—which was meant to include an important retrospective section with works by Picasso, Nonell and Manolo Hugué—was required from Geneva. Juan Ramón Masoliver was in charge of conforming this anthological exhibition, which mainly included a selection of works by artists awarded in previous editions and the aforementioned retrospective exhibition. Picasso’s *Portrait of Sebastià Junyer* was chosen for the promotional poster. Although delays occurred, this anthological exhibition was finally inaugurated in the Geneva Musée d’Art et d’Histoire on March 19, 1956. It was attended by Spanish diplomats, who were thanked by the Director of Geneva museums Marius Noul, while the General Consul and Spain’s delegate in international organizations in Geneva, Luis García Llera, answered recalling the famous 1939 exhibition of “the treasures of the Museo del Prado” and the “permanent and symbolic exhibition of Spanish art held in the Palace of Nations, with Sert’s wellknown frescoes in the Council Chamber.” In parallel, the exhibition catalogue was presented under the significant title *Picasso et l’art contemporain Hispano-Américain* (Masoliver, 1956). It also began recalling the 1939 exhibition and thanking Commissioner Masoliver’s for exhibiting around 270 works—90 of which belonged to the retrospective section and the remaining works were in the selection (Cabañas Bravo, 1996a: 111-34, 2005: 467-84, and 2007d: 62-7, 185-236).

After these episodes in the 1950s, Dalí enjoyed enough occasions for new initiatives and provocations, although they only made him lose much of his credit in the most advanced Spanish artistic spheres, while Picasso managed to keep his in a much more serene and fighting manner. Perhaps the last episode that opposed them in Spain, after Picasso’s death and the restoration of democracy after Franco’s death, involved the actions taken for the return of *Guernica* from New York in 1981. The picture was considered “the last exile from the Civil War,” as the fact was titled in the press
The new Director of Fine Arts Javier Tusell played an essential role in this return. He did not only account for the multiple steps that he had to take (Tusell, 1981: 58-78, and 1999: 259-77), but also for Dalí’s approach to the Administration, at that time, with the intention of organizing a comprehensive anthological exhibition of his works in the Museo del Prado:

His desire to organize an anthological exhibition —Tusell wrote— was mutilated by the arrival of *Guernica* to Spain: after all, Dalí had maintained during all his life an attitude of admiration and, at the same time, rivalry with Picasso. At least, it was possible to organize an exhibition of his graphic work in Madrid — the first to take to the democratic State one of the greatest painters in Spanish 20th century painting.

Thus, in April 1983, a year after Tusell’s resignation, the Dalí anthological exhibition could finally be held: “This was —Tusell argued— the first step for all Spaniards to become heirs of not only Picasso but also Dalí, though both painters had maintained diametrically opposite political stances” (Tusell 1999: 306) [Figure 13].

All in all, their legacy was wider, since —as previously analyzed— the position of both creators regarding what was happening in Spain and the official initiatives launched by the Spanish Administration on occasion of large international exhibitions do not only show and highlight that these painters never lost their connection to their homeland, but
also that they kept two contrasting ways to understand art and its mission, which finally led to two brilliant and dissimilar Spanish contributions to 20th century art.
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1 This paper was published within the research framework of the Spanish R&D&I National Plan On the Republic: Networks and Outward and Inward Journeys in Spanish Art since 1931 (ref. HAR2011-25864).
2 Moreno Villa highlighted Dalí’s presence in two different articles in newspapers El Sol (Madrid) and El Norte de Castilla (Valladolid) (Moreno Villa 1925a: 5, and 1925b: 1). The latter was also published the day after in La Noche (Barcelona), La Voz de Guipúzcoa (San Sebastián), and El Liberal (Bilbao), as well as in the prestigious magazine Revista de Occidente (Moreno Villa 1925c: 80-91).
3 Both the present for the groom and bride, and the preparatory sketches were commented by Margaret Palmer on March 14 in her correspondence with the Carnegie Institute of Pittsburgh. Palmer talks about "the small painting of Venus and Cupids on the rocks" (Pérez Segura, 2012: 155-6), although the small painting about which she talked may as well be Figura damunt les roques (1926), which was in the same exhibition (Cabañas Bravo, 1990: 195-6; Huergo, 2001: 78-9).
4 Orueta addressed the Spanish Embassy on September 15, 1933 to confirm whether Picasso was in his Gisors villa or in Paris, and to ask for his telephone numbers. Madariaga answered the following day commenting him "the indescribable behavior of this gentleman toward an official representative of Spain and a faithful admirer of his painting" after having pervasively tried to invite him to parties, lunches and dinners. In spite of these invitations, he had received no answer and Picasso had not even condescended to pick up the phone, so he considered "deplorable to organize anything with him until he justifies his behavior". Orueta's reply to Madariaga on September 20, 1933 informed him on the project of holding an official tribute exhibition to Picasso as those organized for Zuloaga and Anglada in Madrid. However, he added that "after his letter, the whole project had been completely dismissed, since I can do nothing involving an official tribute to someone who does not keep the most elementary norms of courtesy with

