

CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture

<<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb>> ISSN 1481-4374 ©Purdue University

CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture (ISSN 1481-4374) is a peer-reviewed quarterly of scholarship in the humanities and social sciences published online in full text and in open access by ©Purdue University and in hard-copy annuals in the Purdue University Press series of Books in Comparative Cultural Studies <<http://www.thepress.purdue.edu/series/compstudies.asp>>. *CLCWeb* publishes scholarship in the widest definition of the disciplines of comparative literature and cultural studies designated as "comparative cultural studies." The journal encourages scholarship in a global, international, and intercultural context and work with a plurality of methods and approaches. In addition to the publication of articles, *CLCWeb* publishes review articles of scholarly books and publishes research material in its *Library Series* <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/library.pdf>>. Work published in the journal is indexed in the American Humanities Index, in the Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature, in the Arts and Humanities Citation Index, and in the International Bibliography of the Modern Language Association of America. *CLCWeb* is mirrored on the website of the British Comparative Literature Association <<http://www.bcla.org/clcweb/>>, it is preserved at research libraries in the Stanford University lockss system <<http://www.lockss.org/lockss/>>, and it is archived in the *Electronic Collection of Library and Archives Canada* <<http://www.collectionscanada.ca/electroniccollection/>>.

CLCWeb Volume 7 Issue 1 (March 2005) Article 6
Sophia A. McClennen, "Exilic Perspectives on 'Alien Nations'"
<<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol7/iss1/6>>

Contents of *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 7.1 (2005)
<<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol7/iss1/>>

Abstract: Sophia A. McClennen's paper, "Exilic Perspectives on 'Alien Nations'," is an excerpt from her book, *The Dialectics of Exile: Nation, Time, Language and Space in Hispanic Literatures* (Purdue UP <<http://www.thepress.purdue.edu/series/compstudies.asp>>, 2004). In the paper, McClennen summarizes her theory that exile writing is inherently dialectical. Focusing on writers working in the latter part of the twentieth century who were exiled during a historical moment of increasing globalization, transnational economics, and the theoretical shifts of postmodernism, McClennen proposes that exile literature is best understood as a series of dialectic tensions about cultural identity. Through a comparative analysis of Juan Goytisolo (Spain), Ariel Dorfman (Chile) and Cristina Peri Rossi (Uruguay), McClennen addresses dilemmas central to debates over cultural identity such as nationalism versus globalization, time as historical or cyclical, language as representationally accurate or disconnected from reality, and social space as utopic or dystopic. After presenting an overview of her book, McClennen then focuses on the ways exile writers construct what she calls an "Alien Nation" where competing and contrasting visions of the relationship between the exile and the nation intersect and contradict.

Sophia A. MCCLENNEN

Exilic Perspectives on 'Alien Nations'

This article derives from my book *The Dialectics of Exile: Nation, Time, Language and Space in Hispanic Literatures* (Purdue UP <<http://www.thepress.purdue.edu/series/compstudies.asp>>). First, I present some of the overarching themes of the book in order to focus specifically on the relationship between exile literature and nationalism. My research on exile and nationalism began in the late 1990s when both the term and the concept of "exile" became fashionable. We heard of the theorist as exile, of inner exile, cultural migrancy, nomadism, etc. The exile floated through texts by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, Jacques Derrida, Edward Said, and Homi Bhabha, spilling onto the pages of many analyses of particular literary works. Much in the same way that the term "diaspora" has come to refer to people without national ties, the exile was, and often still is, described as being free of the repressive state of national identity. There are, in my view, two flaws to this line of thinking. First, even if it were possible to experience a purely transnational existence, most of us recognize that globalization does not lead to a power-free, liberated, multi-cultural state of being. Second, the exile's material existence in a world that requires visas, passports, and so on, in a world, that is, where the exile is forbidden to cross particular geographical boundaries, cannot be understood as existence free of the repressive nature of nationalism. I found that in many scholarly works the term "exile" was empty of history and had lost its reference to a painful state of being. Part of my project was dedicated to reconciling the exile of theoretical discourse with concrete cases of exile from repressive authoritarian regimes.

My survey of criticism on exile culture yielded a persistent binary. Scholars suggest that exile is either a creative and liberating state that enables the writer to function freely of the limitations of the local or the national, or they argue that exile literature is profoundly nostalgic and yearns for the lost nation (see Guillén). According to this logic, exile either causes creative freedom and reflects a global aesthetic or it results in heightened provincialism and literary regionalism. Exile writing is either global or it is national. Reading a number of texts from Spain and Latin America post 1960 by exiled writers, I found that rather than favor one side of a binary, many texts actually presented both sides of this dialectic in irresolvable tension. I ultimately chose to focus on three exemplary writers: Juan Goytisolo (Spain), Ariel Dorfman (Chile) and Cristina Peri Rossi (Uruguay). In my book I use the examples of these writers' work to argue for a new theory of exile writing that reflects these tensions and refuses to overemphasize only one facet of the exile's complex cultural condition. The main argument of *The Dialectics of Exile* is that exile culture contains a series of dialectic tensions between 1) nationalism and transnationalism, 2) a notion of time as linear, progressive and historical and a notion of time as cyclical and non-linear, 3) a belief that language is incapable of meaningful representation and a belief that it is only through language that we can remember and record the past, and 4) a representation of communal bonds as both restrictive and comforting. While the work of exiles may waver between these contradictory poles, occasionally favoring one position over another, these tensions persist.

