

On Migration

Diasporization – Transculturality – Transmediality

Cornelia Sieber / Alfonso de Toro (eds.)



PAS S AGEN
PAS S AGES

Transdisziplinäre Kulturperspektiven
Transdisciplinary Cultural Perspectives
Perspectives Culturelles Transdisciplinaires

OLMS

PAS SAGEN PAS SAGES 18

Transdisziplinäre Kulturperspektiven
Transdisciplinary Cultural Perspectives
Perspectives Culturelles Transdisciplinaires

PAS SAGEN PAS SAGES

Transdisziplinäre Kulturperspektiven
Transdisciplinary Cultural Perspectives
Perspectives Culturelles Transdisciplinaires

Direktoren / Directors / Directeurs

Alfonso de Toro (Universität Leipzig), Birgit Mertz-Baumgartner (Universität Innsbruck), Julia Rosmarie Pröll (Universität Innsbruck), Annegret Richter (Universität Leipzig)

Herausgeber / Editors / Éditeurs

Charles Bonn (Université de Lyon), Graham Huggan (University of Leeds), William Luis (University of Nashville), Gabriele Pisarz-Ramírez (Universität Leipzig), János Riesz (Universität Bayreuth), Claudia Gronemann (Universität Mannheim), Marta Segarra (Universitat de Barcelona), Cornelia Sieber (Universität Mainz/Germersheim), Khalid Zekri (Université de Meknès)

Wissenschaftlicher Beirat / Publishing board /
Conseil de publication

Raphaël Confiat (Fort-de-France), Robert Dion (Montréal), Patrick Imbert (Ottawa), Jean-Marc Moura (Paris/Nanterre)

Band 18

Cornelia Sieber / Alfonso de Toro (eds.)
On Migration

2020

Georg Olms Verlag
Hildesheim · Zürich · New York



Cornelia Sieber / Alfonso de Toro (eds.)

On Migration

Diasporization – Transculturality – Transmediality

2020

Georg Olms Verlag

Hildesheim · Zürich · New York



Umschlagbild: Spuren im Sand. © Cecilia Barbier

Das Werk ist urheberrechtlich geschützt.
Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen
des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung
des Verlages unzulässig.

Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen,
Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen
und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung
in elektronischen Systemen.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation
in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten
sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the
Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available
on the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

© Georg Olms Verlag AG, Hildesheim 2020

www.olms.de

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

Umschlagentwurf: Lars Decker, Chemnitz

978-3-487-42292-3

ISSN 1611-1354

CONTENTS

Introduction	7
Alfonso de Toro	
Hybrid and Nomadic Diasporas Staging and Performance of Differences	11
Michael Rössner	
Translating Diaspora	33
Wai Chee Dimock	
Many Islams	45
Amaryll Chanady	
The Flâneur takes the Metro: the Intercultural Production of Locality in the Global City.....	53
Gabriele Pizarz-Ramirez	
“‘It takes courage to remember; It takes courage to forget. It takes a hero to do both.’” The Politics of Remembering in the Work of Carmen Aguirre.....	69
Dieter Ingenschay	
(Post-)Colonialism – Migration – Literature. Spain as an example	81
Cornelia Sieber	
The ‘Migrant as a Metaphor’ and Strategies of ‘Writing back’ in Spanish Representation of Migration.....	93
Jochen Mecke	
The Agonal Principle: Aesthetics of Intra- and Intermediality.....	105
Cornelia Sieber	
Transmedial Encroachment and the Urgency of the Conflicts of Migration in Salvajes (Carlos Molinero, Spain, 2001).....	123
About the Authors	131

INTRODUCTION

This volume is based on the section “Transnationalities – Transidentities – Hybridities – Diasporization”, organized by the Ibero-American and Francophone Research Centers of the University of Leipzig as part of the First Annual Conference of the Centre for Area Studies of Leipzig on “Cultural Encounters – Commodity Chains – Labor Migration: World Regions”, focusing on forms, causes and consequences of the re/location of social, economic and political processes in the era of globalization.

By now, already a decade has passed since our conference section took place and it is due to various circumstances that this volume has not been published earlier and carries along, in some sense, its own migration trace. Nevertheless, the questions examined in the contributions of our section have reached even more topicality in both, the Old World and the New due to the recent increased arrival of refugees to Europe and the harsh discussion about a concrete or “intelligent” wall to shield the USA from Latin American migrants. There is an urgent political and social need for concepts of living together in much more heterogeneous and much fewer familiar societies. Theorists of postcolonial studies such as Homi Bhabha and cultural studies scholars like Stuart Hall have shown for decades that thinking in categories of diverse and clearly, spatially separated cultures and traditions may help us feel ‘homely’ within a certain territory, but that such thinking also just conceals the processes of negotiating power structures and hierarchies as well as differences and changes within and between cultures in contact with one another. Even if the political settings of past cultural contacts that led to colonization have been overcome, their cultural implications such as racism and the idea of separated spheres of center and periphery have not yet vanished and now need to be confronted in the midst of the ongoing migration dynamics. Meanwhile, similar discussions in the North American societies, which consider themselves to be historically formed by European immigrants and their former African slaves and Asian contract workers, and which are now skeptically facing a significant amount of Hispanic and Arab immigration, are arising with comparable controversy, given that the large and rapidly increasing Spanish-speaking population is considered by some to be on the verge of threatening a Protestant-based value system, (see Samuel Huntington’s *Who Are We? The Challenges to America’s National Identity* published in 2004), while Arab immigration is accompanied by fears of terror incited by the media.

Against this background, the present volume seeks to contribute to seeing migration movements and the dynamics and changes they cause within their environments in various contexts and from different angles. Analyzing such dynamics this way might help in shifting perspectives away from considering set orders of cultures and traditions as the norm and lead to a more open view on discrepancy, difference and diversification that were for a long time depreciated as accidental and secondary aspects.

The contributions to this volume range from discussion of models of cultural plurality, cultural translation and multiculturalism (de Toro, Rössner) and analyses of selected literary, dramatic and cinematographic depictions of multicultural dynamics, conflicts and opportunities (Dimock, Chanady, Piszcz-Ramirez, Ingenschay, Sieber) to investigating intramedial dynamics (Mecke), which reveals that even orderly structures such as literary genres – with their distinct characteristics and parameters of form and

arrangement – draw their creativity, relevance and features from dialoguing, sounding and reinterpreting – thus, from shifts such as egression and speculation, which in turn exposes not a calm scene of regularity but of constant unrest and transition.

The volume begins with the contribution by Alfonso de Toro (University of Leipzig), who initiated and inaugurated our cultural studies focused conference section “Transnationalities – Transidentities – Hybridities – Diasporisation” with his investigation into the differences in staging and performance within the Maghreb culture. In his analysis, he underlines the heterogeneity and plurality of the idea of ‘Maghreb’, traces the concept of ‘nomadic diasporas’ and its implications for our understanding of cultures and explores the cultural concepts of Maghrebi thinkers such as Albert Memmi, Jacques Derrida and Tahar Ben Jelloun.

Michael Rössner (Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich / Austrian Academy of Sciences) examines how the concept of the ‘diaspora’ has gone through changes, shifts and pluralizations over the centuries and concentrates on different historical periods, first on 16th century Spanish colonial America, where he finds authors such as Diego Dávalos y Figueroa and Garcilaso de la Vega el Inca communicating with the center via “the typical humanist activity of translating”, and later on the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century, where Latin American writers such as Jorge Luis Borges and Roberto Bolaño refuse to limit themselves to typically Latin American themes and scenes and might be considered, in that sense, as forming a diasporic literature in contact with the global metropolises.

Just as the concepts of the Maghreb and the forms of the diaspora are shown to be diverse and manifold, there are also “Many Islams”, as the title of Wai Chee Dimock’s (Yale University) contribution suggests. She presents notably differing views on Islam, depicting a wide spectrum from the historical cohabitation of Islamic, Christian and Jewish population in medieval Spain under Moorish rule, echoed in the suggestion to call an Islamic cultural center to be built near Ground Zero in New York City the “Cordoba House”, to the harsh rejection of the name because “Cordoba” can also be seen as a symbol of the Muslim conquering of the Christian Spain. Another Islam is presented in the literary works of New York author, composer and translator Paul Bowles, who portrays Islam in the context of his adopted home, the Moroccan town of Tangier, as a peaceful and freedom-oriented religion.

Amaryll Chanady (Université de Montreal) develops ideas on ‘intercultural production of locality’ based on another literary creation. Her reading of the short story “La répétition” (The Rehearsal) by the Haitian-Quebecois Émile Ollivier highlights that the “proverbial Canadian multicultural mosaic”, presented by the several ethnic neighborhoods of Montreal through which the story’s immigrant flâneur strolls, are connected by the city metro as a kind of “mobile non-space”. This underground train becomes the scenery of surprising and spontaneous intercultural encounters and a place to feel individually free in a moment of “being-with-others” that does not ask for separation among religious or ethnic affiliation. In this sense, Chanady claims, the metro can be seen as a metaphor of mobility between cultural borders and as a component of the creation of locality in a globalized world.

Gabriele Piszcz-Ramirez (University of Leipzig) displays another of the many facets of multicultural Canada, focusing on Carmen Aguirre, a playwright who had to

leave Chile as a child with her family after Pinochet's military coup in 1973, and who found refuge in Canada. She traces Aguirre's discussion of the difficulties and troubles in describing her experiences, which were hard for her Canadian classmates to understand, and the retelling of her experiences in plays such as *The Refugee Hotel* (2009), which centers on the issue of self-determination regarding memory, exile and participation in a new cultural space in the northern part of the American double continent.

The contribution by Dieter Ingenschay (Humboldt University of Berlin) considers similar questions and processes of cultural negotiation, but this time in Spain, where the Spanish cultures and languages are not the supervening ones as we have seen it in the Canadian context, but the institutionally settled and ruling cultures. He characterizes Equatorial-Guinean writer Donato Ndongo-Bidyogo and Moroccan-Catalan author Najat El Hachmi as representatives of a 'literature without permanent residence' (Ottmar Ette) and analyzes the texts and themes by which they inscribe themselves into the production of Spanish and Catalan literature. Their presence might contribute to revitalizing the silenced memories of the Moorish epoch of medieval Spain that ended with the Christian reconquering, and of Spain's colonial history in Sub-Saharan Africa. In one of Donato Ndongo-Bidyogo's novels, *El metro* (2007), the metro that Chanady sketches in her article as a metaphor for mobility between cultural borders (see above), becomes the scenery of the failure of the immigration experience of the Cameroonian protagonist, and old colonial stereotypes and hierarchies can be seen as translated into contemporary everyday practice.

Based on Salman Rushdie's concepts of the 'migrant as a metaphor' for our times, and of the 'writing back' of the excluded to the center, Cornelia Sieber (Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz) analyzes depictions and strategies of returning migrants in Spanish artistic representations. As the novel *Madre mía que estás en los infiernos* (2008) and the film *Poniente* (2002) demonstrate, repatriates are often seen with some skepticism by Spain's domestic population because they potentially threaten the rules and norms which they once tried to escape by emigrating. Knowing different ways of societal organization due to their migration experience, repatriates might define their home and regional traditions in a different and less exclusive way, so that their return also implies a rebellious act of 'writing back'.

The two articles that complete this volume were originally contributions to another conference focusing on inter- and transmedial modes. Jochen Mecke's (University of Regensburg) reflections on the agonal principles of intra- and intermediality are included in our views on migration and transcultural dynamics because of their important theoretical insights that strongly relate to our subject matter. Rereading Dadaistic and Surrealistic destructions of the grammatical and morphosyntactic connections between the poetic signs, he demonstrates that modern intramedial renovations involve the "destroying of the form of a well-defined semiotic system", and that it is due to aberrations as found in the deviant spatial dispositions of words in Apollinaire's "Calligrammes" that the linear condition of writing is exposed. On this basis, he points out that "modern purity is not as pure as it seems, but presupposes a difference". In this sense he also examines the intermedial motions between writing and film in the French Nouveau Roman and the Nouvelle Vague and emphasizes that the hypertextuality in

Cortázar's novels reveal that "the pure materiality of the book is spacial and non-directional".

In her second contribution, Cornelia Sieber explores the medial strategies used by the Spanish director Carlos Molinero in his film *Salvajes* (2001), the adaptation of Alonso de Santos' theatrical play of the same name, and specifies them as what she calls a 'transmedial encroachment'. She outlines that the film strives to blur the distance and distinctions between its sphere of representation and that of the audience in order to make the viewers experience xenophobia very closely as a social problem of contemporary societies as a whole, and to demonstrate the urgency of finding new cultural modes and abilities for living in a changing and dynamic transcultural world.

We hope that the different approaches and perspectives on migration and transculturality united in this volume can contribute to the current questions and urgent cultural debate in today's political climate, and we would like to express our gratitude to the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research, which financially supported the First Annual Conference of the Center for Area Studies Leipzig, and to Matthias Middell, the CAS's main coordinator, for his productive cooperation that allowed us to organize the section. We are furthermore grateful to the Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz for its support with the printing costs of this volume, and we would like to thank Dr. Annegret Richter, Anna-Lena Müller and, especially, Cecilia Barbier for their significant help with the volume's layout.

Cornelia Sieber / Alfonso de Toro, January 2020

Alfonso de Toro

University of Leipzig

HYBRID AND NOMADIC DIASPORAS STAGING AND PERFORMANCE OF DIFFERENCES

1. Introduction to the problem

In the present global world, culture, ideas, products, technology, sciences, communication and people are constantly crossing the existing borders. Cultural processes and mega migrations have flooded and are smuggled across them. A clear case for this observation is the border between Mexico and the U.S. The huge construction of a 3000 kilometer shield did not prevent or stop the migration of almost 40-50 million Hispanics into the U.S. At the same time, the cultural borders between France and the Maghreb have changed substantially in the past forty years, although in a completely different way. These floodings of national and topographical borders are taking place all over the world.

The European community dissolves its inner borders, and sooner or later Europe is going to have its common constitution as result of the agreement of Lisbon. In spite of those improvements the differences between the various regions within Europe are enormous, and discrimination, racism and ethnic conflicts are a part of everyday life. Still, migrations cannot be stopped, neither within nor from outside into Europe.

Shields, fences and laws are merely desperate, but ineffective practices in order to control migration. The electronic mail and the World Wide Web have transformed the world into an ever-growing virtual surface that, on one hand, expands the world in an almost infinite way and, on the other hand, compresses it radically so that we live in a permanent implosion.

This condition of a global world and the insight that we today live in a plural-cultural world leads to the consequence that terms like 'Nation', 'national identity', 'national culture' have to be thought and understood in a new way in order to develop a peaceful coexistence.

Globalization is a manifold process with positive and negative sides. It opens borders and makes the world permeable, but at the same time provokes nationalism, essentialism and affirmation of the Local and of the Own, racism and the construction of new shields.

Carlos Fuentes is very aware of this situation and concludes in his book *En esto creo (In What I Believe)*:

For five centuries the West has been travelling to the South and to the East and has imposed upon the cultures of the periphery its economic and political will without asking.

Now, this cultures are coming to the West and put the values which the West had always claimed to be its own, to the test: mobility, free market, and not only considering supply and demand, but also human labour and the protection of human rights that protect each guest worker.

I repeat: global interaction and communication without people cannot exist. (Fuentes 2002: 342)

In this given context, the concept, the thinking and the strategy of hybridity is to hold a prominent place within the actual cultural and epistemological debate. Particularly when thinking in Samuel Huntington's book *Who are We?* (2004), it is to be seen that this author finds himself in a binary opposition against the socio-political, intellectual, and historical position of Homi Bhabha, of William Luis with his concept of 'Latino-Culture', and also of the migration politics of Canada, Europe or Latin America in the context of a liberal tradition. Huntington's conception of the American society is based on the idea of "salience", "substance", and an "American creed" emerging from an Anglo-Protestant, profoundly religious settler tradition. For Huntington, global societies and multiculturalism, which lead to "cosmopolitan and transnational identities" (2004: xvi), represent an evil against the American project of modelling a uniform/integrated Nation. For him, they are the quintessence of the erosion of the American identity, for transnational identities, he claims, encourage the dissolution of the Nation-State into many parallel societies.

These two positions, on the one side hybridity or strategies of coexistence in hybrid societies, and on the other side unilateral identities and national concepts, entered into a new phase of discussion and signification when the signs of failure of a multicultural politics in the Netherlands, England and elsewhere could not be overlooked anymore and the following "clash of civilizations" took place and when the debate concerning an existence of parallel societies in the Netherlands, Germany, and other countries got louder.

In fact, terms like 'Identity', 'Nation', 'National Culture', 'Ethnicity', as well as the notions of 'Text', 'Fiction', 'History' and 'Arts' have received a revision in the context of the *Cultural Studies* and of the theories evolved by Roland Barthes, Foucault, Derrida, Lyotard, Deleuze, Homi Bhabha and Hayden White. These terms and notions have since then been redefined and are now thought to be at the intersections or crossings of culture and the disciplines of scientific thinking. 'Border' is, in this context, no longer a separating or excluding but a 'transversal' or rather 'hybrid' category, a strategy of thinking about the World, Life, Subject, Political Culture and Science as nomadic structures. The category 'border' as a hybrid system has achieved a powerful predomination in all fields of knowledge, sciences and life after post-structuralism, after moments like the fall of the wall in Berlin, after Huntington's controversial books *The Clash of Civilizations* and *Who are We?*, after the war in Iraq, and in the context of the global economy and politics.

2. A post-structural Model of Hybridity

Since the early 90s, I have dedicated several publications to the subject of postmodernism (cf. de Toro 1991; 1996), post-colonialism and hybridity. In these texts, I have analysed hybridity going beyond the evident, which is that hybridity is always inherent to culture, identity and nations, and going beyond the statements concerning the terminological exuberance of the application of the term and its distinction, in modern cultural theory, from its biological and zoological origin (cf. de Toro 1995; 1996; 1997; 2002a; 2004). Particularly in my publications of 2002a and 2004 I try to propose a sort of “model” for this term, which has been largely accepted and applied. To the debate of post-colonialism in Latin America itself and to that of Latin American scholars in the U.S., I have dedicated to it a large essay in 1999. Furthermore, I would like to mention in this context some very important works in this field, for example, that of Scharlau (1994), Herlinghaus/Walter (1994), A. and F. de Toro (1999) as well as Sieber (2005). For this reason, I will just consider some of those proposals in the context of the present volume.

Hybridity is, as a major concept in our times, the object of very diverse reflections and definitions and it is applied in very different fields (cf. Schneider/Thomsen 1997). In order to work in a transdisciplinary and productive, but also, systematic way it is necessary to come to an understanding of the notion of hybridity in a broader metacontext. Hybrid systems are seen as systems “that have a high complexity and that can only be described at the base of the combination of different models and processes” (Schneider/Thomsen 1997: 19). In this context the research for artificial intelligence develops “intelligent hybrid systems”. The mixing of systems has, for example in the fields of technology and medicine the objective to increase efficiency. Acceleration, speed, multifunctionality, increase of the complexity and synergy are other terms to describe hybridity. Often, terms are synonymous and have the same or a similar extensional and intentional relation for example ‘interculturality’, ‘multiculturalism’, ‘mimicry’, ‘nomadism’, ‘heterotopy’, ‘difference’/‘diffaerence’, ‘alterity’/‘altarity’, ‘in-between’, ‘unhomely’, ‘diversity’, ‘third space’, ‘discontinuity’ and ‘intertextuality’, ‘temporality’, ‘heterogeneity’, ‘syncretism’, ‘otherness’, etc.

Because of this variety or terminological labyrinth, we would like to risk a first model for a classification of the different levels on which we think hybridity, and apply this concept. We distinguish between different fields or levels for locating hybridity (cf. de Toro 1997; 1999; 2002a; 2004):

1. Hybridity as an epistemological category or as a category of philosophy of sciences (the disposition of thinking the world as a rhizome and not in dichotomies);
2. Hybridity as a theoretical/methodological category (as a synonym of ‘transversal’ science);
3. Hybridity as a category of cultural theory, as the strategy to manage with different cultural, ethnic and religious groups (that is the site of cultural difference and plurality);
4. Hybridity as a transmedial category, as the use of various media, systems of signs (Internet, Video, Film, virtual worlds, analogous and digital techniques etc.),

- diverse aesthetics (literature, theatre, essay), mixed fields (literature/internet, theatre/video/film/installations, painting/virtual design);
5. Hybridity as an urban category, as form and different types of organisation, plurality of products and heterogeneous objects, art, city culture, architecture, companies, ecology, nature, societies, politics, lifestyles;
 6. Hybridity as the territory of the body;
 7. Hybridity as a technology (natural sciences: i.e. molecular biology; industries: engines with hybrid drive; medicine: micro artificial limbs, virtual surgery);
 8. Hybridity as transtextuality.

In these fields, hybridities are to be thought of in different ways considering their respective functions. Therefore, we should locate the processes of hybridity and determine their fields of application.

Hybridity as an 'epistemological' category (1) means to think of the world, life and knowledge in a temporarily discontinued way starting from the concepts of difference and alterity. We understand difference as the *approach to the 'othering of rationality' and history, as a logic of 'supplementary', as 'fold'/'pleat', as the sliding of cultural unities*, so that they cannot be reduced to signs of any cultural or ethnic origin. While 'differance' means the deconstruction of the metaphysical occidental Logos, 'alterity' refers to an operation of difference to describe very contradictory and heterogeneous objects. With the notion of 'alterity' the procedural character of the negotiation of difference is marked.

Hybridity as a theoretical/methodological concept (2) is the result of a network of theories built upon the base of one main discipline. The term 'trans-' in the notion of transdisciplinarity, then requires a concept of discipline thought as a *net and intersection of elements or parameters appealing to a dialog about determined objects on the base of formulating common questions and problems*.

Hybridity, then, is a matter of *transversal* relations of disciplines, which means the possibility to use scientific models of a diverse provenience as the sciences of theatre, literature, communication, history, anthropology, ethnology, sociology or philosophy, or the recourse to elements of some of this disciplines or theories. Firstly, hybrid and transversal sciences are a concept of transdisciplinarity.

Hybridity and transversal sciences are also related to transculturality (3), which means the recourse to diverse models of culture (or fragments of them) that are not part of the base of the 'home culture'. Thirdly, hybrid and transversal sciences are related to transtextuality, understood as the dialog between texts and discourses which come from different disciplines and cultures. Transtextuality leads to multiple recodifications and reinventions of cultural signs without asking where a certain element is coming from or whether it is "original" or "authentic" or not. Only the productivity of the reinvention is important. These are the main aspects of a hybrid and transversal science (de Toro 1999; 2002a; 2004).

In the context of the crossing of cultures, hybridity means furthermore the emphasizing of the difference by simultaneous recognition of the difference of the other in a common territory that all the time has to be inhabited all over again. In the transcultural communication, these are negotiated, re-codified and build a new 'Otherness', the

‘Own’ and the ‘Foreign’, the ‘Homely’ and the ‘Unhomely’, the ‘Uniform’ and the ‘Heterogeneous’, the ‘Essentialism’ and the ‘Hegemonial’. The concept of hybridity represents the perlaboration/ *Verwindung* of binary systems in a ‘third space’ as a site of enunciation, (but not a process of overcoming/‘*Überwindung*’ or of a mixture ‘*Verschmelzung*’).

Hybridity understood as a ‘transmedial’ category (4) refers to the use of different media that remain autonomous and keep their own function in a representation. The media enter into a competition with each other; they operate in a field of permanent tension. Hybrid transmediality means a transgression, crease/fold/pleat or piles in the context of aesthetic, dissonant processes as the mixture of architecture, art and light installations and virtual works. Here, different systems get into contact: physical methods and processes for the construction and refraction of light, artistic processes, media techniques, aesthetic, arts and philosophy concepts, in order to construct a virtual interactive world that raises a lot of questions, for example concerning perception and reality. The borders of such usually separated fields are overcome in a rhizome-structure (Deleuze/Guattari). Hybridity here takes place on the level of the objects and on that of the disciplines.

Hybridity understood as a category of the body (6) is related to desire, sexuality, power, passion, violence, perversion, memory, history (personal or collective) and knowledge. The hybrid body results from diverse discourses and experiences. Here, the body functions as its own signature, as its own sign, as *body-sign*. The *body-sign* produces knowledge and contains love and hate, acceptance and refusal, and it is first of all body-material, flesh, odour and sweat, it is its own message and medium without an external function, it is not anymore mask or a second-degree sign, an allegory or metaphor.

In the following, we want to consider the actual debate about ‘diasporas’ in relation to hybridity in order to discuss two authors from the Maghreb, Albert Memmi and Ben Jelloun.

3. Performative and nomadic diasporas

During the 90s and at the beginning of the millennium we detected in the social, political and cultural sciences that societies more and more organized themselves in large ethnic groups or communities, particularly in the Megacities such as London, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Paris or Berlin, if we think of Chinese, Indian and Hispanic people or at the Maghreb communities in France. These groups built genuine diasporas in which people have two or more identities, two or more cultural references and two or more loyalties. Mayer (2005) disapproves the utilisation of this term in a fashionable way. In spite of this critic, particularly against the diaspora-Term of Hall, in the 90s, scholars begin to speak about the ‘African diasporas’ and Robin Cohen (1997: 67) considers that with the colonial expansion from the 16th century on “global diasporas” were created. Beyond this classification we find numerous other classifications that led to a very heterogeneous status of the diaspora term, as well with regard to its semantic and pragmatic ‘extension’ and ‘intention’ (vid. the critique of Mayer (2005: 86).

In spite of this plural scepticism, the application of the ‘diaspora’-term to all kind of minorities enjoyed a boom (Mayer 2005: 79; Edwards 2001; Gilroy 1993).

The consequence is that the utilisation of the term ‘diaspora’, particularly after Hall’s conception, requires some explanations because this term is historically much determined by the Jewish history. Traditionally ‘diaspora’ is related to ‘exile’, ‘enslavement’, ‘subjugation’ and captivity. ‘Diaspora’ meant also ‘dispersion’ of a group forced to move away; it meant deportation from one place to another where the group built a close ethnic community marked by codified rituals and habitudes in order to keep the ethnic memory, the identity and the coherence of the group. The members of it consider the place of arrival as temporary, and they hope to come back to their original place (cf. Mayer (2005) and Gafaïti (2005)). The historical diaspora related to Jewish people is very clearly delimited: we have to do with a local culture, because the Jewish communities in the diaspora used not to enter into a negotiation of their culture and to building a “third space”. This was a way to prevent hybridisation processes.

The term ‘diaspora’ begins to widen its semantic field from the 80s on (Mayer 2005: 8-26; Gafaïti 2005: 43) in the sense of the dispersion of different communities but not only in the sense of ethnic communities (cf. *Le Petit Robert* 1994; Gafaïti 2005). Particularly at the U.S. and following Safran (1991); Tölölyan (1991; 1996), Chow (1993); Gilroy (1993); Warren (1993); Hall (1994; 1996); Lipsitz (1994); Mishra (1996); Clifford (1997); R. Cohen (1997); Ph. Cohen (1998); Anthias (1998); Dirlik (2004); Chivallon (2002), we learned that different ethnic groups are not determinate by history, by the debate of colonialism, decolonization or post-colonialism, but by local conditions and local reality. The main preoccupation of these communities is to survive. We can even tell that they find themselves in “extraterrestrial” or “alien” situations: they live in anonymity and in illegality, they work illicitly and they are only tolerated and often persecuted by the police or by paramilitary groups. This groups live in a “situation zero” (cf. de Toro 2003), in discursive situations not of post-colonialism, but the ‘post-coloniality’ and hybridity. The large migration waves are caused by poverty, hunger, wars or genocides. The migrants arrive nowadays in a country with the conviction to not return to the original home and to establish themselves definitely in the arrival country. Even if they are longing and dreaming to return to their original country, this builds a myth of return because the migrants stay in the arrival country. These groups built specific communities but with different interests and after a while they belonged to two or more cultural references obtaining ambivalent and oscillating identities. These groups organized themselves in a similar way in which the cultures of the Indian Ocean in Middles Ages did, even if there are big differences in religious and ritual practices that nowadays do not exist anymore (cf. Goitein 1973, 1999; Vergès 2003; Mayer 2005: 55-59). But like them, actual diasporas define themselves in the new country on the basis of language, in the way they dress, and through culinary and cultural practices. This kind of community is permanently growing like with Hispanics at the U.S., the Maghreb in France, Turks in Germany, or Indians in England. This kind of diaspora I would like to define as a form of economic, political and social organisation where the State is no longer the first and most important point of reference, but the diasporic group or community.

