

This article was downloaded by: 10.2.97.136

On: 26 Sep 2023

Access details: *subscription number*

Publisher: *Routledge*

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: 5 Howick Place, London SW1P 1WG, UK



Edited by Javier Muñoz-Basols, Laura Lonsdale and Manuel Delgado

The Routledge Companion to Iberian Studies

Javier Muñoz-Basols, Laura Lonsdale, Manuel Delgado

Beyond the Nation

Publication details

<https://test.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9781315709895.ch33>

Sebastian Faber

Published online on: 28 Mar 2017

How to cite :- Sebastian Faber. 28 Mar 2017, *Beyond the Nation from: The Routledge Companion to Iberian Studies* Routledge

Accessed on: 26 Sep 2023

<https://test.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9781315709895.ch33>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR DOCUMENT

Full terms and conditions of use: <https://test.routledgehandbooks.com/legal-notices/terms>

This Document PDF may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproductions, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The publisher shall not be liable for an loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

33

BEYOND THE NATION

Spanish Civil War exile and the problem of
Iberian cultural history*Sebastiaan Faber*

The outbreak of the Spanish Civil War in the summer of 1936 and the defeat of the Republic three years later forced a half million citizens of the Spanish state to leave their country. An estimated 160,000 of them would end up in a form of long-term exile (Alted 2005, 52; Rubio 1977, 206–207). Although this amounted to less than 1% of the country's population at the time, the displaced included a significant portion of Spain's cultural elites: writers, artists, academics, politicians, and professionals. Among them were many of the individuals who had shaped two decades' worth of extraordinary intellectual flourishing since the 1910s and helped devise and implement the wide-ranging reforms of the failed Second Republic (1931–1936), which envisioned the Spanish state as a modern, secular, and multinational democracy.

The largest groups of Spanish Republican exiles took up residence in France and Mexico; other host countries that were significant in terms of numbers or status of the exiles they received included the United Kingdom, Argentina, the United States, the Soviet Union, Venezuela, and Chile (Pla Brugat 2007, 19–22). The Franco regime depicted the exiles as traitors, representatives of the anti-Spain, responsible for the outbreak of the Civil War, and agents of dangerous, un-Spanish ideologies. Through strict censorship and other means, the regime succeeded in all but excluding the exiles and their work from public life in the Spanish state, particularly during the 1940s and '50s. If any exile texts circulated in Franco's Spain, it was clandestinely or in very limited forms. The host societies, meanwhile, often benefited significantly from the exiles' presence. Despite the tensions and difficulties that accompany long-term political exile, Spanish Republicans left lasting cultural, academic, political, and economic legacies throughout the world. These legacies – schools of thought, cultural institutions, universities, publishing houses, whole academic fields – are generally acknowledged in the host countries but have remained largely underappreciated in post-Franco Spain.

What has become known in Spanish as *el exilio republicano de 1939* is one of several large-scale displacements from Western and Central Europe throughout the 1930s and '40s, fueled by the rise of Nazi- and Fascist-inspired oppression in Italy, Germany, Portugal, Spain, and the territories under their control. Yet in contrast to most other antifascist exiles, for the Spaniards the defeat of the Axis powers and the end of World War II in 1945 did not herald the possibility of a return home. While Hitler and Mussolini went down with their regimes, the Allied forces permitted Franco to stay in power, forcing the exiles who were still banking on an imminent and triumphant homecoming to adjust their plans and outlook. In fact, the

intensification of the Cold War in the late 1940s allowed Franco to further strengthen his hold on his country's reins. Spain's Republican government in exile formally remained in operation until 1977, 38 years after being established and two years after Franco's death. By then, many of the exiles had died as well.

One single essay cannot do justice to the sheer size and diversity of almost four decades' worth of work by thousands of cultural producers in dozens of different host countries. In what follows, I focus on a core set of problems conjured up by a massive, politically motivated displacement like the one the Spanish Republicans suffered – problems that affect not just the exiles and their hosts, but also the home nation and the scholars tasked with writing a coherent narrative of the history of the exiles' fate and cultural output. In addition to giving an overview of the main trends in Spanish Civil War exile and scholarly approaches to it, particularly in literary and cultural studies, I focus on the *nation* as a category that has been central and problematic in both. After all, while the physical reality of long-term exile undermines the bond between individual and nation, the loss of nationhood tends to endow it with new meaning and weight. By way of example I take a brief closer look at the case of Catalan- and Castilian-speaking intellectuals in Mexico.

