



BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Balibrea, Mari Paz (2005) Rethinking Spanish republican exile: an introduction. [Editorial/Introduction]

Downloaded from: <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/21421/>

Usage Guidelines:

Please refer to usage guidelines at <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/policies.html> or alternatively contact lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk.

Rethinking Spanish Republican Exile. An Introduction

Mari Paz Balibrea, Birkbeck, University of London

The Spanish Republican exile of 1939 holds a very special place in the history and collective memory of contemporary Spain. As a sinister aftermath of the Civil War it has become one of the most decisive historical events of 20th century Spain. However, due to the physical and in most cases definitive expulsion from the nation-state implied by exile, its relevance has been marginalized or plainly ignored in the context of a national history whose dominant narrative strategies turn on the belonging of its protagonists to the nation-state. Despite having been largely ignored by institutions – both Francoist *and* democratic –, Spanish Republican exile invariably returns to the collective and private memories of Spain in a myriad of cultural and political events and practices and has done so for over seventy years now. The status held by Republican exile within Spanish history and historiography is thus richly paradoxical: it is both central and residual; it has been dismissed and ignored by many and yet, its absence is structurally indispensable to any understanding of dictatorial *and* democratic Spain. There is arguably no more resilient ghost haunting actually-existing Spanish (post)modernity than that of Republican exile.

The historiographies of Republican exile, particularly the literary, historical and cultural ones, are considerable. They are marked by the political militancy of many of its practitioners who, either implicitly or explicitly, regard the political and ethical relevance of studying Spanish Republican exile as a way of recuperating it for the history of 20th century Spain. A vast amount of work has been done in the fields of literature and history particularly, which has brought to light an important part of the cultural production, experiences and practices of Republican exile individuals and collectives. Since the 1990s, the GEXEL (Grupo de Estudios del Exilio Literario Español) directed by Manuel Aznar Soler, has produced and coordinated several studies on Republican exile written all over the world. Thanks to this on-going work, many exilic cultural works have been recovered. As a result, what has until recently been a mostly invisible part of Spanish culture and history, now constitutes an immense corpus of knowledge and documents with an increasing body of scholars devoted to its study.¹

But the field has also produced its discontents. Francisco Caudet (33) wrote some years ago of the need for literary and cultural critics of Republican exile to “dialogizar el exilio,” by which he meant the need to “quitar al exilio republicano toda la ganga mitificadora que lo ha ido recubriendo a lo largo de los años” and to incorporate into its study “nuevas perspectivas temáticas y críticas.” The expression, if not exactly its spirit, has by now been embraced by numerous practitioners in the field² – it is included as an epigraph in Ofelia Ferrán’s article included in this issue –, signaling a moment of crisis – as in turning point and transformation – in the development of Republican exile studies. It is precisely at this critical turning point that this monographic issue wants to locate itself too. Its editors recognize the need to demystify and to incorporate new thematic and critical perspectives into the study of Spanish Republican exile; as they also recognize that the ways of exercising critical thinking are multiple, and cannot be contained within the limits of any single volume

or study. The scope of this issue is, therefore, as much critical as it is limited. Aware of a field of study that has engaged practitioners all over Europe and the Americas and across several disciplinary boundaries, the editors of *Rethinking Republican exile* have sought to at least signal their recognition of such a diversity. The contributions included in this volume come from the fields of anthropology, history, philosophy, literature and film studies. Their authors work in the UK, Mexico, France, Denmark, the United States and Spain. A variety of origins and perspectives that, like exile itself, will not be contained by any single line of interpretation. The editors, however, do not wish to conceal that the idea for this volume developed around the following – for us – pressing questions: How are we now, in our present moment, to tackle what I have called above the paradoxical status of Spanish Republican exile in ways that are productive? In other words: how can critical thinking make Republican exile relevant today? These questions demand that critics and scholars reflect on how their work and field are shaped in this context, and to see how their interventions with the present conceptualizations of the Spanish past have political currency today. While these are clearly not the only possible questions one could ask, they are certainly indispensable to any critical and political rethinking of Spanish Republican exile, and the ones we would most urgently like to pass on to readers of this volume.

Out of Bounds?: The Exile Paradigm Meets Spanish Cultural Studies

No exile experience or production can comfortably be framed within a set of disciplinary practices – those of history, literature, art, film –, insofar as each one of these disciplines defines its objects of study by their belonging to the nation. Cultural Studies, for all its own – at its best – radical questioning of disciplinary borders, has done more to reinforce than to challenge this premise. Cultural Studies' celebrated interdisciplinarity is based on the practice of framing and selecting a set of cultural practices (in other words, of defining a cultural field) that are chosen, not on the basis of their aesthetic qualities or adjustment to the rules of a particular genre, but on the basis of their perceived capacity to reveal something characteristic, a defining trait in a given culture.³ What is behind Cultural Studies's idea of culture, as we know, is the anthropological understanding of it as a “whole way of life” (Williams 17), as a “totalidad vivida” (Rowe 27), combined with the assumption that a given culture is made up of heterogeneous practices, histories, temporalities, mediations, languages, etc.⁴ This idea of “wholeness” is more often than not understood as being sustained by a common territory. The same can be said of heterogeneity, insofar as it relies on the premise that difference – provided that it takes place within a common territory – can legitimately be enclosed and to a certain extent unified within a given cultural framework.

The consideration of the national frame as the territorial unity upon which the idea of a cultural field is posited goes hand in hand with Cultural Studies' privileged focus on the cultures generated by modernity.⁵ Jo Labanyi's foundational interventions in the field of Spanish Cultural Studies mobilize for the definitions of Spanish culture a Gramscian vision of a tardy and uneven Spanish modernity as a condition “that allows Spain to emerge [...] as a paradigm model of the importance of culture, and particularly of complex transactions between high, popular and mass cultural forms, in the nation-formation process” (“Gramsci” 102). The persistence in Spain of pre-modern, “primitive,” traditional cultural forms, is reworked in Labanyi, *à la* García Canclini one could say, as the presence of hybrid forms that by the 19th

century are already somehow modernized. This rearticulation does away with old dichotomies of modern and traditional cultures, and with the perceived resilient and static character of the pre-modern in a backward European country, so prevalent in romanticized visions of Spain. The so-called primitive and pre-modern, often signifying the space of the popular, can, from this Cultural Studies approach, be theorized as having the agency of responding and creatively transforming the cultural field of modernity in Spain. And therefore, modernity can certainly co-opt but is also susceptible to being fertilized and challenged by popular and mass-cultural forms. But only to a certain degree. The other important implication of Labanyi's conceptualization is the consideration of modernity and modernization as all-encompassing processes that will ultimately subsume under and assimilate all forms of challenge and difference.

And so, in this reframing of Spanish uneven, tardy and dependent modernity there is no exterior to the modern. It is my contention that this lack of exteriority necessitates, in order to be conceived, a common territory inside of which the whole way of life, the "totalidad vivida" of Spanish culture is understood as taking place. It is this territory that provides the boundaries of what can ultimately be conceived – no matter how complex it seems – as happening under the "rule" of the struggle for Spanish modernity. No cultural or cultural form escapes its hegemony and being defined under its umbrella.