Of course, this type of diasporic organisation is at the moment not the dominant form of life, but it is relevant in Megacities (London, New York, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Paris, Marseille), in big cities such as Berlin, Munich or Holland and till the point that they provoke radical, violent, hegemonic and xenophobic reactions like in France by Sarkozy or by Geert Wilders in the Netherlands, but also in the U.S. represented by Huntington (2004) who considers the Hispanics in the U.S. as a danger to the American State, for the cohesion of the Nation, for the American identity and for the white, Protestant leading class:

The various forces challenging the core American culture and Creed could generate a move by native white Americans to revive the discarded and discredited racial and ethnic concepts of American identity and to create an American that would exclude, expel, or suppress people of other racial, ethnic, and cultural groups. (Huntington 2004: 20)

A situation that will lead to an ethnic, cultural and socio-political conflict:

Historical and contemporary experience suggest that this is a highly probable reaction from a once dominant ethnic-racial group that feels threatened by the rise of other groups. It could produce a racially intolerant country with high levels of intergroup conflict. (Huntington 2004: 20)

And in order to avoid such a conflict he recommends:

This could mean a recommitment to America as a deeply religious and primarily Christian country, encompassing several religious minorities, adhering to Anglo-Protestant values, speaking English, maintaining its European cultural heritage, and committed to the principles of the Creed. Religion has been and still is a central, perhaps the central, element of American identity (Huntington 2004: 20).

In Huntington's opinion, Hispanics build a movement of colonization against the interests of the U.S.:

Mexican immigration is leading towards the demographic *reconquista* of areas Americans took from Mexico by force in the 1830s and 1840s, Mexicanizing them in a manner comparable to, although different form, the Cubanization that has occurred in southern Florida. It is also blurring the border between Mexico and America, introducing a very different culture, while also promoting the emergence, in some areas, of blended society and culture, half-American and half-Mexican. Along with immigration from other Latin American countries, it is advancing Hispanization throughout America and social, linguistic, and economic practices appropriate for an Anglo-Hispanic society. (Huntington 2004: 221)

With devastating consequences:

Mexican, together with other Spanish-speaking population, are creating a bifurcation in the social-political structure of the United States that approximates nationality division.... [and] this could lead to a move to reunite these territories with Mexico. That seems unlikely, but Professor Charles Truxillo of the University of New Mexico predicts that by 2080 the southwestern states of the United States and the northern states of Mexico will come together to form a new country. (Huntington 2004: 246)

This form of organization which is practiced by nomadic managers, whose loyalty is not any more in relation to a Nation, but to the enterprise that pays them, and by global artists and foreign workers in China, Europe, U.S. and Latin America will become the norm in some decades.

This kind of new diasporas are not related to so-called ‘multiculturalism’, but to ‘cosmopolitanism’; it is a planetary concept that considers culture and organizes life in another way, with nomadic and rhizomatic references.

For this reason we can understand this new concept of ‘diaspora’ in the frame of the epistemology of hybridity as difference and multiplicity, as the *potentiality of difference by a reciproque recognition*, and in this way we change the denotation of ‘diaspora’ as dispersion, or formulated in an other way, we complete this denotation in the sense of dissemination and rhizome as a *plurality of experiences, cultural codes, identities that cannot be reduced to one cultural model*.¹ Nowadays, the term ‘diaspora’ represents beside all that, a process of ‘translatio’, of deterritorialization and reterritorialization, movement and negotiation. Writers such as Khatibi, Djébar, Memmi, Meddeb, Tengour, Oumhani, Carlos Fuentes, Mario Vargas Llosa and Salman Rushdie are transnational writers. Where to localize culturally, for example, Cécile Oumhani how defines herself, among others, as a Maghreb writer, who’s grandfather is Scottish and grandmother Belgian and her parents were French with Indian origins; a part of the family emigrated to Canada and she teaches English in Paris?

The term ‘diaspora’ as a part of the epistemology of hybridity is equivalent to the position of Gilroy (1993), a form of historical construction where there are registered traces of history and memory, norms, utopias and projections. The term ‘diasporization’ means for us a ‘staging’, a ‘performance’ or a ‘symbolic representation’ of diasporical situations creating an alternative concept to those as one ‘nation’ or one ‘identity’ based on the binomial ‘blood/soil’, a category that is stressed in the political discourse, but in reality makes less sense every time.

The ‘diaspora’ or the ‘diasporization’ can be considered a network of different cultures and identities in which the individual defines himself through a common experience of other individuals of the communities. Our ‘diaspora-concept’ has in a large measure a metaphorical signification, as in Hall (1994: 401 sq.), but this is not the case of ‘diasporization’ that ‘performs’, are ‘scenified’ and build on a ‘zero-situation’.

In front of the complexity of the term diaspora, it is necessary – Mayer points out – to not forget the historical tradition and the evolution of the term in order to avoid simplifications (Mayer 2005: 62). As consequence it seems better for us to think of ‘diasporas’ as a dynamic open, nomadic, performative process and to talk about ‘diasporas’ in the sense of ‘diasporical situations’ or ‘diasporization’, and in this context ‘diaspora’ represents the opposition of essentialism, sharing common aspects with ‘transnationalism’ or ‘cosmopolitanism’ as far as this concept always means an oscillation between at least two or more cultural models, concepts of nation, identity and life practices.

It is important to underline that writers and essayists such as Khatibi, Djébar and Sansal have developed very early in the discussion not only a particular concept of

1 Chivallon (2002) manifests herself in the same way.

hybridity related to a ‘migrant, cosmopolitan, planetary and diasporical culture’. The ‘Maghreb diaspora’ exists not only outside of the Maghreb, but also in middle of the Maghreb itself (Gafāiti 2005), in the frame of a dialogue and tension between the Occident and the Orient. We have a type of culture that emerges at the interfaces, at the margins of different cultures, as I already formulated in the 90s, but particularly as Vergès (2003) formulated, who put it in relation to culture and commerce of silk at the Indian Ocean, called “Genisa” in the Middle Ages (see also Mayer 2005: 48ff.).

4. The cosmo-humanism and the ‘performative diasporization’

Considering all that what we have exposed till now, we want to speak not only of a type of *performative diaspora*, but in it, of a *performative belonging* and of a *performative hospitality* too, which are always based on the language of the individual and on an “I”, on the *emotion*. Under ‘emotion’ we understand an individual performative experience with a fragmented history of the hospitality traversed by the look, by the body and by the desire and not by citizenship, nationality or State of Rights, nor by the “*prothèse d’origine*” (Derrida). This is the zero-situation that we have already mentioned above and that Derrida expresses inspired by the Khatibi’s term of tattoo:

La rupture avec la tradition, le déracinement, l’inaccessibilité des histoires, l’amnésie, l’indéchiffrabilité, etc. tout cela déchaîne la pulsion généalogique. Le désir de l’idiome, le mouvement compulsif vers l’anamnèse, l’amour destructeur de l’interdit. Ce que j’appelais tout à l’heure le tatouage quand il en fait voir, à même le corps, de toutes les couleurs. L’absence d’un modèle d’identification stable pour un ego – dans toutes ses dimensions: linguistiques, culturelles, etc., – provoque des mouvements qui, se trouvant toujours au bord de l’effondrement, oscillent entre trois possibilités menaçantes (Derrida 1996: 116).

The concept of ‘cultural performance’, the idea of a ‘performative identity’ or of ‘performative diaspora’ do not mean alienation or rootlessness, nor the impenetrability of history, the amnesia or the undecipherable. The concept of ‘performativity’ and that of ‘diaspora’ do not represent a threat either against de cultural patrimony or against the National State; it rather means the reinvention of the self; it is an indeterminate process in which the past performs itself (through the experience and the emotion) and also the present. It is a radical individual and democratic system spread by occidental politics, but devoured by the National State and by Citizenship. It is a performativity of time, place and of the individual where the ‘I’ invents and re-invents himself incessantly because the individual can not exist in a language, in a place and in a time that are withheld to him (Derrida Ibid.: 117):

[...] qu’il est privé de toute langue, et qu’il n’a plus d’autre recours – ni l’arabe, ni le berbère, ni l’hébreu, ni aucune des langues qu’auraient parlées des ancêtres –, parce que ce monolinguisme est en quelque sorte aphasique [...] (Derrida, Ibid.)

The language that this diasporic individual practices is a pluri-language that has its place in-between the languages, a language that is always on the way, that is not tied

to a Logos or in a ‘*prothèse langagière*’, a language that it is always in a process of translation, in movement, in a perpetual performance, as Derrida expresses:

[...] il [le monolinguisme] est jeté dans la traduction absolue, une traduction sans pôle de référence, sans langue originaire, sans langue de départ. Il n’y a pour lui que des langues d’arrivée, si tu veux, mais des langues qui, singulière aventure, n’arrivent pas à s’arriver, dès lors qu’elles ne savent plus d’où elles parlent, à partir de quoi elles parlent, et que est le sens de leur trajet. Des langues sans itinéraire et surtout sans autoroute de je ne sais quelle information. (Derrida, *Ibid.*, 117),

and what Khatibi calls the “chiasme entre l’aliénation et l’inaliénation” (Khatibi 1971: 49) or “langue schize”.

This kind of identity and cultural practice constitutes what I would like to call *cosmo-humanism*. This means the construction of micro-republics, micro-villages, micro-*heimaten* that are able to receive and bring hospitality where different passports, race, religion and culture do not mean exclusion and disparage. *Cosmo-humanism* means the possibility of multiple identifications and *heimaten*, the possibility of practicing difference and recognition.

A boy of about eight years of age was interviewed in the main news in German public television: he said ‘my mother is Chinese, my father is Algerian and I am German’. This kind of multiply cultural reference where a community has the cultural hybridity as an experience of difference is what I call performative diasporas that built a cosmo-humanism.

5. Albert Memmi and the faith with the difference

In *Le nomade immobile* (2000), Memmi develops a concept of ‘in-between’ (*entre-deux*) starting from his condition of interface, as Jews that lived in an Arab area (*Ibid.*: 12). This existential situation represents a first fracture between incompatible ethnic groups. Memmi transposes this micro-experience at a micro-local space to a macro-political and public space.

With such a positionality Memmi opens in *Le nomade immobile* interfaces in order to elaborate a plural cartography, he develops a new concept of cultural hybridity, of a pluricultural identity and of belonging, taking as reference his status as Jewish, Arab and French what is the result not only of a cultural practice, but primarily of a feeling: of a « *complexité reconnue et acceptée par moi qui sera ma meilleure leçon* » (*Ibid.*: 104). He refuses the specification of one identity: “*Quelle tyrannie d’exiger d’un homme de n’avoir qu’une patrie, un amour unique, une amitié exclusive!*” (*Ibid.*: 105) and the reduction of plurality to one cultural reference: “*de ne me laisser engluer dans aucune*” (*Ibid.*: 105).

At the beginning of his reflexions Memmi does not think of cultural diversity as ‘cosmopolitanism’ because he has a pejorative idea of this term or attitude: “*le cosmopolite pourrait les trahir toutes. Il serait un agent double, ou triple, qui trahirait tout le monde*” he tells (*Ibid.*: 108) and he brings this term in opposition to ‘diversity’ and ‘difference’ because he considers in a first moment cosmopolitanism as the

elimination of ‘difference’, of intimacy and of those cultural spaces that he considers mastered (*beherrschbar*) (Ibid.: 110), and in this context he has an ambivalent position in front of the term hybridity that he uses in a very populist way. He oscillates between the concepts of cultural roots and cultural hybridity that is expressed in the oxymoronic title of the book and in the expression: “*Je suis une espèce de nomade immobile*” (Ibid.: 110) that “*réclame surtout de trois patries, et même de quatre. La France, la Tunisie, Israël et l’Italie*” (Ibid.: 111) in order to arrive at a cultural concept of belonging: “*Voilà que j’oublie la Grèce, ma patrie philosophique et celle de tous les philosophes dignes de ce nom*” (Ibid.) and of different cultures and identities: “*J’aurais bien aimé posséder les quatre passeports; en attendant de les avoir tous, c’est-à-dire aucun, j’aurais volontiers manifesté ma dépendance envers chacun*” (Ibid.).

The result is a deterritorialization of the concept on ‘Nation’, ‘Identity’, ‘Belonging’ and ‘Hospitality’ and the refusal of a concept of nation, culture and identity as property based on soil and blood: “*Comment une terre, un pays tout entier, un empire avec ses diverses populations peuvent-ils « appartenir » à quelqu’un, ou à quelques-uns? Parce les parents y sont nés?*” (Ibid.: 113 sq.). As Borges in “The Argentinean writer and the tradition” (1932) or Khatibi in *Maghreb pluriel* (1983) or in *Penser le Maghreb* (1993) and as we will see Derrida in *Le monolinguisme de l’autre* claim:

On ne possède rien d’une manière définitive, ni un être, ni un groupe, ni un territoire. Il vaut mieux parler de dépendance que de possession, ou même d’appartenance.

[...]

‘Ma patrie’ est tout simplement le pays dont j’ai besoin pour vivre, et qui a besoin de moi pour subsister. Pour parler plus philosophiquement, la propriété n’est pas un caractère nécessaire de l’être, mais un élément social et historique, qui peut donc être défait. (1996: 114)

And in this context, Réda Bensmaïa poses the question:

Does the writer *belong* to a nation? What does this *belonging* mean for the Francophone writers? How many different idioms are contained in their written language? How many countries, customs, crossed histories are to be bound in their narratives? (2003: 8)

For Memmi to think of Europe in relation to the Maghreb through his body of a migrant is a permanent oscillation, because it is to re-habit a territory that is at the same time familiar and strange, and like he tells “*ancien*” et “*nouveau*”:

Arrivant en Europe, je balançais entre le désir d’intégration, sinon d’assimilation aux majoritaires, et la mise à distance, rageuse quelquefois, de ce monde nouveau dont je craignais qu’il fût jamais, complètement le mien. Avec le temps, cette distance s’est amenuisée; j’arrive à faire la part, sans trouble excessif, de l’homme ancien et de l’homme nouveau. (2000: 115)

For Memmi, the Western World – for example France – has had a great profit from the big waves of migrations but the hospitality of the arriving country is very restricted and stigmatizes the foreign as such: “*aux étrangers de cesser de l’être, au lieu de les tourmenter en exigeant d’eux une hâte dans l’assimilation qui les plongent dans l’angoisse*” (Ibid.: 117). Memmi articulates here a fundamental, a very actual and urgent

problem: the right of difference, but at the same time the necessity of recognition of the different other. In front of the mega-migration, who can define cultural identity and cultural belonging of millions of migrants? Is it possible to go on speaking in a way “that you are tolerated and welcome in my culture?”, and to whom does a determinate culture belong? This question that Memmi poses is followed by an other conviction: he demands that migrants have to overcome the essentialism of the origin and they have to recognize the advances of Western Societies that not yet have been achieved by Muslim societies: “*les belles avancées de l’Occident, sous prétexte qu’elles n’ont pas été réalisées par leur nation d’origine [...]*” (Ibid.), and he demands also as Khatibi in his book *Le même livre* (1985), do not “*vivre uniquement de ressentiments*” because “*il faut qu’ils trouvent en eux-mêmes la force d’abandonner les mythes compensateurs, et qu’ils prennent quelque distance vis-à-vis de leur communauté. Il faut juger les sien*” (Ibid.).

Memmi elaborates an anthropological and performative concept of difference and of the other, a concept that is not only related to a prisoner of the “prosthesis of the origin”. Following his conception, the cultural belonging and the identity depend only on the free individual decision and he demands: “*libérer l’individu juif de toutes les chaînes séculaires*” (Ibid.: 118) in order to create a common space according to the motto attributed to Chagall: “*Je ne suis pas un peintre juif, je suis un peintre!*”, that he reformulate in: “*Il n’avait pas tort; réclamer une excessive singularité, en art comme en philosophie, c’est restreindre la portée de son œuvre*” (Ibid.: 120) and like Borges affirms in his famous essay “The Argentinean Writer and the tradition”, Memmi expresses this idea in the following way:

Il en sera toujours ainsi, jusqu’au jour, lointain je le crains, où, les uns et les autres auront compris et accepté que chacun a le droit d’être ce qu’il est, c’est-à-dire différent et multiple, notre semblable en somme. (Ibid.: 119)

In order to revendicate this position, Memmi returns once more to the problem of “resentment” (Ibid.: 130). He demands of the Arab World to use its critical spirit in order to develop a “*pensée libre*” (Ibid.) because this “*a contribué au triomphe de l’Occident*” (Ibid.).

Here we can easily get the impression that Memmi speaks a colonial and hegemonic language making allusion to the classical and topical ideas of the irrationality of the Arab World. But his critic is addressed to rigorist and fundamentalist Muslim groups that used this resentment very rooted in ex-colonial mentalities that did not succeed to decolonize themselves, like Khatibi had also pointed out.

This ambiguity in the discourse of Memmi is a constitutive part of the condition of a “*nomade immobile*”, a metaphor which expresses on one hand the necessity to have a cultural place and on the other to consider deterritorialization in the global and plural world.

In this context Memmi has serious problems with the concept of ‘difference’, a term to which he attributes the same signification as those of ‘identity’ and ‘roots’, or ‘origin’, understood in a very unilateral way (Ibid.). Consequently, the term ‘difference’ is good for him for the “*agression raciste*” (Ibid.) and “[*rend*] l’intégration plus difficile” (Ibid.). He considers the three terms, ‘difference’, ‘origin’ and ‘identity’ as a

“parler à tort et à travers” (Ibid.), a position that we shall find also in *Le monolinguisme de l'autre* of Derrida.

For Memmi a concept of difference can only be founded in a universal model after which to tell “être” means to tell, “être différent” (Ibid.). In this context he accepts ‘difference’ in the sense that every “individu singulier” has “caractéristiques et des attaches particulières” (Ibid.: 131). On one hand we have a humanist and Christian concept of that what is a human being, including the idea of a *nostrum universalis*. The problem of this conception lies in its globality in which the cultural difference is covered and disguised, particularly those aspects that are not translated in the other culture. On the other hand, Memmi constants that “la différence est un fait”, and he refuses the *nostrum universalis* after which we all are similar, but under the condition that man do not makes out of the difference “ni un drapeau, ni une arme” (Ibid.). Memmi accuses fundamentalist groups of using the notion of difference as a weapon of battle, as a hegemonic and legitimist discourse of power that wants to impose a specific form of being and life (Ibid.). It is precisely in this back and forth movement, in this oscillation that Memmi negotiates the dichotomy Orient/Occident that led him to the affirmation that: “on a le droit d’être différent” [...], “mais qu’on n’a pas le droit d’imposer ses différences aux autres” (Ibid.).

One problem remains: Memmi evidently does not know or does not consider the theory of ‘difference’ as part of the actual discussion in the theory of culture. He speaks always about difference in a socio-political context connected to a conception of difference as the nostalgia of the origin and of the longing of the roots that he accepts, but at the same time considers as dangerous because such a concept represents the opposite of a humanist and liberal concept of society in the direction of Rorty (1986) or Taylor (1992), for example as he tells: “Dorénavant, notre défi, et il devient de plus en plus urgent, est d’arriver à concilier entre elles [les différences] nos différentes singularités, condition d’une véritable universalité” (Ibid.). Par ‘universality’, he understands “l’humanité vivante se considérant elle-même comme un ensemble” (Ibid.). This reminds us of the dialectic concept of history of Hegel and his concept of ‘Aufhebung’, a sort of reconciliation between the different singularities. Like Sansal, Memmi considers religions and nationalisms as the sources of cultural, ethnic and political conflicts because “ils sont par essence séparateurs” (Ibid.) and as Sansal, Memmi wants to forge a type of Habermasian society in which “seule une organisation du monde un peu plus raisonnable, sinon tout à fait rationnelle, tolérante et laïque nous permettrait d’avancer dans la voie de cette réconciliation” (Ibid.: 132, cf. also 140).

Finally, we can summarize that Memmi changes his position in a very subtle way, but he is obliged to accept difference and hybridity:

Nous souhaitons que notre culture soit homogène, or elle est hétéroclite; qu’elle soit permanente, or elle est changeante; solide, or elle est fragile. Il n’existe pas plus de culture immuable que de culture pure. L’identité n’est pas identique, ai-je noté, et culturellement, nous sommes tous des métis. (Ibid.: 166)

6. Derrida or the fugacity of belonging: to a performative concept of nation, identity and diaspora

In the context of an international conference about francophony in Louisiana, several so called ‘Franco-Maghrebian’ authors were invited to participate. Derrida explains that the conference included “*tous ces problèmes d’identité, comme on dit si bêtement aujourd’hui*” (1996: 26) and he puts the term ‘Franco-Maghrebian’ up for discussion. Derrida underlines the ambiguity of term “*franco-maghrébin*” and he asserts in his book *Le monolinguisme de l’autre* (1996) that of all participants he is the only really Franco-Maghrebian author “*le plus franco-maghrébin de tous*”.

On the fugacity and the difficulty of belonging to a particular culture, Derrida begins a play with his friend, the Moroccan writer and philosopher Abdelkebir Khatibi telling that not Khatibi or the Caribbean writer Glissant, but he, is the Franco-Maghrebian, as we have already mentioned (Ibid.: 25 and ff.).

The fundamental problem that he sees in his affirmation is that the binomial ‘Franco-Maghrebian’ makes allusion to a “*unité historique de la France et du Maghreb, [dont] le « t » n’aura jamais été donné [...]*” (Ibid.: 26). But the essay is in a first instance to legitimize his affirmation. Because being French-Jewish (after the criterion of the blood) and born Algerian (after the criterion of soil) and French (after the criterion of the citizenship) (Ibid.: 30) he is indeed the “*plus franco-maghrébin de tous*”. In spite of this fact, Derrida puts in question that these three criteria could be sufficient to define the identity, belonging of an individual and the hospitality. He rather speaks of the “*trouble de l’identité*” (formulation that reminds us of Butler’s term of “gender trouble”) because following Derrida the so call identity or the belonging and the hospitality cannot be rooted either in blood or in soil, or in citizenship. He refuses a privileged relation between citizenship, language, cultural belonging and identity because of his very arbitrary status, or according to our own formulation, because of the precariousness of such a relation:

La citoyenneté, on le sait, ne définit pas une participation culturelle, linguistique ou historique en général. Elle ne recouvre pas toutes ces appartenances. Mais ce n’est pourtant pas un prédicat superficiel ou suprastructurel flottant à la surface de l’expérience. (Ibid.: 33)

Derrida’s observations are based on two crucial experiences that marked his whole life: at first the Vichy regime decreed that Jewish were prohibited to assist at school; secondly in the year 1940 the same regime abolished his French nationality under the pretext of the Nazi “occupation” in Algeria (Ibid.: 35) – but Algeria was never occupied by the Nazis, so this decision was a pure “*opération franco-française*”, and was rather an act of the French Algeria “*en absence de toute occupation allemande*” (Ibid.: 36).

The fact that a government can arbitrarily abolish the nationality of someone unmasks all actual discourses of the political cast in favour of integration based on citizenship and mastery of the language as a fiction in front of the precarious status of citizenship that cannot be the key of cultural identification or identity for a migrant in the country of arrival, citizenship resulted very fragile in order to become a source for a feeling of belonging. The loss of nationality means as well the breakup or breach with

the belonging to a language that indeed prevents us to make the question who is a truly “*franco-maghrebin*”.

Beyond that, we have also to ask who possess the language, who is the master of a particularly language, a question that forced Derrida to ask himself: “*Est-elle jamais en possession, la langue une possession possédante ou possédée? Possédée ou possédante en propre, comme un bien propre?*” (Ibid.: 35-36). Derrida denies the possibility to possess a language: even in the case of the master of the language, he says that neither the native speaker, nor the national institutions, nor the networks of norms can possess the mother language because “*la langue n’est pas son bien naturel*” (Ibid.: 45), because for “his” language it is an arbitrary act to impose this as “his own” (Ibid.):

Car contrairement à ce qu’on est le plus souvent tenté de croire, le maître n’est rien. Et il n’a rien en propre. Parce que le maître ne possède pas en propre, naturellement, ce qu’il appelle pourtant sa langue; parce que, quoi qu’il veuille ou fasse, il ne peut entretenir avec elle des rapports de propriété ou d’identité naturels nationaux, congénitaux, ontologiques; parce qu’il ne peut accrédi-ter et dire cette appropriation qu’au cours d’un procès non naturel de constructions politico-phantasmatiques; parce que la langue n’est pas son bien naturel, par cela même il peut historiquement, à travers le viol d’une usurpation culturelle, c’est-à-dire toujours d’essence coloniale, feindre de se l’appropri-er pour l’imposer comme ‘la sienne’. (Ibid.: 45)

Inspired by the “non-possession de la langue”, Derrida designs a concept of language, culture and politics that is not rooted in a particular culture, imposed from outside of the individual, a culture that is not “*ni monolingue, ni bilingue, ni plurilingue*” (Ibid.: 55) but “*situé dans une expérience insitu-able de la langue, de la langue au sens large, donc, de ce mot*” (Ibid.: 55), that means, where the individual has primarily a relation with the practice of language that crosses his body and desire, and with the capacity of identification, but at the same time, like in the most of the cases of migrants or ethnic minorities, remains in a ‘*Umhomely*’ (or ‘*Unheimlich*’/ ‘*Uncanny*’) the Bhabha term that is used several times by Derrida (Ibid.: 55, 66) as a place of privation. The result of this Derridian operation based on his own experience, as we already know, to be treated as a Jewish without really belong to the Jewish tradition and community, but at the same time not to be a French man, means to belong to any place and to any culture; all that allows him to liberate the belonging and the hospitality of the criteria of blood and soil and also of citizenship. He liberates also the individual of the already mentioned “*prothèse d’origine*” and of the “*trouble de l’identité*”.

Going out from this context we can speak of a ‘performative’ belonging, hospitality and identity that is always depending of the language, of the own chosen language, inserted in the body and steered or driven by emotion, and under ‘emotion’ we understand the experience of the hospitality that passes by the “*Blick*”, look, gaze, sight, glance, by the corps and by the desire and not by the citizenship or by the “*prothèse d’origine*”. The concept of ‘cultural performance’ and the idea of a ‘performative identity’ or of ‘performative diaspora’ do not mean alienation or rootlessness, nor the impenetrability of history, the amnesia or the undecipherable. The concept of ‘performativity’ and that of ‘diaspora’ do not represent a threat against the cultural patrimony or against the National State; it rather means the reinvention of the self, it is an indeterminate process in which the past performs itself (through the experience and

the emotion) and also the present. It is a radical individual and democratic system spread by occidental politics, but devoured by the National State and by Citizenship. It is a performativity of time, place and of the individual where the 'I' invents and re-invents himself incessantly because the individual cannot exist in a language, in a place and in a time, that are withheld to him (Derrida Ibid.: 117):

[...] qu'il est privé de toute langue, et qu'il n'a plus d'autre recours – ni l'arabe, ni le berbère, ni l'hébreu, ni aucune des langues qu'auraient parlées des ancêtres –, parce que ce monolinguisme est en quelque sorte aphasique [...] (Derrida, Ibid.).