5 They are two incomplete and complementary writings (Renau, 1981b) whose features have already been dealt with elsewhere, and some of their chapters have been reproduced (Cabañas Bravo, 2007a: 27 and 239, no. 1; 2007b: 142; 2007c: 207–40). On the other hand, their lengthy fragments were published by Renau himself on two different occasions. Renau himself pointed out that they were extracts and summaries of a book “currently under elaboration” (Renau, 1981a: 8, and 1982: 20–7).

6 MIPBA September 19, 1936 Decree (Gaceta de Madrid, no. 264, September 20, 1936, p. 1899, with correction in the order of the painter’s surnames on no. 269, September 25, 1936, p. 1969).

7 In view of the publication of an article by Manuel Aznar in Diario de la Marina in Havana relating the odd destruction and theft of art works by the Republican faction, as well as the fact that some Spanish artists including Pablo Picasso and Mateo Hernández had met in Paris to ask the League of Nations for “protection for the Spanish artistic heritage, currently threatened by communist barbarity” —journalist Félix Pita Rodríguez interviewed both artists, who denied it vehemently. Besides, Picasso —who was interviewed while working on the great panaux of a work “under the tragic title of Guernica”— answered indignant that this use of his name was monstrous, as his position in the Spanish conflict was well-known. Picasso added: "At the beginning of the rebellion I was appointed director of the Museo del Prado by the only legitimate Government in Spain, which I accepted immediately. Here is what I am working on for the Spanish pavilion in the Exposition. And here —said Picasso while showing me a superb collection of etchings— are the first tests of *Sueño y mentira de Franco*, which shall be included in the next issue of *Cahiers d’Art*. They clearly express my opinion on the military caste that has plunged Spain into pain and
death”. Picasso continued the interview stressing the ridiculous nature of this story of artistic heritage destruction, “which has been pervasively denied by all intellectuals and artists who have recently visited Spain”. Picasso also recalled the rebel air force bombing the Museo del Prado and the safeguard role played by militiamen. He then argues: “I was invited to visit Valencia to check the condition in which the paintings from the Museo del Prado are kept, and to announce the world that the Spanish people have saved Spanish art, yet this was unnecessary, as the paintings are to come to Paris in the near future, so we all will be able to observe who saves and who destroys culture” (Pita Rodríguez, 1937: 79–81).

Renau (1981a: 141) points out: “It must be highlighted that Picasso was sent the letter long before we received the information on Spain’s participation in the 1937 Exposition. Everything was decided in late November 1936: the pavilion was planned, and construction works began in early January 1937, three months after Picasso had been sent the letter and four months before Picasso began working on his leaflet Sueño y mentira de Franco, his first gesture of public solidarity with the Republic Government up in arms against fascism, seven months before his first sketch and previous studies for Guernica, which was installed in the pavilion some days before its official inauguration on June 12 [sic], 1937. That is, eight months after the reply from the General Board of Fine Arts had been received, and exactly nine months after I had sent my letter...”