None of these influential interpretive framings of Spanish culture coming from Cultural Studies approaches is particularly conducive or adequate to making conceptual and theoretical room for Republican exile. Exiles are by definition *desterrados*, absent from the common territory of the nation, and the business of interpreting their culture is a plurinational (at least binational) project. It involves contact with more than one "totalidad vivida," plus dealing with the question of having violently lost at least one of the common territories involved, which often tilts the balance towards a focus on the relation of exile cultures to the absent nation (as happens in this issue). On the other hand, Cultural Studies is also defined by its ultimately political and historical approach to culture, that is, by its understanding of culture as being conditioned by and intervening in social, economic and political processes; as a key site for the production of identities that are crucial for an understanding of how forms of domination are reinforced or contested. And in that sense, it is difficult to think of cultural corpuses that are more vitally traversed by political and historical conditions than that of Republican exile. Moreover, it is also true that Cultural Studies distinguish themselves by promoting critical approaches that question established notions and that pay attention to previously marginalized areas of study. It is in recognizing that these practices are also inextricably tied to Cultural Studies that I think of them as providing a desirable harbor for Republican exile. One that, to come back to Caudet's coined expression, will succeed in dialogizing its study.

In the end, what is most challenging in dealing critically with the cultures of Republican exile is to find room for this exilic production, not inside Cultural Studies, but inside Spanish historiography and literary history, whose histories and historiographies, as stated at the beginning of this introduction, are framed by national borders. From that perspective the cultures of Republican exile generally unknown or irrelevant to the course of, say, 20th century Spanish literature. The Second Republic incarnates a form of modern state and a once viable path to modernity that feel irretrievably lost and dead to the present of constitutionally-monarchic Spain. And

therefore, the study of Republican exile, as an intellectual and political practice, is haunted by the pathos of melancholia and the shadow of nostalgia. Then, there is the question of relevance. Exile is an excess of the nation, and in order to manage the aporia that Republican exile presents to the perspective of any discipline framed by Spanish borders, its practitioners need to argue how exile manages to speak the nation, even if to undermine it and force it to go where it ceases to be. And therefore the question: Is it feasible to account for the spatial and temporal dispersion and multiplicity of exile cultural products, most of them produced outside of the time and space of Spain, within the framework of interpretive approaches that highlight a desired hermeneutical link between exile and nation? Certainly, not completely. Exile, if we can extrapolate Bakhtin's term from its applications to literature,⁶ is a chronotope⁷ of crisis. It originates in the separation from spatio-temporal coordinates that are perceived as constituting a home, and lives in the often difficult and traumatic adaptation to other spatio-temporal coordinates established in an undesired elsewhere. Neither of the two coordinates can be taken for granted by the exiled person or by us critics when dealing with exile. For that reason, the places and times of Republican exile cannot and will never be totally contained nor exhausted within the Spain that was so traumatically left behind nor within the Spain of today. Exile implies a centrifugal movement. It is by definition dispersion and the multiplication of difference in time and space, a vanishing point on the national map exposing the exiled person to interpellation by a myriad of new historical configurations beyond the nation of origin (I will come back to this). And yet it is methodologically legitimate to argue that a lot more can be done on the part of the historian and critic of the Republican exile to activate the underestimated and suppressed potential of this exile and its products as relevant for the analysis of Francoist *and* democratic Spain, and vice versa. In what follows I try to point to possible theoretical directions in which such potential can be materialized. I will, as I briefly develop my arguments, make references to the critical approaches used by the contributors to this issue, with whom this introduction is in productive conversation.

Towards a Theory of Spanish Republican Exile: Preamble

The above discussion on the centrality of modernity for Spanish Cultural Studies can serve as a point of entry to the kind of exploration that I have been proposing. Modernity is used in my analysis as the conceptual hinge articulating a plausible and productive relation between Republican exile and nation. Definitions of modernity are too complex to be fully developed here. I want to clarify, nonetheless, that I will be using the concept of modernity throughout this introduction in three distinguishable, if interrelated ways. The logic bringing them together stems from a materialist perspective which, without conflating the two, understands Spanish modernity as inextricably linked to processes of modernization.

First, I talk of modernity as a way of conceiving time, a form of temporality (Osborne, "Modernity" 23-45) which totalizes history and time from the point of view of a present conceived as always new, always on the verge of disappearing, and therefore transitory, ephemeral and fragmentary. It is from the hegemony of this present that in modernity past and future are interpreted. This form of temporality is the one embraced by capitalism to implement processes of modernization (and colonization) that are justified in the void created by a homogeneous and empty time, the time of progress presented as good for all. These processes of modernization can

be brought about through the support of a variety of political and social forms, ranging from democracy to authoritarianism. I use this definition to argue that Francoist dictatorship, as well as the Second Republic, need to be understood as modern forms.

Secondly, I refer to modernity as a project (Habermas 98-109), originating with Enlightened thinkers and working together ideologically with the definition of modernity as the time of capital given above. Enlightened thought trusted that the growth of science and rationality would bring about freedom and wealth to all, and to achieve that end of perfectibility and progress their proponents extended the influence of science and rationality to the entire range of social, political and cultural life. The competing and not always compatible projects that sustain and support in delicate and unstable balance the Spanish Second Republic – those of liberals, communists, socialists or anarchists – are, to a greater or lesser extent, the heirs of the utopia inscribed in this project of modernity. This issue opens with a piece by Ana Bundgaard on María Zambrano's early book *Horizonte del liberalismo* that places us just at that historical moment, 1930, when everything was possible for a young generation of brilliant intellectuals who considered themselves as “arquitectos creadores de un futuro de libertad para todos” (15 of manuscript) and who were committed to the emergence of a new, modern, liberal Republican Spain.⁸ Zambrano's optimism and confidence in the future as presented in *Horizonte* speak of a time of crisis charged with new possibilities for conceiving an emancipatory national project. Zambrano welcomes this new time enthusiastically and shapes a project under the umbrella of what she calls “socialismo liberal.”⁹ Zambrano's hope and impulse to work for a new Spain can serve us as an epitome of those other alternative futures that were fatally truncated by the Civil War and the advent of authoritarianism.

On the other hand, the shortcomings, contradictions and perverse outcomes of the Enlightened project, produced in conjunction with the workings of capitalism, have in the last three centuries generated a long list of crisis as well as of critiques of modernity and ultimately, according to many of them, modernity's very demise. Among its critics, Republican exiles – those very same ones who had previously supported the Republic as a modern project – figure prominently.¹⁰

There is still a third sense in which I use modernity. It derives from the previous two, while at the same time opening up their implications in productive ways. It refers to how individuals and collectives experience their own conditions of life, in the understanding that these conditions are brought about by the processes of capital accumulation and the changes in political, social and economic structures that characterize capitalism (Bergman 15, 88-89; Harvey 10-38). I take the coming about of the experiences of modernity as complex and dynamic processes, whereby individuals and collectives experience modernity in different and even contradictory ways. I further understand that those individuals and collectives live and act on their modern experiences, rather than suffering them passively and that, consequently, they are capable of generating modern projects that challenge, and even are antagonistic to, hegemonic configurations of modernity as the time of capital. Put another way, going back to “the time of the new” referred to above, modernity contains a revolutionary element of rupture that is always in need of being controlled and channelled towards unthreatening expressions. This is a crucial point to my argument, insofar as it allows for the theorizing of a co-existence of modern projects that compete with each other for hegemony. It is my argument that the Spanish Second Republic brings into

fruition such a plurality of competing modern projects, some of them centrally articulated against Capital. With the overthrow of the Republic at the end of the Civil War and the expulsion from the country of those who supported it, those modern projects become what I call residual, alternative modernities with respect to the new and hegemonic modernity that Francoism will articulate (I come back to this point below). As dead ends of Spanish modernity they incarnate the foundational break upon which, not only the Francoist project, but the democratic one too will build themselves.