7. Ben Jelloun or the battle for the hospitality

Ben Jelloun is another fundamental author in the context of our argumentation. He puts the concept of 'hospitality' in the centre of his considerations in his book *Hospitalité Française* from 1984, to which he added a new prologue in the 1997 edition. Here he develops a concept of 'hospitality', having as reference Derrida and Lévinas, which he in a first approach defines as “*un droit réciproque de protection et d'abri*” (Ibid.: 10), after that man “*s'ouvr[e] au visage de l'autre – qu'il soit indigne ou voyageur de passage –, ouvrir sa porte, offrir l'espace de sa maison à l'étranger, un principe (la gratuité)*” (Ibid.). This enunciation has a central importance in the context of the actual debate about migration, particularly in France in what is concerning the Maghrebinean migration. The introduction of the Convention of Schengen on the one hand, and the rigorism and Islamism of some groups of Arab migrants, on the other hand, throw a shadow to the debate about hospitality, because hospitality refers to alterity, to difference and finally to hybridity as Derrida puts it: “*l'hospitalité est le nom même de ce qui s'ouvre au visage, ce qui accueille l'autre comme visage. L'accueil accueille seulement un visage*” (dans Ben Jelloun, Ibid.). The 'face' is the door, is the border and represents a whole strategy of alterity and positioning: “*La manière dont se présente l'Autre, dépassant l'idée de l'autre en moi, nous l'appellerons visage [...]. Le visage est une présence vivante, il est expression, [...] Le visage parle. La manifestation du visage est déjà discours*” tells Lévinas (dans Ben Jelloun, Ibid.), which Ben Jelloun translates in expressions as: “*Tu as rempli ma maison*” (Ibid.), “*Tu as rempli avec nous (ou pour nous) la maison*” (Ibid.) or des vœux énoncés tels que “*Que ta maison soit toujours pleine (de gens, d'amis, d'amour, de bienfaits)*” (Ibid.). Following Ben Jelloun, the Moroccan hospitality is rooted in the Arab-Berber and Muslim culture as a signum of identity. Hospitality thought as cultural strategy and being part of very different cultures, it is considered as the key for opening doors in the societies related to the concept of foreignness as Derrida thinks it: “*Le recevoir ne reçoit que dans la mesure où il reçoit au-delà de la capacité du moi, au-delà de ce que je pense lui offrir. L'autre est plus grand que ma maison*” (dans Ben Jelloun, Ibid.: 11). Hospitality is – following Derrida, Lévinas and Ben Jelloun – an attitude in front of the foreignness very similar to the notion of Segalen and what Khatibi concretizes in the figure of the 'Exote': “*seul l'absolument étranger – c'est-à-dire celui qui n'est pas de la famille biologique – peut m'apporter quelque chose qui va me nourrir, m'instruire sur moi-*

même et sur les autres. D'où ce besoin essentiel, vital, d'être dans une relation avec autrui" (Ibid.: 13). Thus, to understand difference is of crucial importance in the conception of hospitality of Ben Jelloun, because it underlines some elemental rules of sociability, of a mutual recognition of the different other but "*sans oublier que tout homme est étranger, mais qu'il n'y a pas d'étranger absolu*" (Ben Jelloun, Ibid.).

Ben Jelloun develops here a very similar concept to that of Memmi already described above. He bases on a universal, Christian, humanist and liberal concept of the individual: "*l'individu est unique et singulier. Dans ce sens, chacun est étranger à l'autre dans la mesure où nous sommes invités à apprendre à vivre ensemble*" (Ibid.: 13 sq.) and he adds that "*Vivre ensemble n'implique pas la fraternité, mais une étrangeté dont il faut assumer le caractère non évident, non naturel. [...]. Accepter une responsabilité engendrée par l'existence de l'autre avec lequel je serais peut-être amené à négocier*" (Ibid.: 14). Negotiation means here the right of difference and the imperative of recognition:

Regarder autrui, c'est lui parler, c'est l'invoquer et lui reconnaître sa multitude de différences qui ne sont pas faites pour séparer mais pour se rencontrer. La différence est ce qui me manque, ce qui me rend capable d'accueillir. (Ibid.)

The quotation shows that foreignness, and per consequence difference, allows liberty, generosity and democracy as well as it is very far from provoking danger or threat.

Considering 'hospitality an "*éthique qui va au-delà de la simple coexistence ou de l'acceptation au nom de la morale ou de l'idéologie de la présence de l'étranger*" (Ibid.: 15), Ben Jelloun wants to give to this universalizing and anthropological concept a political force, meaning the: "*droit de l'accueil et du partage*" (Ibid.), in order to overcome the private space and to move to a public-national space and so to transform hospitality in laws. The observations of Ben Jelloun are the result of the particular historical relation between Algeria and France.

For that he analyses the psychological situation in which the migrants find themselves. On the one hand he describes critically that migrants often live in the nostalgia of the left home, on the other hand he tells that many migrants, v.a. those who are born in France "*sont arrivés sans se poser la question de l'hospitalité et leurs enfants nés en France n'ont aucune raison de la réclamer, parce qu'ils ne sont pas des étrangers*" (Ibid.: 18), but even if they are not discriminated, they are threatened as foreigners in the own country even if they have the French citizenship. An American journalist who leaves Berlin after many decades, in a Talk Show called "Hart aber Fair", got very upset that Germans call the football player Mesut Özil (and player of the national team), born in Germany and speaking perfectly the German language a Turk or a German with *Migrationshintergrund*, with migration background. She was asked how many centuries Germans need to accept that someone who is born in Germany and who is completely integrated is a German.

This lack of recognition is what Ben Jelloun criticizes because it puts the migrants in an ambivalent situation: they are refused as French, but they are French (Ben Jelloun Ibid.: 25). Here, the power of the criterion of blood comes up even in France, at least for all those "Frenchs with migrant background" that do not come from Europe or North America, in the first place and who are not integrated in the notion of the *citoyen*

as member of a civil society: the Republic, and he claims that France after the convention of Schengen 1985, transformed the traditional French hospitality in unhospitality so that the term francophony got to be a farce and the term ‘migrant’ was transformed into a discriminatory term. He adds that personalities like Beckett or Ionesco were not called migrants, but that they were evidently writers of Africa or of the Caribbean. It seems that European countries, so Ben Jelloun in the tradition of Fanon, Memmi and Bhabha, are as afraid of the similarity of the integrated other as they are of the difference, that clearly marks the delimitation between us and the others: “*ce n’est plus la différence qui fait peur, mais la ressemblance*” (Ibid.: 34).

Ben Jelloun argues as Memmi in relation to the concept of difference in a very similar way as the new Right in France does, difference is seen as an obstacle for integration and as an instrument of some groups that try “*creuse[r] de plus en plus la fosse entre vous et nous, [afin] que chacun reste chez soi marinant dans sa différence*” (Ibid.: 35), or groups that want to seduce the migrants exploiting their nostalgic memory: “*soyez différents, cultivez vos mœurs et coutumes*” (Ibid.). Cette façon de penser, ce serait le discours de la “*nouvelle droite*” (Ibid.) in order to make integration impossible. He sees difference in a negative way as “*une forteresse dans laquelle des hommes vont se barricader et tirer à vue sur tout étranger à cette identité qui se présente*” (Ibid.: 48) and he brings this in relation to the “*intégrisme religieux*” (Ibid.) which he calls a “*névrose phobique*” (Ibid.), a discourse that is very similar to the extreme right-wing’s in France that uses the term ‘difference’ to exclude the migrants from integration and from accepting the same civil right for all of them (“*n’aboutit jamais à l’égalité*”, Ibid.: 132; “*le droit à la différence est une concession faite par la majorité à certaines minorités, par les dominants aux dominés, à condition que les rapports hiérarchiques soient sauvegardés*”, Ibid.). At the same time he has to recognize the difference as a constitutive part of identity: “[...] *qu’on le veuille ou non, la différence est ce qui définit l’identité*” and the opposite that “*la différence dans une société c’est la mort de la communication, le ghetto*”, and that “*la différence s’impose d’elle-même; [qu’]on ne peut la nier. En revanche, l’égalité des droits juridiques, sociaux, politiques exige qu’on lutte pour l’obtenir*”. (Ibid.: 132)

In order to propose another concept of hospitality based on the cultural epistemology of hybridity we want to redefine the concept of foreignness and cultural belonging and ‘race’ or ‘migration’ for that of ‘performative diaspora’ as we already have exposed at the inauguration of the Conference.

And here is the position of Ben Jelloun in relation to the terms mentioned above. He is very clear:

Il n’existe qu’une seule race humaine, composée d’ethnies différentes ayant des cultures différentes et des couleurs de peau différentes. Ce racisme-là est avant tout culturel, la race étant le tronc commun de l’humanité. Cette distinction n’enlève rien à l’absurdité des affirmations de ce genre. (Ibid.: 47)

He argues that what was called ‘race’ by the Nazis, has in the present become “*identité culturelle*” (Ibid.), because the notion of identity “*est en train de remplacer la fonction de la notion de race*” (Ibid.: 48). In front of this panorama Ben Jelloun sees the necessity of “*repenser la notion d’hospitalité et d’accueil*” (Ibid.: 49) taking care of the

phenomenon of migration in its whole dimension, historically and politically and that means to elaborate a new concept of cultural and migration politics as well as of the general notion of francophony (Ibid.: 51) as a common space of enunciation, because the question that it imposes is how we can think a Francophony without people, as Carlos Fuentes already in the 90s formulated concerning globalization: “I repeat: global interaction and communication without people cannot exist”. (Fuentes 2002: 342)

Europe has ruined its hospitality under the pressure of global capitalism, technocratization and economization of all fields of society with a higher degree of productivity. For France this evolution represents an anachronism, a contradiction and paradox in the face of the concept of citizenship of 1789 as consequence of the Enlightenment (Ibid.: 58). So, Ben Jelloun considers that France has betrayed her tradition: “*terre d’asile et de liberté pour ceux qui ont dû fuir une dictature, un régime politique [...], [de] terre d’asile et d’exil où l’immigration est une nationalité en soi [...]*” (Ibid.: 59).

In spite of this claim Ben Jelloun is far from accusing Europe or France because migration and integration are a “*responsabilité partagée*” (Ibid.: 60), that has to have the aim to overcome an uneasiness:

[...] d’une urgence, une espèce de brûlure dans le ventre, parce que je suis arabe, vivant entre la France et le Maroc, parce que je suis des deux-rives, concerné par la blessure, impliqué, engagé dans ce qui arrive, et bouleverse le paysage immigré, parce que le racisme n’est pas qu’une animosité désespérante mais aussi un état de fait qui tue. (Ibid.)

To speak of ‘performative diasporas’ means to rethink all of those terms in a space where the principal of cohabitation has to be the right to inhabit a space with the same rights of belonging for all inhabitants of this space:

Le devenir de la culture et de la civilisation du pays des droits de l’homme et de la loi contre l’incitation à la haine raciale dépend aussi des portes qui s’ouvriront pour la coexistence et le métissage.

Il n’est pas évident d’arriver à vivre ensemble, même si la France, de par l’histoire et son tissu social, est une société multiraciale. En tous les cas, c’est une réalité à ne pas enjamber en refusant de la voir, de la reconnaître dans sa complexité, sa richesse et ses risques, à ne pas couvrir du voile trouble d’un malheur sans dénouement. (Ibid.: 62)

It means to inhabit a space without the “*prothèse d’origine*” and that means, too, to risk to think that integration means the integration of the migrants and of those members of the country of arrival that think and feel to be the legitimated inhabitants of these spaces. This concept of reciprocal integration that is not going to be realized 1:1 involves the possibility of avoiding conflicts and racism and a chance for a really post-modern concept of integration.

Bibliography

- Anthias, Flora (1998). "Evaluating 'Diasporas'. Beyond Ethnicity?", in: *Sociology* 32, 3: 557-580.
- Ben Jelloun, Tahar (1997). *Hospitalité Française*. Paris: Seuil.
- Bensmaïa, Réda (2003). *Experimental Nations. Or, the invention of the Maghreb*. Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Borges, Jorge Luis (1989). *Obras completas*. Buenos Aires: Alianza/Emencé.
- Chivallon, Christine (2002). "Beyond Gilroy's Black Atlantic. The Experience of the African Diasporas", in: *Diaspora* II, 3: 350-382.
- Chow, Rey (1993). *Writing Diaspora. Tactics of Intervention in Contemporary Cultural Studies*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Clifford, James (1997). *Routes, Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Cohen, Phil (1998). "Welcome to the Diasporama. A Cure for the Millenium Blues?", in: *New Ethnicities* 3: 3-10.
- Cohen, Robin (1997). *Global Diasporas. An Introduction*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Derrida, Jacques (1996). *Le monolinguisme de l'autre ou la prothèse d'origine*. Paris: Galilée.
- Dirlik, Arif (2004). "It Is Not Where You Are From, It Is Where You Are At. Place-Based Alternatives to Diaspora Discourses", in: John Friedman/Shalini Ramderia (eds.). *Worlds on the Move. Globalization, Migration and Cultural Security*. London: Tauris. pp. 142-165.
- Edwards, Brent Hayes (2001). *The Practice of Diaspora. Literature, Translation, and the Rise of Black Internationalism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Fuentes, Carlos (2002). *En esto creo*. Seix Barral: Barcelona.
- Gafaïti, Hafid (2005). *La diasporisation de la littérature postcoloniale. Assia Djebar, Rachid Mimouni*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Gilroy, Paul (1993). *The Black Atlantic. Modernity and Double Consciousness*. London: Verso.
- Goitein, Shelomo Dov (1973). *Letters of Medieval Jewish Traders*. Princeton: University Press.
- Goitein, Shelomo Dov (1999). *Mediterranean Society. An Abridgement in One Volume*. Berkeley: University Press.
- Hall, Stuart (1994). "Cultural Identity and Diaspora", in: Patrick Williams/Laura Chrisman (ed.). *Colonial Discourse and post-colonial Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press. pp. 392-403.
- Hall, Stuart (1996). "The formation of a diasporic intellectual: an interview with Stuart Hall", in: David Morely/Kuan-Hsing Chen (eds.). *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*. London/New York: Routledge. pp. 484-503.
- Herlinghaus, Hermann/Walter, Monika (1994). (eds.). *Posmodernidad en la periferia. Enfoques latinoamericanos de la nueva teoría cultural*. Berlin: Langer.
- Huntington, Samuel (2004). *Who are we? The Challenges to American's National Identity*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

- Khatibi, Abdelkebir (1971/21983). *La mémoire tatouée: autobiographie d'un décolonisé*. Paris: Denoël.
- Khatibi, Abdelkebir (1983). *Maghreb Pluriel*. Paris: Denoël.
- Khatibi, Abdelkebir/Hassoun, Jacques (1985). *Le même livre*. Paris: Editions de l'éclat.
- Khatibi, Abdelkebir. (1993). *Penser le Maghreb*. Rabat: SEMR.
- Lipsitz, George (1994). *Dangerous Crossroads. Popular Music, Postmodernism, and the Poetics of Place*. London: Verso.
- Mayer, Ruth (2005). *Diaspora. Eine kritische Begriffsbestimmung*. Bielefeld: Transcript.
- Memmi, Albert (2000). *Le nomade immobile* Paris: arléa.
- Mishra, Vijay (1996). "The Diasporic Imaginary: Theorizing the Indian Diaspora", in: *Textual Practice* 10, 3: 421-447.
- Robert, Paul/Rey-Debove, Josette/Rey, Alain (1994). *Le Petit Robert*. Paris: Dictionnaires Le Robert.
- Rorty, Richard (1986). "On Ethnocentrism: A Reply to Clifford Geertz", in: *Michigan Quarterly Review*. 25,3. Summer: 525-534.
- Safran, William (1991). "Diasporas on Modern Societies. Myths of Homeland and Return", in: *Diaspora* 1, 1: 83-89.
- Scharlau, Birgit (ed.). (1994). *Lateinamerika denken. Kulturtheoretische Grenzgänge zwischen Moderne und Postmoderne*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Schneider, Irmela/Christian W. Thomsen (eds.). (1997). *Hybridkultur: Medien, Netze, Künste*. Cologne: Wienand.
- Sieber, Cornelia (2005). *Die Gegenwart im Plural. Postmoderne/ postkoloniale Strategien in neueren Lateinamerikadiskursen*. Frankfurt: Vervuert.
- Taylor, Charles (1992). *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton: PUP.
- Tölölyan, Kaching (1991). "The Nation-State and its Others", in: "Lieu of a Preface", in: *Diaspora* 1, 1: 3-7.
- Tölölyan, Kaching (1996). "Rethinking Diaspora(s). Stateless Power in the Transnational Moment", in: *Diaspora* 5, 1: 3-36.
- Toro, Alfonso de (1991). "Postmodernidad y Latinoamérica (con un modelo para la novela latinoamericana)", in: *Revista Iberoamericana*. 155-156: 441-468. German version: "Die Postmoderne und Lateinamerika", in: Eckard, Höfner/Konrad. Schoell (eds.) (1996). *Erzählte Welt: Studien zur Narrativik in Frankreich, Spanien und Lateinamerika. Festschrift für Leo Pollmann*. Frankfurt/Main: Vervuert. pp. 259-299.
- Toro, Alfonso de (1995). "Jorge Luis Borges. The Periphery at the Center/ The Periphery as Center/The Center of the Periphery: Postcoloniality and Postmodernity", in: Fernando de Toro/Alfonso de Toro (eds.). *Borders and Margins: Post-Colonialism and Post-Modernism*. Frankfurt/Main: Vervuert. pp. 11-45. Spanish version: "Postcolonialidad, Postmodernidad y Jorge Luis Borges. La periferia en el centro – la periferia como centro – el centro de la periferia: postcolonialidad y postmodernidad", in: *Iberoromania*. 44, 2 (1996a): 64-98.
- Toro, Alfonso de (1997). "Fundamentos epistemológicos de la condición contemporánea. Postmodernidad, Postcolonialidad en diálogo con Latinoamérica", in: Alfonso de Toro (ed.). *Postmodernidad y postcolonialidad. Breves Reflexiones sobre la*

- cultura latinoamericana*. Frankfurt/ Main: Vervuert. pp. 11-50. English version: "The Epistemological Foundation of the Contemporary Condition: Latin America in Dialogue with Post-modernity and Postcoloniality", in: Richard A. Young (ed.), *Latin American Postmodernisms. Postmodern Studies 22*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi. pp. 29-51.
- Toro, Alfonso de (1999). "La postcolonialidad en Latinoamérica en la era de la globalización. ¿Cambio de paradigma en el pensamiento teórico-cultural latinoamericano?", in: Alfonso de Toro/Fernando de Toro (eds.). *El debate de la postcolonialidad en Latinoamérica. Una postmodernidad periférica o Cambio de paradigma en el pensamiento latinoamericano*. Frankfurt/ Main: Vervuert. pp. 31-77.
- Toro, Alfonso de (2002a). "Jenseits von Postmoderne und Postkolonialität. Materialien zu einem Modell der Hybridität und des Körpers als transrelationalem, transversalem und transmedialem Wissenschaftskonzept", in: Christoph Hamann/Cornelia Sieber (eds.). *Räume der Hybridität. Postkoloniale Konzepte in Theorie und Literatur*. ("Passagen – Studien zu Wissenschaft und Kultur. Frankophonie und Anglophonie"). Hildesheim: Olms. pp. 15-52.
- Toro, Alfonso de (2004). "Hacia una teoría de la cultura de la hibridez como sistema científico transrelacional, transversal y transmedial", in: *Texto Crítico* 25/26 (Stanford University): 197-235.
- Vergès, Françoise (2003). "Writing on Water: Peripheries, Flows, Capital, and Struggles in the Indian Ocean", in: *Position* II, I: 241-257.
- Warren, Kenneth (1993). "Appelas for (Mis)recognition. Theorizing the Diaspora", in: Amy Kaplan/Donald E. Pease (eds.). *Cultures of United States Imperialism*. Durham: Duke University Press. pp. 392-406.

Michael Rössner

*Institut für Kulturwissenschaften und Theatergeschichte der
Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien
Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München*

TRANSLATING DIASPORA

The discussions about diaspora seem to have reached such an intensity in the last two decades that the intervention of translators could be quite helpful in order to clearly understand what we are speaking about and where we are speaking from. However, the concept of translation is not simple either, and I would therefore like to begin by explaining that I use the word “translation” in the broader sense of German Translation or Spanish *traducción*: that is to say as a cultural translation, of which linguistic translation is only a very specific sub-category, a de-contextualization and re-contextualization process consisting of a conflictive negotiation between the traces of the two contexts that never entirely comes to an end – a concept similar to Derrida’s *différance*. In our 2010 Vienna conference on *Translatio/n*, we therefore proposed the English term *translatio/n* in order to differentiate between this cultural translation and normal (linguistic) translation. And it is precisely this meaning of *translatio/n* that I would like to employ for analyzing the various uses of the diaspora concept.

These are, in fact, so manifold that the last years of diaspora studies, after decades of “expansion”, have been characterized by the work of categorization, of ordering and classifying the wide variety of concepts of diaspora – first by Robin Cohen in the various editions of his *Global diasporas: an introduction* (1997, 1999, 2001, 2005 rev. 2008), in which he distinguishes fundamentally among the five “ideal types” of diasporas: “Victim”, “Labour”, “Imperial”, “Trade” and “Deterritorialized” (Cohen 2008, 18). This is a helpful distinction, but it is obviously a distinction *a posteriori* – based on our current perception of diaspora. What I would like to outline here is a more historical view, looking at certain kinds of diaspora as *translatio/ns* of previously existing diaspora concepts and/or situations. Obviously, we have to start in Ancient Greece, as diaspora is a Greek word: *διασπορά*, “scattering, dispersion”. In Ancient Greece the term *diaspora* meant “the scattered” and was used to refer to citizens of a dominant city-state who immigrated to a conquered land, for instance to Sicily, with the purpose of colonization, forming thereby what was called “Magna Graecia”. However, when the Romans did the same thing, they did not forge a new term for this – as far as I am aware, there is no Latin expression for diaspora. Why did they not translate it – in a linguistic sense – when Sicily became the first official “colonia” of the Roman Empire?

I think that this is obviously due to a much lesser awareness of what we would call “ethnicity” in modern terms. The Greeks of the Classical period, when the first histories were written, clearly believed that they were, culturally at least, “one people”, the Hellenes. At the same time, they also believed they were divided into tribes of legendary origin: Dorians, Achaeans, Ionians, Aeolians. These different appellations are somewhat problematic, because their use, even amongst ancient writers, is often inconsistent and imprecise, and could surely be analyzed in terms of Anderson’s

“Imagined communities”. In any case, this multiple ethnic affiliation (to the “Hellenes”, the “Ionians”, and the founding city, e. g., Athens) seems to form the basis for the notion of “diaspora”, which has a quite positive connotation, as “σπορά” means seed, and therefore diaspora may be translated (in a linguistic sense) also by sowing – Derrida enthusiasts could even think of rendering it “dissemination”. Such a connotation is clearly the basis for one of the characteristics enumerated by almost every diaspora study: that the members of the “diasporic community” “retain a collective memory, vision or myth about their original homeland including its location, history and achievements” (Cohen 2008: 6).

When the Romans arrived in Sicily, they did not found cities that were to some extent related to a “mother city”; rather, they came as colonizers in the modern sense, partitioning land and using the island’s fertility (at that time) to secure the food supply to the Italian mainland. And when they conquered nearly the entire Mediterranean step by step, they never had the idea of being “dispersed” or “disseminated”. Being “Roman” was no longer a question of ethnicity: It was a legal status to be achieved. Being “cives Romanus” gave you some rights other people did not have, irrespective of your ethnic or geographic origin. Obviously, Rome was the center and origin of all rights and social systems, but it was not a “homeland”: It was a point in space, a symbolic location that was the root of world order in the Ancient World. And yet, Rome was responsible for the first translatio/n of diaspora following the use of the word during Greek colonization: The destruction of the Jerusalem temple in the year 70 led to the first mention of a diaspora created as a result of exile. In the Septuagint, the phrase “εσῆ diaspora en pasais basileias tēs gēs” (ἦσε διασπορά εν πάσαις βασιλείαις της γης) translates to mean “thou shalt be a dispersion in all kingdoms of the earth”. The word Diaspora, then, was used to refer to the population of Jews exiled from Israel in 607 BCE by the Babylonians, and from Judea in 70 CE by the Roman Empire. It subsequently came to be used to refer interchangeably, but exclusively, to the historical movements of the dispersed ethnic population of Israel, the cultural development of that population, or the population itself. In the Merriam-Webster dictionary we learn that even today, when capitalized and without modifiers (that is, simply the Diaspora), the term refers specifically to the Jewish diaspora; when uncapitalized, the word “diaspora” may be used to refer to refugee populations of other origins or ethnicities. Obviously, what the Septuagint created was not only a translation of the Hebrew Bible, but also a *translatio/n* of the concept of diaspora that could now be used – and it obviously was – by the Greek-speaking Jewish diaspora in the Roman Empire for a diaspora of Cohen’s “victim type”. However, it is extremely important that it is not only ethnicity, as in the Greek case, that determines the “imagined community”, but also the relationship to a well-defined location – the “promised land” – and to a special body – “God’s chosen people” – that lend the new concept a sacral and exclusive character: There can be no comparable second diaspora. This may well be the reason why our dictionaries still distinguish between capitalized Jewish Diaspora (singular) and non-capitalized diasporas (plural), which are currently the subject of diaspora research. But can one jump directly from the Ancient World to 20th century diasporas? I think we should first take a look at other possible translatio/ns of diaspora throughout history.

The next possibility of using the term would have been during the “Barbarian migration” (*Völkerwanderung*) after the decline of the Roman Empire. Obviously, during these centuries, many communities were “dispersed from an original ‘centre’ to two or more foreign regions” (Cohen 6), but did not retain a “collective memory” about “their original homeland” – at least there are no traces of such memory in the texts of Barbarian writers of these ages. Goths in Italy or Spain did not consider themselves expatriates, or members of diasporic communities. As far as we know, there were no identity constructions founded on “collective memory” that affected the political organization of the new communities, such as the Longobard Kingdom in Italy or the Gothic Kingdom in Spain. Even as far as language is concerned, the invaders seemed to surrender to the colonized people – so that the Romance languages Italian, Spanish and French show very few “Germanic elements”. This has to do with religion, too: The invaders were christianized by the conquered culture. However, it is interesting that in medieval Spain, for instance, which was divided into an Arabic Muslim part and a Spanish Christian part, neither the Arabs under Christian domination (*moriscos* or *mu-déjares*) nor the Christians under Muslim domination (*mozárabes*) considered themselves “diaspora”, while the Jews in both parts did. We may therefore say that “diaspora” was not subject to *translatio/n* in medieval societies – but even such a non-*translatio/n* clearly had repercussions for the word’s meaning. While in Ancient Roman society, Jewish diaspora was perceived more in an ethnic sense, in medieval society it acquired a more religious connotation. In Renaissance Europe, it took on this sole contextualization when the Reformation led to a territorial division between Protestant and Catholic zones following the famous rule “*Cujus regio, eius religio*”, meaning the religion of the ruler dictated the religion of the ruled. The rulers of the German-speaking states and Charles V, Holy Roman Emperor, agreed to this principle with the Peace of Augsburg (1555), which created a difficult situation for the remaining Catholic communities in Protestant countries and vice versa. Consequently, the religious connotation of diaspora became the dominant one in modern European societies. When you look up the definition of diaspora in German encyclopedias from as late as the 1960s, you will first find the definition of “diaspora churches”, and then the Jewish Diaspora, as the only two possible meanings of the term. Even today, on the internet you might also find this interpretation of diaspora, e.g. for the small Evangelical-Lutheran Church in Romania: “Most communities are far away from each other, which makes the ELCR a diaspora church” (cf. www.oikoumene.org).

It is remarkable that after three decades of intensive use of the term in the post-colonial context, current diaspora research seems to completely ignore this religious meaning, although contemporary philosophy (e.g., Agamben, Žižek or Badiou) tries to use religious dynamisms to explain social problems. In Cohen’s scheme of victim-labour-imperial-trade-deterritorialized diasporas, the only possible classification would be in the last group, but this clearly does not match the definition given above. Obviously, some *translatio/ns* lose their relevance: While the religious connotation is still present for Jewish diaspora and even for Muslim diaspora (in the Western world), Christian diaspora only rarely becomes a field of research for contemporary scholarship (as was the case, for instance, at a conference in Göttingen in 2008: “‘Fremd im eigenen Land’: Diasporic cultures – diasporic mentalities?”).