The challenges of cultural history

The magnitude, quality, and length of the Spanish Republican exile experience pose difficult challenges for historians of culture whose primary categories of organization are national language and identity. Since their rise in the nineteenth century, histories of national art, literature, or thought are chronological narratives that assume a level of organic unity in their corpus of study: an internal coherence woven by genealogical lines of influence and inspiration, a shared language, and a shared physical space, public sphere, and collective destiny. In the case of twentieth-century Spain – multinational, multilingual, deeply divided, and geographically dispersed – the existence of such an organic unity is not by any means self-evident (Epps and Fernández Cifuentes 2005, 11–45). Does a novel written in Castilian by a Spanish exile who has lived in Buenos Aires for thirty years still qualify as a Spanish novel, even if it was never published, reviewed, or read in Spain? Should it, and its author, be considered part of Spanish literary history, Argentine literary history, or no literary history in particular? And what if the novel was written in Catalan and published in Mexico City? In what national tradition should we include the work of Jorge Semprún, an exile from Spain who wrote most of his extensive prose production in French, and whose recurring themes place him closer to Primo Levi and Arthur Koestler than to most of his Spanish contemporaries? Is it proper to consider Eugenio Granell – a novelist and well-known late Surrealist painter whose trajectory of displacement included the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Puerto Rico, and New York – as a Spanish artist? There are two obvious arguments against that claim. First, he did not pick up a paintbrush until finding himself exiled to the Caribbean; he most likely would not have considered a painting career had he not been uprooted by the Civil War. Second, he saw himself as much a Galician as a Spaniard – even though he wrote in Castilian.

Two additional elements further complicate the relation between notions of national identity and overarching narratives of cultural history. The first of these is the fact that the Franco regime insisted on constructing official histories of Spanish culture that consistently marginalized the exiled Spanish Republicans, along with culture produced in Catalan, Basque, and Galician, while allowing very little margin for any alternative views. As Fernando Larraz has shown in relation to Spanish literary history, regime-sanctioned or regime-tolerated narratives were fatally skewed but nevertheless became deeply ingrained

in the institutional DNA of Franco's Spain – Royal Academies, encyclopedias, anthologies, cultural canons, and awards and, most importantly, school and university curricula and doctoral dissertation topics. Rather than “un bloqueo total” of the exiles' cultural production, Larraz writes, “lo que se produjo fue una manipulación mucho más dañina para los intereses de los exiliados;” “los prejuicios de toda índole impidieron casi siempre lecturas limpias y adecuadas” (Larraz 2009, 15). Curiously, these histories were not fundamentally revised after the country's transition to democracy, which left many basic institutional structures intact. In this way, post-Franco histories of culture continued to be marred by the “inercias y tópicos” produced under Francoism (Larraz 2009, 15). The exiles, to be sure, produced alternative histories of culture based on different conceptions of Iberian history and its relationship to modernity. But, as Mari Paz Balibrea has argued, those, too, have been largely ignored in post-Franco Spain (Balibrea 2007, 29–30).

The second complicating element is the fact that among a significant portion of the republican exiles the experience of displacement spurred a newly intensified focus on their own national identity. In some, this fueled a resurgence of different forms of cultural nationalism and pan-nationalism whose tenets harkened back to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In some way this rise of cultural nationalism was surprising, given the profoundly cosmopolitan, internationalist outlook of Spanish cultural elites in the 1920s and '30s (Blanco Aguinaga 2005, 85–97). On the other hand, celebrations of national history and identity had been expressly encouraged among the global Left during the four years of the Popular Front period (1935–1939), in an attempt to counter the mobilizing power of the rabid nationalism embraced by the fascist and conservative Right (Faber 2002, 28–51). Finally, and more generally, Yossi Shain (1989) and Judith Shklar (1998, 38–55) have shown that exile often exacerbates nationalistic tendencies. The struggle for cultural and political hegemony that political exiles are forced to wage in their confrontation with the hostile home regime almost inevitably takes the nation as its main reference point (Shain 1989, 20–21).

Reactions to displacement

If the size, quality, and length of Spanish Republican exile pose certain difficulties for historians of Spanish national culture, historians of Spanish Republican exile as such face challenges of their own. How does one construct a coherent, evolutionary narrative from an infinitely wide range of experiences that occurred in dozens of countries spread over several continents? Not only were there many kinds of exile, but also the very term “exile” is not always the most fitting one to describe the experience of displacement lived by citizens of the Spanish state in the wake of the Civil War: groups and individuals left for different reasons, under different circumstances, enjoyed different kinds of legal status, and faced different options when it came to the possibility or desirability of return. (As we see in a moment, for example, the notion of return took on a different meaning for Catalan exiles than for Spanish ones.) The term “Republican,” for its part, may be accepted as a generally accurate indication of the exiles' disagreement with the Franco regime, even if that disagreement manifested a wide range of gradations. Yet “Republican” does little justice to the exiles' ambivalent views about the five years of Republican government in Spain, and fails to acknowledge the dynamic variety of their political identities and affiliations in an ever-changing international context. The adjective “Spanish,” finally, blurs the extent to which the very definition of Spanishness – if there was such a thing to begin with – was one of the major political and cultural stakes in the Civil War and its aftermath. An exile who, from abroad, refers to “*el país*” or “*la patria*” may be invoking Spain, but she may also well be invoking Catalonia, Galicia, or the Basque Country.