One last important point. Throughout this introduction I use the term nation to refer to Spain and its problematic, antagonistic relation to Republican exile. By so doing, my intent is not to homogenize or minimize the importance of attending to the plurality and complexity of exiles (such importance is noted in this issue by Ferrán and Naharro-Calderón). I am aware of the complexity of Republican exile in the experiences of half a million people affected by it. I am also aware that Spain is a plurinational nation-state and that not all nations within Spain have dealt equally with their exilic legacy. However, I maintain the dichotomy Spain (understood as a nation and as a state)/Republican exile because I think it constitutes the axis without which we cannot fully grasp the multiple questions pertaining to the study of Spanish Republican exile(s). Republican exile as a whole, as a concept even, is constituted in the actions of those in power – a power they have illegitimately acquired – in Spain in 1939, who use the full force of the state and of its international allies to directly or indirectly expel from Spain half a million people on the basis of their perceived alliances to the overthrown Republic. Expulsion in these circumstances is therefore the constitutive act of Spanish Republican exile and it necessarily defines all those affected by it, Andalusian, Catalan, Basque or Galician. But also, what is even more important for my argument, the expulsion of those siding with the Spanish Republic materializes a break within the processes of Spanish modernity and modernization (will come back to this below) that is structural in nature, as well as political, social and cultural in kind. The consequences of this break are, to this day (as López and Naharro-Calderón's articles in this volume seek to demonstrate), being felt across Spain, including its *comunidades históricas*. It is to signify this enormously important and far-reaching impact – exile – of the violent actions of the state and its domestic and international allies upon the subsequent developments in the country – nation/nation-state – as a whole, that I argue the relevance of maintaining the singular when theorizing the pair nation/exile. This way of conceptualizing Republican exile does not take away from the validity of each and every one of the myriad possible actualizations of the relationship (or lack thereof) between exiled subjects or collectives and their country of origin, however contradictory and varied these actualizations might be. What it wants to do, with the benefit of hindsight, is to function as a condition of possibility framing the extent and limits of those particular cases.

This notwithstanding, there is no question that the analysis of Republican exile that makes up this introduction, as well as the aspects of this exile explored by all the contributors to this volume, with the exception of Roger Bartra, speak most accurately of Republican exile in its relation to the hegemonic Spanish and Spanish-speaking configurations of the nation.¹¹ As a consequence, the realities and complexities of dealing with Republican exile in the minority nations, Catalonia, the Basque country and Galicia, are not necessarily being addressed by the analyses included in the present issue. This is particularly so the more discussions centre around the cultural

legacies of Republican exile understood in their narrow sense as relating to literary, essayistic and artistic products. Minority nations of Spain, devoid of a state to bring prominence to their territorial borders, have historically used language as one distinctive defining trait of their respective differences with the nation-state. Such different configuration of the nation helps to explain why and how it has been possible in these contexts to mobilize language as a strategy to integrate exiled corpuses,¹² circumventing in this way the absence of a common territory during the exile years. Therefore, we cannot talk about the problematic relation between Spanish Cultural Studies and the exilic paradigm in the same way when it comes to, for instance, Catalan literature. Catalan historiographies of it have amply integrated Republican exiled authors without encountering the conflicts and incompatibilities in narrative strategies and ideological underpinnings that characterize their Spanish counterparts.

However, there is also a way in which this distinction can be taken too far, and this is clearer the more we move into the social and political arenas. To continue with the Catalan case, it can be argued that along with the discourse of recuperation that presides over the integration of Catalan exiled writers into their national canon, a politics of history is functioning too. The latter uses Catalan Republican as an expression of national culture repressed by Francoism along with any other manifestation of national sentiment, one that can now, in democracy, be vindicated as Catalonia's own legacy. By including Republican exiled writers in historiographies of the transitional and democratic periods, the idea that Catalonia and Catalan nationalists were always the enemies and victims of Francoism gets reinforced, exonerating along the way all those in Catalonia who, more or less actively, contributed to the establishment and perpetuation of the dictatorship. While Catalan exiles were certainly among Franco's victims, it is historically unsound to assert the same of all Catalan nationalism. The discourse of recuperation is hereby put at the service of a strategy that glosses over the complexities of the historical relation between Catalonia and the Francoist state. Such a complex history demonstrates how Catalonia too, notwithstanding all of its national particularities, was part of a Spain divided by the Civil War. Moreover, during the dictatorship and subsequent democratic period, it partook again of the historical processes that brought about that structural break mentioned earlier as the condition of possibility of relations between Republican exile and Spain.

To conclude, there are differences and the need to historicize the specificities of the Catalan, or Basque or Galician cases can never be stressed too much. Nonetheless, it is crucial to establish points of articulation with the nation-state, Spain, to which they belong willy nilly. Historical phenomena of the magnitude of the Civil War and its aftermath, involving fatefully all those living in the country at the time, as well as generations to come, cannot be fully addressed otherwise.

Theorizing Republican Exile

For Republicans who had to flee their country exile had to be lived as a crisis of modernity: all those modern projects the Republic had made conceivable and attainable were now being wiped out by Francoism; those nation-states incarnating what was supposed to be models of the most advanced modern societies in the world had been complicit in the demise and wiping out of the Republic; finally, by being expelled from Spain, exiles would be prevented from participating in the development

of new modern formations within the country. While the term Republican exile refers most often to the brutal experience of being expelled from the land, it would be accurate to extend its meaning to the experience of being brutally expelled as well from one's own relation to modernity.

In the absence of all those Republican exiles, years of dictatorship and economic prosperity to come would make the reconstitution of Spanish modernity, even if in different, even antagonistic terms to those articulated by the Republic, possible and viable.¹³ Key to an understanding of how Francoism succeeds in perpetuating itself in power during 36 years is to recognize how, through processes of modernization, it manages to introduce or make possible, sometimes against its own interests, new configurations of modernity.¹⁴ It is to the extent that the Francoist regime is capable of modernizing the country that it turns itself into a viable state form for so many years. By the 1960s, the prosperity brought about by the *desarrollista* plans of modernization put in place the conditions for making possible the appearance of new configurations of the modern.¹⁵ New configurations that turned out to be – even when they articulated a critique of the regime –¹⁶ incompatible with those that had come to fruition during the Republic. Nobody saw as clearly as Max Aub how inoperative and out-of-synchrony Republican exile political and cultural thinking was when he went back to Spain in 1969 from his exile in Mexico. Expressions of modernity under the dictatorship had been generated in the absence of models other than those imposed by the regime. The Francoist state erased the traces of Republican modernities so efficiently that even those who opposed the regime articulated their arguments outside of any substantial claim to the exiled legacy, let alone those who supported or just put up with the dictator. This is nowhere more apparent than in the transitional period to democracy, when no meaningful vindication of the Republican past on the part of relevant politicians would make itself heard. And so, the forms and conceptualizations of modernity that Republicans took with them into exile would continue in democracy, as under the dictatorship, to be residual, alternative and certainly incompatible with respect to Spanish dominant versions of it. As is well recognized now, in many – not in all – fundamental ways, Spanish democracy is posited on, and not against, the achievements of the dictatorship when it comes to the task of constructing a modern country. And to that extent, for democracy as well as for the dictatorship, exile represented that outside without which they could not have constituted themselves.¹⁷ Helena López's argument in her contribution of the existence in dictatorial as well as in transitional Spain of a social fantasy of the democratic country that is built on the necessary, constitutive exclusion of exile, is postulated on these premises of continuity and exclusion. What is perhaps most perverse about this exclusion of exile in the democratic social imaginary that she shows, is that it comes together, as two sides of the same coin, with the removal of the dictatorship. While the ejection of the dictatorship from this democratic imaginary conveniently hides the existence of very real continuities between the two regimes, that of exile reinforces the constitutive nature of its absence since the end of the Civil War.