1. Global diasporas: the Latin American point of view

Now let us proceed to my focal field of investigation, Latin American culture and literature. In a speech delivered three weeks ago in Vienna on diaspora, Walter Mignolo said that he acknowledges only two diasporas of importance for Latin America. The first is the arrival of the Europeans in the Conquista, which led to the death of a significant part of the indigenous population and the loss of control over their land. The second is the arrival of poor European migrants in the 19th and 20th centuries. The first one – which we could classify in Cohen’s scheme as “imperial” (although I would like to make it quite clear that there are enormous differences between British imperial colonization in the 18th century and Spanish imperial colonization in the 16th century) – would be the “bad” one, while the second one almost led to an assimilation of the newly arrived colonizers with the “subalterns”.

I shall not discuss these clearly provocative theses in a post-colonial context here, but they certainly open the perspective on the discussions of diaspora and transnationality, which have their origin in the United States of America, the very place with the biggest interest in overcoming diaspora identities. Indeed, should we understand the most important superpower of our world as a mere agglomeration of various diasporic communities, with the outnumbered Native Americans constituting the sole exception?

The question of diasporic identity, however, was still quite relevant in the first century after the Conquista, the 16th century. In this context, I shall now analyze a case of double diaspora in the Vicekingdom of Nueva Castilla (Perú): the Spanish-born poets of the Academia Antártica, and Garcilaso de la Vega el Inca, son of a Spanish nobleman and an Inca princess, born in Cuzco and living and writing in Spain. The most notable thing about the poets of the so-called “Academia Antártica” is their effort to keep pace with the development of Humanist studies and Petrarchist poetry in Europe – which obviously had their center in Italy. Peruvian intellectuals tried to enter directly into a dialogue with the European center, Italy, thereby excluding their own “homeland”. This was the case for Diego Dávalos y Figueroa, a Spanish poet married to a conquistador’s widow, and therefore a landowner in what is today Bolivia, on the *altiplano*, in a region where no other Europeans lived (cf. Colombi-Monguio 1985; Rössner apud Kohut/ Rose 2000). But Dávalos, with only the help of his wife and a few books he had brought from Europe, creates a Renaissance dialogue (cf. Ricardo 1602) on philosophical and poetological questions with many inserted poems. Some of these are translated from Italian; some are written half in Italian, half in Spanish; and one of his subjects is precisely the “questione della lingua”; that is to say, the question of which regional idiom from Italy should be used for writing poetry. He concurs with Pietro Bembo, asserting that it should be Tuscan; but what a difference, making arguments in the middle of nowhere on the Peruvian *altiplano* (published afterwards in Lima and probably seldom read in Europe) compared to Messer Bembo’s exposition, published in Venice (cf. Pietro Bembo 1525) for all his fellow humanists in the European capitals!

Do we not see in this attitude a sign of diasporic identity: not a Spanish one, but a “European” diaspora trying to keep in contact with the symbolic center, Italy – which was a kind of spiritual “homeland” for humanist intellectuals in the Renaissance? We

could say the same thing of the Portuguese poet Enrique Garcés residing in Peru, who first translated Petrarch's entire oeuvre (translation in the basic sense of the word) into Spanish during the first 70 or 80 years of the 16th century. His translation (elaborated in around 1580 in Peru) was published in Madrid 1591 (cf. Garriba 2003), and remained the only Spanish translation until 1976(!). This in itself may seem remarkable, but what makes it interesting is the fact that Garcés' translation was obviously not intended for Spaniards unable to read Italian, but for humanists well acquainted with Petrarch's original. This is documented not only by Cervantes' praise of Garcés' poetic qualities, which he held in higher esteem than Petrarch's own, as he writes in 1585 in his bucolic novel *Galatea* (that is to say, six years before the publication date of Garcés' translation – thus, the diaspora communication functioned perfectly, as Cervantes must have read a handwritten copy of the Peruvian translation in Spain)¹, but is also documented by various moves by the translator himself to outdo the original. In his paratexts, he likes to play with the peripheral context of his work. In an introductory sonnet, dedicated to the work itself (“Seguid pluma el trabajo comenzado”), he states that Petrarch ought to be happy that he had been “españolado” in such a rich peripheral country as Peru (“ado al mundo se reparte / tanto oro y plata”). Elsewhere in the introduction, Garcés answers a sonnet dedicated to him by another member of the Peruvian “Academia Antártica” in a trilingual form – one verse is in Spanish, the next is in Italian, the third is in Latin, and then the pattern repeats – with a quadrilingual sonnet (Spanish-Italian-Latin-Portuguese). But most importantly, he presents his work as a challenge to the Europeans; he leaves five of the 366 poems untranslated – four due to censorship problems. The fifth text, however, he pretends is too difficult to translate, challenging the European humanists to amend this while preserving all the qualities of the original: “Prueve pues a supplir algún buen genio/ la falta de mi pobre y rudo ingenio./ Al que supliere en esto mi rudeza/ supplico que conserve la armonía/ del texto, no olvidando la agudeza/ del artificio, y de la poesía”. The mockery is obvious: The translator's feigned lack of ability unveils the real inability of the European humanists, who were unable to translate the entire *Canzoniere* (and would not do so for four more centuries!). But Garcés does not just omit five poems from his version of Petrarch's magnum opus; he also adds others. Among poems by other authors whom Petrarch alludes to in his work, there is a translatio/n which, beyond a mere translation, is a palimpsestic overwriting of one of the most famous texts of the *Canzoniere*, “Italia mia, benché ‘l parlar sia indarno”. This canzone appears now as an exposition of the problems of Garcés's new homeland: “Aunque mi hablar, Pirú, venga a ser vano”. This is an incredible provocation: a canonic masterpiece from the center (Italy) serves as an expression (and therefore ennoblement) of the problems encountered at the periphery

1 De un Enrique Garcés, que al piruano reino enriquece, pues con dulce rima, con subtil, ingeniosa y fácil mano, a la más ardua empresa en él dio cima, pues en dulce español, al gran toscano, nuevo lenguaje ha dado y nueva estima, ¿quién será tal que la mayor le quite, aunque el mesmo Petrarca rescuite? (Cervantes apud Avalle Arce 1961: vv.15-22).

– in a country that does not exist as a nation, but that acquires through this “cultural translation” a new degree of prestige.

Altogether, these examples make it quite clear that Garcés’s edition was, in fact, not designed for those of his compatriots who were unable to read Italian, and therefore ignorant of the poetic qualities of the original, but was meant specifically for those who were well acquainted with the original and therefore able to read this translation as a higher degree of *imitatio* and *aemulatio* in the humanistic tradition. Again, we may say that this is an expression of a diasporic identity: the affirmation of one’s participation from the outermost periphery in the current discussions and literary communication processes in Europe, with its spiritual center, Italy, and the peripheral center, Spain, which somehow doubles the diasporic relation.

The mestizo Garcilaso de la Vega el Inca, son of an Inca princess and a Spanish nobleman, and nephew of the famous Renaissance poet (and imitator of Petrarch) Garcilaso de la Vega, is another – and quite different – case of “double diaspora”. The son of a Spanish father residing in Peru and an Inca mother born in the Inca capital of Cuzco was sent to Europe at the age of 20, where he served for several years in the army and undertook humanist studies. These studies led to three main literary works, the plans for which he announced from the beginning (in the prologue to the first). All of these works are related to his mestizo condition and to the typical humanist activity of translating, but also to his royal (or at least noble) blood on both sides. Garcilaso makes this condition quite clear in the prologue to his first book, a translation of Leone Ebreo’s neoplatonic dialogue *Dialoghi d’amore*, dedicated to the Spanish king, in which he states:

[...] este género de tributo se os debe por vuestros vasallos los naturales del Nuevo Mundo, en especial por los del Piru y más en particular por los de la gran ciudad del Cuzco, cabeza de aquellos reinos y provincias, donde yo nací. (Garcilaso de la Vega 1996: 101)

This “tribute” to a person of royal blood must therefore be a “royal” one, and so translation, the noblest humanist activity, is required. However, it must be the most difficult kind of translation:

[...] este primero, humilde y pequeño servicio, aunque para mí muy grande, respecto el mucho tiempo y trabajo que me cuesta: porque ni la lengua italiana, en que estaba, ni la española, en que la he puesto, es la mía natural, ni de escuelas pude en la puericia adquirir más que un indio nacido en medio del fuego y furor de las cruelísimas guerras civiles de su patria [...].

Only a translation of a canonical text from one foreign language into another foreign language satisfies the conditions that Garcilaso el Inca imposes on himself, insisting on the difficulties caused by his “first” diasporic condition: as an “indio” in a peripheral region surrounded by civil war. It is already in this first “proemio” that he announces what was to become his entire literary work: after the translation of Ebreo’s text, “La Florida del Inca”, and “Comentarios reales”.

In his last and most important work, “Comentarios reales”, the first part of which was published in Lisbon in 1609, Garcilaso el Inca once again presents himself as a

translator or interpreter (“comento, glosa e intérprete”) for Spanish historians, because the phonetic and morphologic differences between Quechua and Spanish – so he tells us – are so great that the Spaniards were unable to understand exactly what they were told about Inca history. His task, as he explains in chapter 19, is therefore to repeat what others (the cronistas) wrote, but as a

[...] comento para declarar y ampliar muchas cosas que ellos asomaron a decir, y las dejaron imperfectas, por haberles faltado relación entera. Otras muchas se añadirán que faltan de sus historias, y pasaron en hecho de verdad, y algunas se quitarán, que sobran, por falsa relación que tuvieron, por no saberla pedir el español con distinción de tiempos y edades, y división de provincias y naciones, o por no entender al indio que se la daba, o por no entender el uno al otro, por la dificultad del lenguaje; que el español que piensa que sabe más dél, ignora de diez partes las nueve. (Ibid.: 156)

Following this modest self-definition as an “interpreter”, we find something that appears to completely subvert established Spanish historiography. If we can still call him a translator, the Inca presents himself here as the perfect incarnation of the Italian word “traduttore-traditore”: Only the deconstruction of the European histories of Peru and their re-*translatio/n* will make it possible to read Andine myths as similar to “la idolatría de la Antigüedad”, according to his claim. This is obviously an important task for Garcilaso el Inca: to translate cultural elements into a symbolic language familiar to Europeans – e.g., by translating (in VI, XXIX) the Incaic adolescence rituals into those of medieval knights in the tradition of the Spanish “*novelas de caballería*”.

All this work serves his most important purpose, already expressed in the “Proemio”, where he presented himself as a “natural de la ciudad del Cozco, que fue otra Roma en aquel imperio”. This sentence shows obvious traces of its original conception in Latin: “*altera Roma in illo imperio*”. The city of Rome is referred to here not as its contemporary reality, but as a symbol of origin – the origin of religion, of the legal system, the foundation of each and every right of government as it is conceived in the figure of *translatio imperii* in the political and juridical debates from the Middle Ages onwards. And here lies the revolutionary element in the Inca’s argumentation: If Rome is *the* origin, an “*altera Roma*” is impossible, as it would lead to a duplication of history, of religion, of truth, of rights, of property, and of power. Such a position is only possible from a “second-level” diasporic position, i.e., as a “subaltern” in the center, the colonial motherland, displaced from the periphery (cf. Rössner 2011).

In order to argue this kind of subversion, the Inca is once again compelled to employ a new concept of translation that we may surely read as *translatio/n*: There are, in fact, two world orders, but one of them is just a prefiguration of the other, similar to the kind of translation discussed above, where some stories in the Old Testament must be read as prefigurations of the Gospels. So the Inca’s “translations” of Inca rituals, everyday life, and government into a Spanish context serve not only to explain these things to the Spaniards, but also to establish a relationship between the two cultures, the two systems with their respective “Romes”, similar to the Old and New Testament, or – as he implicitly suggests – to the relationship between St. John the Baptist and Christ himself, because the Incas – as he presents them – acted as colonizers and

civilizers of the primitive Indians, thus preparing the path for the Spaniards, although they had only a “*lucero de alba*”, a feeble light of dawn, and not the full light of religion.

In this way, Garcilaso el Inca, reading “translation” as “interpretation” in his text, is able to establish Incaic culture as a kind of source code for a cultural translation already performed by the Spanish conquistadores and missionaries, securing for himself, a mestizo of royal blood, a special, high-ranking place in post-Columbian Hispanic society. However, he has to accomplish this from without, from the Spanish mainland, in a kind of double diaspora that therefore subverts the concept of diaspora itself: The “homeland” is simultaneously diasporic periphery, and vice versa. Even if Garcilaso’s translation/interpretation itself never arrived at a definitive target text in the sense of a permanent fusion of the two cultures, we may imagine the problem he tried to resolve as two world histories, two epistemic systems based on an absolute centrality; as two circles with their centers in Rome and Cuzco. As long as the two did not communicate, they could carry on their own centralities, but their clash during the Conquista had not resulted – at least not immediately – in a complete extermination of the Andine system. Instead, the two circles as conceived by Garcilaso merge to form an ellipse, a figure with two competing centers. (It may be no coincidence that in *Le pli*, Deleuze defines the ellipse as the expression of baroque culture, in contrast with the circle or the sphere as the expression of classicist culture; cf. Deleuze 1988). Therefore, there can be no displacement, as the center is the periphery, and vice versa. Two centers in competition, that is to say: permanent tension, their tension mitigated only by the steady work of translation, succeeding momentarily in converting the ellipse into a circle, but ultimately seeing the tension/bipolarity/elliptic structure return, to be fully eliminated only by violence. That will definitively be the case when the center of Rome’s mythic origin is replaced by the center of *raison – ratio* during the 17th and 18th centuries, but like all historical upheavals, this development does not take place everywhere and in all fields at the same time.

It is this “*ratiocentrism*” at the heart of the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized that forms the object of post-colonial analysis. It is no less at the heart of the traditional concept of translation (without a slash), which has been undermined by the last four decades of translational theories, and by the *translational turn*. However, it is also the basis of concepts of diaspora that ignore translatio/n processes. We can perhaps take the Inca’s example as a starting point for a more complex reading of the hybridization processes that take place in diasporic communities – above all, in those that have recently discovered themselves to be such.

2. Rising Nationalism and its translatio/n of “diaspora”

The 20th century conception of diaspora would obviously have been impossible without the rise of nationalism in the 19th century. The renewed nationalisms in the post-89 world may explain the continuously increasing interest in diaspora questions. As we have seen, Renaissance diaspora – although realizing some features of the concept – does not use the term; it remains limited to the religious sphere, i.e., to Jewish diaspora and *per analogiam* to the diaspora situation of Christian confessions in some regions. With the discovery of language as a decisive factor for nation-building and the

subsequent formation of imagined communities in Europe from the late 18th century onwards, the foundation for the construction of diasporic communities was laid. In fact, small linguistic and/or religious communities that, especially in Central Europe, existed and communicated in a plurilingual space, began to conceive of themselves as diasporic groups: German-speaking peasants in Romanian or Hungarian or Czech regions, Croatians in the German-speaking Western Hungary (today part of Austria), Italians in a Croatia surrounding in Venetian/Austrian Dalmatia, and so on. With the growing emigration to the Americas, diasporic groups of these new linguistic nationalities, together with newly formed “homelands” (for instance Germany and Italy, new “national states” founded in 1870), supported these tendencies, which ultimately led to a century of ethnic cleansing and the creation of new (this time displaced) diasporic communities – most recently in Bosnia-Herzegovina and in Kosovo.

As a result, contemporary diasporic communities that are analyzed, for instance, in Robin Cohen’s Oxford-based Transnational Communities Programme (cf. www.transcomm.ox.ac.uk), are referred to almost exclusively as “national” groups. From 36 groups, only a few are “continental” – Africans divided in mahgreb/sub-saharan, Latin Americans (but with some national sub-groups), South Asians (although there are specialized projects on Pakistanis, Vietnamese, Indians, and even “sub-national communities” as Sikhs, Gujaratis, etc.).

3. Inflation of diasporas: Globalization, Transnationalities, Migrations, hybrid identities. Diasporic Literature? – Exilio, Desexilio, Diáspora

Nevertheless, the “inflation” of diasporas has less to do with nationalisms – although, as we have shown, it is still the first approach for research activity in this field – but much more with globalization, growing migration, mobility, and the forming of transnational and hybrid identities. Again, I would like to analyze this development by presenting examples from my field of research, Latin American literature.

In the 1970s and ‘80s, reader interest in Latin American literature grew in Europe (the so-called boom). Meanwhile, a growing number of states in the sub-continent were ruled by military dictators. Internal repression, along with an increasing prestige in the Western world, forced or prompted many writers to emigrate, leading most of the continent’s literature to be produced in exile. Among the effects of this exile was a greater awareness of a Latin American (supranational) community that, for the first time, also comprised Portuguese-speaking Brazilians. Another effect was an even stronger orientation toward the expectations of US-American and European readers, which led to some repetitive patterns that were mockingly qualified by the next generation as “Macedonismo” (from the name of García Márquez’s location in his novel *One Hundred Years of Solitude*). This reaction on the part of younger authors coincided with the end of most dictatorships, opening up the possibility for the exiled to return to their homelands. Some of them did so – and wrote about their experience as “ex-diasporic community” coming home (“Des-exilio”). Some did not, and continued living, writing, and sometimes teaching in the USA or in Europe. Some of the young people “back home”

also followed their example and emigrated. It is for this group and their specific in-between writing that has in part absorbed the lesson of rebellion against Macondismo that literary criticism now uses the term “diaspora” (Conteris 2006; Rössner 2005).

But what does “diasporic literature” really mean in this context? Astonishingly enough, it seems to be the contrary of the nationalist concept of diaspora, a translatio/n of Bhabha’s Third Space concept into a “non-located” literature that seeks to get rid of the essentialistic obligation to be “Latin American” (which, for many years, obstructed the unreserved recognition of Jorge Luis Borges’s work in the Western world). In fact, in the late 1990s, two groups of younger writers were finally able to reach the Western World with their declarations of independence from Macondism: the group “McOndo” led by Chilean-American writer Alberto Fuguet, and the Mexican group “Crack” with Jorge Volpi and Ignacio Padilla, among others. While “McOndo” proclaims an international media culture as basis of the reality they want to describe, “Crack” seems to abolish traditional concepts of diaspora by proclaiming the “chronotope zero”, the “non-location”, and “non-temporalization” in an “Aesthetics of dislocation” (*estética de la dislocación*, Ignacio Padilla; cf. “Manifiesto del Crack”).

In fact, we can find examples in Latin American literature of such forms of writing, even predating the new tendencies outlined above. The most striking example is surely Julio Cortázar’s novel *62 modelo para armar* (1968), in which a group of strange figures living and acting in different places seems to be united in a virtual location that makes their activity in Paris, Vienna, London, and other real European cities appear to be part of a cosmic game taking place in overlapping dimensions (“the City” and “the zone”) that are organized more by systems of affinities than by geography. Cortázar, an Argentinian writer who lived in Paris from 1950 onwards, but who nevertheless did not write merely in Spanish, but in a decidedly Argentinian form of it, was a member of the *Collège de Pataphysique*, an esoteric circle referring to Alfred Jarry’s invention of Pataphysics as the “science not of rules, but of exceptions”, and strongly influenced by the associative methods of French surrealism. In his famous novel *Rayuela* (“Hopscotch”), Cortázar had, in fact, already created a world that admitted a new kind of relationship between the place of exile (Paris) and the “homeland” (Buenos Aires). Moreover, in one of his short stories (“El otro cielo”), he opened a virtual “passage” between contemporary Buenos Aires and 19th century Paris through an urban *Passage* (the *Galérie Vivienne* and the *Pasaje Güemes*) and therefore abolished the – necessary – opposition of the diasporic condition between homeland and place of exile. However, in *62: A Model Kit*, the “chronotope zero” seems to be plainly realized, and the translatio/n of diaspora has reached a point at which all the essentialist relationships of the concept no longer apply.

In the most recent literature, we can certainly mention Roberto Bolaño, who was born in Chile, raised in Mexico City, and wrote most of his work in Spain. In his most famous novels, *Los detectives salvajes* (1998) and the posthumous masterpiece *2666* (2004), Bolaño realizes – beyond non-location and non-temporalization – the second proposal of Padilla’s manifesto text: all locations and all times together in a polyphonic, overlapping set of fragmented perspectives that deal with current problems in our world (e.g., the border problem between the US and Mexico, the African wars, the impact of the Nazi past), but cannot be ascribed to any location, be it in space or in time. If we

want to call this kind of literature “diasporic”, as most critics do, we obviously need to “translate” diaspora into a purely relational concept of dislocations that admits only relational orientations, and not essentialist ones. The era of “homelands” and of related nostalgias obviously no longer exists. I would not say that this is the only perspective possible in the 21st century, but perhaps diaspora research should consider it a bit more than it has done in the last decades. This would at least prevent us from falling back into essentialist and nationalist perspectives that have, in the past, proven not only inadequate, but also politically dangerous.

Bibliography

- Bembo, Pietro (1525). *Prose di M. Pietro Bembo nelle quali si ragiona della volgar lingua scritte al Cardinale de Medici che poi è stato creato a Sommo Pontefice et detto Papa Clemente Settimo divise in tre libri*. Venice: Tacuino.
- Cervantes, Miguel de (1961). *La Galatea*, ed. por Avalle Arce, Juan Bautista. Vol. II, p. 214, vv.15-22. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- Cohen, Robin ([1997] 2008). *Global diasporas: an introduction*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Colombi-Monguio, Alicia de (1985). *Petrarquismo peruano, Diego Davalos y Figueroa y la poesia de la Miscelanea Austral*. London: Tamesis.
- Conteris, Hiber (2006). “Exilio, “desexilio” y “desterritorialización” en la narrativa de Mario Benedetti (1973-1999)”, in: *A Contracorriente. A Journal on Social History and Literature in Latin America*. Vol. 4, No. 1, Fall: 40-66.
- D’Avalos y Figueroa, Diego (1602). *Primera parte de la miscelanea austral de don Diego D’Avalos y Figueroa, en varios coloquios. Interlocutores, Delio, y Cilena. Con la Defensa de damas*, Lima: Antonio Ricardo.
- Deleuze, Gilles (1988). *Le pli. Leibniz et le baroque*. Paris: Minuit.
- Garcilaso de la Vega el Inca (1996). *La traducción del Indio de los Tres Diálogos de Amor de León Hebreo, hecha de Italiano en Español por Garcilasso Inga de la Vega, natural de la gran Ciudad del Cuzco, cabeza de los Reynos y Provincias del Perú, Dirigidos a la Sacra Católica Real Magestad del Rey don Felipe nuestro señor. En Madrid. En casa de Pedro Madrigal*. M.D.X.C.: *Proemio al Rey*, in: *Garcilaso de la Vega el Inca: Comentarios reales*, ed. E. Pupo-Walker, Madrid: Cátedra. p. 101.
- Garribba, Aviva (2003): “La prima traduzione completa del Canzoniere di Petrarca in spagnolo: “Los sonetos y canciones del Petrarca, que traducía Henrique Garcés de lengua thoscana en castellana”. Madrid, in: *Artifara*, n. 3, (luglio - dicembre): sezione Addenda, <http://www.artifara.com/rivista3/testi/petr01.asp>. 12.05.2003.
- Manifiesto del Crack* (2000), in: *Revista de cultura lateral*. Vol. 70/oct.: <http://www.circulolateral.com/revista/tema/070manifiestocrackIII.html>. 05.02.2000.
- Ökumenischer Rat der Kirchen: Mitgliedskirchen: Rumänien*. <http://www.oikoumene.org/de/mitgliedskirchen/regionen/europa/rumaenien/evangelisch-lutherische-kirche-in-rumaenien.html>. 25.07.2010.
- Rössner, Michael (2005). “Érase una vez un boom. Reflexiones carnales acerca de fenómenos de preglobalización postcolonial en el siglo pasado”, in: José Manuel

- López de Abiada – José Morales-Saravia (eds.). *Boom y Postboom desde el nuevo siglo: impacto y recepción*. Madrid: Verbum. pp. 248-267.
- Rössner, Michael (2011). “Orden mundial y entremundos: historias universales paralelas en los Comentarios reales”, in: Gerhard Üenzkofer – José Morales Saravia (eds.): *El Inca Garcilaso de la Vega: entre varios mundos*. Lima: Fondo Editorial, Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos.
- Rössner, Michael (2000). “«La nieve de aquella sierra ofende a la flaqueza de mi vista» o la perfección humanista frente al «abismo andino»: Dávalos y Figueroa y su Miscelanea Austral”, in: Karl Kohut; Sonia M. Rose (eds.). *La formación de la cultura virreinal: 1. La etapa inicial*. Frankfurt/M.: Vervuert. pp. 93-102.
- Transnational Communities Programme*: “Diasporas and Transnational Communities: a Bibliographical and Study Guide”, <http://www.transcomm.ox.ac.uk/wwwroot /bibliogr.htm>. 12.08.2028.

Wai Chee Dimock

Yale University

MANY ISLAMIS

I'd like to begin with the United States, with the controversy over the proposed Islamic Center in Lower Manhattan, and with a few facts that most of us probably already know, but that are still worth going over. The story has a long background, perhaps longer than we realize. In July 2009, Soho Properties, the owner of the site on Park Place, announced that it was going to build an Islamic community center there. The site, two and a half blocks from Ground Zero, was previously occupied by a Burlington Coat Factory, closed since 9/11, when airplane wreckage tore through the building. The proposed community center would include a museum, theater, September 11 memorial, space for interfaith meetings, multi-media library, fitness center, swimming pool, basketball court, culinary school, bookstore, childcare center, and food court. It would not be a mosque, though it would provide overflow prayer space for a mosque in nearby Triceba. It was to be named Cordoba House. The name "Cordoba" reminds us that the story stretches back much farther than one year, that there is a much longer cultural memory at work here. The reference, of course, is to the great Islamic city in medieval Spain. Captured by a Muslim army in 711, Cordoba became the provincial capital of al-Andalus in the eighth century, and then the metropolis of the Caliphate of Cordoba, from 929 to 1031. By the mid-10th C, Cordoba boasted a population of some 500,000, compared to about 38,000 in Paris. The city had 700 mosques, some 60,000 palaces, 70 libraries – one of which reportedly housed 500,000 manuscripts – and scholars from all over the world. Cordoba also had some 900 public baths, as well as Europe's first street lights. It was a magnificent time, considered by many to be an era of unmatched peaceful coexistence among Muslims, Christians and Jews. Hybridity wasn't a theory, it was an everyday practice, saturating the music, the cuisine, the fashions, indeed every aspect of culture, from the very large to the very small. The Mudejar architecture on the Iberian Peninsula, a blend of European, Middle Eastern, and North African influences – rhythmic, geometric, distinguished by intricate tilework and woodwork – gave this hybridity a concrete expression in brick and stone.

Throughout its long life, Cordoba has been the site of many battles, and it's perhaps not surprising that it should be embroiled in another one, this time in the New World. It says much about the political realities in the United States that the name "Cordoba House" has now been dropped. Instead, the community center is simply called by a blander, more innocuous name, Park51, its actual address on Park Place. This is in part a response to the polemics coming from opponents of the project like Newt Gingrich, the mastermind behind the 1994 Republican takeover of Congress, and a presidential candidate for the 2012 election. Gingrich, a history professor before he entered politics, has nothing to say about the historical hybridity of Corboda. He presents the city instead as a monolithic entity, the "capital of Muslim conquerors who symbolized their victory over the Christian Spaniards by transforming a church there

into the world's third-largest mosque complex." Gingrich sees the Park Place project as another would-be act of conquest, an "Islamist cultural-political offensive to undermine and destroy our civilization."