These observations ultimately suggest that exiles grapple with a series of identity conflicts. These points of tension coalesce in exile literature into a set of common concerns over the relationship between the exile and the nation, time, language, and space. Understanding the exile's experience of nation as dialectical allows us to account for the tensions between nationalism, transnationalism, globalization, counter-nationalism, and anti-nationalism present in exile texts. Regarding time, writing about the exile experience reflects the fact that the exile has been cast out of the present of their nation's historical time. This causes a series of dialectic tensions between different versions of linear/progressive/historical time and the experience that exile is a suspension of linear time. This suspension of linear time includes a sense that time is cyclical and primordial (linking exiles across the ages) and a sense that time is relative and fractured (casting the exile outside of meaningful/monumental time). Exiles tend to recognize that they are in exile due to specific historical events and yet, once outcast from that history, they begin to question the legitimacy of historical time. Furthermore, writers in exile typically are forced

to leave their countries precisely because of their relationship to, and use of, language. Consequently they see language as both a source of power and a source of pain. They appreciate language's ability to fuel the imagination just as they realize that dictatorships manipulate language (through censorship and propaganda) in order to quell independent thought. The dialectics of language for the exile relate to contradictory depictions of language as regional or universal, meaningful or meaningless, powerful or useless, authoritarian or liberating, communicative or misleading, and so on. The fourth dialectic tension I analyze in *The Dialectics of Exile* relates to space. Exiles describe the spaces in which they live as liberating and also confining. Their depictions of "imagined communities" are either comforting and capable of solidarity or threaten to repress difference and destroy the individual (see Anderson). It is noteworthy that the dual gestures of narrating utopic and dystopic spaces are common in exile writing. Consequently, spatial dialectics in exile writing relate to many factors regarding both real and imagined territories of existence. My book dedicates a chapter to analyzing the dialectics of exile as they relate to each of these four key categories of identity, followed by a chapter that applies these concepts to the cultural identity of the exile.

Returning to my topic of focus for this article, the following argument suggests that the exile's experience of nation undergoes a physical and conceptual transformation in the latter part of the twentieth-century as a consequence of transnationalism and postmodernism. The weakening of the nation-state associated with transnationalism combined with the fragmentation of the subject and language associated with postmodernism create an unprecedented situation for the political exile. The experience of these particular exiles, then, bears the marks of their historical context and puts pressure on the binary thinking of nationalism versus globalization. The exile writing of Juan Goytisolo, Ariel Dorfman, and Cristina Peri Rossi exemplifies a third way of defining cultural identity, which holds nationalism and transnationalism in persistent dialectic. These writers combine at least four separate attitudes about nationalism in their writing: First, they reject the authoritarian nationalism of their former countries. Second, they promote a counter version of their nation. Third, they oppose the negative effects of global politics and economic policies since these are often directly or indirectly responsible for authoritarian nationalism. And fourth, they also suggest that transnationalism or post-nationalism may be liberating to the subject because nationalism always implies the repression of difference. It is my argument that the exile's competing and conflicting views on nationalism and globalization constitute the notion of what I call "Alien Nation." And, in order to appreciate the historical context of these writers, it is useful to recall how radically the role of aliens or exiles shifts in the latter part of the twentieth century. While modern national identity reflects earlier mass migrations, the movement of people after the 19th century generally presents a threat to an already established national identity. Historians consistently observe a rise in nationalism in response to mass immigration and migration. In the twentieth century immigrants move to nations that have already defined their borders and carved a national image. After the establishment of national borders, it is culturally terrifying for a country to be threatened by the presence of a new culture that could potentially redefine national identity. So, the immigrants, refugees, and exiles of the twentieth century are faced with metropolitan centers that see them as outsiders with no place in the project of nation building. Such exiles and immigrants typically arrive in nations that are hostile and unwelcoming. This antagonism is further exacerbated by the fact that many exiled intellectuals have found themselves in the "Belly of the Beast," José Martí's term for the metropolitan city. In the specific cases of Juan Goytisolo, Ariel Dorfman, and Cristina Peri Rossi, they flee from authoritarian, corporatist governments in Spain, Chile, and Uruguay to Paris, Washington DC, and Barcelona respectively (Goytisolo now resides between Paris and Marrakech. Dorfman spent time in Amsterdam and Paris before coming to the U. S.). The "beast" for them is not only a metropolitan city but also a source of political, economic, and cultural imperialism. Moreover, the nations to which these exiles fled were often supportive in varying degrees of the installation of authoritarian rule in their homelands. When exiles flee their homeland only to take up residence in a country that supported the dictatorship that caused their exile this creates a bizarre situation where a site of refuge is also the cause of the need to seek refuge. The double, contradictory significance of the

host nation has a profound impact on the exiles' sense of nationalism and globalization inasmuch as it exposes the limits of national sovereignty. Their former nation has been radically altered as a consequence of global politics proving for these exiles that nationalism and globalization no longer make sense as discrete concepts.