Consequently, Republican exile cultures where the aforementioned – residual, alternative, incompatible – forms and conceptualisations of the modern are expressed, should be considered as exterior indeed to the Spanish modernity rooted in Francoism and later continued in democracy. One might say that the challenge of cultural historians and otherwise scholars of Republican exile is to prove in their analyses and interpretations that, even though it might seem counterintuitive, this relation of

exteriority and incompatibility defining the pair Republican exile-modern (authoritarian and democratic) Spain, does not equal irrelevance or insignificance, a *de facto* no-relation.

Towards a Theory of Republican Exile: Some Conclusions

The ethics and politics of Republican exile studies nowadays hinge upon the activation of two mutually supportive discourses: integration and recuperation. But I am afraid that what is posited as the recuperation of Spanish Republican exile for the history of Spain, however well intentioned it might be, will not yield the desired results. I am sceptical of the “integration” principle underlying the political project of many scholars and practitioners in the field, to the extent that it draws a direct relation between the penetration of exile studies and texts within the Spanish fields of education, literature and academia more generally, and the restitution to what constituted that exile of its deserved place in Spanish history(ography). By way of “making room” for exile, we reduce its problematic to one of representation. The assumption here, it seems to me, is that once the under- or un-represented is made present in a benign political context, the exile person, the exile community will have come back home. The dream of a circular exiled time comes true in this way: the break in the continuum of time opened up by exile, a gap monstrously dilated in all those years of longing to go back, closes finally in a full circle when the presence of what was made absent realizes itself in the nation. As if time had not gone by, as if nothing had been irretrievably lost. Framed by the portrait of (self)-representation, assimilated within Spain, in the “sameness” of the nation-state, Republican exile is neutralized, and in that way co-opted. These integrating mechanisms succeed in this way in masking Republican exile as that impossible-to-integrate outside that the absence of it in transitional and democratic Spain from positions of recognition in power and in hegemonic formations of memory demonstrates Republican exile to be. What gets crucially lost in the “generosity” of such a democratic, pluralistic gesture (“aquí cabemos todos”), are the variety of political and ethical projects, what I have earlier called the alternative modernities, dead ends of Spanish modernity that those expelled in 1939 carried with them. By agreeing to become a normalized part of the now democratic and constitutionally-monarchic nation-state, exile legitimises Spain’s really-existing modernity and democracy, embracing it as its own, glossing over the latter’s abject ties to the dictatorship that made modernity possible by way of erasing and expelling those who did not submit to its reactionary version of it. Spanish Republican exile as the outside of Spain’s really-existing modernity relinquishes in this way its status and meekly accepts the law and the language of the Same.

What is arguably most politically powerful in Republican exile is that, given its outside-of-the-nation condition, exile is outside of the latter’s sovereignty¹⁸ as well, and therefore structurally capable of critical positions with respect to Spain that are barred to those living inside. From that point of view, the truly challenging politico-cultural task for cultural critics of Republican exile is not to strive to get this exile “correctly” (self)-represented and recognized within Spain. After all – we should not forget Bourdieu’s lesson here –, and independently of the good intentions of individuals involved in the production, distribution and marketing of these cultural products, by succeeding in having, or aspiring to have Republican exile cultural products circulate inside the Spanish cultural field today, we might not be doing much

more than succeeding in fetishizing them,¹⁹ as Naharro-Calderón's contribution so forcefully explains and so succinctly summarizes in the concept of "exiliobusiness."

Another critical way of approaching the politics of recuperation of the Spanish Republican exile is to devise a form of such recuperation that preserves as a critical position the marginality – externality, to be more accurate – and non-assimilative nature of exile. This is the position that I start to theorize in what follows, pointing as I go to possible lines of critical exploration that might be productively pursued when one moves in this direction.

Spanish Republican Exile as Countermodernity

New possibilities of strategically mobilizing other theoretical, political and critical approaches to the study of its cultures open up when we define Spanish Republican exile in terms of its problematic relation to modernity, or more specifically, as *constitutive* outside of the Spanish modern nation after 1939. This *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies* has very recently paid well-deserved attention²⁰ to reactionary thinking and its indispensable role in the constitution of the Spanish modern nation (Moreiras 124).²¹ In particular, Leyte's contribution to that issue, while speaking from a more general Western philosophical point of view, elaborates on the paradoxes and complexities of considering that "lo 'reaccionario' forma parte constitutiva de la filosofía" (139), as a residue that can never be overcome insofar as it is needed by philosophy in order to assert itself (138). The study of Spanish exile, and in particular its Republican version, can benefit from this line of thinking. I do not mean this in the sense that Republican exile can be said to be, *per se*, a politically reactionary phenomenon.²² Rather, I want to engage productively with those aspects of the study of reaction and its relation to the modern that allow us to think of reaction as a *constitutive* resistance to modernity that, in turn, defines modernity by allowing it to assert itself and to become what it is. Similarly, it can be argued that exile is relevant to the nation-state on the basis of the former being a constitutive resistance to the latter. Two things separate Republican exile's *constitutive* resistant position as I am defining it from those of other reactionary forms of thought. First of all, that its resistance is exercised, not from the negation of modernity, but from alternative, residual and incompatible versions of a modernity understood as a historically and geopolitically defined configuration of the modern. And second, that its resistance is exercised, not from a denied inside, but from a consciously excluded outside, from the radical impossibility of coming back, to re-insert or to be re-inserted in the nation and its constituted form of modernity.

The case of Zambrano in particular illustrates the usefulness of reaction in exploring Republican exile. Bundgaard argues in her article that, already in 1930 and before exile, Zambrano's nuclear concept of "razón poética," the one that would articulate all of her philosophy, was already being formulated. What Zambrano is attempting in 1930 around the concept of "nuevo liberalismo" is a timely critique of modernity that goes to the root of Enlightenment as a critique of "la razón clásica," or logical reason, which "no sirve ya para hacer política revolucionaria" (Bundgaard 10). Zambrano's well-known critique of modernity's repression of the irrational: passion, instinct, spirituality and faith, besides being perfectly tuned to the great philosophical and political problems of the 20th century, is postulated from within modernity. The Zambrano of 1930 wants to revolutionize Spain through a new liberalism that entails a new understanding of modern life, and to that effect she will give support to the

Second Republic. In exile, Zambrano will transform her politics in “desarraigo existencial y metafísico. El exilio pasa a ser espacio de revelación del ser y la mística será la nota predominante en su pensamiento” (Bundgaard 18). It is undeniable that this position entails an abandonment of politics and a flight from philosophy. But at the same time, such attitudes represent Zambrano’s exacerbation and radicalization of a critique of reason which she had started long before going into exile. Her “philosophical” positions in exile mark not only a *beyond*, but also a position *against*, modernity, as constituted in the very specific history of her expulsion from Spain and, in that sense, Zambrano’s “counterposition” speaks (to) the nation. Which takes me to my next point about Republican exile as countermodernity.