To recover the lost meaning of Cordoba, we need to go back to Imam Feisal Abdul Rauf, the chief architect for the project. Born of polyglot Egyptian parents, raised in a mix of Islamic and western cultures, Feisal emigrated to America in 1965 at the age of 17, attended Columbia, taught public high school, and worked in the real estate business before founding a small Sufi mosque in New York city, in 1983. He is a gourmet chef, blending Asian, Arabic and Western cuisines. Largely apolitical before 9/11, he began speaking out against radical Islam after the attacks, charging the terrorists with violating the "Abrahamic ethic" common to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. He forged links with rabbis and Christian clergy in an interfaith alliance. Despite his criticism of the Iraq war and the Abu Ghraib abuses, the Bush Administration sponsored speaking tours for him to serve as an ambassador to the Arabic-speaking world. He is indeed subversive, but as one commentator observes: "What he wants to subvert are dictatorships in Islamic nations." How can it be that all of this is forgotten? And how did the community center, which attracted very little attention when it was first announced over a year ago, become such a toxic subject? The storm began in May 2010, when, after a 29-to-1 vote by the Lower Manhattan Community Board to endorse the project, Rudolf Murdoch's media empire sprang into action. (One of many ironies, and an index of the cynicism at work here, is the fact that Feisel's book, *What's Right With Islam*, was published by Harper, part of the Murdoch empire.) On May 6, ultra-conservative blogger Pamela Geller wrote in the *New York Post*, "Monster Mosque pushes ahead in the shadow of World Trade Center Islamic Death and Destruction." The next day, Geller's group, Stop Islamization of America, launched "Campaign Offensive: Stop the 911 Mosque!" Even some prominent Democrats, such as Harry Reid, then Speaker of the House, and Howard Dean, the former Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, joined this chorus. By September, 70 percent of Americans thought that the center should not be built on the Park Place site, though it seems unlikely that many of them would have visited the site, or seen the seedy porn shops and betting joints the community center would replace.

The hysteria surrounding the center was distressing. It was also nothing new: A local Catholic priest ruefully noted the parallels to the fierce opposition – claims of foreign invasion, of "Popish" threats to America, and so on – encountered two centuries ago by a proposal to build what is now St. Peter's Church in lower Manhattan, completed in 1775. Yet the St. Peter's example is, in many ways, a hopeful sign: Perhaps 200 years from now; the Islamic center would be an equally familiar, equally unobjectionable landmark in the borough. Whether or not the center is built, however, the controversy seems to mark a turning point for the role of Islam in the United States, a moment when developments could crystallize in one of two directions: either toward demonization, as the fearmongers apparently hope; or toward a gradual acceptance of Islam as one of the great religions of the world, on par with Judaism, Hinduism, Buddhism, and others. What are some of the signs that the latter might be a real possibility?

Well, for one thing, the dividing line on this issue is, in fact, anything but predictable, anything but carved in stone. There are those like Newt Gingrich whose

incendiary remarks surprise no one. But there are others not lining up as we might expect them to. Already, we've seen that there are some prominent Democrats among the chorus of opponents. And there are some equally prominent Republicans on the other side. Charlie Crist, former Governor of Florida, is one of them. So too is Senator Orrin Hatch from Utah, who is a Mormon, and who feels compelled to defend the right of Muslims to build on their own property, citing the fact that Mormon churches have historically faced the same opposition.

At the very least, the Islamic center is complicating the political landscape of the United States, undoing some traditional political allegiances, but also creating some new ones. So, while it is true that it has been a toxic subject, the very fact that Islam is so much in the limelight suggests that it might evolve into a more complex force in the public consciousness, with more to contribute to American society. The news media have actually offered some unusually helpful commentaries, and I would like to focus on one in particular. This is a long essay, "Muslims in the Middle," by William Dalrymple, in the Aug 16 oped page of the New York Times. Dalrymple writes:

[...] many of our leaders have a tendency to see the Islamic world as a single, terrifying monolith. Had the George W. Bush administration been more aware of the irreconcilable differences between the Salafist jihadists of Al Qaeda and the secular Baathists of Saddam Hussein's Iraq, the United States might never have blundered into a disastrous war.

And he goes on to say:

Feisal Abdul Rauf of the Cordoba Initiative is one of America's leading thinkers of Sufism, the mystical form of Islam, which in terms of goals and outlook couldn't be farther from the violent Wahhabism of the jihadists... In the eyes of Osama bin Laden and the Taliban, he is an infidel-loving, grave-worshipping apostate; they no doubt regard him as a legitimate target for assassination. For such moderate, pluralistic Sufi imams are the front line against the most violent forms of Islam. In the most radical parts of the Muslim world, Sufi leaders risk their lives for their tolerant beliefs, every bit as bravely as American troops on the ground in Baghdad and Kabul do.

Dalrymple does not use the word "hybridity" to describe Sufism, but that's exactly what it is: an open-ended form of Islam, insufficiently orthodox, too tolerant of its non-Islamic neighbors, too ready to cooperate with them, and even to borrow from them. And he is right to say that it is this form of Islam that is most under attack, most in danger. A series of bombings in 2010-11 suggest that things are happening with a speed and a deadliness to which we have yet to become accustomed. The first is the double suicide bombing in a Sufi shrine in Karachi on Thursday evening, October 7, 2010, killing at least 9 people. The New York Times reports:

It was the first attack on the shrine, the grave of the Sufi saint Abdullah Shah Ghazi, and it appeared to be an effort by hard-line militants in Pakistan to strike at the heart of Sufism, the moderate, more flexible blend of Islam practiced by most Pakistanis.

The attack came three months after militants struck one of the country's most important Sufi shrines in the city of Lahore, which left at least 42 people dead.

The bombing took place on Thursday evening because the shrine is always packed with people at that time. Along with the attacks on Data Darbar in Lahore mentioned in the *New York Times*, and Rehman Baba's tomb, this seems to be the beginning of an all-out war by the TTP – the Tehrik Taliban Pakistan – on the Pakistani population at large, 95 percent of which practices Sufism.

The second bombing, which happened less than 24 hours later, makes it clear that this Islam-on-Islam violence – directly specifically at Sufis – might turn out to be the dominant norm. This one also took place inside a mosque – the Shirhat Mosque – in Northern Afghanistan, and succeeded in killing its intended target, Governor Mohammed Omar of Kunduz province, who, only five days earlier, had told CNN about the growing pressures from the Taliban in this region.

The third bombing occurred on April 3, 2011. The Sakhi Sarkar Shrine, in Pakistan's Punjab province, was blown up by two Taliban suicide bombers during the annual ceremony for the Sufi saint to whom the shrine was dedicated. Forty-one people were killed; over a hundred were wounded.

In one sense, these bombings might seem quite far away from the United States, or from Europe. But in another sense they are not, because the Islam that is being shaped and reshaped by these episodes of violence is not a singular given, but literally at the crossroads, with more internal divisions than we can imagine, and with many possible futures, with all-too-real consequences for all of us. The clash of civilization here isn't between Christianity and Islam, but between those who claim a linear descent in a genealogy of righteousness, pure and unadulterated; and those who have taken in too much, and branched out too much, to claim that purity of descent. In fact, there is even a rough parallel between the physical attack on Sufis by Islamic extremists in Pakistan and the verbal attacks on Sufis by Christian extremists in the United States. In each case, it is those on the far end of the spectrum who feel that they have the right to discipline and punish those in the middle.

The World Trade Center site is especially interesting in this context. As historian Paul E. Amar has shown, this area was historically called "little Aleppo," a Cordoba-like urban community settled by Syrian merchants, comfortable with those of other faiths and with non-doctrinaire views on gender. Muhammad Atta, who wrote his thesis on Aleppo (with a secondary focus on Cairo, his hometown), hated just this sort of tolerant urbanism, and in attacking the World Trade Center, was apparently also attacking its precursor on the same site. And yet, while specific communities, or specific buildings, could be destroyed, the idea of Cordoba has proved resilient across hundreds of years. Park51 is going forward. Iman Rauf is no longer directly involved; he and his wife, Daisy Khan, are trying to raise funds for a community center elsewhere in the city. But the developer, Sharif al-Gamal, remains firmly committed to the project, basing his vision now on the Jewish Community Center in Manhattan, itself modeled on the non-sectarian outreach of the YMCA. Meanwhile, in the still-functional old building on Park Place, Friday prayers are held every week for several hundred people; film showings and Arabic classes proceed briskly; and Sunnis and Shiites have been meeting regularly here for much needed dialogue.

Literature, I'd like to think, is animated by the same spirit. And I'm not even thinking of canonical Sufi poets such as Hafiz, with his love of drink and his ambiguous

erotic attachments, but of the more general tendency of literature – especially the novel – to describe the world in a web-like, detail-rich fashion, a jumble of things heterogeneously thrown together, rather than a dedication to a single ideal. Dogmatic piety can never occupy every inch of the novelistic canvas. It can appear only as one player among others, in a representational spectrum that includes many other candidates. In that sense, it almost doesn't matter which novel we pick if we want to showcase an Islam that is manifold rather than singular. Almost any example would do the job.

Still, Paul Bowles' *The Spider's House* seems especially salient. What this novel offers seems to be a classic hybridizing environment – namely, the many faces of Islam in Morocco – against a deeply resented French colonial presence. Islam is split three ways in this context (and even this might be an over-simplification). And the fault lines come powerfully to the foreground during the month of Ramadan, on two interconnected explosive subjects: first, whether the *hadja*, the traditional pilgrimage to Mecca, should take place; and, secondly, whether there should be any celebration of the Aid el Kebir, the feast that ends the Ramadan. The Istiqlal, the Independence Party, whose primary goal is to get rid of the French, insists that there should be no celebration as long as Morocco is saddled with a Sultan who is a French puppet. The Chorfa, the religious traditionalists, despise the Istiqlal because they are so ruthless and so opportunistic. And the ordinary people, the majority of the Moroccans, are caught in the middle. Paul Bowles describes the experience of Amar, a young boy, as he argues with his boss, a sympathizer of the Istiqlal:

“This year, not a single hadji from Morocco has got into Mecca. They all got as far as Djedda and had to get back.”

“Poor things,” said Amar, commiserating immediately.

“Poor things?” the man cried. “Poor donkeys! They should have stayed home. Is this a year to go off to Mecca, when that filthy carrier of a dog they gave us is still sitting there on the Sultan's throne? No, I swear if I had power I'd shut the doors of every mosque in the country until we get our Sultan back. And if that doesn't bring him, you know what will.”

Amar did indeed know. The man meant jihad, the wholesale slaughter by everyone of all available unbelievers. (Bowles 1957: 46-7)

In Paul Bowles' Morocco – as in today's Pakistan and Afghanistan – those who become victims of the *jihad* are not just the hated foreigners, but many locals considered traitors to the Islamic cause. As Amar walks the streets of Fez and comes upon more and more corpses – bodies of Moroccans – this is what he thinks:

Had it been Frenchmen they were killing he would have understood and approved unquestioningly, but the idea of Moslems murdering Moslems – he found it difficult to accept. And there was no one he could talk with about it: his father would never say more than he had already said, that all politics was a lie and all men engaged in it *jiffa*, carrion. (53)

Amar is right about the contempt that the religious traditionalists feel toward the nationalists. But his father, a Chorfa, does in fact have a bit more to say. When it becomes clear that the Istiqlal has made it impossible for anyone to get a sheep to celebrate the

Feast of the Aid el Kebir, he simply says, categorically: "It's the end of Islam, all this. Just as it was written. By the Moslems' own hand." (120)

It would be difficult for anyone in the West to make a more fatalistic prediction. What does it mean for Amar to be somewhere in the middle, between the ruthless determination of the Istiqlal and the bottomless despair of his father? There is not a lot of hope coming from *The Spider's House*. However, there is one episode worth noting, witnessed by two American tourists. A boy takes off his shoes and wades into a pool to fish out a large, drowning insect. He holds the insect in his hand. Then the insect flies away. And the boy seems satisfied. Stenham, the American tourist watching this, is utterly mystified, and says so to his companion:

"Now, that was a strange bit of behavior. The boy made a special trip into the water just to pull out some kind of insect."

"Well, he's kind-hearted."

"I know, but they're not. That's the whole point. In all my time here I've never seen anyone do a thing like that."

He looked at the boy's round face, heavy, regular features, and curly black hair.

"He could be a Sicilian, or a Greek," he said as if to himself. "If he's not a Moroccan, there's nothing surprising about his deed. But if he is, then I give up. Moroccans just don't do things like that." (251)

The young boy, who has gone to all that trouble to save the drowning insect, is Amar. His is not an especially Islamic form of behavior. On the other hand, there's also no specific prohibition in the Koran against it. It is a space of indeterminacy, a space in which things are not fully spelled out, not fully known, where we might yet be taken by surprise. The novel, a genre energized by partial predictability, shows us many similar scenarios. And it could be that Amar really has something of the Sicilian, or the Greek, in him. It's an interesting possibility. The novel never goes any further in this direction. But it has already made its point.

Bibliography

- Adler, Margot (2011). "Developer: Plans for N. Y. Mosque Going Forward," *National Public Radio*, May 5: <http://www.npr.org/2011/05/05/135951856/developer-plans-for-n-y-mosque-moving-forward>. 30.08.2012.
- Bowles, Paul (1957). *The Spider's House*. London: Macdonald.
- Dalrymple, William (2010). "Muslims in the Middle," *New York Times*. August 16: http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/17/opinion/17dalrymple.html?_r=1&ref=opinion. 11.09.2011.
- Elliott, Justin (2010). "How the 'Ground Zero Mosque' Fear Mongering Began," *Salon*, August 16: http://www.salon.com/news/politics/war_room/2010/08/16/ground_zero_mosque_origins. 08.08.2012.
- Gitlin, Todd (2010). "The Subversive Theology of Iman Rauf," in: *New Republic*, 24 August. <http://www.tnr.com/blog/foreign-policy/77176/ground-zero-mosque-the-subversive-theology-imam-rauf-contd>. 05.09.2011.

- Imtiaz, Huma (2010). "Sufi shrine in Pakistan Hit by a Double Bombing," *New York Times*, October 7: <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/08/world/asia/08pstan.html>. 05.11.2011.
- Ratnesa, Romesh (2010). "Ground Zero: Exaggerating the Jihadist Threat," *Time*, August 18: <http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,2011400,00.html>. 31.09.2013.
- Tiedeman, Catherine (2010). "Daily Brief: Afghan Governor", *New York Times*, October 8: <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/08/world/asia/08pstan.html>. 31.09.2013.

Amaryll Chanady

Université de Montréal

THE FLÂNEUR TAKES THE METRO: THE INTERCULTURAL PRODUCTION OF LOCALITY IN THE GLOBAL CITY

“La répétition” (The Rehearsal), a short story by the Haitian Quebecer Émile Ollivier, stages the multicultural city of Montreal as the setting for an emblematic contemporary experience of *flânerie*, or urban strolling, by a newcomer trying to recreate a sense of home and belonging. In the metropolis of the francophone province of Quebec, the immigrant protagonist wanders through several ethnic neighborhoods representing the proverbial Canadian mosaic before taking the underground train, in which he observes a surprising and spontaneous intercultural encounter between a local young white woman and an older European immigrant.

The narration begins with the *flâneur*'s exit from a cinema where he has watched *A Touch of Evil*, a cinematographic account of the conflictual collaboration between a United States and a Mexican policeman on the US-Mexican border. The transition from the international border in the film seen by the story's narrator-protagonist, to the intra-national ethnic boundaries of the fragmented city as perceived by the urban stroller in Montreal, and finally to the crossing of cultural divisions in the enclosed space of the metro compartment, symbolizes the evolving transcultural dynamic of the global city. Although internal borders have become just as important as external ones, both are increasingly permeable, albeit in complex and ambivalent ways. The narrative progression of the story also situates Montreal as a transnational hub connecting North America, Europe and the Caribbean through migration and international connections, and not only through cinematographic representations of otherness abroad. The most significant aspect of the story, however, is the apparently contradictory conjunction of the *flâneur*, an emblematic nineteenth-century European figure, and the metro, a mode of transportation linked to a later period of modernity. In the context of the rich ethnic diversity characterizing both North American settler societies and contemporary global cities, this juxtaposition of the early modern and the later modern modes of transportation signals not only different modes, but also different stages in the spatial and social manifestation of ethnic and cultural differences. I wish to argue that the adaptation of the figure of the leisurely Parisian stroller in this context illustrates an apparently successful attempt to create a feeling of place and belonging by an immigrant in a city that is both ethnically diverse and hybridized by distinct temporalities, including the traditional way of life of the small, homogeneous, face-to-face neighborhood community, and the contemporary urban scene combining popular culture industries, older representations of high culture, and efficient modes of transportation necessary for the economic vitality of the metropolis.

I will contrast the experience of the fictitious Canadian immigrant *flâneur* on the metro with that of a recent autobiographical avatar of the Parisian *flâneur*, the anthropologist of “supermodernity” Marc Augé, who also describes his experience on the

underground train. For Ollivier's immigrant, the intercultural encounter on the metro transforms the moving compartment into a metaphor of mobility which goes beyond the mere description of newer forms of sociality made possible by the particular spatial characteristics of certain kinds of public transportation that bring together people of different origins. More than a simple example of the historical mobility of urban experience transformed by newer mobility systems such as the metro, the scene in the compartment points to a specific transformation of the contemporary North American metropolis: from a patchwork of ethnic ghettos to a site of more extensive intercultural mingling that involves mobility across cultural borders and promises a greater possibility of integration and belonging. This brings to mind Iris Marion Young's positive image of "unassimilated otherness" and the "being-together of strangers" in the city, a situation which she contrasts favorably with the exclusions and homogenization of small communities based on commonality (1990: 318-319). Various meanings of the term mobility are thus relevant to our understanding of the story's complex depiction of the contemporary Quebec metropolis – mobility systems such as the metro, historical transformations of forms of being-with-others in urban environments, and the replacement of rigid ethnic boundaries by more fluid border crossings.

In Augé's account of his travels on the metro, on the contrary, the compartment becomes a metaphor for disintegration from the perspective of a native resident for whom the changes observed on the familiar urban underground train represent the uncanny dissolution of traditional ways of life and modes of belonging brought about by the increasing ethnic hybridization of the city and other social developments. Whereas in Ollivier's story the metro, built at the time of the Montreal Expo or international fair in 1967, indicates mainly curiosity, openness to otherness, and the desire for intercultural contact, Augé's Parisian metro, which is much older and linked to the anthropologist's memories of his own childhood, represents the disconcerting presence of various others as they inexorably transform his beloved mobile space of belonging from an iconic scene and symbol of the stimulating experience of the modern urban environment to a bewildering manifestation of what he calls supermodernity. In the writing of both Ollivier and Augé, spatial figures of shared mobility provide us with a particular perspective on modes of being-with-others, but while they point to a hopeful future in the case of Ollivier, they indicate a slightly uncanny present for the Parisian anthropologist.

Intercultural encounters are essential for the emergence of a feeling of home for the Montreal newcomer who does not wish to be confined to an ethnic ghetto. A sense of place, however, is also a question of familiarity with a physical space. Ollivier's narrator-protagonist has finally achieved a successful kinaesthetic, cognitive and emotional mastery of the urban landscape of his adopted home after a quarter century of extended ramblings in the city. His reference to "inhabiting" a part of the city in which each façade is familiar to him and in which he has metaphorically "drawn" his planets and "created" ports, bridges and overpasses (Ollivier 2001:130) brings to mind Heidegger's notion of dwelling, since Ollivier uses the word "habiter" not in the usual sense of merely living in a particular location, but in that of being familiar with a place. Translated in French as "habiter," the same term used by Ollivier, Heidegger's dwelling involves the material and mental transformation of our world into a familiar

environment that is directly relevant to our lived experience. In his article “Dwelling, Building, Thinking” (Heidegger 1977/2008: 355), the German philosopher illustrates this notion with the bridge linking the two banks of a river and thus transforming our concrete use of space as well as our mental map of the new locale resulting from its construction. Although Ollivier’s bridges are not actual architectural interventions in the built environment but only mental maps and pedestrian itineraries connecting parts of the city, these maps are essential for his ambulatory appropriation of his new place of residence. His late twentieth-century form of dwelling, however, excludes the spiritual dimension of Heidegger’s fourfold (the “Geviert”; Heidegger 2008: 352) connecting the earth and the sky, mortals and divinities, thus resembling the spiritual homelessness of modernity invoked by the philosopher. Rather, Ollivier’s reference to inhabiting through spatial familiarity in a specifically urban environment echoes Benjamin’s description of the Parisian *flâneur*, for whom the street becomes a dwelling, since “he is as much at home among the façades of houses as a citizen is in his four walls” (Benjamin 1973: 37). The city, however, does not consist only of streets, parks, and buildings, but also of a motley crowd of strangers, who are an integral part of the urban environment. Ollivier’s emphasis on the visual aspect of strolling, which includes the observation of one’s fellow users of urban space, establishes an obvious link with the nineteenth-century Parisian writers discussed by Benjamin, mainly journalists and urban chroniclers who described human types and street scenes from the perspective of an external observer. In Ollivier’s contemporary adaptation of the *flâneur*, the metro in particular becomes a “theater where everything is always representations, unforeseen events, projections, phantasmagorias, fluctuating mirages” (2001: 132)¹. Just like his nineteenth-century counterpart, the narrator-protagonist becomes a consumer of the urban spectacle, which is both a fascinating expansion of personal experience and a compensation for the anonymity and deracination brought about by urban life, as well as, in his case, by his situation as a foreigner from a very different cultural background. As Benjamin reminds us, the modern city produced a special kind of uneasiness, since people “had to adapt themselves to a new and rather strange situation, one that is peculiar to big cities” (Benjamin 1973: 37). Both Heidegger’s notion of dwelling, with its emphasis on the emergence of familiarity with place through the conjunction of the material and the mental, and Benjamin’s portrait of the urban stroller, thus shed light on the experience of the story’s protagonist.

Ollivier’s Montreal is presented as an icon of urban diversity due to its status as a cosmopolitan city and a metropolis in a multicultural settler society. Whereas the nineteenth-century Parisian *flâneur* was confronted by the rapid urbanization and modernization of life, Ollivier’s narrator-protagonist must confront not only the ethnic and linguistic divisions within the North American city, but also his own very visible physical difference and foreign origins. His reflection in the store window at the beginning of the story destroys his fleeting identification with the white actor in the film he has just seen and whose gestures he imitates, and highlights the contrast between his appearance and that of the other inhabitants of the city. Although the traditional *flâneur* often appeared as an outsider who remained aloof from the passersby he observed

1 [...] théâtre où tout est toujours représentations, imprévus, projections, fantasmagories, fluctuants mirages.” All translations are my own unless otherwise indicated.

(Nesci 2007: 61), whether he was a marginal character, a dandy, a poet or a journalist, Ollivier's stroller is explicitly marked as out of place by his personal appearance. He describes his "intolerable anguish" ("angoisse intolérable", 2001: 129) as he realizes that he will never be in the position of the white hero of the film who falls into the arms of Marlene Dietrich, an icon of Western beauty and seduction. Walking away with the slow gait of a camel ("avec une lenteur de chameau", 129), he remembers his initial experience of a city that had appeared as mysterious as a sphinx to him. Although he has now appropriated it spatially through the creation of mental maps of familiar streets, it still remains foreign in many ways. His self-description as an incongruous camel in a northern sphinx-like city illustrates the profound sense of estrangement felt by an immigrant of color, who is very much aware of his difference from the majority encountered in his urban walks and reflected through the modern technologies of the cinematographic spectacle.

The contemporary immigrant *flâneur* is also confronted by the transformation of perceived space by personal memories in a very different way from that of the native resident. Although the historical stratification of the city is visible to varying degrees for residents, tourists and immigrants alike, as fragments of the past remain underneath the constructions of modernity, the urban palimpsest of personal memory in the case of an immigrant involves the individual investment of public spaces and buildings with memories of a former home. Michel de Certeau explains how the native user of urban space appropriates the built environment not only by creating habitual paths in a personal "practice of space" ("*pratique de l'espace*"), but also by remembering demolished buildings in his neighborhood containing "accumulated times": "It is striking, here, that the places in which people live are like the presences of diverse absences. What can be seen designates what is no longer there" (1984/1988: 108). Memory in this case converts the impersonal space of the city to a personal invested space of emotional attachments and individual or shared stories that de Certeau describes as "a sort of anti-museum" (108), since the museum is a repository of artificial, officially created history. It thus empties the official places of sanctioned history and commemoration, such as monuments and buildings, of their imposed collective meaning by reinvesting them with private signification. This appropriation or inhabiting of urban space converts the built environment into a rich and constantly changing constellation of reminders of one's individual past that de Certeau calls "haunted places" (108). In the case of the immigrant, however, personal memories triggered by particular places often concern not the past of the presently lived space, but familiar spaces, practices and people known prior to immigration. Ollivier's narrator, for example, is transported by the music he hears in the Montreal metro to his own childhood lived elsewhere. He is assailed by images of the past that are superimposed on his surroundings, and thus empty them of reality: "... I will never know whether what I describe exists or whether I have invented it" (Ollivier 2002: 133)². The urban environment of the immigrant thus becomes not a personal palimpsest invested with meaning and depth by the sedimented past of the presently lived place, which would convert impersonal space into place, but a de-territorialized personal palimpsest that turns perceived reality into an unreal imaginary

2 In the Original: "je ne saurai jamais si ce que je decris existe ou si je l'ai inventé".

realm invaded by other places. The familiarity of frequently traveled pathways therefore creates a superficial sense of dwelling as it dissolves into the phantasmagoria of personal memories in another country.

If Benjamin's *flâneur* and de Certeau's urban stroller are already isolated individuals in the anonymity of the modern city, the predicament of the contemporary immigrant *flâneur* thus seems particularly acute, since his perceived space is emptied out by personal recollections and attachments to foreign places. Furthermore, he cannot identify with the ubiquitous images of the native inhabitant, both in person and in the virtual reality of the cinema and other technologies, as I have pointed out with reference to the story's initial emphasis on racial difference. The perceived environment is thus emptied out not only by a lack of local memorial sedimentation, but also by a lack of a feeling of commonality with its inhabitants. The description of the comfort and safety of the "homeplace" felt by the African American cultural critic bell hooks as she leaves the hostile white spaces of her city for the familiarity of her African neighborhood (1991: 41) suggests one solution: constructing homogeneous neighborhoods linked to specific ethno-racial groups in which one can experience a sense of community. Ollivier's narrator-protagonist illustrates this possibility as he rambles through Montreal's Portuguese, Greek and Italian neighborhoods. These are hardly idyllic spaces, however. Contrary to bell hooks, Ollivier does not stress the comfort and safety of the ethnic community, but its limitations. The Greeks and the Portuguese remember their former lives, described as their "splendor of yesteryear" ("leurs splendeurs d'antan", Ollivier 2002: 131), thus suggesting a parallel with the narrator's own childhood memories in another place. But whereas the narrator roams through the city in his search for new experiences in his adopted home, the residents of the ethnic ghetto are tied to a static past elsewhere, which constantly reminds them of their present state of exile. Moreover, the artificial nature of their imperfectly recreated past lives is emphasized by reference to the inexorable dissolution of authenticity as the Italians, clinging to traditional community activities such as bowling in improvised urban spaces of leisure, cannot prevent their Sicilian accents from being interlaced with Quebec oaths. These artificial reconstructions of former community life are not only unsatisfactory and threatened with inevitable erosion; they are also exclusive. The narrator cannot belong to these enclaves, but observes them from without, savoring these spaces of difference with their unique sights, odors and sounds, just like the traditional *flâneur* who remains aloof while enjoying the urban spectacle. But whereas the iconic European stroller was free to roam through what he considered as his city, Ollivier's protagonist, who explicitly draws the reader's attention to his foreignness, suggests that enclaves of difference become a barrier to integration. His refusal to enter the anglophone area of town, iconically represented by Greene avenue, indicates that the internal borders of the mainly francophone city are either completely impenetrable or only available for superficial incursions. The spatial fragmentation of the multicultural city thus illustrates a social ghettoization that leaves many immigrants excluded. Ollivier's representation of the urban mosaic closely resembles Salman Rushdie's condemnation of the "ghetto mentality":

To forget that there is a world beyond the community to which we belong, to confine ourselves within narrowly defined cultural frontiers, would be, I believe, to go voluntarily into that form of internal exile which in South Africa is called the 'homeland'. (1991: 19)

The socio-spatial configuration of the city, which guides the stroller's peregrinations along particular trajectories, thus becomes a metaphor for a particular type of being-with-others based on the juxtaposition of homogeneous communities in a multicultural nation. Relations between these communities are limited to the superficial curiosity of the consumer of the urban spectacle, when they are not entirely prohibited by the invisible boundaries of language and culture. The urban mosaic thus echoes the international divisions symbolized by the filmic representation of the U.S.-Mexico border at the beginning. An alternative to this model is fleetingly indicated in the story when Ollivier's narrator-protagonist turns to nature, describing himself as a trapper walking under the trees and among the boulders of Mount Royal, the centrally located forested park in the city. This attempt at indigenization, through which the immigrant searches for a sense of belonging by identifying with a figure closely linked to the wilderness and represented in countless narratives as a stereotype of successful adaptation to a difficult environment, occurs after his wanderings through and avoidance of several internal ethnic borders in the city. The fantasy of finding a home in nature, however, is not just anachronistic in an urban environment; it is also impractical, since the cold drives urbanized modern individuals, no longer capable of confronting the elements, into the protective space of public and domestic shelter. It is with obvious pleasure that Ollivier's narrator-protagonist leaves the frigid expanse of Mount Royal to enter the warm and welcoming womb of a metro station, described as a "crossroads without God, without passion, without fighting, this common space without belonging ... this refuge without isolation" (2001: 132)³. The metro is of course a "non-place," defined by the anthropologist Marc Augé as an anonymous space of transit or consumption such as the train station, shopping mall or airport waiting lounge in which interpersonal relations, the sedimentation of memory and the anchoring of personal identity are impossible, "a world thus surrendered to solitary individuality, to the fleeting, the temporary and ephemeral" (Augé 1995/2008: 63). Whereas non-places are usually seen as the epitome of depersonalization in their haphazard aggregation of isolated individuals, Augé points out that their anonymity also provides a space of freedom from habitual social and familial responsibilities.