The exiles' reactions to their forced displacement varied enormously as well. This variation was in part a function of age, background, and temperament, but also of the exiles' widely different circumstances: exile environments and trajectories ranged from fairly luxurious to highly precarious or outright life-threatening. The handful of Spanish intellectuals housed from 1938 on in the Mexican "Casa de España," for example, enjoyed a warm welcome, including a good salary and plenty of opportunities for teaching and publishing without the handicap of a language barrier. A core group found long-term employment in El Colegio de México, the prestigious graduate institution into which La Casa de España soon evolved (Lida and Matesanz 1988). Those academics – relatively few in number but high in prestige – who were lucky enough to land jobs in the rapidly expanding world of United States higher education, too, tended to be well off materially. Yet they often found themselves isolated in cultural, geographical, and linguistic terms, an isolation that in the 1960s evolved into a decidedly conservative profile (Faber 2008, 65–72; Resina 2005). On the other end of the spectrum, thousands of Spanish Republicans ended up in French concentration camps; more than 10,000 Spanish refugees were taken prisoner by the Germans after the French capitulation (Pike 2000, 3); and thousands ended up in Nazi extermination camps, including, prominently, the Mauthausen-Gusen complex. Others risked or lost their lives fighting in the European resistance against the Nazis or working as liaisons with the anti-Francoist struggle in Spain itself (Pike 1993).

Exile politics

The exiles' relationships with their host governments were often complicated. Problems started with conditions for admission and behavioral expectations once admitted. In the wake of the Great Depression many states around the world had adopted stringent immigration policies that affected not only Jewish refugees from Central Europe but other anti-fascists looking for asylum as well (Wyman 1984). As Hannah Arendt has argued, the rise of the modern nation-state and the concomitant definition of individuals' rights as a function of their legal status within nation-states have allowed governments to punish unwanted individuals and groups with denationalization or expulsion, leaving them practically without rights (Arendt 1973, 276–80). The fate of the thousands of stateless Spanish refugees in French concentration camps before and during the German occupation illustrates this well. Not surprisingly, Spanish exiles were all too aware of the fact that their survival depended on the willingness of foreign governments to take them in. Feelings of gratitude and dependency often conditioned exiles' place and role in their host societies, as did legal restrictions on the activities and rights of refugees, permanent residents, or naturalized citizens.

The Republicans' clearly pronounced political profile did not help matters. The United States, for example, applied a very restrictive immigration policy and party militants on the Left had a difficult time getting into the country (Alted 2005, 302; Namias 1992, 93–94). Those that did manage to get an entry visa often lived for years under the watchful eye of US intelligence services and became targets of suspicion or even persecution, as occurred with the filmmaker Luis Buñuel and his friend José Rubia Barcia, who in the late 1940s became a target of the House Un-American Activities Committee, was arrested and threatened with deportation (Fox 2008, 175–85; Martín 2010, 421–521; Namias 1992, 92–102; Rips 1981, 120–21). The group of Spanish exiles that ended up in the Soviet Union included the almost 3,000 children who were sent there between 1937 and 1939 and who were not able to return to Spain after the Republic's defeat and the outbreak of World War II (Alted 2002, 131). Some among the adult exiles in the USSR, between 1,000 and 2,000 in number, attracted the suspicions of

the Stalin regime (Alted 2002). A particularly curious case was that of the Dominican Republic, whose right-wing dictator Rafael Leónidas Trujillo accepted a contingent of some 3,000 Republican exiles, whom he saw in part as a means to “whiten” his country’s population, assigning them to agricultural colonies. The Spanish Republicans faced enormous difficulties dealing with their host country’s climate in both meteorological and political terms, and many left for friendlier environments as soon as they had the chance (Lloréns 1975; Naranjo Orovio and Puig-Samper 2009). Still, the Republicans’ legacy on the island is significant; among other things, they helped organize the opposition against the dictatorship (Vega 1984).

The government of Mexico, led until 1940 by President Lázaro Cárdenas, was by far the most generous and welcoming of all the host countries. Between 1939 and 1942 it would end up giving shelter to more than 20,000 Spanish Republican refugees. Yet even in Mexico the exiles faced strict regulations – participation in Mexican politics was strictly forbidden, for example – and a never-absent undercurrent of distrust. While the exiles in the Spanish-speaking Americas did not have to deal with the language barrier that their companions in the United States, France, or the United Kingdom faced, there was plenty of cultural and political friction between the representatives of the former empire and those of their former colonies (Faber 2002, 242). Still, in no other country have exiles from the Spanish state – Spaniards, Catalans, Basques, Galicians, Valencians – left a more indelible mark in the spheres of publishing, philosophy, science, industry, education, art, anthropology, literature, and film (Faber 2013).