Another possible line of theorizing Republican exile as existing in a relation (of exclusion) to Spanish modernity comes from postcolonialism and from Latin Americanism. These critical approaches provide us with theoretical²³ discussions of colonial, postcolonial and indigenous practices and products as potential forms of countermodernity (Kraniauskas 121) that are postulated from positions of partial and/or ambiguous, exteriority with respect to the countered modernity.²⁴ Again, as in the case of reactionary thinking, it is not without careful discernment that we can claim the advantages of using certain Latin Americanist or postcolonial strategies for the study of Republican exile. Colonialism, as the defining horizon of modernity in these critical approaches, cannot possibly define the problem that Republican exile has with modernity. In a way, the political position held by postcolonial studies critics and Latin Americanists on the one hand, and that held by critics of Spanish Republican exile on the other stem from opposite poles of the problem of modernity. For the former what is at stake is the violently enforced *inclusion* in modernity that colonialism inflicted upon colonial subjects; for the latter, the violent *exclusion* of Republican exiles from the modern as incarnated in the Spanish Second Republic. What they share is a constitutive relation of resistance to a modernity that is defined as violent and oppressive because such violence and oppression have determined the constitution of their relation to it: in the case of postcolonial and subaltern communities, a problematic relation of inside/outside and marginality; and in the case of Republican exile, a relation of exteriority.

By reconceptualizing Republican exile as countermodernity we can make strategic use of interpretative tools that have proved very productive in these other fields of study. More importantly, we shed new light on often revisited and very familiar exilic topics. I am thinking here of the question of temporality. I have earlier spoken of exile as a chronotope of crisis, that is, as a form of deterritorialization that is negatively – even pathologically – affected by its subjects’ being violently removed from their previous fixed locations in space and time. Postcolonial and Latin Americanist reading strategies allow us, critics of Republican exile, to rethink the textualization of temporality and history in many exilic texts from a more politically effective position. By privileging a definition of modernity in temporal terms, as the time of capital, colonialism and imperialism, linear progress, development and so on, these critical approaches construct the subversive and alternative nature of their texts and subject positions precisely in the textualization or otherwise performance of a break in such a conceptualisation of time. The colonizing work of modernity is therefore boycotted, interrupted in the celebration of alternative temporalities said to exercise what the subalternist historian Guha called semiotic breaks (qtd. in Kraniauskas 112) with dominant modern perceptions of time and history; or is boycotted in the symptomatic reading of present, modern texts where traces of

suppressed, violent colonial pasts are revealed thereby producing a disjunctive enunciation (Bhabha 297-315).

Let us now come back to Republican exilic production where the treatment of temporality is also fundamental, bearing in mind exile's condition as chronotope of crisis, to try to open up a route to interpret these exilic formations as critical interventions in Spanish modernity. Many exilic cultural products are characterized by the recurrence of a fixation with the past. This is often interpreted as evidence of a nostalgic structure of feeling (Valis 117-133) that is ultimately melancholic and paralysing to the point of rendering these texts useless to the forward-looking nation. But, could not these texts be reactivated in our analysis as counter-readings of modern temporality (or modernity as a particular temporality) and interruptors of it? Could not they be said to signal, against a modernity defined by its problematic relation to and denial of the past, a new political and critical role for memory? Ofelia Ferrán's piece on María Teresa León's *Memoria de la melancolía* included in this issue precisely points in this direction when interpreting León's memoirist text as being in contact with the Spanish present situation: "León's text, and the mass graves still being exhumed today in Spain, are ghostly embodiments of an uncomfortable past *in the present*, reminders, most uncomfortably of all, that the transition to democracy has been uneven and incomplete, that Spanish society still has great debts with its past, that the appropriate *lieux de memoire* still need to be created" (23 of the manuscript, emphasis in the original). From a different point of view, Roger Bartra in the interview included in this volume embraces melancholia and the attachment to the past as being one of the most stimulating triggers of artistic and cultural production in the Hispanic tradition.

As we ponder the critical possibilities opened up by considering Republican exile's fixation with the past as critical interventions on Spanish modernity, new critical approaches that put memory and the past at the centre of their political agendas can be incorporated: Derrida's postulation of hauntology as the inescapable mode in which the past critically inhabits the present (11);²⁵ or Benjamin's critique of history and progress, which proposes an alternative understanding of revolution as the recuperation and liberation of an oppressed and victimized past, and of the task of the historian as that of making present and vindicating the past of the victims (256, 260-63). Or more generally, the array of approaches encompassing studies on cultural memory. Inside this volume, the contributions by López and Naharro-Calderón, with their emphasis on proving the importance of Republican exile memory for democratic Spain and on analysing the politics of exclusion that has presided over the dominant treatment of Republican exile since 1939, belong to this line of investigation.

Finally, a recent book by Eduardo Subirats, *Memoria y exilio*, is a step in this same direction of arguing the paradoxal centrality of exile thought to any history of Spanish modernity.²⁶ Subirats reads in the numerous and significant cases of exiled thought all throughout Spanish history, – from the expulsion of the Jews and Moors, to the voluntary exile of José María Blanco White, all the way to Republican exile and Juan Goytisolo –, a continuity of "tradiciones de resistencia humanista" (16), a coherence in their "condición paradójica de intelectuales desterrados y testimonios privilegiados de la historia cultural lusohispánica" (16) to even posit "la propia condición exiliada de la tradición intelectual lusohispánica" (16-17). Subirats maintains with modernity and the Enlightenment a necessary love-hate relationship. If the workings of colonialism occupy an important part of the book, it is equally true that Subirats, whose criticisms range from the Spanish Empire to Almodóvar, mourns

the perpetual “aspiración truncada” (13) to a modern Spain: “los poderes inquisitoriales, [...] desde el siglo XVI, han mantenido persistentemente al mundo ibérico y sus colonias americanas al margen de las reformas intelectuales y políticas europeas ligadas a la Reforma religiosa, al Humanismo científico y a la propia Ilustración. [...] Este desplazamiento continuo y las sucesivas fracturas de la conciencia intelectual lusohispánica distinguen, en fin, a estas culturas como una perpetua negación de sí mismas y un ‘continente vacío’” (14, 17). In a way, this is a rather common position/place in the history of Spanish liberal intellectuals – once again “el problema de España” – as Spain’s inability to catch up with European modernity. According to him, it is to those thinkers and collectives who were expelled from the nation that one has to look for the most insightful and best-informed perspectives on the Spanish nation. Even more, the truncated character of Spanish Enlightenment – or, to use Subirats’s own expression in a previous book, “la ilustración insuficiente” – is in direct relation to the expulsion of those who could have written its history otherwise. And that is precisely why they were expelled. By locating meaning in exile, a meaning that is relevant to the understanding of the nation, Subirats destabilizes a view of Spanish history and, by extension, its culture, as self-contained within the boundaries of the nation, as exhausted in the narratives and practices, -resistant or conformist, subaltern or hegemonic-, of its citizens and inhabitants “in residence.” By constructing exile as the negative of Spanish modernity, Subirats brings the outside inside, in the sense that it makes the outside relevant to the inside, not in order to integrate the former into the latter, but to interrupt and disjoint its discourses. The memory of exile inaugurates thus a hauntology, an echo of the nation that, nonetheless, will not be allowed to identify with it.