Renau (1980: 19) commented in 1980 that it was at the end of 1936 when he visited Paris for the first time “carrying an official invitation for Picasso and other Spanish artists living in Paris to take part in the Spanish pavilion in the World Exposition the following year”. The 1981 manuscript (Renau, 1981a: 1, 4, 17 and 24) also stresses on several occasions that it was his first visit to Paris and that it occurred in December 1936. On this issue and the commission of a mural painting to Picasso, he even insists on the fact that “I completed this mission in late December 1936” and that the date of “January 1937” repeated by “all commentators on Guernica without exception [...] corresponds to the invited artists’ subsequent official communication of consent sent to pavilion Commissioner José Gaos for their respective aid to be determined”.

Mateo Hernández —as well as other Spanish artists living in Paris— was contacted on April 12, 1937 by pavilion general commissioner himself, José Gaos, who personally invited him to take part. However, a week later the sculptor wrote to Ambassador Luis Araquistáin pointing out that the commissioner’s proposal was “placing a small sculpture completed by me in 1923 in a corner behind the building”. Under these conditions he stated that he could not accept the invitation. The diplomat replied on April 20 that Gaos had misinterpreted his plans and invited him to study in situ, together with the pavilion architects, the location and work he desired to exhibit, asking him to reconsider “the problem of his collaboration, which we all respect so much”. However, the susceptible sculptor finally decided not to take part in the Spanish pavilion, possibly because he was also proposed for the French pavilion, where Hernández was to exhibit up to 27 sculptures in the Les Maîtres de l’Art Indépendant, 1895–1937 exhibition celebrated within the latter’s framework in the Petit Palais between June and October 1937, which also included works by Picasso, Juan Gris, María Blanchard, Gargallo and Hugué (Cabañas Bravo, 2010b: 85-6).

Renau (1981a: 143; and 1981b: 22) writes about this meeting with Picasso: “After the famous conclave before whom Picasso tore out the papier-tapis polychrome wrapper on his work —with all our admiration— we had our last private meeting. I uttered a truly museographic blasphemy: ‘What do you think of a special room in the Museo del Prado being prepared after the war for a joint exhibition of Las Meninas, your Guernica and Los fusilamientos de la Moncloa?’ He stared at me for some seconds with deep sympathy, turned his head and kept on working. We said goodbye as cordially as usually...”

Nueva Cultura reproduced in full pages in the summer of 1937 nine pictures of elaboration stages of Guernica and a fragment of the study of the horse head upside down and Picasso’s folder of Sueño y mentira de Franco (including a text and 18 etchings). It was announced that “this work [had been] donated by Picasso to the Spanish people”. Print run included 30 not-for-sale issues, 150 printed issues in Imperial Japan, and 850 issues printed on Montval paper, all of them numbered and signed by the artist. These photographs and the folder were preceded by a large picture of Picasso and a legend that read: "Pablo Picasso, the great Spanish artist who, in these dramatic moments undergone by Spain, has put his art and person in service of the fight for the independence of his fatherland” (Nueva Cultura, 4-5, June-July 1937: 3-13). Cahiers d’Art, on the other hand, apart from including an article by José Bergamín identifying Goya and Picasso (5-35) in its 1-3 1937 issue, also published the series Sueño y mentira de Franco (3750), as well as a poem by Paul Éluard on the town of Guernica (36). In December 1937 Cahiers d’Art dedicated its monographic issue 4-5 —directed by Zervos— to the famous mural painting, its preparatory works and stages with 69 illustrations, Dora Maar’s photographs and articles by Zervos (105-11), Jean Cassou (112),
Since the war broke out, the representatives of the Republican Government in United States supported propaganda both to take advantage of Spanish art in exhibitions in the Washington embassy itself and in American museums, and to counterbalance the parallel labor of rebel representatives. Falange foreign propaganda chief, Joaquín Rodríguez de Cortázar, asked for Francoist participation in the New York Fair on November 23, 1937 (New York World’s Fair 1939-1940 Records. Manuscripts and Archives Division. The New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox and Tilden Foundations). The correspondence of Fernando de los Ríos accounts for these arrangements since late 1936—see the telegrams to the Minister of State and Propaganda: December 3, 1936, FDR 25/1/17; February 11, 1937, FDR 25/2/12; April 2, 1937, FDR 25/2/47. Fondo Fernando de los Ríos, Residencia de Estudiantes, Madrid (FFDR, RE).