In addition to the complex relationships with different types of host regimes, Spanish Republican exile communities were plagued by deep internal divisions of a political and personal nature. For some, the defeat of the Republic and the failure of the Allied Forces to liberate Spain after vanquishing fascism led to political disenchantment. For others, it meant a sharpening of their political commitment and resolve. Tensions that had been mounting during the Civil War – between anarchists and communists, for instance – grew stronger in defeat and spurred decades’ worth of exclusions, accusations, recriminations, and even physical violence (Glondys 2013, 37–38). To complicate things further, political affiliations were cross-cut by personal and regional feuds and alliances. As had been the case during the war, these conflicts were in part a function of larger geopolitical developments. From the late 1940s on, the Cold War in particular shaped the Spanish Republican exile experience. As Franco positioned himself as the anti-communist “Sentinel of the West” the international isolation that had marked Spain in the immediate post-Civil War years turned into gradual acceptance: a treaty with the United States (1953) and admission into the United Nations (1955). And while many members of the Spanish Communist Party (PCE) in exile remained beholden to the Soviet Union (Morán 1986; Pike 1993), those exiles most radically opposed to the USSR – anarchists, liberals, and anti-Stalinist communists – were recruited into the so-called Cultural Cold War, in particular through the CIA-sponsored Congress for Cultural Freedom (Glondys 2013). For someone like Max Aub, a socialist who was critical of the Soviet Union and Communist Party policy but who nevertheless refused to join the anti-communist camp, the Cold War became “un falso dilema” that impeded the adoption of a third way between capitalism and communism (Aub 1967, 49; Aznar Soler 1996).

Exile and national identity: the case of Mexico

Regardless of geography, displacement came with numerous challenges. Leaving Spain compelled the exiles to reconsider their national identity, the role and function of their work, their relation to what they considered to be their homeland (be it Spain, Catalonia, Basque Country, or Galicia) and, especially in the case of the writers, the identity and location of their audience

and their own relationship to that audience. Did it make sense for exiled poets, novelists, and essayists to continue to direct themselves to readers in Franco Spain, for instance, even though in practice those were all but unreachable? Should they write for their fellow exiles? Or was it more advisable, or effective, to try to reach out to the reading public in their host countries? Francisco Ayala, who took on this question in a seminal 1947 essay, urged his fellow exiles to wrestle themselves free from their obsession with Spain and concluded that the exiles wrote “para todos y para nadie” (Ayala 1990, 213).

Exile, as a concept and as a phenomenon, derives its meaning – its attraction and its pain, its charm and its echoes of tragedy – from a simple notion: the connection between culture and place. The curse that plagues writers and other cultural producers who choose exile, or who are forced into it, is the romantic idea that the only culture that is authentic to and relevant for a particular space is the culture produced within that space by people who can, moreover, claim an organic relation to that space. By this logic, only someone born in France, writing in France and in French, or born in Italy and writing in Italy and in Italian, is worthy of inclusion in the master narrative of French or Italian literature. An added problem is that exiles often lose the institutional power to define the limits of relevant spaces, and the power to consecrate cultural products as being authentic and relevant. This is why they themselves often end up excluded from cultural histories, or relegated to their margins. Much of exiles’ lives and work is dedicated to resisting this dynamic: to proving that it is they who most authentically represent the nation they left behind. The irony is that, even if that is true at the beginning, it becomes necessarily less true with each passing year.

These are, in essence, the ingredients of what I have called a struggle for cultural hegemony. Among the exiles from Republican Spain, the tactics followed in this battle were diverse, and their results uneven. Some prominent intellectuals in the exile community doubled down on cultural nationalism, aggressively and obsessively identifying their work and language with some kind of national essence. Others worked in the opposite direction, seeking to subvert the connection between organicity and cultural value, claiming that the experience of uprootedness is itself as a source of superiority or privilege: a road toward emancipation and enlightenment. This idea lives on in the connection that Roger Bartra – son of Catalan Republican exiles in Mexico – establishes between melancholia and lucidity (Balibrea 2005, 127). The need to defend the exiles’ definition of Spanish culture, past and present, also spurred productive and innovative institutional work. José Bergamín’s publishing venture in Mexico, *Séneca*, managed to publish a range of outstanding books, including the complete works of Antonio Machado and the first edition of Federico García Lorca’s *Poeta en Nueva York* (Faber 2002, 138–41). Philosophers such as José Gaos, Eduard Nicol, and María Zambrano dedicated their professional work to a critique of modernity from a position of Hispanic cultural specificity, thus partly paving the way for later innovations in Latin American thought (Balibrea 2007).

While some exiles built on the internationalist legacy of the avant-garde 1920s and embraced a new form of cosmopolitanism, others gave in to an exalted cultural nationalism that, among those in the Spanish-speaking Americas, could manifest itself in forms of Pan-Hispanism with a curious undertone of imperial nostalgia. The poet Juan Larrea, for example, who served as the driving force behind the Junta de Cultura Española and its journal *España Peregrina* (a precursor of *Cuadernos Americanos*), defended the curious argument that the defeat of the Spanish Republic in 1939 inaugurated a new era in which the spirit of Spain, embodied in the Republican exiles, would turn the Western hemisphere into the savior of civilization. In practice, Larrea’s millenarian rhetoric only serves to underscore the exiles’ actual marginalization. A certain fascination with Spain’s imperial past, seen as a source of glory and pride and as the positive foundation of modern Spanish-American culture, is also present in

Luis Cernuda's exile poetry written in the United Kingdom (1938–1947), the United States (1947–1952, 1961–1963), and Mexico (1952–1963) (Blanco Aguinaga 1998; Faber 2000). There are clear rhetorical and conceptual points of connection between the pan-Hispanist ideas embraced by some of the Republican exiles and the discourse on Hispanidad as it was articulated around the same time by the Franco regime – points of connection that signal a common nineteenth-century genealogy. Both stipulate a basic linguistic and cultural unity of the entire Spanish-speaking world, minimizing the specificity of Spain's former colonies; and in both, the assumption of Spain's central place within that unity serves as a source of hope or pride. Yet while some of the Republican exiles fell prey to a form of imperial nostalgia, it is important to point out that Franco's Hispanidad, with its emphasis on Catholicism and hierarchy, tapped into a much more reactionary vein than the exiles' versions of Pan-Hispanism, which often emphasized shared progressive, liberal, or radical traditions (Rehrmann 1996) and rejected imperialism on principle.