Diasporizing Republican Exile

Two contributions to this issue account for that excess of exile that moves it beyond an intrinsic relation to a longed-for and lost centre. Without them, this issue would be failing to point to one of the most unexplored aspects of Republican exile, its generating of a diaspora. As Clifford argues in relation to contemporary theorizations of diasporic movements:

The centering of diasporas around an axis of origin and return overrides the specific local interactions (identifications and ruptures, both constructive and defensive) necessary for the maintenance of diasporic social forms. The empowering paradox of diaspora is that dwelling *here* assumes a solidarity and connection *there*. But *there* is not necessarily a single place or an exclusivist nation. (269, emphasis in the original)

Contemporary approaches to diaspora are explicitly recuperated in our issue through the words and perspectives of Roger Bartra. They are indispensable the more we move away from cultural elites and into an interest in the experiences, lives and cultures of those exile collectives constituting what Carles Fontserè called in his memoirs “exiliats de tercera.” The article on the *Unión de Mujeres Antifascistas* by historian Mercedes Yusta in this volume shows the ways in which exile collectives and individuals – those women in the UMA – interacted locally, in their *here*, precisely in the process of keeping their “solidarity and connection *there*.”²⁷ By so

doing, they intervened in and were affected by the histories of their host countries. What Yusta's article helps to reveal is how "these women were capable of constructing extensive networks of female solidarity" (Yusta 2 of manuscript), at the national level with French women and with other International Communist and Women's associations, to the point that "they [these associations] were an extremely important channel for rooting Spaniards in the society in which they were exiled." (Yusta 2 of manuscript).

Finally, for an issue that seeks to redefine and explore new avenues for the theorization and interpretation of Republican exile, it did not seem completely out of place to include an interview with one of its protagonists. By choosing Roger Bartra, the son of Catalan Republican exiles in Mexico but not, *strictu sensu*, part of this exile, our intention was twofold: first, to challenge the limits of Spanish Republican exile studies in the sense of exploring the centrifugal force of exile I referred to above and, in so doing, provoking the question: where does Republican exile stop being of concern to "us," its practitioners? The second intention was to have the opportunity to interrogate a cultural anthropologist whose work has extensively dealt with questions of national identity and more recently, of deterritorialization and diaspora in the Mexican and Latin American context, about Spanish/Catalan Republican exile. In other words, to ask him to reflect upon this (multiple) exilic history both as part of his lived experience and in relation to his own formal knowledge and research on national identity and diaspora in contemporary Mexico. The purpose was to see if both angles, experiential and intellectual, could be made to illuminate and fertilize each other. How was Bartra's life and professional trajectory influenced by Spanish/Catalan Republican exile?²⁸ But also, could contemporary diasporic and exilic movements in the Americas, through the interpretation and biography of Bartra, be made to relate to Spanish Republican exile?

Naharro-Calderón closes his contribution to this volume by calling for a productive recuperation of the diasporic experience of Republican exile in post-11M Spain. The point of such a recuperation, he argues, would be to make Spaniards reflect upon those other diasporic subjects, the immigrants inhabiting their territory now and, by extension, upon the whole disastrous global situation of "violencia planetaria de corte estatal y terrorista" (31 of manuscript). The unexpected presence of Bartra in this issue stems from a similar political purpose to the one articulated by Naharro-Calderón: by de-centering Republican exile in theoretical and experiential routes that have left Spain behind, to make it present and relevant in the world of today.²⁹

The cultures of Republican exile constitute a big corpus of works that, as of today and with the exception of isolated, famous figures, remains largely unexplored. This ignorance about the exilic primary texts and their authors is coupled with the tacit acceptance of very strong cultural, political and historical paradigms and discourses that have made possible the invisibility of this corpus. As new scholars and the public in general become interested in Republican exile, it is important not to lose sight of the fact that this corpus of texts, with all of its material and symbolic cultural value, puts us in direct contact with what is, without a doubt, the most important event in the history of 20th century Spain: the Civil War. Moreover, it is the legacy of one of the first massive diasporas in 20th century world history.³⁰ Despite those who think that the cultures of Republican exile were irrelevant to the history of Spain or to the study of diasporic cultures in the 20th century, the editors of *Rethinking Spanish*

Republican exile would like to invite readers to do precisely that: to think about this exile again.

Notes

¹ It would be impossible here to do justice to all the scholars and writers that have intervened in the field. Suffice it to say that Vicente Llorens, José María Marra López, Javier Rubio and José Luis Abellán did the pioneer work in the study of the literature and culture of Republican exiles in the 1960s and 1970s. The aforementioned GEXEL, which has its own publications devoted to Republican exile including the proceedings of all of the their conferences, is the current best resource to map the field.

² Sebastiaan Faber's recent and important *Exile and cultural hegemony* stems from this same critical spirit while focusing on the political and ideological consequences of exile on Spanish Republican intellectuals and evaluating their significance in the history of Mexico.

³ In the words of Eric Mottram: "Ya que una cultura consiste en eventos en una interacción dinámica y – como señala Whitehead – cada evento forma intersecciones con todos los otros eventos, el problema está en seleccionar eventos que den acceso al patrón de interacción. La enseñanza de los estudios culturales es el arte de seleccionar el grado necesario de detalles para que la cultura comience a revelarse" (qtd in Rowe 31).

⁴ Culture is defined by Labanyi ("Gramsci" 98) as "site of struggle between a plurality of dominant and subaltern constituencies, each of which is in turn a mixture of heterogeneous tendencies vying for dominance."

⁵ This is most openly expressed in the subtitle to Graham and Labanyi's foundational book of Spanish Cultural Studies: *Spanish Cultural Studies. An Introduction. The struggle for modernity*.

⁶ The concept of the chronotope is extremely useful for an interpretation of exile literature also, given the bakhtinian concept's focus on the spatio-temporal coordinates.

⁷ Michael Holquist and Caryl Emerson define it as: "a unit of analysis for studying texts according to the ratio and nature of temporal and spatial categories . . . An optic for reading texts as x-rays of the forces at work in the culture system from which they spring." (*Dialogic* 425-426). Bakhtin develops the concept of chronotope in two papers: "Forms of Time and Chronotope in the Novel" (1981) and "The Bildungsroman and Its Significance in the History of Realism" (1986).

⁸ Another example: in a letter to Ortega y Gasset where Zambrano reproaches her "maestro" for not having taken public, strong sides with the antimonarchic opposition, Zambrano says of her generation: "nuestra alegría está en sentirnos instrumentos y sólo aspiramos a tener una misión dentro de algo que nos envuelve, el momento histórico" (quoted in Bundgaard 31).

⁹ According to Bundgaard, Zambrano criticizes "el liberalismo 'viejo'" for its being "capitalista y burgués" (Bundgaard 33). However, as Bundgaard also points, Zambrano's critique was of "liberalismo clásico racionalista" as much as of Marxist communism.

¹⁰ Combinations of these two definitions make up the most common uses of the concept of modernity. Commonplace expressions in the analyses of Spanish contemporary history, such as "Spain's struggle for modernity" or "Spain's tardy and uneven modernity" present, for instance, in the vocabulary of Labanyi's texts discussed above, allude to these meanings.