Nevertheless, it is commonly assumed that nationalism and transnationalism represent two opposing poles. Nationalism, or the belief that one's nation is distinct and constitutive of a community to which one belongs and from which one's cultural identity has been formed, is challenged by the theory of transnationalism which argues that such affiliations have been, according to Timothy Brennan, "rendered obsolete by the international realities of multinational corporations and the telecommunications industry" (45). The exile is identified as precisely someone who has lost national ties, a transnational. Yet, the condition is a direct consequence of national developments (that prohibit existence at home) and international developments (that pressured these nations to join the international market and intervened in national politics). Describing the role of the "nation" in exile writing as that of an "Alien Nation" also connects, obviously, to the exile's condition of alienation. In many ways, it is the multiple alienations of the exile, which makes the concept of an "Alien Nation" clearer. The exiles I studied experience many layers of alienation, some historically specific and others transhistorical. Transhistorically, the figure of the exile is the quintessential "alien," solitary and melancholy, out of place. Paul Ilie, writing on pan-Hispanic exile literature, refers to the universal alienation of exiles: "across the centuries in different countries, the literatures of exiles originate in different national experiences and nevertheless converge in the common loneliness of physical or psychological displacement" (227). Ilie privileges this common bond and further states that this shared experience "reaches beyond nationality and time itself" (227). While Ilie is justified in highlighting the existence of alienation in the exile experience regardless of nationality or historical moment, this should not overshadow a critical assessment of alienation's historical particularities. Alienation, while universal, only makes sense when relating to a distinct, local space from which one has been isolated. These exiles also suffer alienation in a Marxist sense. Expanding on Marx's theory, the alienation of the exile serves to magnify the four levels of alienation that the individual suffers in capitalist society. Marx argued that under capitalism the working class individual becomes alien to 1) the results of his labor, 2) the nature in which he lives, 3) other human beings and, finally, 4) himself ("Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844" 72-74). In the case of the exile from capitalist society these alienations intensify: By being banished from his country the exile has lost his job, his land, his compatriots and is further isolated and estranged from that society. Moreover, many of these exiled intellectuals find themselves in this position precisely because they advocated marxist critiques of a class-based society. Goytisolo, Dorfman, and Peri Rossi both before and after exile leveled harsh criticisms at bourgeois values and capitalism. Despite the fact that these writers have bourgeois origins, their connection to class privilege is tenuous and complicated, which only serves to exacerbate their experience of alienation. Consequently, Marx's universal condition of alienation under capitalism obtains to these exiles in a particular way. Moreover, these exiles' experience of Marxist alienation becomes intertwined with the transhistorical treatment of the exile as alien.

Thus far I have described two central layers to the complex alienation of exiled writers: They are alienated because they are outcasts and they are often outcasts because they are critics of capitalism and its alienating effects on society. In addition, the alienation of the writers I studied also relates to the fact that they experienced exile after 1960, revealing the shift from modern to postmodern notions of social estrangement. Alienation, as found in the writing of the High Modernist period, is a condition, which affects the artist as he confronts the rise of the metropolitan city. Aijaz Ahmad points to the work of the cubists, Joyce's *Ulysses*, and Eliot's *Waste Land* as artistic representations of the impact of the modern city on individual identity. He argues that "in none of the major modernists, however, was the idea of a fragmented self, or the accompanying sense of unbelonging, ever a source of great comfort; it came usually, with a sense of recoiling, even some terror" (129). Despite its relentless nature, the modern desire to combat social isolation never diminishes. In fact many modern writers who never were exiled have been

described as "exiles in the homeland" or inner exiles, where one's exile is nationally internal. For instance, in the United States the literature of the "lost generation" -- Gertrude Stein's term for a group of writers from the 1920s -- describes writers who felt alienated from their national culture. This feeling of internal exile, described by Malcolm Cowley in *Exile's Return*, caused some of these writers to travel abroad to Europe. Moreover, the writers of the early 1900s, who witnessed the commercialization of culture preceding the Depression, felt a "sense of difference" and isolation which became a constant theme in their writing (Cowley 7). In modernism, alienation is an unpleasant and painful experience. Much cultural production during modernism, then, demonstrates the self's alienation from the rise of the city and from the increasing entrenchment of modern society. The 1960s witnessed the influence of poststructuralist theory and the center for these changes in critical theory was Paris, a common way station for exiles and itinerant intellectuals. The poststructuralists transformed the systematic thinking of structuralism in favor of a view of the world as arbitrary and unconventional. Due to their disappointment with politics and history: "The poststructuralists attacked the scientific pretensions of structuralism which strove for the modern goals of foundation, truth, objectivity, certainty, and system" (Best and Kellner 20). Whereas structuralism did not focus on the dilemmas of the subject because it focused on the sign, under poststructuralism there is an emphasis on the fragmented sign and consequently on the fragmented self. Some suggested that a fragmented identity was no longer a source of anguish, as under modernism, but necessary and positive. The bourgeois obsession with representing the anxiety of the alienated self under modernism was abandoned in favor of a radical rearticulation of the self as endlessly splintered and different. The existential quests of modernism were discarded as useless efforts at uncovering a centered and knowable subject. Ahmad explains the move from alienation as anguish to alienation as celebration: "The terrors of High Modernism at the prospect of inner fragmentation and social disconnection have now been stripped, in Derridean strands of postmodernism, of their tragic edge, pushing that experience of loss, instead, in a celebratory direction; the idea of belonging is itself seen now as bad faith, a mere 'myth of origins'" (129). According to poststructuralism, alienation has lost its marxist resonance as a call toward revolution and the exile lives alienation positively as "new being" (Seidel x).