The resurgence of pan-Hispanist ideas among Spanish-speaking exiles in Latin America serves to underscore the extent to which their experience differed from that of Republicans who identified with a different linguistic and national tradition. The community of Catalan exiles in Mexico, for example, which included anthropologist Joan Comas, philosopher Eduard Nicol, and the writers Josep Carner, Vicenç Riera Llorca, Agustí Bartra, Lluís Ferran de Pol, Avel·lí Artís-Gener, and Pere Calders, undertook a wide range of professional initiatives while also founding Catalan-language publishing houses and journals whose relative isolation in the host country was much more evident than those undertaken in Castilian. Still, some 170 books and dozens of journals in Catalan appeared in Mexico between 1939 and 1975 (Férriz 1998; Noguera Ferrer & Guzmán Moncada 2004, 12).

Joan Ramon Resina has convincingly argued for the specificity of Catalan exile after the Civil War. "El exilio catalán de 1939," Resina writes, "ni puede subsumirse sin más en el español, ni en la vaguedad de una abstracción que acaba siempre invocando otras expatriaciones, otras ausencias" (2012). Three principal factors determine this specificity: the political and cultural situation of Catalonia during the years of the Republic, marked by a measure of political recognition after four decades of energetic cultural development; the political and cultural situation of Catalonia during the Franco regime, shaped by ruthless repression of Catalan language, culture, and activism; and the fact that, given these realities, Catalan-speaking exiles related very differently not only to their homeland but also to the continuing legacies of Hispanic and Hispanist imperialism in Spain's former colonies. If the Spanish-speaking exiles tended to identify unwittingly with the colonizers, the Catalans identified with the colonized: their language and culture, too, had suffered under Spanish dominance. Given the blanket repression of Catalan culture by the Franco regime, moreover, the Catalan exiles felt the burden of responsibility for cultural survival even more heavily.

Exile and Iberian cultural history

From a scholarly perspective, the study of Spanish Civil War exile opens up central questions that affect the field of twentieth-century Iberian studies as a whole. Most of these questions can be framed as a problem of relations. How should historians of culture understand the relation between the culture produced in Spain and that produced by (former) citizens of the Spanish state abroad over a period of almost forty years? Are the culture of *la España del interior* and *el exilio* to be seen most fruitfully as two separate entities, or as part of an organic whole? Is one the core or rump and the other a peripheral appendix? Are those relations between exile and home front different for culture produced in Catalan, Castilian, Basque, or Galician? More

in general, how should we understand the relation between culture produced in Castilian and culture produced in other Spanish languages? What is the relation between history and politics, on the one hand, and art and literature, on the other? How do we assess culture produced by citizens of the Spanish state – whether in Spain or in exile – in relation to modernity, however defined? Were the exiles stubbornly or tragically “stuck” in the past, whereas their countrymen in Spain remained contemporaneous with the rest of the (Western) world? Or was it precisely the other way around – that is, was the widening gap between the exiles and the cultural producers in Franco Spain due to the latter’s isolation from twentieth-century normality, whereas the exiles could read and write much more freely?

Scholars and intellectuals have adopted widely divergent positions on these questions. Within the field of literary history, it was Francisco Ayala – an exile himself – who in 1981 argued against the notion of “exile literature” as an organizing principle. For Ayala, displacement was a non-literary factor that had no decisive, let alone consistent, influence on the content or form of narrative fiction produced by exiled writers (Ayala 1981, 63). If any group of authors was affected by the aftermath of the Civil War, it was those who remained in Spain, not those who left. The exiles’ work could evolve more freely and naturally, more in touch with their times, than that of the writers living under the Franco regime (1981, 65). That said, Ayala’s minimizing of the experience of displacement also assumes that the Spanish exiles never cease to be Spanish. His inversion of the hierarchy between the culture produced within the boundaries of the Spanish state and that produced outside of it by individuals born within it, returns in a different guise in Henry Kamen’s *The Disinherited: The Exiles Who Created Spanish Culture* (2007). Kamen, a British historian of Spain, argues that the authors of many of the canonically central works of Spanish cultural history were in fact expelled from their home country or forced to leave. While representing Spain as cursed with a chronically intolerant state, he also, at the same time, relativizes the importance that Spanish exiles granted themselves and their work.