¹¹ This is certainly not an indicator of the editors not attaching importance to these aspects of Spanish Republican exile studies. It goes without saying that not all possible angles of this utterly complex field can be covered in one volume. In what follows I briefly address the most pressing implications of the differences in the study of the exile of communities from the historical communities of Spain, and their relation to their nation of origin.

¹² I will only mention here that this strategy is not without problems of its own, namely when we come to the thorny question of those exiled writers and artists who did not produce their work in the minority language, but in a different one, Spanish or otherwise.

¹³ The conglomerate of social forces allying themselves against the Second Republic in the run up to, and during the Civil War can be adequately labeled as reactionary. In perspective, though, the reactionarism of these rebel forces can be more accurately labeled as reactionary modernism (Neocleous 24), and Francoism a combination of this reactionary modernism first, and capitalist modernization later on. 20th century history is full of political reactionarisms, which have been enormously productive to the advance of capitalist modernization. Neocleous coins the aforementioned concept of reactionary modernism to refer to these, a concept derived from his analysis of the relationship between the artistic avant-garde and German fascism. He characterizes reactionary modernism as: "'modernist' in actively affirming the qualitative transformation in our social

To cite this article: Mari Paz Balibrea (2005) Rethinking Spanish republican exile. An introduction, *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies*, 6:1, 3-24, DOI: 10.1080/1463620042000336884

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1463620042000336884>

experience brought about by the socio-economic conditions of modernity, and ‘reactionary’ in the sense that what it seeks to retrieve is already lost and must therefore be created anew” (30). In other words, a kind of reactionarism that mythifies the past and the desire to restore past social and political forms in a radically transformed future but on the other hand actively supports the socio-economic forces of capitalist modernity (Neocleous 31). As Francoism becomes a solidly established state, its support of the socio-economic forces of modernity is rendered increasingly clear, as is the purely rhetorical and ideological nature of its imperialist project. Once the need to do the revolution (the *coup d’état* of 1936) to impose itself is past, Francoism turns into a form of conservative modernity, in the sense that “it offers a quantitative regulation of the disruptive temporality of modernity, repressing the possibilities inherent in its performative character by reducing them to adaptation to a pre-given social type” (Osborne, “Times” 139). In Francoism, the adaptation had to be to the authoritarian state. Regardless of how much a reactionary vision of the national past continues to be postulated by the ideological state apparatuses of Francoism, the rapid process of modernization turns the country into a consumer society, that is, into a – narrowly-defined, unequal and unevenly distributed, but nonetheless unmistakably – modern society. Those living in such modern society found themselves immersed in a homogeneous, empty time that sought and many times succeeded in alienating and depoliticizing them. Max Aub in *La gallina ciega* verified this with bitter clarity. Franco’s death produces the gradual elimination of those reactionary elements in the process of Spanish modernization that had been dragged from the previous regime. The new one, democracy, substitutes them by a sanctioned conservative modernity, which will guarantee the continuity in socio-economic matters, while introducing new political institutions. I elaborate further on these topics, particularly with respect to how they affect the treatment of Spanish history in “Max Aub.”

¹⁴ See Gracia (37 and 384) for a very different—and nowadays hegemonic—view of modernity under Francoism, as the exclusive territory of anti-Francoism.

¹⁵ It would be wrong to claim that Spain in the 1950s and mostly in the 1960s becomes a homogeneously modern country. But it is equally wrong to deny, I think, that the processes of modernization that so importantly define those decades did nothing to bring about – if in a contradictory and unequal manner – homogenized forms of modernity to the country, namely as a result of the spread of consumer society and mass culture.

¹⁶ Political and cultural contacts between more or less critical factions inside Francoist Spain and those in exile did indeed exist and need to be taken into account in a more in-depth analysis than the one that I have time to do here. However, I insist on my basic thesis that the political and cultural legacies of Republican exile are fundamentally done away with, more blatantly during Francoism first, more subtly in democracy later on.

¹⁷ In the context of Republican exile studies, Naharro-Calderón (“Falacias,” and in his contribution to this issue) has also insisted on the idea that exile is inherent to the constitution of any nation.

¹⁸ I do not have room here to develop the question of the relation between sovereignty and exile. See Agamben (“Politica” 47-52) for a theorization of this question, and the crucial place occupied by exile as a philosophical and political concept and in relation to sovereign power. Agamben, in a variation of his well known theorization of the ambiguous relation of abandonment between sovereignty and sacred/bare life as hinging upon the state of exception, put forward in *Homo Sacer*, locates exile in the same originary sphere as sovereign power: “el exilio no es, pues, una relación jurídico-política marginal, sino la figura que la vida humana adopta en el estado de excepción, *es la figura de la vida en su inmediata y originaria relación con el poder soberano*” (48 emphasis in the original). Also in *Homo* (104-111, esp. 110-111). Agamben’s thesis reinforces my own argument of exile as being in a constitutive relation to the nation. It remains to be argued – I will only suggest the possibility here – how exile’s undecidable and ambiguous politico-juridical relation of exile to nation, as being inside and outside, and as the ultimate victim of the state, can be construed as an advantageous position of enunciation from which to undermine the nation. In other words, can Spanish Republican exile be empowered by way of revealing its potential for a critique of Spain? This is the challenge.

¹⁹ Consider, for instance, Rafael Chirbes’s caustic article included in the special issue of *El País* weekly cultural supplement, *Babelia*, devoted to Max Aub. The article is significantly entitled, “Quién se come a Max Aub.” For a discussion on how Republican exiles are used as tools of political legitimation in Mexico and democratic Spain, see Faber (267-274).

²⁰ See the monographic issue (2004) 5:2, *Spanish reactionary thinking*, edited by Alberto Moreiras.

²¹ In fact, all contributions come to reinforce this idea. As Moreiras says: “In the light of Spanish history, it would seem, and this is proved by Ucelay and Leyte, by Villacañas and Williams, by Pavlovic and Vilarós, in different ways, that there is no progressivism which is not attached to a deeper

To cite this article: Mari Paz Balibrea (2005) Rethinking Spanish republican exile. An introduction, *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies*, 6:1, 3-24, DOI: 10.1080/1463620042000336884

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1463620042000336884>

reaction, which of course leaves open the question as to the hidden progressivism of reaction itself” (129). For another philosophical discussion of how reaction is a form of modernity, see Osborne, “Times.”

²² Which is different from acknowledging that certain Republicans in exile articulated reactionary forms of thought, as Faber (120-147) has convincingly proven. For elaborations of political reactionarism see those of Osborne (“Times”) and Neocleous. Moreiras (123-124) too defines three differentiated forms of conceptualizing reaction in modern philosophy: those of Schmitt, Althousser and neo-Spinozian positions. Finally, see note 13 above for a discussion of reaction in relation to Francoism.

²³ To the inclusion, in the case of Latin Americanism, of critical concepts such as transculturation, heterogeneity, hybridity and subalternity

²⁴ I do not mean to conflate these distinguishable critical practices beyond the frame of my discussion. What brings together postcolonialism and Latin Americanist perspectives in my use of them is the way in which both of them need to grapple with how to articulate the relation of modernity/colonialism/imperialism with their colonial others. Furthermore, I am aware that many Latin Americanists have rejected the post-colonial paradigm as a valid one to interpret the impact of the Spanish Empire in Latin America and its aftermaths, insofar as it presupposes a notion of modernity as enlightened reason on the part of the colonizers that is not applicable to the Spanish Empire. However, to the extent that the impact of modernity in Latin America is undeniable from our historical perspective, even if it was not there at the time of the *conquista*, I think that my argument is still valid.