Manuel Sánchez Arcas was appointed president of the Inter-ministerial Committee of Direction of Participation; Fernández Balbuena was appointed general commissioner, and Martí was appointed assistant commissioner and architect of the Spanish pavilion (Murga Castro, 2010: 216).

The Erica Reed was the first American ship to transport food and medicines to Spain and evacuated several Spaniards by means of the Lincoln Brigade [Braun press note on September 14, 1938, International Coordination Committee 2, Section J, Box 2, Spanish Refugee Relief Organization Collection, Columbia University, New York. Cited in Carroll & Fernández, 2007: 47]. Its arrival to Barcelona in November 1938 was portrayed by Robert Capa in one of the reels in his celebrated The Mexican Suitcase [The Robert Capa and Cornell Capa Archive, International Center of Photography, New York].

Nowadays these frescoes are known as Love Peace and Hate War after the restoration labor completed by Esther López Sobrado, Javier Gómez Martínez and the University of Cantabria, where they are currently exhibited (Murga Castro, 2014: 511).

Juan Larrea, secretary in the Board of Cultural Relationships in Paris, was appointed delegate of the Spanish Committee for the New York event, while Augusto Barcia was appointed president of the Technical Commission. Ángel Ferrant, on the other hand, a member of the Delegate Board of Artistic Heritage in Madrid, was in charge of the preparation of the works sent from inland Spain.

Letter from De los Ríos to Álvarez del Vayo, New York, September 13, 1938. FFDR, RE, FDR 26/50/22. Three months after this proposal Timoteo Pérez Rubio wrote De los Ríos from Barcelona on their mutual interest in organising “the great exhibition of Spanish art”, yet “as long as the American State guaranteed the return of the works to the legitimate Government of Spain”, which would mean two exhibitions of etchings by Goya and paintings by El Greco. Finally, only the pieces in private collections formed part of the exhibition Masterpieces of Art. European Paintings and Sculpture from 1300-1800 that was held on occasion of the New York event (Murga Castro, 2014b: 513-4).

Two Women at a Bar (Lent by Walter P. Chrysler, Jr., New York), Youth (Edward M. M. Warburg, New York), Two Acrobat (Thannhauser Gallery, Paris), Youth Leading a horse (William S. Paley, New York), Les Demoiselles d’Avignon (MoMA), The Poet (George L. K. Morris, New York), Harlequin (Paul Rosenberg, Paris), Woman in White (MoMA, Lillie P. Bliss Collection), Seated Woman (MoMA), Portrait (Walter P. Chrysler, Jr., New York), The Mirror (MoMA, donation by Simon Guggenheim), the etching Minotauromachy (Henry P. McIlhenny, Germantown), and the sculpture Head (Weyhe Gallery, New York). (Art in our Time, 1939).

Telegram from De los Ríos to the Minister of State and Propaganda in Valencia — Washington, May 1, 1937. FFDR, RE; FDR 25/2/67.

Besides, in March 1939 Levy had organized in his gallery three individual exhibitions of Dalí’s works (Jacobs, 1999: 95-102).

Unlike it was expected by the groups of patrons, Dalí’s sirens were initially fish-shaped and woman-legged, though they were refused by organizers, so he ended up taking this character to his ballet Bacchanales, where love goddess was a Venus-legged fish head.


Dalí pursued this aim since his first ideas in 1937. Indeed, in the summer that year Edward James, patron of the surrealists, offered him to produce the first version of the play, which Dalí refused in favor of the experienced dance company directed by René Blum (Murga Castro, 2012: 350).
This ballet included pieces from Wagner's opera *Tannhauser*, choreography by Massine, and curtains and costumes designed by Dalí, and tailored by Prince Schervachidze and Barbara Karinska (Murga Castro, 2012: 353-9).