Literary histories published in Spain during and after the dictatorship, on the other hand, tend to place the center of gravity and normality within the Iberian Peninsula. In the first couple of decades, mentions of the exiles and the work were unlikely to pass the censor’s muster; later, they were awkwardly relegated to appendices (Balibrea 2007, 42–50; Larraz 2009, 81–100). Since the late 1990s, research groups have formed – most prominently the Grupo de Estudios del Exilio Literario (GEXEL) at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona – whose main purpose has been to recover the intellectual legacy of Spanish Civil War exile for democratic Spain, starting from the premise that that legacy was unjustly ignored or trivialized both during the dictatorship and in the first decades of post-Franco democracy. In addition to scholarly studies and conferences, GEXEL has also spearheaded a biographical dictionary and editions of exiles’ works that had never appeared in Spain.

Mari Paz Balibrea has provided a convincing and combative rationale for the need of recovery while pointing out that such a recovery can never be total. If the Transition of the 1970s largely ignored the significant cultural and political legacy of the exiles, she argues, it did so at the nation’s peril. Spain today is far from a perfect democracy; it continues to suffer from the unaddressed legacies of Francoism. One major source of *alternative models* for a Spanish democracy – and therefore a major source of inspiration for reform – is precisely the largely untapped and forgotten legacy of the Republican exiles. In *Tiempo de exilio* (2007), Balibrea makes this argument specifically in relation to the work of Max Aub, María Zambrano, and Eduard Nicol. The value of their contribution lies precisely in its exilic difference, in the fact that it cannot be completely assimilated into post-Franco Spain.

At the opposite side of a polemical divide stands the work of Barcelona critic Jordi Gracia. In *A la intemperie. Exilio y cultura en España* (2010), Gracia makes three central arguments.

First, that Spain's democracy today has largely freed itself from the Francoist legacy. Second, that this democracy was born out of the efforts – initially tentative but increasingly courageous – of formerly Francoist writers within Franco Spain to carve out a space for liberalism and democracy. And third, that those who had left Spain – that is, the exiles – only contributed to this process to the extent that they abandoned their stubborn loyalty to the republican cause and their corresponding illusions of cultural superiority, and recognized instead that their role was a subservient, supportive one in relation to *la cultura del interior*. Gracia insists, however, on the notion that *la cultural del exilio* and *la cultura del interior* should be seen as part of “un solo cauce” (Gracia 2010, 19).

If Gracia, Balibrea, and others largely continue to read, interpret, and assess the cultural production of Spanish Civil War exiles in relation to the Spanish state, other critics – particularly those working outside of Spain – have attempted to turn the difficult relationship between exile and home culture into a lever for rethinking the overall structure of the scholarly fields tasked with studying the culture and history of the Iberian Peninsula and its diasporas. Such attempts have been made most prominently and productively under the umbrellas of Trans-Atlantic Studies, Iberian Studies, and Trans-Area Studies. What all three have in common is a desire to move beyond accounts of cultural history that privilege the nation-state, and instead to pay attention to individuals, currents, and genealogies that cross cultural and linguistic borders.

In reference to understanding Spanish Civil War exile, all three have valuable contributions to make. Trans-Atlantic Studies rejects the division of the Spanish-speaking world as an object of analysis into “Peninsular” and “Latin American” studies, while also recognizing the multicultural and multilingual nature of the geographical space that once made up the Spanish and Portuguese empires (Gabilondo 2001; Gerassi-Navarro & Merediz 2009). Iberian Studies, for its part, rejects the hegemony of Castilian in the fields that study the cultural production in the Spanish state – and the chronic repression, by that state, of non-Castilian cultures – emphasizing the multicultural and multinational nature of Spain and Portugal (Resina 2009, 2012). Within exile studies, Iberian Studies has served to underscore that the multicultural and multilingual are also defining features of Spanish Civil War exile communities, and to highlight the double marginalization of Basque, Galician, Catalan, and Valencian exile production. At a more general and polemical level, Iberian Studies has functioned as a basis from which to articulate a critical analysis of the ways in which Castilian-speaking exiles in U.S. universities and elsewhere laid the basis for a Hispanism that sidelined non-Castilian Hispanic cultures and attempted to re-assert the cultural hegemony of Spain over Latin America (Faber 2008, 55–72; Resina 2005). Trans-Area Studies, finally, seeks to abandon scholarly approaches to culture that assume a static relationship between place and production – such as the traditional philologies – in favor of models and fields that privilege movement. More dynamic models, the argument goes, are simply more fitting to understand the cultural production of a century such as the twentieth, which not for nothing has been dubbed “the century of displacement” (Ette 2012, 30).

If these three new approaches provide a deeper, more complete, and more rigorous understanding of the cultural production of Spanish Civil War exile – and therefore of twentieth-century Iberian culture as a whole – the narrow disciplinary framework, inherited from the philological school and reinforced by Francoism, that defines Spanish culture as culture produced in Spain, by Spanish-born individuals in the Castilian language has, by contrast, proven quite unproductive for that purpose. And yet somehow its tenets remain in force. This is clear from recent literary histories such as José Carlos Mainer's nine-volume *Historia de la literatura española*, which fails to acknowledge, let alone take to heart, any of the critiques leveled

at the field from Iberian or Trans-Atlantic Studies. Tellingly, Mainer cavalierly announces in the editor's prologue that his monumental history will only occupy itself with works written in "nuestra lengua" (2011, vii), pointing to a chronic problem in the field of *Filología Española* (Santana 2006, 115). Similarly, the volumes dedicated to the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth minimize the extent to which the evolution of literature in Spain was shaped by developments originating in Latin America (Mejías-López 2009).