Ollivier's description of the mobile non-space of the metro, following that of the separate ethnic neighborhoods of the city and the rapid flirtation with indigenization, clearly presents this form of being-with-others as a positive alternative to religious and ethnic belonging, since the passengers congregate freely as individuals, and not as members of social groups. The narrator's metro compartment becomes a cocoon of warmth, not only because of the physical comfort it provides, but also because its public and anonymous space is non-exclusionary. As John Urry points out with reference to the new system of train transportation in the middle of the nineteenth century in England, access to public transport was seen as an egalitarian development allowing

3 In the Original: "Carrefour sans dieu, sans passion, sans combat, ce lieu collectif sans appartenance ... cet asile de repli sans isolement".

individuals from all classes and professions to travel together in the same enclosed space (2007: 104). Catherine Nesci's discussion of the revolution in urban transportation brought about by the omnibus in Paris after 1830 also highlights the democratic connotations of this type of public transport, which changes the mode of interaction of the city's inhabitants and creates new forms of cohabitation, albeit in a superficial way, since social differences are not eradicated (2007: 21-22). In Ollivier, however, the metro also becomes a theater of a more symbolic personal interaction across cultural boundaries in a protected space of intimacy, which is somewhat more surprising. One would think that the metro, even more so than the train, does not seem conducive to any form of social interaction, except on the most superficial level. How can this icon of urban modernity, generally seen as a noisy, crowded but efficient means of rapidly conveying harried workers and shoppers through the belly of the city, represent a positive alternative to the isolation of the outsider in the ethnic mosaic of neighborhoods beyond the mere accessibility of a democratic space of anonymous togetherness? Furthermore, mobility on the underground train does not involve the same possibility of becoming familiar with the outward configuration of the urban environment as in the case of the bus, which affords a privileged observational position to the mobile *flâneur* and contributes to the visual mapping of the city. In his study of the way in which people construct mental images of and pathways through the city, Kevin Lynch even considers the metro an example of urban "detachment": "The buried paths of the Boston subway could not be related to the rest of the environment except where they come up for air ... The subway is a disconnected nether world ..." (1960: 57). While that may certainly be the case for many users of the public transportation system, Ollivier's urban stroller is very much aware of the spatial configuration of the metro line he chooses to take, which he describes as a horseshoe linking two northern parts of the city of Montreal along a curved route encompassing the entire downtown area. It thus imitates the concave trajectory of descending and ascending at a different station, but also becomes a metaphor of inclusion through its u-shaped encircling of the city's neighborhoods. Far from representing a static spatial figure, the configuration of the metro network is an emblem of shared mobility and gathering up of different parts of the city along a route symbolically shaped like a receptacle.

The spatial symbolism of the story gives an added dimension to the metro as emblematic of urban being-with-others. Whereas the metro has become a familiar experience in many large cities, serving as the locale for countless novels and films, it also frequently becomes an illustrative example of the anonymity of the non-place. Furthermore, like the train and the bus, the metro is a relatively recent phenomenon that has created not only new democratic public spaces, but also new forms of social togetherness that may create discomfort and even accentuate the feeling of isolation of individuals in an anonymous group of travelers. As the sociologist Georg Simmel observed with respect to trains and buses, it is disconcerting to find oneself enclosed for longer periods of time with strangers one cannot avoid looking at but with whom one does not speak (Benjamin 1973: 38). In his study of what he calls "mobility systems", John Urry describes the emergence in modernity of new socialities ruled by laws and conventions regulating behavior in the micro-spaces of public conveyances, especially trains, as well as practices such as reading, which function as a screen to protect the privacy of

train passengers by shielding them from undesired visual contact with others (2007: 106). But he also insists on the pleasures resulting from these new mobilities, based on “an intermittent face-to-face relationship with other people” and “different embodied performances,” which he describes as “forms of material and sociable dwelling-in-motion” (36-37). These forms of corporeal travel create weak ties that “connect people to the outside world, providing a bridge other than densely-knit ‘clumps’ of close friends and family” (48). Whereas the train and the omnibus also afford a privileged view of the surrounding countryside or urban scene, the underground metro exacerbates the forced proximity through its visual enclosure. The unnatural random togetherness, while it may seem perfectly normal and even pleasurable to long-term residents with social and familial networks, may very well increase the sense of loneliness and alienation of a newcomer or someone who already feels marginalized for social and racial reasons, as in the case of Austin Clarke’s black metro commuter in Toronto.

In his story “Canadian Experience” (Clarke 1986), for example, the Toronto metro is an uncomfortable micro-space roaring through dark and malodorous subterranean passages and transporting an aggregation of individuals with hermetic, inexpressive faces reminding the protagonist of his loneliness and racial difference. Contrary to Ollivier’s metro, Clarke’s train moves directly south, symbolically expelling the Caribbean immigrant through its role in his suicide. Rather than a metaphor of inclusive mobility, it thus becomes one of excretion and purification (Chanady 2009).

The metro’s lack of an outside view, combined with the co-presence of many individuals, however, also facilitates the discrete observation of fellow travelers by the urban anthropologist or people watcher. In his 2008 book on the Parisian metro, Marc Augé explicitly refers to his anthropological observation of the changing clientele of the metro as a form of *flânage*, albeit one with a definite academic purpose. In an earlier text, he had explicitly invoked walking through the tunnels of an underground train as a version of de Certeau’s urban “practice of space” through strolling (1997: 159).

Augé’s contemporary *flâneur* in the metro provides a counterpoint to that of the immigrant observer in Ollivier and Clarke by introducing the perspective of the native inhabitant of the city faced not with the novelty of the urban spectacle, like the nineteenth-century *flâneur*, nor with the sense of estrangement experienced by the foreigner, but with the loss of what the anthropologist Arjun Appadurai calls locality. In his study of changing relations between individuals and space in the contemporary globalized world, Appadurai defines locality as not merely a sense of place or familiarity with a particular locale, but also a “phenomenological property of social life, a structure of feeling” (1996:182), as opposed to the *neighborhood*, which refers to “actually existing social forms” (179) or “life-worlds constituted by relatively stable associations, by relatively known and shared histories, and by collectively traversed and legible spaces and places” (191). This distinction echoes Anthony Cohen’s differentiation between a specific social structure and the notion of community, which involves a strong symbolic dimension and a sense of belonging.

In his study of the symbolic construction of community, Cohen considers the latter not “as a morphology, as a structure of institutions capable of objective definition and description” but as “a matter of feeling, a matter which resides in the minds of the members themselves” (2007: 19, 21). Appadurai’s notion of locality thus resembles

Cohen's definition of community in that he also insists on the importance of the imagination, "through which local subjectivity is produced and nurtured" (1996: 198), although his term "locality" explicitly emphasizes the spatial dimension. He points out that locality is not a given, but produced through rituals and "technologies for house building, garden cultivation, and the like" (180) – in other words, immaterial and material practices reminding us of Heidegger's concept of dwelling as building and thinking.

The concept of locality, however, places much more emphasis than Heidegger does on the social dimension, the being-with-others without which locality as a structure of feeling cannot exist. Appadurai's discussion of the erosion of locality is particularly relevant in the case of Augé's more recent experience of the Parisian metro. The production of locality, according to Appadurai, is increasingly difficult in modern times, owing to the integration of local communities within the nation state that transforms more traditional ways of life.

Furthermore, the ubiquity and scale of migration leads to the emergence of "trans-localities" or neighborhoods composed of people of different origins who maintain contact with their homelands (192) thus giving rise to "a more complicated, disjointed, hybrid sense of local subjectivity" (197). Finally, he mentions the mass media as an important contributing factor.

Augé, as a *flâneur*-anthropologist of the first decade of the twenty-first century in the Parisian metro, provides a personal illustration of this loss of locality. He explicitly describes himself as a *flâneur* (2008: 55, 57) and an ethnologist of contemporary spaces who has substituted the major metro stations or transfer nodes for the villages of Africa (56). Otherness, the traditional object of the anthropologist's inquiry, has now entered the familiar space of the metropolitan city.

Contrary to the former country-dweller for whom the city is a bewildering chaos of strangers, Augé starts his essay by explaining that he has always been a Parisian and always taken the metro. Instead of feeling nostalgic for the peacefulness and slow pace of rural settings, he longs to leave the disconcerting solitude of the countryside to come back home to the city. In spite of the anonymous crowds of the metro, he feels a sense of solidarity and fraternity (10) with his fellow passengers. He explains that taking the metro is part of his geographical and social identity (12), and refutes its definition as a non-place, contrary to his view of it in his earlier essay on non-places (1995/2008). For those who take the metro regularly, it is associated with memories, habits, and frequently encountered faces.

More importantly, however, the regular passenger has a sense of "corporeal intimacy" ("intimité corporelle", 34) created by the embodied memory of descending the stairs and inserting a ticket into the turnstile. This description reminds us of Gaston Bachelard's house as a protected intimate space in which personal memories are linked to movement, such as climbing stairs or turning door-knobs (1964/1994). The metro stations thus become an extended home for the native resident. Furthermore, the venerable age of the Parisian underground has facilitated its entry into the cultural imaginary of its residents.

The many references to the metro in French songs, films, and literature transport Augé back to his childhood and youth. Elsewhere in his 2008 essay Augé invokes the

power of station names to bring back the past, including both the official history of the city and his own personal experience (72-73). The metro is also described as a space conducive to reading and the free roaming of the imagination (28), again reminding us of Bachelard's spaces of intimacy in the home seen as a cocoon protecting his childhood reveries. Augé's metro is thus certainly a place (as opposed to a non-place), which he had defined in his 1995 study as a locale linked to identity, history and being-with-others.

Moreover, his description of the metro as a bridge linking the shores of the Seine, as well as "places and beings" ("des lieux et des êtres", 2008: 27), has resonances of Heideggerian dwelling as it was exemplified by the German philosopher through the iconic bridge. Augé's metro thus becomes a multivalent metaphor for mobility – that of transportation, a particular physical and mental "practice" of urban space, a constantly renewed rhizomatic linkage of people and spaces, and continual movements between the present and the past.

His beloved metro, however, is rapidly being transformed into an alien and disturbing space. It is no longer the circulatory system of the center of the world, the "arteries, heart and veins" ("les artères, le coeur et les veines", 35) of the country liberated by the Allies at the end the Second World War, a system of which each passenger could appropriate a portion, thus transforming it into a personal space invested with memories. On the contrary, it has become merely one of the "spaces of circulation and consumption characteristic of our times" ("espaces de circulation et de consommation caractéristiques de notre époque", 36).

As globalization has multiplied urban transportation systems throughout the world, the rapid developments of the second half of the twentieth century have literally de-centered Paris by taking away its centrality as a capital of civilization. Whereas Benjamin had described the city in the title of one of his essays as the "capital of the nineteenth century" (1973: 155), Augé describes its central transportation system, a synecdoche of the city itself, as a mere non-place resembling that of countless other places in the world.

The city is also de-centered (2008: 54) by the extension of new metro lines to greater Paris, thus effacing the distinction between city center and suburbs in a confusing tentacular grid. The resulting masses of suburban commuters, described as internal tourists (52), change the composition of the urban crowd. Moreover, the metro has been invaded by poverty, ethnic diversity due to mass migration mainly from former colonies, foreign tourists, insecurity (terrorism, pickpockets), the "museification" of metro stations through historical plaques, and new technology (49).

The bewildered Parisian passenger of an earlier age (in this case Augé himself) is "less and less at home" ("moins et moins chez lui", 68), a citizen of the world in his own city. Furthermore, developments in communication and other forms of technology have eliminated most forms of personal communication between the passengers and the metro employees (conductor, controller, ticket agent), as well as among the passengers, who travel in isolated bubbles, immersed in their private worlds of computers, mobile phones, televisions, and music playing devices.

The very existence of a concrete place of belonging has changed in the case of the technology-savvy youth who are used to "only being at home by being outside of

themselves" ("n'être chez lui que hors de lui") through an "intimate expulsion of the self" ("expulsion intime de soi", 69) into a non-localizable virtual space. While this may feel natural to them, the loss of a feeling of intimate connection with a familiar, comforting, and spatially circumscribed locale is acutely felt by Augé, who sees himself as a stranger among the new generation. Described as "alterity itself" ("l'altérité même", 15), they perturb him and make him feel excluded (87), no longer part of his era (88), and definitely no longer in the position of a native informant representative of his community (25).

Finally, the perception of the built environment of the metro stations is transformed by the experience of the aging body, as crowded escalators and rushing hordes of commuters threaten to leave him behind.

As Urry points out in his study of mobilities, an important component of physical travel is the "sensescape" of the external world, based largely on the body's "kinaesthetics, the sixth sense that informs one what the body is doing in space through the sensations of movement registered in its joints, muscles, tendons and so on", particularly the "mechanics of space" as the feet touch the pavement or the hands touch the steering wheel (2007: 48).

When Augé describes the metro as a metaphor of the "withdrawal of life and the progress of history" ("*la vie qui se retire et de l'histoire qui avance*", 83), he is thus referring to the global sensescape of the metro, which indicates that the life that is withdrawing is his own vitality and youth, as well as that of the forms of community of yesteryear. This nostalgic description of the metro is thus a scene and metaphor of the inexorable progress of modernization, suburbanization and globalization, as well as the inevitable degeneration of the human body.

Augé's 2008 metro is hardly the neutral, democratic and shared space of the public conveyance described by Simmel and Urry, but an emotionally invested personal space that has changed with its invasion by other users to the point of non-recognition. Significant in this regard are the direct and indirect references to ethnic others, such as Romanian musicians (42), South American marionette players (43), the "France of diversity" ("*France de la diversité*") which is "overrepresented" ("*surreprésentée*", 43) in the metro, visible minorities and suburban youth (a metaphor for mainly Arabic youth from the underprivileged Parisian *banlieues*, 84).

While Augé insists particularly on the estrangement caused by the visibility and behavior of the younger generation in general, his description of them as an "immense migratory wave" ("*immense vague migratoire*", 85) and his equation of youth with the suburban Arabic youth (86), suggests that the presence of ethnic and racial others is more disconcerting to the anthropologist at home as it is abroad, since their presence in the metropolis transforms the familiar locality. His solution is to imagine the individual stories of his fellow passengers, as an ethnologist or a novelist, in a form of empathy that allows him to belong to his time for a while longer. He also wonders whether talking to them will dissipate his feeling of estrangement.

Is Augé's attempt to "penetrate others' subjectivity" ("*pénétrer la subjectivité d'autrui*", 26), especially in the case of immigrants of color, a contemporary development of the older *flâneur's* sustained interest in unfamiliar others, as in the case of the idealized portraits mentioned by Benjamin? The latter's emphasis on the comforting

nature of these descriptions by the chroniclers of urban experience suggests an obvious parallel: "The long series of eccentric or simple, attractive or severe figures which the physiologies presented to the public in character sketches had one thing in common: they were harmless and of perfect bonhomie" (Benjamin: 37).

Augé's attempted imaginary identification in the context of the increasing foreignness of the familiar metro brings me back to Ollivier's immigrant narrator, who takes a rapt interest in his fellow metro passengers, although not in the form of imagining their lives, except for his final reflection on whether their paths will ever meet again. Comfortably installed in the metro compartment, he observes them as if he were a reincarnation of the benjaminian *flâneur*, enjoying the "phantasmagorias" (132), carried away by the "spectacle" (133), and observing faces like a "detective" (133). It is interesting that all these terms are also used by Benjamin in his description of the nineteenth-century stroller.

The particular passage of Ollivier's story in which he describes the interaction between two fellow metro passengers could be seen as a vignette of urban experience akin to that observed by the Benjaminian *flâneur*. An extraordinary scene transpires in front of him as an elderly, elegant European gentleman with a foreign accent gives an unsolicited singing lesson to a young Quebec woman, a total stranger to him, who is rehearsing a Schubert *Lied* for an audition. The incongruity of the occurrence is compounded by the avuncular gesture of kissing the woman on both cheeks to wish her good luck.

Contrary to Augé's young metro passengers, whose mobile music listening devices make them impervious to any companionable intrusion, and also prevent them from sharing their music with others, Ollivier's young woman's repetition of her score and the visibility of the open sheet music facilitate interpersonal contact, both with the opera singer of European origin, and the fascinated immigrant observer who silently participates as a spectator in this staging of an impromptu performance. As the gentleman leaves the compartment, the immigrant observer closes his eyes, forgetting the icy wind outside and wondering whether the two singers will ever meet again.

Both Augé's and Ollivier's text somewhat nostalgically invoke the past. The elderly opera singer laments the passage of time, notably through a reference to Berlin before the Second World War and to a familiar theater in Montreal which was replaced by a tower of concrete, glass and steel, and this return to a lost past is underscored by the antiquated attire of himself and his wife. But the immigrant observer of the scene is not trying, like the Parisian *flâneur*-anthropologist Augé, to prevent his familiar space from disintegrating by trying to comprehend his bewildering surroundings. The contact between a native and a foreign-born resident in the multicultural city which has become his adopted home does not destroy the familiar space of a metro associated with childhood memories, but creates a space of sociality in which people of different generations and national origins can interact through their shared love of music.

The term phantasmagoria, however, used by Ollivier's narrator at the beginning of the scene, does remind us of Benjamin's criticism of the superficial and sterile spectacle observed by the *flâneur* and described by the writer of physiologies. Is the performance in the metro compartment a compensatory illusion hiding the reality of social exclusion and the feeling of estrangement by the immigrant, just as the attempted

identification between the aging Augé and the young Parisians fleetingly pushes not only the acute awareness of the passage of time and the feeling of being left behind into the background, but also the reality of racism? Is it not significant that actual words are exchanged only between the white singers in Ollivier's story, while the immigrant of color silently observes the scene?

Finally, we may wonder whether the "weak ties" created by the intermittent face-to-face contact of contemporary mobility systems (Urry 2007: 48) provide a satisfactory solution to exclusion.

In spite of the ambiguity of the final scene of Ollivier's story, however, I believe that it constitutes a lucid reflection on the predicament of diversity, migration, and inter-generational distance – in other words, the difficulty of constructing locality in a modern globalized world. The spaces of contemporary mobility systems are represented in the story as a microcosm of society in which new socialities avoid ethnic fragmentation on the one hand, and atomized anonymity on the other. As Ollivier's narrator writes: "the game of belonging is played by both, and as long as the players do not recognize each other as partners of the same game, if they do not read each other mutually in their gaze, they remain strangers" (2001: 130)⁴. This recognition has already taken place in his case, since he explicitly affirms that Montreal is now "his" city. The reference to the shared "game" is particularly significant when seen in the context of the performance of the singers in the metro compartment at the end of the story.

Contrary to traditional figures of the *flâneur*, such as Asmodée in the 1831 text *Paris, ou le Livre des Cent-et-un*, who sees himself as a dispassionate observer of the visual signs of other people's pleasure that he does not share (Nesci 2007: 59), the protagonist watching the operatic performance in Ollivier's story shares the emotion of the singers, exclaiming: "*J'en ai le soufflé coupé*" ("It takes my breath taken away", 2001: 138). Even though no words are exchanged between the singers and the black observer, their shared emotion transforms them into players of the same game, a musical performance in which different people play different parts, all of them essential to the artistic experience.

Whereas the resident *flâneur* in the Parisian metro laments the loss of locality, feeling profoundly disconnected from the feelings of his fellow travelers, the immigrant *flâneur* in Montreal allegorizes the metro as a shared space whose accessibility and facilitation of random togetherness make the mutual exchange of the gaze and sharing of the voice possible, leading to a common feeling of artistic elation among passengers of very different origins.

In a certain way, this identification through common interests brings us back to the function of the early nineteenth-century *flâneur* as studied by Catherine Nesci, who explains that the literary and journalistic portraits created by the *flâneur*-writer provided "mirror-images" ("images miroirs", 2007: 55) for Parisian readers that facilitated their identification with the new urban environment. Although Ollivier's observer-narrator expresses an awareness of his external difference with respect to other inhabitants

4 In the Original: [...] le jeu de l'appartenance se joue à deux et tant que les joueurs ne se reconnaissent pas comme partenaires du même jeu, qu'ils ne le lisent pas mutuellement dans leur regard, ils demeurent des étrangers.

of the city at the beginning of the story, his emotional engagement with the activities of his fellow travelers on the metro creates a resemblance facilitating a feeling of belonging.

Augé and Ollivier thus illustrate two different perspectives on locality in the global city, that of the resident and that of the foreigner, but both emphasize the difficulty of adjusting to one's environment, and both suggest ways to overcome this estrangement: by observation, identification and empathy. And in both cases, the metro becomes a metaphor of mobility between cultural borders and generations that is an essential component of the creation of locality in a globalized world.

Bibliography

- Appadurai, Arjun (1996). *Modernity at Large*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Augé, Marc (1997). *L'impossible voyage: Le tourisme et ses images*. Paris: Rivages.
- Augé, Marc (2008). *Le métro revisité*. Paris: Seuil.
- Augé, Marc (1995/2008). *Non-places: An Introduction to Supermodernity*. Transl. John Howe. London: Verso.
- Bachelard, Gaston (1964/1994). *The Poetics of Space*. Trans. Maria Jolas. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Benjamin, Walter (1973). "The Paris of the Second Empire in Baudelaire", in: Walter Benjamin, *Charles Baudelaire: A Lyric Poet in the Era of High Capitalism*. London: NLB. pp. 9-106.
- Certeau, Michel de (1984/1988). *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Translated by Steven Rendall. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Chanady, Amaryll (2009). "The Trans-American Outcast and Figurations of Displacement", in: *Comparative Literature*, 61, 3: 335-345.
- Clarke, Austin (1986). "Canadian Experience", in: Austin Clarke, *Nine Men Who Laughed*. Markham, Ontario: Penguin. pp. 29-51.
- Cohen, Anthony P. (1985/2007). *The Symbolic Construction of Community*. London: Routledge.
- Heidegger, Martin (1977/2008). "Building Dwelling Thinking", in: David Farrell Krell (ed.). *Basic writings*. London: Harper Perennial Modern Thought. pp. 343-363.
- hooks, bell (1991). *Yearning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics*. London: Turnaround Press.
- Lynch, Kevin (1960). *The Image of the City*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Nesci, Catherine (2007). *Le flâneur et les flâneuses: Les femmes et la ville à l'époque romantique*. Université Stendhal, Grenoble: ELLUG.
- Ollivier, Émile (2001). "La répétition", in: (idem). *Regarde, regarde les lions*. Paris: Albin Michel.
- Rushdie, Salman (1981/1991). *Imaginary Homelands*. London: Granta Books.
- Urry, John (2007). *Mobilities*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Young, Iris Marion (1990). "The Ideal of Community and the Politics of Difference", in: Linda J. Nicholson (ed.). *Feminism/Postmodernism*. New York: Routledge. pp. 300-323.

Gabriele Pizarz-Ramirez

University of Leipzig

**“IT TAKES COURAGE TO REMEMBER; IT TAKES COURAGE
TO FORGET. IT TAKES A HERO TO DO BOTH.”
THE POLITICS OF REMEMBERING IN THE WORK OF CAR-
MEN AGUIRRE**

In 2000, nearly 30 years after General Pinochet had seized power in Chile, Canadian-Latino playwright Carmen Aguirre wrote *The Refugee Hotel*, a comedic drama about refugees who fled Chile in the wake of the September 1973 military coup. The play was produced by Marilo Nuñez and the Alameda Theater Company in Toronto where it premiered at Theatre Passe Muraille in October 2009. In 2010 *The Refugee Hotel* received a nomination for the prestigious Dora Mavor Moore Award, an important Canadian theater prize, for Outstanding New Play. Set in Vancouver, the play dramatizes the agony, concerns and survival strategies of a group of Chileans who come to Canada after their escape from the military regime and who are put up in a residential hotel. The play explores the personal forms and public politics of remembrance with respect to Chilean history and interrogates the trauma of exile, while pointing to the invisibility of Canadian Latinos in Canada and within the field of Latino and inter-American Studies.

Latin Americans in Canada are a relatively small but growing minority, as opposed to the large numbers of people of Latin American descent in the United States. They comprise between 300,000 and 400,000 people. Many Latinos came to Canada as political refugees and exiles from dictatorships in Latin American countries. Especially in the 1970s and 1980s, major immigration was composed of Latin Americans who were granted political asylum. In recent years, a new generation of Latinos has emerged who were either born in Canada or emigrated there in childhood, like Carmen Aguirre, whose parents fled Chile when she was five years old. Aguirre's texts, such as her play *Qué Pasa Con La Raza, Eh* (produced by the Latino Theater Company in Vancouver in 1999) or *The Refugee Hotel*, foreground experiences of in-betweenness, dislocation and marginalization, as texts by border writers from the U.S.-Mexican border have done. However, these texts are also shaped by the exilic experience of loss, trauma and survival, experiences that can only partially be addressed by the paradigms of border studies¹.

In an interview that Carmen Aguirre gave to a Canadian radio station on launching her autobiography *Something Fierce: memoirs of a Revolutionary Daughter* (2011), she talked about the psychological burden of living as a refugee abroad and working in the resistance, and about the toll it took on her family. When Aguirre was 11, her mother moved her and her sister from Canada back to South America, where the mother, together with her boyfriend, worked for the Chilean resistance movement.

1 For an overview over the field of border studies and its guiding paradigms, see e.g. Anzaldúa 1987, Calderón/Saldívar 1991, Pérez-Torres 1995, and Saldívar 1997.

While living in Bolivia and Peru, the family, including the children, adhered to rules of secrecy, meaning that most contacts were anonymous and the danger of arrest was always imminent. An 11-year-old Aguirre was told by her parents: “If 24 hours pass and we don’t come back, call this number and say you’re with the Tall One and Raquel. Then hang up. Within an hour someone will knock on the door. Answer it, and then you and (your sister) go with that person” (Tremonti 2011). While her sister remained apolitical, Aguirre actively joined the resistance movement when she was 18, hoping to help reinstall a socialist system in Chile. After the plebiscite in 1988 when Pinochet was denied another eight-year term in office, and the 1990 elections after which Chile officially returned to democracy but Pinochet retained many of his offices, she, like many of her fellow underground activists, felt that they had lost their cause. “It is only now, i.e. many years later that people started to talk about the effects of that on their psyche and on their bodies. A lot of people died quite young [...] because of the stress of what it was like to be in the resistance and then to have lost and then to have been left to their own devices” (Tremonti 2011).