Alienation in the poststructuralist account of it has also lost any reference to geographical place. It no longer motivates one to act and it no longer has a connection to a political struggle in a particular location. The link between the exile's alienation and nationalism is no longer desirable because the individual's allegiance to a nation is considered to be oppressive. If the goals of nationalism are "creating an administrative economy, a repressive apparatus capable of waging war, and a sense of belonging that glosses over class conflicts," then such repressive thinking must be destroyed (Brennan 45). Ahmad explains that literary theory exalted "cultural nationalism as the determinate ideological form of resistance against the dominant imperial culture throughout the 1970s; but then in the 1980s -- owing to the rise, in particular, of deconstruction and, in general, of poststructuralism -- nationalism itself, in all its forms, came to be discarded as an oppressive, coercive mechanism" (37). The poststructuralists argue that the exile should enjoy the absence of national ties and abandon the quest for home. The exile is heralded as the postmodern hero, a role model for the fragmented self (I should note that I am using postmodernism as a larger umbrella term for a variety of theoretical shifts that took place in the latter part of the twentieth century, among which we find poststructuralism; for more detail on these distinctions please see *The Dialectics of Exile* 17-20).

The problem with the poststructural view of alienation is that the cultural production of exiles in the latter part of the 20th century is rarely, if ever, void of any connection to geography, history, and the subject's pain of alienation. Like modernist writing, the literature of exiles in the era of postmodernism also displays great fear at the splintered self. While alienation in the work of Goytisolo, Dorfman and Peri Rossi is different from that found in the work of Joyce, Unamuno, or Martí, to cite a sample of various modernist writers in exile, it is hardly something to celebrate. Because the writers in my study witnessed failed challenges to capitalism, they lack faith in the possibility of a successful Revolution and they question whether culture can potentially be

subversive. The trend after 1970 was to argue for local resistance and the abandonment of global or universal strategies. Yet, exile literature wavers between seeking subversion locally and globally. The local only makes sense within the global. Dorfman writes, for instance, in the introduction to *Viudas* (1981), his first novel written in exile, that in an effort to avoid censorship in Chile and in order to gain access for his text in his native country he had to use a distant language. Writing about the case of the *disappeared* (political prisoners who were abducted and never accounted for) his allegorical language transforms the story to a level which is "menos local y más universal" (8-9) ("less local and more universal"). As an exile, narrating only the local is not sufficient. Dorfman must narrate his nation's horror from a new perspective -- one that recognizes that similar atrocities happen all over the globe: "Esa tragedia podía ocurrir en todas partes y en cualquier momento y a cualquier persona" (8-9) ("This tragedy could occur anywhere, at any time, to anyone").

I now would like to present a concrete example of how the concept of "Alien Nation" functions in the work of Juan Goytisolo and Ariel Dorfman (for brevity's sake, I have chosen only two of the three writers I researched and would encourage readers curious about Cristina Peri Rossi to consult the book). Both Goytisolo and Dorfman describe alternative nations that are meant to challenge and substitute for the national images promoted under dictatorship. Francisco Franco and Augusto Pinochet, dictators of Spain and Chile, each deployed fascist ideologies of a return to national origins alongside promises to construct a modern industrialized nation. These versions of authoritarian nationalism relied on a complex combination of pre-modern and modern conceptions of society. By pre-modern, I am referring to pre-Enlightenment thinking, i.e. pre-rational, where society was organized according to kingdoms and empires and individuals pledged allegiance to their kings and their kings' gods. The pre-modern in Francoist Spain centers on the era of the Cid, the Spanish Reconquest, and subsequently on the Castilian imperialism of the Catholic Kings. Pinochet's version of the pre-modern is less historically specific and is more closely associated with Catholicism than national history: Pinochet describes his assumption of power as a second coming, often using religious rhetoric in his speeches. Moving from the pre-modern to the modern, history witnesses the birth of the nation and of modern forms of social organization. Individuals are conceived of as citizens and they choose their leaders as opposed to inheriting them. Modernity also refers to the transition from feudalism to capitalism and the nation was the center for the development of capitalist modes of production. Technically the nation-state is modern and secular. What makes these notions slippery when dealing with Franco and Pinochet, though, is that these dictators were advocates of economic modernization, but, they also expected unconditional obedience from the populace. So the version of the nation they promote borrows from both modernism and pre-modernism and reflects the uneven historical development of Spain and Latin America. Goytisolo and Dorfman employ similar tactics in their efforts to narrate against authoritarian nationalism: they create counter nations, they suggest that the nation is always repressive, they celebrate the loss of the confines of national identity, and they worry that globalization may be more repressive than nationalism. As they provide these competing dialectical versions of the nation, Goytisolo and Dorfman respond to the pre-modern and modern ideologies disseminated by authoritarian nationalism. Not only do they recast the pre-modern and modern nation created by dictatorship, they also provide a postmodern critique of nationalism. Despite the fact that these two writers were exiled more than a decade apart, from different nations, and under different personal circumstances, remarkably, their exile writing displays very similar narrative strategies.