Conclusion

Many of the displaced intellectuals from Republican Spain, in particular writers and artists, continued to identify with the home nation throughout their long years of exile. They lived and worked for Spain, Catalonia, the Basque Country, or Galicia. But that does not necessarily mean that they can be unproblematically incorporated into Iberian cultural history alongside those who stayed behind. Two stubborn facts militate against that procedure. First, it is beyond dispute that the displacement itself – leaving the geographical space of home for a long-term existence in another country, culture, and sometimes language – transformed the exiles' work and worldview. It did not change it in uniform ways, as Ayala is right to point out – but change it certainly did. Second, in countless cases the exiles' work has had a greater influence on their host environments – students, readers, critics, colleagues, and peers; institutional landscapes and cultural histories – than in Spain, whether during or after the dictatorship. Gracia is right to argue that the exiles and their legacy played a relatively minor role in the transition to democracy. He is wrong, however, to invoke that fact in order to minimize the exiles' cultural or political influence: their influence was simply felt elsewhere.

Central in the debates over the relation between the exiles' work and *la cultura del interior* have been notions of relative quality, relevance, normality, and contemporaneity. Can the exiles' work be generally described, as it is by Gracia and others, as anachronistic, nostalgic, out-of-touch, and weighed down by dogmatically held political commitments? Or does the immense corpus of art, literature, thought, film, and science produced by Civil War exiles distinguish itself from the culture produced in Franco Spain – stunted by censorship, repression, and isolation – by the fact that it was of higher quality and more in touch with its times? If these debates have been less than productive, it is because they have been taking place largely within the confines of a single academic field, *Filología Española*. Here, again, a widening of the scholarly scope is helpful.

Any approach to cultural history that takes the nation-state as its principal organizing unit is bound to misunderstand or underestimate exiles' life, work, and genealogy. Given the massive impact of displacement on twentieth-century culture, particularly culture produced by individuals born in the Iberian Peninsula, it can be argued that the nation-based framework is insufficient to understand Iberian cultural production generally. In that sense, Spanish Civil War exile studies have proven to be a productive locus of innovation for the field as a whole.

Works cited

- Alted, Alicia. 2002. "El exilio español en la Unión Soviética." *Ayer* 47: 129–153.
 ———. 2005. *La voz de los vencidos: el exilio republicano de 1939*. Madrid: Aguilar.
 Arendt, Hannah. 1973. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
 Aub, Max. 1967. *Hablo como hombre*. México: Joaquín Mortiz.
 Ayala, Francisco. 1981. "La cuestionable literatura del exilio." *Los cuadernos del norte* 2 (8): 62–67.