What Aguirre describes as the ‘lost cause’ of the Chilean resistance movement may account for the long silence about the psychic and mental burdens carried by those who had left the country in 1973. *The Refugee Hotel* can be seen as part of the work of revisiting this history, both as personal memory and as collective trauma. Aguirre has stated that the play came out of her reaction to two events: the 1998 arrest of Pinochet in London, and the 1995 death of her uncle, a Chilean exile, who drank himself to death on Vancouver’s skid row (Aguirre, *The Refugee Hotel*). Both events are significant in the context of the play: For many exiled Chileans, Pinochet’s arrest opened a wound that had never been allowed to heal, since Pinochet ruled Chile for 17 years and was never made fully responsible for his crimes, even after his arrest. The victims of his dictatorship who escaped death in Chilean concentration camps suffered the traumatic effects of torture and institutionalized violence without ever being able to fully work through their trauma, given the amnesia and displacement of Pinochet’s crimes in Chile.

The play and its production in 2009 foreground the politics of remembering and forgetting, both on a personal level, and in the public sphere. The play tells the story of eight Chileans gathered in a small hotel, retrospectively and from the point of view of one member of the group, Manuelita, who was an eight-year-old child upon her arrival in Canada, but who is now an adult. Looking back on what happened in the refugee hotel 30 years ago, Manuelita, who appears as an alter ego to Carmen Aguirre who also came to Canada at a very young age, remembers the first week in the life of the refugees in Vancouver. Before the actors come onto the stage, she introduces the play’s key theme of remembrance with the sentence: “It takes courage to remember, it takes courage to forget, it takes a hero to do both” (18). This sentence not only opens the play, but also concludes it when Manuelita transforms from her child’s persona into her adult self in the play’s epilogue. *The Refugee Hotel* spotlights the psychic and mental pain the residents have suffered as a result of displacement, torture, violence, and the loss of their homes, as well as their ways of coping in an environment largely ignorant of their plight.

The residents in the hotel are all affected by traumatic memories. There are La Flaca, Manuelita's mother, a university teacher who joined the resistance in Chile, got caught and tortured, and narrowly escaped death; and her husband, Fat Jorge, a former bank accountant who was largely apolitical until he got arrested by the secret police and broke under torture, giving away information about a colleague. There is Manuel, a 17-year-old student who has been severely tortured in the infamous concentration camp Pinochet established on Dawson Island, and who will later try to commit suicide. There is Isabel, who remains mute throughout most of the play, the loss of her voice signaling her state of shock and her inability to speak about her memories. Other residents include the Mapuche Cristina, whose parents were "disappeared" by the Chilean secret police, and Juan, a miner and unionist who escaped prison after several months of incarceration. Finally, there are La Flaca's and Fat Jorge's two children, eight-year-old Manuelita and her ten-year-old brother Joselito, who were torn from their relatives in Chile and who struggle to understand what has caused their parents to flee their homeland.

The traumas suffered by the characters manifest themselves in various ways in the play. The memories of the coup and its aftermath reemerge in the nightmares, traumatic flashbacks, and hallucinations of the refugees. The pathology of trauma, as Cathy Caruth has observed, consists in the structure of its reception: The traumatizing event is assimilated only belatedly, in its repeated *possession* of the one who experiences it. According to Caruth, to be traumatized is to be possessed by an image or an event (Caruth 4-5). This "possessedness" is particularly evident in Fat Jorge's recurring nightmares, in which he relives the days he spent in prison and under torture. In these dreams he hears the screams, wailing, and moaning of the other prisoners, and remembers conversations with fellow inmates. Possessed by their recollections, Jorge and his wife La Flaca have difficulty reestablishing their relationship or even communicating their experiences to each other – both must cope with unspeakable memories, and they have lost trust in one another. Other characters display different effects of trauma, such as Isabel, who has lost her voice and whose only means of expression is to rock her body rhythmically back and forth. The memories are also embodied in the torture marks some residents carry, like the scars La Flaca has where her nipples used to be, and the cigarette burns on the body of Manuel. The violence archived in their bodies reminds the characters constantly of their past and their own horrible experiences. When Manuel is examined by a physician upon his arrival he reports:

"Cigarette burns. Blow torches. Electricity. Many blows to the head. Heart failure. Brought back to life. Fingernails pulled out. Raped by men. Raped by dogs. Electricity. To the gums. To the eyes. To the tongue. To the anus. To the testicles. Starvation. Dehydration. Hypothermia. Solitary confinement. Many many many blows to the head. And I'm alive." (Ibid.: 56)

A few days later, Manuel decides to end his life by jumping out of the window:

"Is it possible to have lived too long at the age of seventeen? [...] Enough is enough. Ya basta ya! Basta. My mother used to say, nothing belongs to us, Manuel. Absolutely nothing. Not even our bodies. We come from the dirt and when we die, we go back to the dirt." (Ibid.: 76)

The pain the residents experience is intensified by feelings of guilt over leaving Chile, and by confusion about their role as exiles in Canada. A sense of disorientation and uncertainty dominates many conversations in the play – about the refugees' future in Canada, their responsibility towards those who stayed back, and the question of whether leaving the country was a form of treason. In a crucial scene, two of the refugees struggle openly with their feelings of anger, guilt, and fear, accusing each other of cowardliness. Cristina, the Mapuche woman who recalls how her parents were taken away by the secret police, draws a line between the Mapuche, who in her eyes have always been courageous, and other Chileans, whom she regards as cowards because they did not interfere when their immediate neighbors were arrested:

CRISTINA: I've come to the conclusion that our country is a country of cowards - [...] (70)

They just sat and watched my parents being taken away, nobody helped, they just sat and watched like they were watching TV.

JOSELITO: (CONFUSED) TV?

CRISTINA: My parents. They took them away and the neighbours, all of them, the very ones that saw me being born just sat and watched. I was at the craft market, trying to sell some pottery, that's all. (Ibid.: 72)

Fat Jorge, who was arrested while working at the bank by police who were looking for his colleague, has just recently become radicalized and calls for action:

FAT JORGE: I refuse to believe that Chile's done for. I refuse, I don't care if I have to go sneak back in tomorrow, I don't care about the fucking blacklist –
CALLADITA KEEPS ROCKING.

FLACA: (GETTING UP) Fat Jorge, you're drunk.

FAT JORGE: I see it clearly now! Thank you, comrade Cristina, for the clarity! I see it so well! Here we are, in a hotel, a HOTEL -that's just too fucking ironic- in a goddamn hotel, in the heart of the monster, as refugees, REFUGEES, do you hear me? Since when do refugees stay in hotels and watch TV and learn English? I see it now! This is all a set up! That's what it is! Exiles, my ass. If we had balls, we'd be there, we'd be living in the underground, helping out. I'm leaving. Come on! Get up! All of you! You too, comrade Bill! We're leaving this place right now! (Ibid.: 73)

Fat Jorge, who, under torture, gave away information about his colleague, leading to the latter's arrest, attempts to compensate for his feelings of guilt by accusing Cristina of a lack of moral courage, and by pleading with the others to return to Chile and take action. He lacks the firmness and conviction of his wife La Flaca, appearing as a man who was drawn into imprisonment and exile by accident, and who now feels spurred into action:

FAT JORGE: I can't stay here, Flaquita. I can't. Everything smells the same here. They spray everything.

(TO CRISTINA) And you! You call our people cowards? What about you? If you're so goddamn brave, then why did you leave? Why?

CRISTINA: They killed my parents.

FAT JORGE: So you leave? Just like that?

CRISTINA: No! Not just like that!

FLACA: Fat Jorge: don't.

FAT JORGE: Why didn't you stay and join the underground?

CRISTINA: You white ass fuck! You live your cushy life in downtown Santiago and now all of a sudden 'cause you found out there's a fence that divides the rich from the poor, now all of a sudden 'cause you decided to jump to the side of the fence that the rest of us have always been on, now all of a sudden you can look me in the eye with no shame whatsoever and ask me why I love life so much that I decided to live it?! Fuck you.

FAT JORGE: Answer the question.

FLACA: Leave her alone, Fat Jorge. Can't you see she's a kid?

CRISTINA: (TO FAT JORGE) 'Cause I'm scared. Okay? You satisfied now? 'Cause I'm so scared that I haven't slept or eaten for months and I was afraid of myself. Afraid of what I might do. I was afraid of turning into a traitor. From sheer fear. So when I saw the opportunity to run, I ran, okay? Satisfied? Now, you may know a little bit about fear, comrade. But I know a lot about it. I am a Mapuche. We've lived in fear for four hundred and fifty years. And I've seen what fear can do. It can turn you into a traitor or into a hero (75).

[...]

FAT JORGE: She's not a traitor. But I am, Flaquita. I am. I'm here when I could be there. Oh, my God. (RUNNING HELPLESSLY AROUND THE ROOM) I'm stuck here. I'm stuck here. I'm stuck here [...]. (Ibid.: 75)

The scene foregrounds the characters' confusion about their role in Canada, and their uneasiness at staying in a refugee hotel while their friends and relatives back home are being tortured and killed. It also posits different positions against each other – that of Cristina, whose people have developed resistance strategies over centuries because the Mapuche were persecuted from the colonial era onwards, and that of Fat Jorge, who only recently discovered his political consciousness and agency.

The play also stages the children's disorientation as they think about leaving the hotel and traveling back to Chile in a search for their grandmother, and getting away from their parents, whom they suspect are criminals. They are shown to have partially internalized the ideological doctrine of the regime: Joselito, convinced that his parents are "crazy" and "communists" (95) because they did not end up in jail, argues that "[g]ood people don't leave their kids behind just like that. With no word" (95).

Aguirre's play is driven as much by the project of uncovering the personal stories of trauma that have been left untold by Chilean exiles in Canada as by the larger endeavor to break the long silence concerning the 17 years of Pinochet's rule. The play presents a representational site to approximate an unrepresentable reality in a context (democratic Canada) that is largely oblivious to the historical reality of 9/11, 1973 and to the experiences of Chilean exiles, with grave human consequences.

The silenced histories that Aguirre privileges in her play can be read as communal trauma narratives about a forgotten, and thus ghostly period in the history of the Americas.

In her study *Where Memory Dwells*, Macarena Gómez-Barris has extensively written on the cultural productions emerging from the national trauma created by the coup in Chile. As she takes the reader on a journey through what she calls "the complex memoryscape of terror" (72), she points to the evacuation of stories and details about the dictatorship from the public sphere in Chile, an absence that has accounted for the haunting character and the ghostliness of these stories and details. The works of artists and writers, as Gómez-Barris argues, have been a major site of "socially breaking

through and witnessing the hegemony of public silence, concealment, or the flattening of the complex subjectivities of loss and survival” (106). As we contextualize *The Refugee Hotel* in the body of texts that do this work of remembering, we are made aware that the amnesia and the silencing of violence in the coup’s aftermath were not only present in Chile, but also in Canada. The play’s survivor characters bring the history of the coup to the Canadian public in all its tragedy and disastrous mental consequence.

Aguirre recalls that when she came to Canada in the 1970s, she was largely unable to share her experiences with her new classmates because nobody could even remotely imagine the reality from which she had escaped: “We learned never to talk about what was happening in Chile. From the moment when I told some classmates very matter-of-factly in grade two that my stepfather and some of my family members had just come out of a concentration camp that was the national soccer stadium, I was Crazy Carmen” (Gallant). The ignorance in Canada about what happened in Chile in 1973 echoes the historical amnesia in Chile itself where governments were ready to “move on” quickly after the dictatorship ended, without attempting to deal with the atrocities of the past and the violence perpetrated by the Pinochet regime. It is no coincidence that it took Aguirre nine years to be able to stage the play in Canada, because she found it extremely difficult to get theater companies interested in a topic that for Canadians seemed too remote. The forced preemptive closure on the past of the Chilean Pinochet dictatorship both in Chile itself, but also in many other countries (including Canada)², lends added significance to the play that, staged in 2009, provoked highly emotional reactions among Latino audiences, especially from Chilean exiles. As producer Marilo Nuñez recalls, audience members gave their own testimonies, describing their own encounters with state violence and torture, as well as their methods of survival:

The response to the show was unbelievable. People would come up to me, hug me tightly, crying, sobbing, couldn’t speak [...] the way that this play made people feel [...] was kind of cathartic [...]. (“*Making The Refugee Hotel Part 10*”)

The play and its production also implicitly interrogate Canada’s self-image as a benevolent player in global affairs, or what Montreal activist Yves Engler has described as *The Black Book of Canadian Foreign Policy*. Engler observes that the then Canadian president Trudeau was quick to politically recognize General Pinochet’s coup regime when it seized power on September 11, 1973, after a period of diplomatically isolating and financially boycotting the democratically elected Allende government:

In 1964 Eduardo Frei defeated openly Marxist candidate Salvador Allende in Chile’s presidential elections. Worried about growing support for socialism, Ottawa gave 8.6 million to Frei’s Chile, its first aid to a South American country. When Allende won the next election Canadian assistance disappeared [...] In 1972 Ottawa joined Washington in voting to cut off all money from the IMF to the Chilean government. When Allende was first elected all Western banks, including Canada’s withdrew from Chile [...] Allende invited

2 There was a significant difference in the way this period in Chilean history was represented in the former “Eastern bloc” countries, many of which practiced solidarity with the Allende government and its socialist goals. E.g. in the former German Democratic Republic the atrocities of the Pinochet junta were highly publicized and widely discussed in the media. Like many Western democracies, Eastern bloc countries also offered asylum to numerous political refugees.

Pierre Trudeau to visit Santiago. Ottawa refused “for fear of alienating rightist elements in Chile and elsewhere” [...] Within three weeks of the coup, Canada recognized Pinochet’s military junta. (Engler 2009: 99)

While Canada also offered asylum to thousands of Chileans who fled the Pinochet dictatorship, at the same time, it provided massive economic assistance to the regime. Just after the coup, Canada “voted for a US\$ 22 million Inter American Development Bank loan” and “endorsed sending 95 million from the IMF to Chile and supported renegotiating the country’s debt held by the Paris Club” (Engler 100). While the play stages the support given to the refugees by Canadians, it also makes clear that this help came largely from Canadian human rights organizations and individuals who sympathized either with the refugees’ situation as exiles from their country, or with their political views.

While *The Refugee Hotel* foregrounds the agony and suffering endured by the exiled Chileans in their first week in Canada, the play also shows how they develop strategies of survival – employing humor, constructing a community, and reasserting cultural traditions. The refugee hotel is a comedic drama, although the humor is a dark one. The play contains several absurd episodes, such as when Fat Jorge attempts to talk to the coke machine in the hotel’s foyer to get coke; or when Pat Keleman, the social worker who takes the refugees to the hotel, tries to explain to Jorge and Flaca in a hilarious mixture of French and rudimentary Spanish where they are, and that they do not have to pay for lodging. A few scenes later, when Manuel tries to commit suicide by jumping out of a third story window, he is unaware that a huge garbage container full of pink cotton fibers beneath the window will absorb the impact. The others who have watched him fly by their windows and witness his miraculous survival start calling him Condor Passes, an allusion to the famous Andean song “El Condor Pasa”. At the same time that Manuel jumps out of the window, fellow refugee Cristina sticks her head into an oven in her room, hoping to die from asphyxiation, but unaware that it is not a gas, but an electric, oven. While burning her hair she, like Manuel, survives, and is subsequently called “cakehead” by the others:

FAT JORGE WALKS RIGHT INTO THE ROOM. EVERYONE FOLLOWS. THEY SEE CRISTINA WITH HER HEAD IN THE OVEN, SURROUNDED BY SMOKE.

FAT JORGE: Holy shit.

THEY RUN TO HER AND PULL HER OUT. HER HAIR IS BURNT. HER FACE IS BLACK.

FAT JORGE: Woman! If you’re gonna commit suicide like that, at least make sure it’s a gas oven!

JOSELITO: Yeah! This is electric!

MANUELITA: Your hair’s burnt.

JOSELITO: And your face is all black!

FLACA: Would everybody just shut up and take pity on the poor girl?

CRISTINA: Shit. This is an electric oven?

FLACA: Yeah.

CRISTINA: How the hell was I supposed to know that? (79)

[...]

FAT JORGE: Hey! We'll have to call you Condor Passes! Flying by our window like that like the King of the Andes. And you! Wanting to bake your head like that! We'll just have to call you Cakehead!

MANUEL STARTS TO LAUGH. THEY ALL LAUGH (80).

Humor here serves as a form of relief from the memory of terror, an escape from the trauma, and a way to build community with others. As Freud has shown in *Wit and Its Relation to the Unconscious*, there is a connection between 'wit' and unconscious passions and fears. According to Freud's (1938) interpretation of humor as an expression of suppressed thoughts and feelings, humor can be seen as a way to represent the 'unspeakable', i.e. to express what cannot otherwise be said. Since wit uses many of the same strategies as dreams do in order to interpret reality and turn it on its head, it can be similarly subversive, and allows for the expression of taboo ideas.

Cultural traditions and their preservation also prove enormously significant in the process of remembering and healing. One of the tropes that reemerge in the play is dance, especially the figure of the sole cueca dancer that is visible only to some characters in the play. The cueca, a traditional folkloric dance, is usually interpreted as a courting ritual. The dance is generally associated with rural culture, and particularly with the culture of the *huaso*, the Chilean version of the Argentinian gaucho or the U.S. American cowboy. Pinochet tried to turn the cueca into a national dance in the late 1970s, making it part of military parades, while persecuting and prohibiting other forms of popular music such as the Andean flute music that had served as a major source of inspiration for the leftist *Nueva Canción* movement. While cueca had previously celebrated love, laughter and country life, under Pinochet and military rule it came to be an emblem of his dictatorship. The *Cueca Sola* emerged among the wives of political prisoners and families of the disappeared as a symbolic gesture of the resistance to Pinochet. It was danced alone by women in city centers and town commons, evoking the spirit of those who were missing, who had been detained and never returned. The *Cueca Sola* thus served as a haunting form of remembrance and an assertion of the presence of the disappeared, not only in the memory of their loved ones, but in public memory. The sole cueca dancer, a *huaso* in traditional dress, emerges at the play's beginning and does his zapateos. As the audience cannot see his face in the dim lighting and a hat conceals his face, the figure conveys a sense of ghostliness. He reappears in several scenes in which La Flaca and Fat Jorge try to reestablish their relationship, and in a scene in which Cristina and Manuel are shown to discover the attraction they have for each other. The cueca dancer in the context of the political dimensions of the play is also a symbol of cultural survival, a piece of popular culture that the refugees have brought from Chile and that they preserve in Canada, and something that they have reappropriated from the dictator. In one scene, the cueca dancer hands Fat Jorge a record of Inti-Illimani, a popular music group that had emerged from the song movement *Nueva Canción Chilena* and that was strongly associated with the resistance to Pinochet. Inti-Illimani, who were on tour abroad at the time of the coup, continued to develop their careers in exile and supported the resistance movement with their songs. The play's cueca dancer handing Jorge the record can thus be seen as a gesture that links the cueca to the celebration of a resistant musical tradition.

Community turns out to be of key importance for the refugees. At the play's beginning even the members of the family – La Flaca, Fat Jorge, and their two children – find it hard to communicate with each other. The others also seem utterly lost in an environment that they barely understand and that has very little knowledge of their situation. As the play progresses, though, both the similarity of their experiences and their common cultural memories of Chile enable at least some of the group's members to slowly establish or reestablish emotional connections of love and trust with each other. One may assume that it is this trust that causes Isabel (whom the others have affectionately started calling “Calladita” – little silent one) to regain the capacity of speech towards the end of the play. By sharing stories and by listening to Chilean music and dancing, the refugees start a gradual process of healing. Moreover, the play also suggests that the story of the Chilean refugees is part of a larger story of exile, migrancy, and marginality that unites many Canadians. The gay receptionist of the hotel who, in the beginning, is totally indifferent to their situation, develops true empathy for and interest in their lives in the course of the play. As they prepare to leave the hotel for more permanent lodgings, he reaches out to them, giving Fat Jorge his record player and offering Cristina a job in the hotel. Pat Keleman, the social worker who brings the refugees to the hotel, is the daughter of Hungarian refugees; her memory of her own story of exile enables her to relate to them emotionally, and to provide not only practical help, but also human warmth.

The play's end once again points to the fragility of the balance the refugees have struggled to regain in Canada, as Manuelita (now again looking back as an adult) tells the audience in the epilogue what has become of them over the course of 30 years. Some of the former residents of the hotel have succeeded in making a life for themselves in Canada while continuing the work of remembering, like Isabel (Calladita), who now runs a successful bakery where she sells gingerbread houses “depicting real-life experiences, such as people attempting suicide by sticking their heads in electric ovens” (125). Others did not escape the long-term consequences of the abuse and torture of the dictatorship, like Manuel, who died from a brain aneurism when “all those blows to the head finally caught up with him” (125), or Fat Jorge, who died a homeless alcoholic. The refugee hotel becomes a place of remembrance itself: The receptionist “filled a wall with photographs” of the many refugees who followed the Chileans there, [f]rom Guatemala, El Salvador, Vietnam, Iran, Ethiopia, Somalia, Yugoslavia, Colombia, Iraq...” (126). The play thus offers a point of reference to many social groups in Canada who look back on experiences of exile and dislocation, and who have fled from a multitude of terror-ridden places.

When director Marilo Nuñez set out to stage the play in Toronto, she soon realized that no company in the city could promote Canadian Latino theatre. At a reading of the play in which Nuñez participated, it turned out that the cast was predominantly non-Latino because the organizers could not find a sufficient number of professional Latino actors who were qualified to do the job. This eventually brought Nuñez to found the Alameda Theater Company in 2006, the first Latino-Canadian theater company in Toronto. Alameda Theater Company calls itself “an avenue for Latin voices” (Alameda Theater Company), and strives to establish a network for professional Latin Canadian theatre artists in Canada. It creates visibility for Canadian Latinos, similar to the Latino

Theater Group in Vancouver, founded by Carmen Aguirre in 1994 and consisting of nonprofessional actors. Both companies have provided Canadian Latin American artists with the chance to stage plays such as *Que Pasa Con la Raza, Eh*, and *The Refugee Hotel* which bring the histories of the various Americas together in the stories of their exilic people. *The Refugee Hotel* as staged by the Alameda Theater Company was a truly inter-American event – actors from various Latin American countries enacted a story of trauma and survival, unearthing memories that not only Chileans, but also many other Latin Americans, can relate to.

While the issues of political violence and trauma link the play with much of Latin American writing, it also raises many issues that dominate Latino artistic productions in the US, especially as it foregrounds immigrant experiences of disorientation and marginalization. Although *The Refugee Hotel* obviously does not fit many of the paradigms of border theory, it invites a dialogue between Latin Americans in Chile and elsewhere, Latinos in the United States, and Latinos in Canada. So far, Canada has been largely ignored in Latino Studies as well as in inter-American discourses in the United States. The huge majority of critical Latino Studies focus on the border between the U.S. and Mexico, rarely considering the other border that links the U.S. with its northern neighbor. However, as plays such as *The Refugee Hotel* show, the critical discourses about the hemisphere and about Latino identities in the Americas need to incorporate Latino Canada as a space of inquiry, to enable new discussions about Latino culture on the continent. While a simple transferal of U.S. created theories from Border or Chicano Studies to Canadian Latinos would be the wrong approach to meaningfully embracing the multiplicity of Canadian Latin American experiences, it is a dialogue that is sorely needed to gain a more comprehensive view on border and hemispheric issues in the various parts of the Americas.

Bibliography

- Aguirre, Carmen (2010). *The Refugee Hotel*. Toronto: Talon Books.
- Aguirre, Carmen (2011). *Something Fierce: Memoirs of a Revolutionary Daughter*. Vancouver: Douglass and McIntyre.
- Aguirre, Carmen (2011). *The Refugee Hotel*. <http://talonbooks.com/books/the-refugee-hotel>. 05.09.2001.
- Alameda Theater Company (o.J.). “An Avenue for Latin Voices”. http://www.alamedatheatre.com/downloads/AlamedaTheatre_Donation_Form.pdf. 05.9.2011.
- alamedatheatre (2011) “Making *The Refugee Hotel* Part 10”; <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vws90j8hKNM>.05.09.2011.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria (1987). *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco: spinsters/aunt lute.
- Calderón, Hector und José Saldívar (eds.) (1991). *Criticism in the Borderlands. Studies in Chicano Literature, Culture, and Ideology*. Durham und London: Duke University Press.
- Caruth, Cathy, (ed. and intros.) (1995). *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.

- Engler, Yves (2009). *The Black Book of Canadian Foreign Policy*. Black Point (Nova Scotia): Fernwood Publishing Co.
- Freud, Sigmund (1938). "Wit and its relation to the unconscious", in: Brill, A. A. (ed.) *The Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud*. New York: Random House. pp. 631–803.
- Gallant, Paul (n.d.) (2011). "Ghosts of revolutions past. Carmen Aguirre's new play, *The Refugee Hotel*, peers into personal and shared refugee experiences". <http://www.eyeweekly.com/theatre/article/71191>. 10.09.2011.
- Gómez-Barris, Macarena (2009). *Where Memory Dwells. Culture and State Violence in Chile*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Pérez-Torres, Rafael (1995). *Movements in Chicano Poetry. Against Myths, Against Margins*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Saldívar, José David (1997). *Border Matters. Remapping American Cultural Studies*. Durham und London: Duke University Press.
- Tremonti, Anna Maria (2011). "Something Fierce: Carmen Aguirre". Feature Interview with Carmen Aguirre. *The Current*, May 11: Cbc.ca. <http://www.cbc.ca/video/news/audioplayer.html?clipid=1919340860>. 05.09.211.

Dieter Ingenschay

Humboldt University of Berlin

(POST-)COLONIALISM – MIGRATION – LITERATURE.
SPAIN AS AN EXAMPLE

1. Introduction: Spain: a country of immigration?

In 1996, Rafael Puyol, professor for Human Geography and Head of the Universidad Complutense de Madrid at the time, assured me that, unlike Germany, Spain was not a country of immigration; at least if one disregarded the few thousand Germans and Englishmen along the Mediterranean coast and on the Balearic and Canary Islands.

He was right: according to the official census of Spain in the year 1996, the percentage of foreigners amounted to solely 1.37%. And yet, Puyol was mistaken at once: given that during the 14 years after his statement, Spain was exposed to the consequences of migration flows from Latin America, Eastern Europe and Central and Northern Africa. In these years, the number of foreigners based in Spain increased from 1.37 to 12%. The major part of this group involves immigrants from Latin America (36%). This is hardly surprising given that the colonial history between Spain and Latin America lasted several centuries and that it brought with it not *merely* exploitation, suppression and genocide, but also the Hispanicization of Latin America in terms of linguistic and cultural aspects. African immigrants make up the second largest part, especially originating from Sub-Saharan parts of the continent. Romanians compose the third largest group of immigrants in Spain.

Following the debate on post-colonialism within the field of the Anglo-American *Cultural Studies*, the more recent international research community has strongly focused on the postcolonial *conditio* of *particular* parts and regions of the Caribbean as well as in Central and South America. In doing so, it has triggered a major debate. Leading academics in the field of *Postcolonial Studies* (like Bill Ashcroft or Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak) argued in favor of a (relative) comparability of distinct postcolonial states. Numerous scholars (e.g. José Joaquín Brunner, Walter D. Mignolo, Alfonso de Toro, Patricia Seed, Helen Tiffin, an anthology by Herlinghaus/ Riese), agreed with this assertion, at least partly. Others, e.g. Klor de Alva, disagreed decisively. The latter argued that the social-political and cultural situations of Latin-American nations were hardly the product of a warlike process of decolonization (following the model of the British Empire), but rather the result of internal disputes among different social groups; e.g. among Spain-oriented Creoles or other European-born immigrants with their specific social roles, and indigenous population, or former African slaves, etc.