Juan Goytisolo leaves Spain in the 1950s and officially goes into exile in Paris in 1961. Goytisolo was a child during Spain's Civil War but became actively involved in a Socialist underground in his 20s. He is part of a generation of post-Civil War exiles from the 1950s, many of whom were writers who could not function under the strict censorship of Franco's Spain. Because this generation inherited the consequences of the Civil War and felt powerless to overthrow Franco, writers from this generation are particularly sensitive to the notions of historical agency and an active subject. Referring to his generation Goytisolo writes "para los hombres y mujeres de dos generaciones sucesivas, más o menos dotados de sensibilidad social y moral, y para quienes la

libertad de medrar o enriquecerse de forma más o menos honesta no podía satisfacer en modo alguno sus aspiraciones de equidad y justicia, las consecuencias del sistema han sido de un efecto devastador: un verdadero genocidio moral" (España 206) ("for the men and women of two successive generations, more or less endowed with social and moral sensibility, and for whom the freedom to thrive or enrich themselves in a more or less honest way could not satisfy in any way their hopes for equity and justice, the consequences of the system have had a devastating effect: a true moral genocide"). After Goytisolo's exile from Spain in 1960, most critics recognize a transformation in the narrative of Goytisolo (for a summary of the different periodizations of Goytisolo's narrative prior to exile, see Sanz 19-29). This shift is based on his desire to find a "new language" in order to challenge the social and economic structures of Spain. Goytisolo distanced himself from the literary production of politically committed writers still residing in Spain at a round table discussion in the 1970s: "En España, todavía hoy, la mayor parte de los escritores comprometidos que atacan la clase social que ocupa el poder (esta casta que controla los mecanismos del poder) emplean, sin darse cuenta, el mismo lenguaje que ella. Una misma retórica, aunque de signo opuesto" (qtd. in Sanz 88-89) ("In Spain, even today, the majority of politically committed writers that attack the social class in power [the caste that controls the mechanisms of power] uses, without realizing it, the same language. The same rhetoric, even though it is of the opposite sign"). Once in exile, Goytisolo sought a new narrative voice to critique the political situation in his country and this critique became less local.

Goytisolo's three novels written in exile -- *Señas de identidad* (1966), *Reivindicación del conde don Julián* (1970), and *Juan sin tierra* (1975) -- coupled with his extensive critical writings reveal a complex, almost obsessive, critique of Spanish nationalism. While some scholars have suggested that *Juan sin tierra* signaled Goytisolo's complete break from his Spanish heritage, I contend that his writing suggests otherwise (see Ugarte). In *España y los españoles* published in 1979, Goytisolo retraces Spanish history, attempting to destroy the false myths of Spanish essences. His principle thesis is that official versions of Spanish culture erase the truth of Spain. "No existe una sola España, sino varias Españas de diferentes niveles económicos, sociales y culturales: toda tentativa de reducirlas a un denominador común nos lleva a sacrificar la realidad a la arbitrariedad de un método"(8) ("A single Spain does not exist, but rather a variety of Spains according to different economic, social and cultural levels: every effort to reduce them to a common denominator causes us to sacrifice reality to an arbitrary method"). Consequently Goytisolo attacks official Spain -- the Spain of the Catholic Kings and of Franco-- only to replace this false version of the nation with a more accurate picture of Spain as multicultural and diverse. Much of Goytisolo's writing in exile works to create a counter-nation that can challenge the version of the nation promoted by Franco. In *Señas de identidad*, Alvaro, the novel's protagonist, favors association with Spanish outcasts: "aquella España errante, la España peregrina sustituía en tu corazón a la España oficial" (342) ("that errant Spain, the wandering Spain substituted in your heart for official Spain"). In *Reivindicación del conde don Julián* he writes of the "destruction of Sacred Spain" (52), that is the Spain of the Cid, Seneca, and the generation of '98. These oppressive and repressive national images are replaced by Count Julian, the Visigoth who facilitated the Muslim invasion of Spain in 711, and with other outcasts from Spanish official history like José María Blanco White, Luis Cernuda, Américo Castro and Luis Buñuel (see Sieburth 168).

These narrative gestures that attempt to challenge the image of Spain promoted by Franco and to replace it with a more "authentic" version belie the persistence of modernist sensibilities in Goytisolo's work. In these instances, Goytisolo works to replace a faulty system with a better one. In these modernist moments he also suggests that he can use language as a powerful weapon to rebuild the nation. Under Franco language was warped and manipulated, "a fin de esterilizar la potencia subversiva del lenguaje o convertirlo en instrumento dócil de un discurso voluntariamente amañado, engañoso y adormecedor" (*España* 213) ("in order to sterilize the subversive potential of language or convert it into a docile instrument of a discourse voluntarily manipulated, deceptive and soporific"). The adjectives Goytisolo uses to refer to language -- manipulated, deceptive and soporific -- could evoke a poststructuralist position on language. But, for Goytisolo, this linguistic