- . 1990. *El escritor en su siglo*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- Aznar Soler, Manuel. 1996. "Política y literatura en los ensayos de Max Aub." In *Actas del congreso internacional "Max Aub y el laberinto español,"* edited by Cecilio Alonso, 568–615. Valencia: Diputación de Valencia.
- Balibrea, Mari Paz. 2005. "Interview with Roger Bartra." *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies* 6 (1): 123–131.
- . 2007. *Tiempo de exilio: una mirada crítica a la modernidad española desde el pensamiento republicano en el exilio*. Barcelona: Montesinos.
- Blanco Aguinaga, Carlos. 1998. "Ecos del discurso de la Hispanidad en poetas del exilio. El caso de Cernuda." In *El exilio literario español de 1939. Actas del Primer Congreso Internacional*, vol. 2, edited by Manuel Aznar Soler, 273–294. Sant Cugat del Vallès: Cop d'Idees; GEXEL.
- . 2005. "Max Aub y la cultura internacional del exilio republicano." In *Homenaje a Max Aub*, edited by James Valender and Gabriel Rojo, 85–97. México, DF: Colegio de México.
- Epps, Brad and Luis Fernández Cifuentes. 2005. "Spain beyond Spain: Modernity, Literary History, and National Identity." In *Spain beyond Spain: Modernity, Literary History, and National Identity*, edited by Brad Epps and Fernández Cifuentes, 11–45. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press.
- "España Peregrina." 1940. *España Peregrina* 1: 3–6.
- Ette, Ottmar. 2012. *Transarea: Eine literarische Globalisierungsgeschichte*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Faber, Sebastiaan. 2000. "'El norte nos devora.' La construcción de un espacio hispánico en el exilio anglosajón de Luis Cernuda." *Hispania* 83 (4): 733–744.
- . 2002. *Exile and Cultural Hegemony: Spanish Intellectuals in Mexico, 1939–1975*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- . 2008. "Economies of Prestige: The Place of Iberian Studies in the American University." *Hispanic Research Journal* 9 (1): 7–32.
- . 2013. "Los exiliados españoles y las instituciones mexicanas: Entre la autonomía y la cooperación." *Historia del Presente* 22: 75–84.
- Férriz Roure, Teresa. 1998. *La edición catalana en México*. Zapopan: Colegio de Jalisco.
- Fox, Soledad. 2008. "Clamando en el desierto. El exilio de José Rubia Barcia." In *Contra el olvido: el exilio español en Estados Unidos*, edited by Sebastiaan Faber and Cristina Martínez-Carazo, 175–186. Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá, Instituto Universitario de Investigación en Estudios Norteamericanos Benjamin Franklin.
- Gabilondo, Joseba. 2001. "Introduction." *The Hispanic Atlantic. Arizona Journal of Hispanic Cultural Studies* 5: 91–193.
- Gerassi-Navarro, Nina and Eyda Merediz. 2009. "Introducción: Confluencias de los transatlántico y lo latinoamericano." *Revista Iberoamericana* 75 (228): 605–636.
- Glondys, Olga. 2013. *La guerra fría cultural y el exilio republicano español: "Cuadernos del Congreso por la Libertad de la Cultura (1953–1965)"*. Madrid: CSIC.
- Gracia, Jordi. 2010. *A la intemperie: exilio y cultura en España*. Barcelona: Anagrama.
- Kamen, Henry. 2007. *The Disinherited: The Exiles who Created Spanish Culture*. London: Allen Lane.
- Larraz, Fernando. 2009. *El monopolio de la palabra: el exilio intelectual en la España franquista*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.
- Lida, Clara E. and José Antonio Matesanz. 1988. *La Casa de España en México*. México, DF: El Colegio de México.
- Lloréns, Vicente. 1975. *Memorias de una emigración: Santo Domingo, 1939–1945*. Barcelona: Editorial Ariel.
- Mainer, José-Carlos. 2011. *Historia de la literatura española. Modernidad y nacionalismo, 1900–1939*, vol. 6, coord. José-Carlos Mainer. Barcelona: Crítica.
- Martin, Fernando Gabriel. 2010. *El ermitaño errante: Buñuel en Estados Unidos*. Murcia: Tres Fronteras.
- Mejías-López, Alejandro. 2009. *The Inverted Conquest: The Myth of Modernity and the Transatlantic Onset of Modernism*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Morán, Gregorio. 1986. *Miseria y grandeza del Partido Comunista de España, 1939–1985*. Barcelona: Planeta.
- Namias, June. 1992. *First Generation: In The Words of Twentieth-Century American Immigrants*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

- Naranjo Orovio, Consuelo and Miguel Ángel Puig-Samper. 2009. "De isla en isla. Los españoles exiliados en República Dominicana, Puerto Rico y Cuba." *Arbor* 735: 87–112.
- Noguer Ferrer, Marta and Carlos Guzmán Moncada. 2004. *Una voz entre las otras: México y la literatura catalana del exilio*. México, DF: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Pike, David Wingeate. 1993. *In the Service of Stalin: The Spanish Communists in Exile, 1939–1945*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 2000. *Spaniards in the Holocaust: Mauthausen, The Horror on the Danube*. London: Routledge.
- Pla Brugat, Dolores. 2007. "Introducción." In *Pan, trabajo y hogar: el exilio republicano español en América Latina*, edited by Pla Brugat, 19–34. México, DF: SEGOB, Instituto Nacional de Migración, Centro de Estudios Migratorios.
- Rehrmann, Norbert. 1996. *Latinamerika aus spanischer Sicht: Exilliteratur und Panhispanismus zwischen Realität und Fiktion (1936–1975)*. Frankfurt: Vervuert.
- Resina, Joan Ramon. 2005. "Cold War Hispanism and the New Deal of Cultural Studies." In *Spain beyond Spain: Modernity, Literary History, and National Identity*, edited by Brad Epps and Luis Fernández Cifuentes, 70–108. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press.
- . 2009. *Del hispanismo a los estudios ibéricos: una propuesta federativa para el ámbito cultural*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.
- . 2012. "Presentación." *Fractal* 66–67. Accessed July 2, 2014. <http://www.mxfractal.org/RevistaFractal6667Presentacion.htm>.
- Rips, Gladys Nadler. 1981. *Coming to America: Immigrants from Southern Europe*. New York: Delacorte Press.
- Rubio, Javier. 1977. *La emigración de la guerra civil de 1936–1939: historia del éxodo que se produce con el fin de la II República española*. Madrid: Librería Editorial San Martín.
- Santana, Mario. 2006. "Mapping National Literatures: Some Observations on Contemporary Hispanism." In *Spain beyond Spain: Modernity, Literary History, and National Identity*, edited by Brad Epps and Luis Fernández Cifuentes, 109–124. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press.
- Shain, Yossi. 1989. *The Frontier of Loyalty: Political Exiles in the Age of the Nation-State*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Shklar, Judith N. 1998. *Political Thought and Political Thinkers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Vega, Bernardo. 1984. *La migración española de 1939 y los inicios del marxismo-leninismo en la República Dominicana*. Santo Domingo: Fundación Cultural Dominicana.
- Wyman, David S. 1984. *The Abandonment of the Jews: America and the Holocaust, 1941–1945*. New York: Pantheon Books.