The 4th Biennial of Art could not be held, although it had been prepared between 1956 and 1958 in Caracas — where political changes finally frustrated it — and between 1958 and 1961 in Quito — where its fate ran parallel to the meetings of the Organization of American States, whose delays finally prevented it from being held. After this last failure and the death of Panero, the Biennial was transformed into the so-called *Art from America and Spain* exhibitions organized by Luis González Robles. Only one exhibition was finally held in Madrid in 1963, followed by a long itinerary of anthological exhibitions across Europe, where Spain offered itself as an interlocutor with Latin American culture and art (Cabañas Bravo, 1996a: 135-49; 2007d: 67-79).

After more than a year of preparations, the Biennial of Art was attended, according to ICH data, by 885 artists from 21 countries with a total number of 1,750 selected works and 300 works in special rooms. Nevertheless, Spain contributed 630 artists and the Biennial was not attended by artists from some small republics such as Guatemala, Haiti or Jamaica, while the presence of others such as Costa Rica, Puerto Rico, Panama, Guatemala and the Philippines was merely nominal or story, like that of Canada and the United States; the cases of Brazil, Uruguay and Mexico were the most lamented absences. The Biennial included monographic exhibitions of several artists proposed as instigators of Hispanic vanguard such as Clará, Colom, Sunyer, Salvador Dalí, Cecilio Guzmán de Rojas and a group of ‘precursors’ such as Beruete, Juan de Echevarría, Gimeno, Iurrino, Nonell, Pidelaserra, Regoyos and Solana. The exhibition filled more than 50 rooms in the Museum of Modern Art — which was reorganized for the occasion —, the Society of Friends of Art, exhibition palaces and the Crystal Palace in El Retiro Park, and several rooms in the Archaeological Museum. Forty awards were given (the healthiest ones were worth 100,000 pesetas) in the different sections of the contest: Benjamín Palencia, Vázquez Díaz, Bernaldo de Quirós (Argentinean) and Mallol Suazo in painting; Joan Rebull in sculpture; Gutiérrez Soto in architecture, and Argentinean Alberto Guido in etching. Other minor awards were given to Spanish artists Vázquez Molezún, José Planes, Eudald Serra, Cristino Mallo, Martín Llauradó, Cruz Solís, Joaquín Vaquero, José Caballero, Juan Antonio Morales, Zabaleta, Miguel Villá, López-Villaseñor, Esplandiu, Tenreiro, Juan Torráis, Francés d’Assis Gali, Amat, Romero Escassi, Pedro Mozos, Rafael Pena, Enrique G. Ricart and C. Pascual de Lara, and American artists Daniel Ramos Correa, José Domingo Rodríguez, Marina Núñez del Prado, Samuel Román Rojas, Blanca Sinisterra, Sergio Montecino, Eligio Pichardo, Manuel Rendón and López Dirube.

In this sense, the activity developed in Caracas was much wider, since it was a true ‘cultural week’, until October 20, and included the aforementioned sculpture and painting exhibition in the Cultural Center, an exhibition of caricatures in the Free Art Workshop, poetry readings in the Instituto Escuela, concerts in the States; the cases of Brazil, Uruguay and Mexico were the most lamented absences. The Biennial included monographic exhibitions of several artists proposed as instigators of Hispanic vanguard such as Clará, Colom, Sunyer, Salvador Dalí, Cecilio Guzmán de Rojas and a group of ‘precursors’ such as Beruete, Juan de Echevarría, Gimeno, Iurrino, Nonell, Pidelaserra, Regoyos and Solana. The exhibition filled more than 50 rooms in the Museum of Modern Art — which was reorganized for the occasion —, the Society of Friends of Art, exhibition palaces and the Crystal Palace in El Retiro Park, and several rooms in the Archaeological Museum. Forty awards were given (the healthiest ones were worth 100,000 pesetas) in the different sections of the contest: Benjamín Palencia, Vázquez Díaz, Bernaldo de Quirós (Argentinean) and Mallol Suazo in painting; Joan Rebull in sculpture; Gutiérrez Soto in architecture, and Argentinean Alberto Guido in etching. Other minor awards were given to Spanish artists Vázquez Molezún, José Planes, Eudald Serra, Cristino Mallo, Martín Llauradó, Cruz Solís, Joaquín Vaquero, José Caballero, Juan Antonio Morales, Zabaleta, Miguel Villá, López-Villaseñor, Esplandiu, Tenreiro, Juan Torráis, Francés d’Assis Gali, Amat, Romero Escassi, Pedro Mozos, Rafael Pena, Enrique G. Ricart and C. Pascual de Lara, and American artists Daniel Ramos Correa, José Domingo Rodríguez, Marina Núñez del Prado, Samuel Román Rojas, Blanca Sinisterra, Sergio Montecino, Eligio Pichardo, Manuel Rendón and López Dirube.