state is the direct result of Francoist policies. Goytisolo suggests that the reconstruction of Spain requires that language be re-infused with meaning and historical specificity. Writing shortly after Franco's death he states: "Frente a tal situación de envenenamiento y asfixia, el sistema actual significa el reajuste del lenguaje a los hechos" (*España* 213) ("Faced with such a situation of poisoning and asphyxia, the current system signifies the readjustment of language to facts"). Language is Goytisolo's prime weapon of national reconstruction and he relies on it as a way to recuperate his preferred vision of Spanish history. At the end of *Señas de identidad* Alvaro hears the voices of a forgotten Spain calling him to record and remember a history threatened with extinction: "antes de ver restaurada la vida del país y de sus hombres deja constancia al menos de este tiempo no olvides cuanto ocurrió no te calles" (422) ("before seeing the life of the country and its people restored leave a record of this time don't forget how much happened don't be silent"). And the dialectic between nation and counter-nation in Goytisolo's exile writing is only part of the *Alien Nation* found in his work. The modernist impulses I have described explain the nationalism of Goytisolo, but what of the transnationalism? There are two main epistemological sources of transnationalism for Goytisolo. One relates to a pre-modern vision of community identity and the other is postmodern. Goytisolo's pre-modern transnationalism refers to a timeless, borderless community of pariahs and other social outcasts. As *Señas de identidad* closes Alvaro dreams of the day "cuando también tú te has librado de ellos y navegas a solas / diciéndote / bendito sea mi desvío / todo cuanto me separa de vosotros y me acerca a los parias" (416) ("when you too have liberated yourself from them and you navigate alone / saying to yourself / blessed be my deviation / everything that separates me from all of you and brings me closer to the pariahs"). This theme is repeated and increasingly intensified in *Reivindicación del conde don Julián* and *Juan sin tierra*. Goytisolo's protagonists constantly fantasize about the pleasures of living outside of a controlling system. In these moments Goytisolo glorifies exile as a necessary step towards freedom and away from the oppression of national identity. Yet these moments of celebration are always countered by moments of anguish and loss: "país (el suyo) en que los malestares, dolencias, desórdenes, paulatinamente endémicos, solapadamente morbosos, han entrado en una fase contagiosa y viva" (*Juan sin tierra* 211) ("Country [yours] in which the discomforts, ailments, disorders, gradually endemic, secretly morbid, have entered into a vivid and contagious phase"). Try as he might, he cannot erase his past: "tu casta (sí, la tuya) pese a tus esfuerzos por zafarte de ella" (67) ("your caste [yes, yours] in spite of your efforts to get out of it").

Goytisolo's postmodern account of transnationalism finds its best example in the figure of the tourist. Beginning with *Señas de identidad* the tourist is presented as the ultimate consumer of national identity: "Los millones de extranjeros que visitan la Península la contemplan ya a través del telón alienador de la moderna sociedad de consumo" (*España* 205) ("The millions of foreigners that visit the Peninsula already contemplate it through the alienating curtain of modern consumer society"). The tourist wants to purchase a memory of a nation that often doesn't exist. The tourist strips the nation of meaning, gliding over the surface of national monuments and histories, translating historic events and memories into cheap souvenirs to be purchased, taken home, and forgotten. In the last scene of *Señas de identidad* Alvaro visits Montjuich in Barcelona. The castle there dates back to the Middle Ages and the fortress was used as a prison during the Spanish Civil War. Important historical figures, like Luis Companys an advocate of Catalan nationalism, were imprisoned and murdered at the site. Alvaro visits Montjuich in 1963, ten years after the Pacts of Madrid established US military bases in Spain and improved Spain's foreign relations policy paving the way for heightened tourism. While Alvaro looks for clues to his past and an understanding of his relationship to Spain, he is accompanied by tourists from Europe and the United States. The fragmented narrative presents the reader with Alvaro's thoughts mingled with the trivial chitchat common to tourists. The tourist group looks at a monument to the Civil War dead and Alvaro overhears a French tourist saying "prend moi une photo" (417) followed by "de quelle guerre s'agit-il?" (418) Alvaro asks himself: "La ciudad que contemplaban, ¿era la tuya?" (406) ("The city they contemplated, was it yours?"). What happens to nationalism when it becomes a commodity for sale to tourists? Recognizing that transnationalism can also translate into globalizing economics

Goytisolo's last words in the novel are "Introduce the coin" in the four most common languages of tourists visiting Spain.

One of the most significant differences between Goytisolo's experience of exile and Ariel Dorfman's is the disparity in their sense of political agency. Whereas Goytisolo's generation felt historically paralyzed, Dorfman had the experience of feeling like a productive agent of social change. Being a part of the success of Salvador Allende, elected Socialist President of Chile from 1970-1973, has a profound effect on Dorfman's work and explains his persistent sense of hope. Once in exile, Dorfman wonders whether the Unidad Popular, Allende's party, was doomed by the requirements of transnational capitalism. Was national sovereignty a myth? In *The Last Song of Manuel Sendero* (1986), Dorfman's second novel after exile, nationalism is complicated by the positive nationalism of the Allende years and the negative nationalism of the Pinochet regime. Dorfman's exile writing critiques the image of Augusto Pinochet, dictator of Chile from 1973-1990. For Dorfman, the figure of Pinochet represents the authoritarian nation. As is common in authoritarian takeovers of leftist governments, Pinochet explained his suspension of Chile's constitution and civil rights as a necessary solution to the chaos of Socialism. Pinochet's government was based on a myth of national reconstruction and a return to the "normal course of history" that the Socialists had attempted to obstruct with their brief period in office. Like Franco, Pinochet considered himself both the head of state and the pre-ordained protector of Catholic values in Chile. Pinochet's rhetoric of legitimacy combined pre-modern and modern notions of, on the one hand, a monarch who was destined to rule the land, and, on the other, a president who heads a nation of citizens. For example, Pinochet employed mythical and mystical discourse when he promised to return the nation to its origins and into the hands of God. Furthermore these pre-modern images referring to a religious legacy and a return to origins had modern and modernizing goals as Pinochet tried to force Chile into the international capitalist marketplace. According to Manuel Antonio Garretón military regimes like Pinochet's "were committed to restructuring their respective capitalist systems and then reinserting them into the global capitalist system" (15). Economically Chile practiced modern capitalism, but socially Chileans were expected to remain pre-modern with none of the rights associated with modern society.