²⁵ There has been an important amount of work done in studies on Spain using this frame of hauntology and spectrality in cultural approaches to the question of how and why in transitional and democratic Spain there is such a clamorous silence of the Spanish recent past of dictatorship. See Ferrán and López in this issue for a fuller discussion and bibliography on the matter.

²⁶ Subirats deals with Latin America, including Brazil and the Iberian Peninsula, Spain and Portugal. I will refer here only to the implications of his ideas to the study of Spanish history.

²⁷ In the words of one of its members, Paquita Merchán, “No hablábamos de nosotras, de cómo vivíamos, sino de los presos, de España...Estábamos volcadas [...] no había más que España, no veíamos otra cosa” (Yusta 50).

²⁸ In the words of Bartra: “The condition of a permanent exile has given me, as an anthropologist, the very necessary estrangement to study the country where I was born” (Balibrea 129).

²⁹ At the end of his book on Spanish Republican exiles in Mexico, and after a discussion of how the PRI used Republican exiles as tools to legitimate their own politics, Sebastiaan Faber brings his argument to an end by signalling new directions for research: “To what extent the Spaniards’ left-wing political baggage might in turn have contributed to the breakdown of that [PRI’s] hegemony, a process initiated in 1968 and currently still in progress, is an issue that remains to be investigated” (273 emphasis in the original). I believe that the work of Roger Bartra is a step in that unexplored direction.

³⁰ Agamben (Homo 131-132, “Política” 45) argues that it is after WW1 that the exile, refugee condition becomes symptomatic of a crisis in the fundamental categories of the Nation-State. Along with the displacement of White Russians, Armenians, Bulgarians, Greeks, Germans, Hungarians and Rumanians that he mentions as examples of this new critical condition, one should certainly include that of Spanish Republicans only a few years later.

Works Cited

- Abellán, José Luis. *Filosofía española en América (1939-1961)*. Madrid: Guadarrama, 1963.
- Abellán, José Luis, ed. *El exilio español de 1939*. 6 vols. Madrid: Taurus, 1976.
- Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer. Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.
- . “Política del exilio.” *Archipiélago* 26-27 (1996): 41-52.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.

- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Speech Genres and Other Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986.
- Balibrea, Mari Paz. "Max Aub y el espacio-tiempo de la nación." *Escritores, editoriales y revistas del exilio Republicano de 1939. Actas del Tercer Congreso Internacional*. Ed. Manuel Aznar Soler. Barcelona: GEXEL: Associació d'Idees, 2004, forthcoming.
- Bhabha, Homi. "DissemiNation: Time, narrative, and the margins of the modern nation." *Nation and Narration*. Ed. Homi K. Bhabha. London: Routledge, 1991. 291-322.
- Benjamin, Walter. "Theses on the Philosophy of History." *Illuminations*. New York: Schocken Books, 1973. 255-266.
- Bergman, Marshall. *All that is solid melts into air. The experience of modernity*. London, Verso, 1982.
- Caudet, Francisco. "Dialogizar el exilio." *El exilio literario español de 1939. Actas del Primer Congreso Internacional*. Ed. Manuel Aznar Soler. Barcelona: GEXEL/Cop d'Idees, 1998. 31-55.
- Chirbes, Rafael. "Quién se come a Max Aub." *El País, Babelia* (31 May 2003): 4-5.
- Clifford, James. "Diasporas." *Routes. Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, Mass./London: Cambridge University Press, 1997. 244-277.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Specters of Marx. The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning, and the New International*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Faber, Sebastiaan. *Exile and Cultural Hegemony. Spanish Intellectuals in Mexico, 1939-1975*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2002.
- Fontserè, Carles. *Un exiliat de tercera. A Paris durant la Segona Guerra Mundial*. Barcelona: Proa, 2000.
- Gracia, Jordi. *La resistencia silenciosa. Fascismo y cultura en España*. Barcelona: Anagrama, 2004.
- Habermas, Jürgen. "Modernity – An Incomplete Project." *Postmodernism. A Reader*. Ed. Thomas Docherty. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993. 98-109.
- Harvey, David. *The condition of postmodernity. An inquiry into the origins of cultural change*. Cambridge MA & Oxford UK: Blackwell, 1989.
- Kaplan, Caren. *Questions of Travel. Postmodern Discourses of Displacement*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1996.
- Kraniauskas, John. "Hybridity in a Transnational Frame: Latin-Americanist and Postcolonial Perspectives on Cultural Studies." *Nepantla: Views from South* 1:1 (2000): 111-137.
- Labanyi, Jo. "Gramsci and Spanish Cultural Studies." *Paragraph* 22:1 (1999): 95-113.
- . and Helen Graham. "Culture and Modernity: The Case of Spain." *Spanish Cultural Studies: An Introduction*. Eds. Helen Graham and Jo Labanyi. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995. 1-19.
- Leyte, Arturo. "La naturaleza reaccionaria de la filosofía." *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies* 5:2 (July 2004): 131-143.
- Llorens, Vicente. *La emigración Republicana*. Vol 1 of *El exilio español de 1939*. Madrid: Taurus, 1976.
- Marra López, José Ramón. *Narrativa española fuera de España, 1938-1961*. Madrid: Guadarrama, 1963.

- Moreiras, Alberto. "Spanish Reactionary Thinking: an Introduction." *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies* 5:2 (July 2004): 123-130.
- Naharro-Calderón, José María. "Falacias de exilios." *El exilio literario de 1939: Actas del Congreso Internacional celebrado en la Universidad de la Rioja del 2 al 5 de noviembre de 1999*. Eds. María Teresa González de Garay Fernández and Juan Aguilera Sastre. Barcelona: GEXEL: Associació d'Idees, 2000. 350-358.
- Neocleous, Mark. "Radical conservatism, or, the conservatism of radicals." *Radical Philosophy* 93 (Jan/Feb 1999): 24-34.
- Osborne, Peter, "Modernity is a qualitative, not a chronological, category: notes on the dialectics of differential historical time." *Postmodernism and the re-reading of modernity*. Eds. Francis Barker, Peter Hulme and Margaret Iversen. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992. 23-45.
- . "Times (Modern), Modernity (Conservative)? Notes on the Persistence of a Temporal Motif." *New Formations* 48 (Spring 1996): 132-141.
- Rowe, William. *Hacia una poética radical. Ensayos de hermenéutica cultural*. Rosario and Lima: Beatriz Viterbo and Mosca Azul, 1996.
- Soldevila Durante, Ignacio. *Historia de la novela española*. Madrid: Cátedra, 2000.
- Subirats, Eduardo. *Memoria y exilio*. Madrid: Losada, 2003.
- Ucelay-da Cal, Enric. "Lost Causes as a Historical Typology of Reaction: a Spanish Perspective, from Jacobites to Neofascists and Spanish Republicans." *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies* 5:2 (July 2004): 145-164.
- Valis, Noel. "Nostalgia and exile." *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies* 1:2 (Sept 2000): 117-133.
- Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.