In this sense, the activity developed in Caracas was much wider, since it was a true ‘cultural week’, until October 20, and included the aforementioned sculpture and painting exhibition in the Cultural Center, an exhibition of caricatures in the Free Art Workshop, poetry readings in the Instituto Escuela, concerts in the Cultural Center, and different conferences with multiple speakers and participants. The exhibition in Paris was held under the title *Exposition Hispano-Américaine* and was attended by forty artists with one only work by each of them, except Picasso. Out of them, fifteen were Spanish artists from the so-called Spanish School of Paris (Ángeles Ortiz, Clavé, Colmeiro, Óscar Domínguez, Fenosa, Fin, Flores, Gacía Condoy, Lobo, Parra, Palmeiro, Pei
Ceferino Palencia, Augusto Fernández, Ramón Peinador, Pablo Almela, Ceferino Colinas, Giménez Botey, Camps Ribera, Marín Bosqued, Joan Renau, Germán Horacio, María Luisa Martín, Luis Alaminos, Jordi Camps, García Narezo and Vicente Rojo.

Opposition to the 2nd Biennial of Art in Cuba —prepared for 1953 to commemorate the centenary of the birth of José Martí and fostered by both Franco’s and Bastista’s regimes— began to be quite clear in October 1953. Cuban artists undertook notorious actions and published rejection writings, and their antiexhibition position gained solidarity from numerous artists in other countries such as Guatemala, Colombia, Argentina, Chile and Uruguay, among others. Adhesion writings from Mexico stood out, being sent by anti-purist writers led by Rufino Tamayo, including Carlos Mérida, Gironella, José Luis Cuevas, Raúl Anguiano, Héctor Xavier, etc.; exiled Spanish artists such as Rodríguez Luna, Climent, Bartolí, Gaya, Souto, etc.; supporters of social realism led by Diego Rivera, Siqueiros, Xavier Guerrero, Leopoldo Méndez, and Chávez Morado; and exiled Spanish artists living in Paris, who sent a wire on February 9, 1954 signed by Picasso, Clavé, Peinado, Lobo, Ismael de la Serna, Ángeles Ortiz, Viñes, Pelayo, etc. stating: "the Spanish artists living in Paris support the protest of Cuban artists against the Francoist exhibition". All this criticism ended up delaying the inauguration of the 2nd Biennial, and had previously achieved the organization and inauguration on January 28, 1954 of a counter-Biennial exhibition in the Lyceum Club in Havana that was attended by more than forty Cuban artists and counted on the solidarity of musicians, writers, intellectuals, etc. This counter-exhibition was subsequently taken to the Universidad de Oriente in Santiago de Cuba and Camagüey. This was also related to the celebration of the 1st University Festival of Contemporary Cuban Art, also inaugurated in Havana on May 17, 1954 — on the eve of the inauguration of the Biennial of Art — and including works by numerous artists and intellectuals.
‘Picasso/DalÃ, DalÃ/Picasso’, which runs from March 20 to June 28, is a painstakingly researched and provocative show that, curator William Jeffett explains, highlights specific points of encounter between the two men to expand our understanding of both. Pablo Picasso (1881-1973), a lifelong hero of the left, fundamentally challenged the way we view art and reality with Cubism. DalÃ was enraged when Picasso was selected to produce work for the World Exhibition in Paris. And while Picasso initially seemed fond of DalÃ, keeping the mountain of correspondence that DalÃ bombarded him with over the years and paying for his first trip to the US in 1934, the younger man’s pursuit of fame and fortune in the States created a distance between them.