In *The Last Song of Manuel Sendero* Dorfman's critique of Pinochet's version of the nation occurs on every symbolic level that Pinochet himself tries to occupy. For instance, Dorfman counters Pinochet's image as a pre-modern savior and he also critiques Pinochet's capitalist goals for modernizing Chile. In so doing, Dorfman rejects the concept of nation that Pinochet represents. The nation should not be a space of oppression, the leader should not be an authoritarian father and its people should not be treated as naive children. When Dorfman works on these issues he does not reject the concept of nation, but instead argues for a different nation that contrasts the military regime in power in Chile. It is important to note, however, that Dorfman's literature does not merely suggest one, unified version of the nation. In *The Last Song of Manuel Sendero*, for example, Dorfman narrates two alternative nations. The first refers to Chile under Allende and is nostalgic for the past: "You take charge of the government, the poor take over, and one of those unique and miraculous periods opens up for the first time ever, and there's a real possibility of putting an end to the misery of all of those kids" (32). But this utopic nation came to an end and was replaced by tyranny: "they throw you out. And these sons of bitches take your place" (32). So the vision of Chile under Allende does not provide a solution for Dorfman to Pinochet's nation. Elsewhere in the same novel Dorfman narrates a mythical, manichean nation where the good are able to defeat the forces of evil: "Once upon a time ... on the frontier of a fairy tale, there was a singer whose name was Manuel ... Once upon a time there was a land of meanwhile, a time between parentheses ... Once upon a time Manuel Sendero had dreamed that his voice could rescue his beloved from Hell and resurrect his son and move the beasts to pity. Once upon a time ... Manuel Sendero believed that he was immortal" (407). In this quote Dorfman equates nation with myth, as did Pinochet. Similar to the way that he contrasts Pinochet with Allende, Dorfman tries to suggest a version of the nation that is benevolent and holds the possibility of peace. Interestingly, Dorfman chooses to narrate two separate alternatives to Pinochet's Chile. The first refers specifically to Allende's Chile, but the second version of the nation has no temporal or

spatial markers. Dorfman's narrative answers Pinochet's version of Chile on both a national and a transnational level.

In comparison with Goytisolo whose mythical, borderless nation is made up of pariahs, outcasts, and social misfits, Dorfman's pre-modern vision of community has heroes, martyrs, and happy families. These differences evoke the disparity between their experiences of exile: Goytisolo's "self" exile after decades of life under Franco contrasts that of Dorfman who left Chile shortly after the experience of being a part of a successful socialist government. Consequently, Goytisolo's ideal community is defined by its separation from normalizing, hegemonic social structures and Dorfman's is characterized by manicheism and the triumph of good over evil. While their images of these communities differ, their desire to imagine and narrate them is similar. Not only do both authors conjure alternative nations free of the repressive characteristics of their former nations, but both spend considerable time combating the false images of the nation perpetuated by the Franco and Pinochet regimes. Goytisolo's descriptions of republicans from the Civil War and Dorfman's memories of Allende rescue important historical events from the collective amnesia imposed by authoritarian censorship. Goytisolo and Dorfman create counter-versions of national identity in response to the pre-modern and modern national images constructed by Franco and Pinochet. Yet, as Dorfman and Goytisolo endeavor to provide an alternative view of their nation's history, their ultimate critique is postmodern. Dorfman rejects the image of Pinochet by defining him as a puppet of multinational corporations. David, an exile from Chile in *The Last Song of Manuel Sendero* sums up a fellow exile's thoughts on Pinochet's persistent presence: "He said ... that revolutions have failed because we haven't taken into account that the ones who made them were old men. That exploitation starts in everyday life, in the family, in sexual relationships, in emotional unhappiness, in the authority of the father over the child and the husband over the wife. That while that wasn't changed, revolutions would go on reproducing the same old structures of domination" (264). Dorfman suggests that domination is a function of modern civilization and that any form of nationalism inherently includes social repression. In this version of the nation, Dorfman favors the destruction of any form of nationalism. Dorfman's ultimate fear is also of the postmodern, specifically of the ubiquitous presence of transnational capitalism and of the end of the subject. What if the Allende years were only an illusion of political possibility and social agency? David and Felipe, two Chilean exiles, debate this issue while stuck in a traffic jam in Mexico. David says: "I hope you told them that our experiment failed." Felipe: "Failed? I wouldn't say that. You learned a lot. People were educated." David responds: "Failed, Felipe. [Nothing we did] has any permanent value ... Not valid. And I don't see where we did much consciousness raising, do you?" (83). David characterizes capitalism as an uncontrollable force, which the individual is powerless to stop. Later Dorfman describes Pinochet's Chile as a postmodern space of hyperconsumerism: "Ex-Chile: it was, but is no more. A trademark, a copyright, a department store more than a country. Like a supermarket of underdevelopment ... Third World Shopping Center" (93-93). This is the version of the postmodern, with its homogenizing potential and its conversion of people into goods, which Dorfman endeavors to undermine through parody. Once again there are similarities between Goytisolo and Dorfman's strategies. Where Goytisolo mourned the loss of the nation to the hyper-consumerism of tourism, Dorfman reads transnational capitalism as the harbinger of the devastating social effects of multinational corporations. Goytisolo imagines a Spain where everyone performs Spanishness for an endless parade of photo-snapping tourists and Dorfman envisages Chile turned into an enormous sweatshop.

The exile writing of Goytisolo and Dorfman supplies many contradictory versions of the nation. Their work is nationalist when they suggest an alternative version of the nation and it is transnationalist when they critique all forms of nationalism. According to Goytisolo and Dorfman, transnationalism offers possible freedom from the repressive nation, but it also enables a new form of social control, which may be even more powerful than nationalism. Each of these writers is committed to conveying the history of their nations that was being suppressed by authoritarianism. This act of historical reconstruction is an act of remembrance. Simultaneously they seek to dismantle what they perceive as the false image of the nation projected by the dictator's regime. In these moments they ask their readers to disremember these artificial nations.

The constant oscillation between remembrance and disremembrance in their narratives is further accompanied by utopic and dystopic images of the effects of globalization and transnationalism. Combined together such gestures illustrate how exile writers create a complex dialectical vision of the relationship between exile identity and nationalism, leading to what I have described as "Alien Nation."

Works Cited

- Ahmad, Aijaz. *In Theory: Literatures, Classes, Nations*. London: Verso, 1992.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. 1983. New York: Verso, 1991.
- Best, Steven, and Douglas Kellner. *Postmodern Theory: Critical Interrogations*. New York: The Guilford Press, 1991.
- Brennan, Timothy. "The National Longing for Form." *Nation and Narration*. Ed. Homi Bhabha. London: Routledge, 1990. 44-70.
- Cowley, Malcolm. *Exile's Return*. 1962. New York: Viking, 1974.
- Dorfman, Ariel. *The Last Song of Manuel Sendero*. Trans. George Shivers and Ariel Dorfman. New York: Viking, 1987.
- Dorfman, Ariel. *Viudas*. Mexico: Editorial Siglo XXI, 1981.
- Garretón, Manuel Antonio. "Fear in Military Regimes." *Fear at the Edge: State Terror and Resistance in Latin America*. Ed. Juan E. Corradi, Patricia Weiss Fagen, et. al. Berkeley: U of California P, 1992. 13-25.
- Goytisolo, Juan. *España y los españoles*. Barcelona: Editorial Lumen, 1979.
- Goytisolo, Juan. *Juan sin tierra*. Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1975.
- Goytisolo, Juan. *Reivindicación del Conde don Julián*. Mexico: Mortiz, 1970.
- Goytisolo, Juan. *Señas de identidad*. Mexico: Mortiz, 1966.
- Guillén, Claudio. "On the Literature of Exile and Counter Exile." *Books Abroad* 50 (1976): 271-80.
- Ilie, Paul. "Exolalia and Dictatorship: The Tongues of Hispanic Exile." *Fascismo y experiencia literaria: Reflexiones para una reanonización*. Ed. Hernán Vidal. Minneapolis: Institute for the Study of Ideologies & Literature, U of Minnesota, 1985. 222-54.
- Marx, Karl. "Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844." *The Marx-Engels Reader*. Ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd ed. New York: Norton, 1978. 70-93.
- McClennen, Sophia A. *The Dialectics of Exile: Nation, Time, Language and Space in Hispanic Literatures*. West Lafayette: Purdue UP, 2004.
- Sanz, Santos. *Lectura de Juan Goytisolo*. Barcelona: Gráficas Diamante, 1977.
- Sieburth, Stephanie. *Inventing High and Low*. Durham: Duke UP, 1994.
- Siedel, Michael. *Exile and the Narrative Imagination*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1986.
- Ugarte, Michael. *Shifting Ground: Spanish Civil War Exile Literature*. Durham: Duke UP, 1989.

Author's profile: Sophia A. McClennen <<http://www.personal.psu.edu/users/s/a/sam50/>> teaches comparative literature, Spanish, inter-American literature, and Women's Studies at the Pennsylvania State University. Her teaching and research interests further include media studies and comparative cultural studies. McClennen's first book, *The Dialectics of Exile: Nation, Time Language and Space in Hispanic Literatures* (Purdue UP <<http://www.thepress.purdue.edu/series/compstudies.asp>>, 2004), is a comparative study of exile literature from Spain and Latin America. Her second book, *Ariel Dorfman: An Aesthetics of Hope*, is forthcoming from Duke University Press. She has also co-edited, with Earl E. Fitz, a volume on *Comparative Cultural Studies and Latin America* (Purdue UP <<http://www.thepress.purdue.edu/series/compstudies.asp>>, 2004). She has published and presented widely on comparative cultural studies and Latin America in journals such as *World Literature Today* (2004), *A contracorriente* (2003), the *ADFL Bulletin* (2003), *Revista de estudios hispánicos* (2002), *The Review of Contemporary Fiction* (2000), *Cultural Logic* (2000), and *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* (2000): <<http://clcwebjournal.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb00-1/mcclennen00.html>>. E-mail: <sam50@psu.edu>.