Given that the relation between the colonizing motherland and the subaltern colonies (Spain – Latin-America) is characterized with an inter-mixture, the present case can be distinguished from the British Empire. Besides that, it appears to me that Latin America used to be held in high esteem by Spain, at least until the most recent forms of migration began to alter that. For a long time, Latin America constituted the ‘Promised Land,’ which was considered *the* destination for Spanish emigrants. Emigrants

from poor regions of the country, but also for brisk entrepreneurs that went to live in the colonies in order to gain prosperity by agriculture, commerce and small-scale industry. And still during Franco's dictatorial regime, Latin American countries, especially Mexico, were popular havens for the Republican government in exile as well as for many Spanish intellectuals. In turn however, the political developments of the 1970s made Latin American authors seek refuge in Spanish exile, in order to escape the arising Southern American dictatorial regimes. Thus, the literature by considerable Latin American writers was one produced by expatriates. By now, one can make out a gap in the literature produced by Latin Americans in Spain: Even though the process of democratization in their countries of origin has often been more successfully managed than in Spain itself, some authors are still subsumed under the label of exile literature. Also, younger writers are still considered to be exile authors, especially those coming from Cuba. However, there are young authors that describe themselves as part of the flows of migration instead of making use of the intellectual self-definition of being an expatriate. E.g. the title of the novel *Paseador de perros*, by the young Peruvian Sergio Galarza (Candaya, 2009) alludes to an occupation that is very prevailing among the poor in Latin America: unemployed people walking dogs for a lousy pay, a phenomenon that is observable in every park in Buenos Aires. By transferring this model of job to Madrid, the Latin American author perceives himself as part of the international flow of immigration. So does Marco Valle, author of a testimonio, who depicts a protagonist, an Argentinian immigrant that works alongside others from Central Africa and Eastern Europe in the Galician agriculture and pisciculture (*Los árboles de la muerte. Crónica de un inmigrante sin papeles*).

But my topic is not primarily the immigration of Latin Americans to Spain. Rather, the aspect of migration allows me to point out Spain's postcolonial context. Once Spain had lost its last colonies in 1898, namely Cuba and the Philippines, the Spanish philosopher Ángel Ganivet proposed to compensate this loss with a new colonial activity. What he suggested was a focus right on the doorstep, i.e. Northern Africa. After the victory in the Spanish-Moroccan War (1859), not only the city of Tetuan (Spanish up to 1956), but also numerous smaller territories in the region were under Spanish rule.

In 1912, the Spanish expansion politics preempted the German Emperor and his fruitless colonial policy, and led to the division of Morocco into a French and a Spanish protectorat.

In the year 1976 the Spanish colony Saharawi gained its independence but was instantly annexed by Morocco. The only remaining Spanish exclaves on Northern African territory are Ceuta and Melilla (besides the Perejil Island and other uninhabited spots of land). What might be of more interest is Spain's public national engagement for its former colony Saharawi. Besides that, I would like to refer to Spain's active (some say aggressive and hegemonial) cultural policy in Morocco (e.g. in the field of promoting the Spanish language). All this is a result of the outlined political developments.

What might be less known is the existence of two minor Spanish-speaking state formations in sub-Saharan Africa – I will focus on one of them now by approaching Donato Ndongo.

2. Traces of migration from Africa

2.1 Equatorial Guinean literature and its most famous representative: Donato Ndongo-Bidyogo

Donato Ndongo-Bidyogo was born in 1950 in Neifang. At that time, Neifang used to be part of Spanish-Guinea; nowadays it is known as Equatorial Guinea. Equatorial Guinea's national language is Spanish. That is also the language Ndongo applies for his writings. In the year 1960, at the peak of Franco's political career, he went to Spain for the first time, where he was confronted with the severe prejudices of his school-mates. Nowadays, he fluctuates between Madrid, Malabo and his American domicile in the State of Missouri, where he is also part of the faculty.

Ndongo is not the only Equatoguinean that sought refuge in Madrid after the regained Independence (1969) of the country had been followed by a bloody dictatorship. Practically, the entire critical and intellectual elite was situated in the Spanish capital (however, few in number). And yet, their story still needs to be written, given that both the Francoist and the post-Francoist Madrid did not offer a forum (as in Paris the group *Présence africaine*) that could have guaranteed a network for Afro-Hispanic authors (Pedro Crisanto Bueriberi, Juan Balboa Beneke, Anacleto Oló Mibuy, Paco Zamora).

In terms of assessing and evaluating the literature of Equatoguineans in Spain at the time, *littérateurs* and literature professors acted surprisingly clueless and arrogant. In 1966 for example, the Spanish literary scholar Carlos González Echegaray passed judgement on the novel *Cuando los combes luchaban* (subtitle: *Novela de costumbres de la Guinea Española*) by Leoncio Evita Enoy. This was one of the first novels written in Equatorial Guinea (by the way, the novel is defending Spanish colonialism). In his preface, González Echegaray writes:

En cuanto al estilo, he corregido algunas construcciones excesivamente extrañas a nuestra sintaxis y algunos errores de propiedad en la aplicación de los vocablos castellanos, pero he dejado a la obra en su estilo propio, que a las veces puede parecer en la forma, duro, y en el fondo, ingenuo, pero que es una muestra estilizada del castellano medio, hablado por nuestros negros. (11)

This is how much credit the 'subalterns' were given in terms of how to be able to talk. Maybe this assertion emerged bona fide; but with the theoretical knowledge on how to approach underlying literary concepts like deterritorialization (Deleuze/ Guattari) or mimicry (Bhabha) – knowledge that we do possess nowadays, the state-ment sounds more than strange.

El metro (2007)

In his last novel, Ndongo is not focusing on an Equatoguinean but on the young Cameroonian Lambert Obama Ondo; by doing so, he turns away from the level of autobiographic references that was prevailing in his previous writings. After having been disappointed personally within his family, Lambert moves to a provincial town, where he falls in love with Sylvie. However, he loses his job and is forced to face the worsening

economic situation, he sets off for Douala, a port city, where he has a relative and plans on getting taken on as a dockworker. Ultimately, he loses his job again, this time due to his pro-union involvement. He hides in a container ship in order to be taken to Spain, but he is discovered, caught and turned in to the Senegalese police.

In Senegal, he succeeds to get in touch with a gang of smugglers that enables him to cross the Moroccan border. From Saharawi, he is taken on a refugee boat, called *patera* in Spanish; he gets to Andalusia where he works in the production of fruit and vegetables – like so many other *sin papeles*, illegal immigrants. He is spotted again and has to move on. After his arrival in Madrid, he learns that Sylvie is supposed to get married. In order to let her parents have an appropriate *Mahr*, he has to borrow some money. Therefore, he commits himself to sell illegal copies of brand-name products on the street, on behalf of a backer. One night, a group of xenophobic skinheads, *cabezas rapadas*, chases him on the metro, stabbing a stiletto in his lungs and passing him on their way out:

Los tres jóvenes rapados entraron en el mismo coche... sintió sus dedos como garras tirar de él hacia atrás con fiereza, y oyó sus palabras, apenas un susurro a tres voces: nunca más follarás con blancas, mono asqueroso, negro cabrón. Y al tiempo, un recio puñetazo y la de un fino estilete punzar su costado y perforar su pulmón. (455f.)

The topic of the African immigrant losing his life on the subway, back in the days in Paris, was introduced to the discourse already decades ago by the Moroccan Rachid Boujedra and his novel *Topographie idéale pour une agression caractérisée* (1975). Boudjedra's novel involves a North African Berber who cannot read the writing on the bill boards or interpret the subway map.

Ndongo's protagonist, however, appears to be a modern, real and well-survivable immigrant in the Madrid of today. On the one hand, Ndongo's version of the topic is consistently characterized by obvious references to the current situation of migrants in Spain and their field of occupation. That way, the novel appears as a commentary on the current living conditions of African immigrants in Spain. On the other hand, however, and according to the American Hispanist Michael Ugarte and his interpretation of *El metro*, the novel provides information on the backgrounds, the migrants' motifs, on their misery and despair and the economic and political repression that precede the decision to take the risk of an illegal immigration. In addition, the novel depicts Lambert Obama as a tradition-conscious man who is very connected to his tribe.

Ndongo pursues his reflexions on the phenomenon of migration in a way that he has already taken in his previous literary works *Las tinieblas de tu memoria negra* and *Los poderes de la tempestad*; the former ends with the emigration to Spain; in the latter the plot begins with the return to Africa (See Antonio Uribe, *Emigración y retorno en la narr de DNB y de Inongo-vi-Makomé in Andres-Suarez 2004*).

In *El metro*, he confronts the opposing realms – the rural Africa and the metropolitan Europe. His protagonist, lacking permanent residence, is oscillating between them and finally loses his life. Although from the African perspective, Europe is repeatedly praised to be a 'Promised Land', empirically it turns out to be a fake paradise. Ndongo accuses this deficiency not only in his literary writings but also in interviews (for instance "Una nueva realidad") and essays, where he, for instances in his long

article “Guineos y españoles en la interacción colonial (1778-1968)” (in the edition *España en Guinea. Construcción del desencuentro [1778-1968]* 1998: 107-217) approaches the relation between colonial power and colonized subjects.

Among the numerous press commentaries on *El Metro* there is one I want to focus on; it is about an article that involves a presentation of the present novel in the Casa África in Santa Cruz de Tenerife – thus on one of the Canary Islands, one of the main arrival points for African flows of migration. Ndongo criticizes European politics, especially the Spanish attitude towards those African countries which “no hace más de 50 años [que] empezaron a independizarse y han heredado el modo de ejercer el poder que tenían los gobiernos coloniales”.

In light of the terrible dictatorship in his country of origin, which immediately followed the domination of the Francoist Spain, Ndongo combines the description of a post-colonial *conditio* and post-dictatorial aspects and condemns the stupidity to which dictatorship sentences the people:

No hay ni un sólo país africano pobre, todos ellos cuentan con materias primas suficientes como para ofrecer una vida digna a sus habitantes, pero el beneficio de su venta a espaldas a Europa está gestionado por dictadores que prefieren mantener a la población en la ignorancia, único modo que las dictaduras tienen de perpetuarse como todo el mundo sabe. ()

As long as the battle against dictatorial regimes is not fought consequently, Ndongo considers the effort of non-governmental organizations as fruitless (“*Todo eso no sirve de nada si se apoya a dictadores*”).

No necesitamos ONG, ni que adopten niños, sino ayuda para construir democracia, pero los gobiernos europeos prefieren las materias primas a los derechos humanos. (www.laopinion.es/secciones/noticia.jsp?pRef=2964_8_11551_Cultura-y-comunicacion-Ndongo-presenta-Metro-relato-sobre-emigracion). 07.09.2012.

Donato Ndongo is the most famous Equatoguinean author; not in terms of his style and diction, but rather because of his concern and project, namely the thematization of dictatorship and migration through a literature without permanent residence; in this respect one also has to mention Juan Tomás Ávila Laurel (*La carga*, 1999, *Arde el monte de noche*, 2009) and Maximiliano Nkogo Esono (*Nambula*, 2006).

The slowly growing presence of these and some more authors in the discourse of some specialists in Spain is gradually modifying the image of the immigrant with its prejudice, believes Marco Kunz in his critical panorama “La inmigración en la literatura española contemporánea”.

2.2 The Moroccan-Hispanic literature and its most successful representative: Najat El Hachmi, *El último patriarca* [*L'últim patriarca*; 2008]

Najat El Hachmi is a young and very successful writer from Barcelona but of Moroccan origin. And she is by all means not the only author with a ‘migration background’ that is publishing in Spanish or another co-official language in Spain. Mentioning the co-

official languages, there seems to be a particular openness towards literature written by migratory authors; I mention another two examples: In order to commemorate the time under Sadam Hussein, the Iraqi Pius Alibek has put down his memories in Catalan (under the title *Arrels nòmades*), whereas the black African (Kameroun) author Víctor Omgba has drawn up his *Calella sen saïda* (2001) in Galician.

Yet, in North Africa, Castilian/Spanish institutions (e.g. Instituto Cervantes) promote those circles and groups that – in terms of the publication of their literature – draw on the Spanish language. In 1997, AEMLE (Asociación de Escritores Marroquíes en Lengua Española) was founded; according to their webpage with the aim

[...] de llegar a hacernos conocer en España, que se sepa que hay marroquíes que escriben en la lengua de Cervantes y que con el tiempo deben hallar un sitio en el seno de la cultura española. (http://usuarios.lycos.es/aemle/_private/creacion_aemle.htm). 03.10.2012.

AEMLE's general secretary, the writer Mohamed Bouissef Rebab (*El dédalo de Abdelkrim*, 2002) envisions himself as a representative of a 'new', transnational, hybrid literature, if not necessarily as a – in Ottmar Ettes' terminology – representative of a 'literature without permanent residence':

[...] los marroquíes, al expresarse en español, tienen en cuenta que no hay una única cultura pura. Lo que se está haciendo es darle valor positivo al grado de ósmosis y diálogo que hay entre las culturas de España y Marruecos (Hipanistas que cierran el siglo XX y abren el nuevo milenio", in: Centro Virtual Cervantes El español en el mundo. Literatura marroquí de expresión española (2005). www.cvc.cervantes.es/obref/anuario_05/bouissef/p05.htm). 27.02.2012.

The topic of migration to Spain is even more prominent among Moroccan than among Equatoguinean authors; both Abdel Hamed Beyuki (*La transición en Marruecos*, 2000) and Mohamed El Gheryb (*Dormir al raso*, 1993) for instance constitute an example for a form of cultural production that the critic Réda Bensmaïa has indicated as "nomadismo". They can also be referenced in terms of other recently developed concepts in the field of cultural criticism, for example Ette's "literatures without permanent residence" or Fernando de Toro's 'literatures of displacement'.

For several reasons, I have decided to focus on *L'últim patriarca*, a work by Najat El Hachmi, born in 1979 and based in Barcelona since the age of seven. Given that she entitled an earlier published autobiographic review confidently with *Jo també sóc catalana – Me too, I'm Catalan* – it is not surprising that she rejects the label 'migrant literature' for her own work. This rejection also applies for the novel *L'últim patriarca*, published in Catalan in 2004 (also published in Spanish under the title *El último patriarca*) and honored in the same year with the award Ramon Lull, the most important Catalan literary prize.

The novel tells the exceptional story of the family Driouch. The first part of the book takes place in a Moroccan Berber village; the plot of the second part is located in Catalonia. The former has its focus on the 'patriarch' Mimoun Driouch, already evoked in the title, whose life, from birth to marriage and his first emigration to Spain, is told from his daughter's perspective. In the latter part, the focus is shifted to a nameless first-person narrator, who does not only pick up the new European language with a

Catalan dictionary, but who will also be successful in school and later in university. By getting married without her father's approval, she will finally dissociate herself from his despotic power and his environment's misogynous practice. The marriage that she planned on putting on a solid basis lasts but a short time. Instead, she completes the revenge on her father, who is willed to assimilate on one hand, but dominated by a phallogocentric conservatism on the other, and finally breaks with the patriarchal supremacy, by letting herself in for a sexual relation with her uncle. Of course, she arranges it so that her father becomes a witness.

The core of the novel is constituted by a double but intricately linked conflict: a gender conflict that emanates from a staunchly faith in the male superiority and that sets as a norm the utterly enslavement of the women in terms of her sexuality and her physical castigation.

Besides that, we can detect a cultural conflict that contrasts the rural context of an Islamic Berber village in Morocco and the upright Catalan city and its narrow-minded system of values in a way which makes the protagonist settle for the European way. Indeed, at first sight, overcoming the patriarch in his unlimited misogyny seems to be the external aim.

However, it is made clear that the protagonist, a protagonist who was raised according to the norms of a harshly applied religiosity, above all has to find her own place in this new society.

The process of emancipation is accompanied by two significant inter-textual references: Mimoun Driouch begins to work independently as a minor constructor and gradually reaches a modest prosperity for his family. Thereupon they move into a house that comes with a bathtub and a separate room for the daughter. They call their new home "our house on Mango Street". This is a clear reference to the famous and programmatic novel *The House on Mango Street* by the Hispanic author Sandra Cisneros. The reference is aimed at the homey feelgood effect which is affiliated to Esperanza Cordero's, the protagonist's move into 'her' own house.

The first intertextual reference alludes to a prototypical work of the *chicana* movement in the US. The second massive intertextual reference, however, aims for the Catalan writer Mercè Rodoreda, known as the author of the Barcelona novel *La Plaça del Diamant* (span. *La Plaza del Diamante*, 1962). The links are numerous and extend to the imitation of stylistic elements.

The protagonist's process of emancipation in *L'últim patriarca* bears a resemblance to the development of Rodoreda's protagonist, Natàlia. But principally, the author's biography, dulled by exile and sweetened and salted by amours, seems to be a reference for the narrator.

Especially, one intimate detail of her less agitated youth¹. After her father passed away, Mercè, descending from the Catalan bourgeoisie, gets married to her uncle Joan Gurguú; but only after having obtained the pope's approval. In *L'últim patriarca* the uncle will visit and seduce the protagonist. He will be doing this in a way that appears almost obsessively (in the first part of the novel), given that it permits the young women

1 Apart from the naming of the collection *Espejo roto, Mirall trencat* in chap. 35, p. 321.

to keep intact her maidenhead until her marriage: per angustam viam, by means of anal intercourse.

¿Lo has hecho alguna vez por detrás?, dijo de pronto entre tanta ternura, y yo no, que duele, y él no te preocupes, yo te enseñaré, si sabes cómo hacerlo no tiene que hacer daño. ¿Quién mejor que tu tío para enseñarte ese tipo de cosas, eh? Son el tipo de cosas que deben quedar en familia. Dijo trae el aceite de oliva, y no fue la mantequilla de Marlon Brando, que nosotros somos mediterráneos. (336)

The first intertext, Sandra Cisneros' *The House on Mango Street*, constitutes the link between the novel with its undeniable topic of migration and the recent *in-between-literature* that can be labeled *literatures of displacement* or 'literature without permanent residence'. The references to Rodoreda however are more complex: on the one hand, they demonstrate Najat El Hachmi's desire to be noticed as a Catalan writer (and not as an author with a 'migration background').

El Hachmi also demonstrates in an obvious way, that cases of domestic violence against women are not exclusively (maybe not even primarily) an Islamic problem; she also alludes to this fact in numerous interviews. And ultimately, this depicted detail has a novel-immanent function: at the end of the book, the patriarch's own sexual praxis during his youth is pictured. A sexual praxis that is employed calculatedly in order to finally 'disempower' him. These are the last sentences of the novel:

Fue allí mismo... cuando llamaron al timbre y en el videopertero apareció la cara de padre. Un padre que ya no volvería a ser patriarca, no conmigo, porque lo que había visto no podría contarlo, que ni él hubiera imaginado nunca una traición tan honda, y aún menos viniendo de una hija tan amada. (337)

In order to fathom the dimensions of the preceding act (the protagonist pretends to be enjoying it) I have to refer back to a passage in the first part of the novel; namely the part in which the violation of the boy Mimoun by his uncle on his mother's side is explicitly depicted (35) – certainly, there are other passages in which the public problems of young Muslim women in Barcelona, where in neighborhoods like Vic approx. 30% of the population are migrants, is better reflected.

The most illustrative example being the topic of the headscarf, a topic well and multifariously captured by the novel: the father, who seeks to adapt to the Spanish society, refuses the headscarf for his daughter, given she is attending public school. After having married, albeit without her parent's approval, she herself turns to the headscarf again, in order to go and see her mother as a married woman:

Me puse el pañuelo en la cabeza para ir a visitar a madre. Pasé tan rápido como pude por el principio de la calle para que no me viesen los vecinos que me conocían de toda la vida. Anda que con lo guapa que estás con tu pelo, quítate eso de la cabeza, niña. Los más sútiles dijeron te veo muy cambiada y los que todavía lo fueron más me volvieron la cara y no me saludaron. (325)

3. Synopsis

Although it is a minor and fairly neglected one, we have heard that there *is* a production of literature in Spanish and its co-official languages, which attends to the relatively new questions of immigration on the Iberian Peninsula. I attempted to illustrate this by means of one example taken out of the Sub-Saharan and one of the North African context.

There are obviously Spanish authors who have put that into writing or reflected it in essays (authors without background of migration or with meandering migration trajectories such as Juan Goytisolo, who has published an essay volume together with Sami Nair on the condition of North African immigrants, *El peaje de la vida*).

Let's get back to Latin America as a post-colonial realm. Let's think about the time before the Boom of Latin American literature; back then, Europe was not aware of being eurocentric given that the term was only circulating among people like Franz Fanon and other exotics. At that time, almost half a century ago, the Mexican Carlos Fuentes introduced himself at the Parisian publisher Gallimard with the words: "Je suis un romancier mexicain", whereupon the assistant that welcomed him, chased up: "sans blague?" – seriously?

Before the Spanish Empire fought back, Europe overlooked the literary production and the cultural theories in and from Latin America. Nowadays, not only a richer literature, but also relevant contribution to the theoretical discussion on questions related to post-colonial aspects especially emerges in Latin America.

If the Spanish history of disregard towards *littératures mineures* repeats itself, also this time it is rather a tragedy than a farce. Or are we confronted with a single opinion, when the Spanish historian María Rosa Madariaga publishes an article on the question ¿Existe una élite hispanohablante en Marruecos?, where she states:

[...] no creemos que se pueda hablar propiamente de una literatura marroquí en castellano. [...] Sentimos que decirlo: no basta con poder expresarse con cierta soltura en castellano para creer que puede uno, así sin más, ponerse a escribirlo con igual desparpajo [...].

Se trata de un español aprendido 'en la calle', y no en la escuela de primaria. No hay razón para no exigirles lo mismo que se le exige a cualquier español que tenga vocación de escritor: rigor y calidad en el uso del idioma. (<http://www.marruecosdigital.net/existe-una-elite-hispanohablante-en-marruecos/>). 12.11.2012

I wonder, whether in light of the migrant's despair the eloquent discourse on an aesthetic 'before Schiller' does not turn out to be an empty appearance. Above all, however, the historian Madariaga seems to misunderstand Spain's historical situation as a former colonial power. Already ten years ago, Alfonso de Toro alluded to the fact that the application of the concept of post-colonialism to Latin America presupposed a paradigm shift. This also goes for Spain. But the paradigm shift is not at choice; one cannot opt for the option not to perform it without taking the risk to miss the connection to a tendency that seems to bridge the gap between the fields of Cultural Studies and the society that finances it. The 'writing-inbetween-worlds' (Ottmar Ette), the increasing emergence of 'literature without permanent residence' is more than a collateral

phenomenon of migration: at the same time, it is a historical obligation for all the colonial undertakings, whose disastrous consequences cannot be reduced to the genocide of the indigenous population of Latin America.

In light of the long defense of colonial undertakings by reactionary institutions such as the Catholic Church or the national self-dramatization by the *caudillos* Franco and Salazar, this element is also prominent in the post-dictatorial self-discovery.

The fact that literature – at times of globalization – can contribute to such processes of social consciousness-raising is a poignant one, but nonetheless also brings about some sense of optimism.

Bibliography

- Bouissef Rekab, Mohamed (2002). *El dédalo de Abdelkrim*. Granada: Port royal ediciones.
- Boujedra, Rachid (1975). *Topographie idéale pour un agression caractérisée*. Paris: Denoël.
- Cisneros, Sandra (1984). *The House on Mango Street*. Houston: Arte Público Press.
- El Gheryb, Mohamed / Morena, Pasqual (1994). *Dormir al raso*. Madrid: ediciones Vosa.
- El Hachmi, Najat (2008). *El último patriarca*. Barcelona: Editorial Planeta.
- El Hachmi, Najat (2010). *Jo també sóc catalana*. Barcelona: Labutxaca.
- Enoy, Leoncio Evita (1953). *Cuando los combes luchaban: novela de costumbres de la Guinea Española*. Madrid: IDEA (CSIC).
- Galarza, Sergio (2009). *Paseador de perros*. Barcelona: Candaya.
- Hamed Beyuki, Abdel (2000). *La transición en Marruecos*. Madrid: ediciones Vosa.
- Kunz, Marco et al (2002). *La inmigración en la literatura española contemporánea*. Madrid: verbum.
- Laopinion.es: “Ndongo presenta ‘El Metro’, el relato sobre la emigración”, http://www.laopinion.es/secciones/noticia.jsp?pRef=2964_8_115511_Cultura-y-comunicación-Ndongo-presenta-Metro-relato-sobre-emigración
- Laurel, Tomás Ávila (1999). *La carga*. Valencia: Editorial Palmart.
- Laurel, Tomás Ávila (2009). *Arde el monte de noche*. Madrid: Calambur Editorial.
- Madariaga, María Rosa: “¿Existe una élite hispanohablante en Marruecos?”. <http://www.marruecosdigital.net/existe-una-elite-hispanohablante-en-marruecos>
- Nair, Sami (2000). *El peaje de la vida*. Madrid: Aguilar.
- Ndongo-Bidyogo, Donato / de Castro, Mariano (1998). *España en Guinea. Construcción del desencuentro [1778-1968]*, Toledo: Ed. Sequitur.
- Ndongo-Bidyogo, Donato (1987). *Las tinieblas de tu memoria negra*. Madrid: Editorial Fundamentos.
- Ndongo-Bidyogo, Donato (1997). *Los poderes de la tempestad*. Madrid: Cyan.
- Ndongo-Bidyogo, Donato (2007). *El metro*. Barcelona: El Cobre Ediciones.
- Nkogo Esono, Maximiliano (2006). *Nambula*. Madrid: Morandi.

- Rekab Bouissef, Mohamed: “Hispanistas que cierran el siglo XX y abren el nuevo milenio” http://cvc.cervantes.es/lengua/anuario/anuario_05/bouissef/p05.htm*
- Rodoreda, Mercè (1965). *La Plaza del Diamante*. Barcelona: Edhasa.
- Rodoreda, Mercè (1978). *Espejo roto*. Barcelona: Seix Barral.
- Valle, Marco (2003). *Los árboles de la muerte. Crónica de un inmigrante sin papeles*. Oviedo: Asociación Cambalache.

* Kindly take into account the considerable lapse of time between writing and publishing this article as it might affect the accessibility of the links mentioned.

Cornelia Sieber

Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz

**THE ‘MIGRANT AS A METAPHOR’
AND STRATEGIES OF ‘WRITING BACK’ IN SPANISH REPRESENTATION OF MIGRATION**

For centuries, Spain could not be considered to be a country of immigration. Although profound processes of cultural change and exchange had been taking place throughout its history stemming from the presence of Romans, Visigoths and Moors, the Iberian State has, since the 15th century, been more known for its strategy of resolving inner social problems by stimulating or forcing emigration instead of searching for ways of negotiating social conflicts within its borders, and less for trying to cohabitate with immigrants or outside cultures on its ground. During the 15th and 16th centuries, the adventurers, rebels and second sons, the excluded of the feudal system, found new territories in the Canary Islands and in the New World, in turn avoiding a strong pressure to change the medieval social structures. Simultaneously, minority groups like the Jews and Moors were expelled in favour of social stability and homogeneity of the Catholic society. Even in the 20th century, there took place massive emigration of the defeated political opponents of Franco as well as work-related migration to Latin America (820.000 people from the 1950s to the 1970s) and to Western Europe (650.000 people in the 1960s; see migration-info)

Only in the mid-eighties, when Spain joined the European Union, the situation started to change. Many of the emigrants came back, and the economic growth started to attract even people from other countries. At the end of the millennium, Spain already hosted about 700.000 immigrants, and in 2007, there were five million people from abroad living in the country, one million of them without legalization (see focus-migration).

Being such a recent dynamic of just the last two decades, structures of integration and the cultural capabilities caused by a new heterogeneity are just now emerging and are currently in the process of forming and developing. And the arts play an important role in this process when sketching ‘possible worlds’ in response to this new situation.

There is a remarkable number of Spanish essays, stories, novels, films and songs that address these new dynamics. Some of them, in referencing recent immigration, echo explicitly, or touch on implicitly, a reflection of the nation’s history of sending away its undesired sons, and we find strategies of a re-writing, or a ‘writing back’ of these historical exclusions, through the ‘migrant metaphor’. In this sense, I would like to use here the two famous terms coined by Salman Rushdie, the ‘migrant (as) metaphor’ and ‘writing back’.

The notion of ‘writing back’ became famous after Rushdie developed it in an interview with the *Times* in London in July 1982, stating that “the empire writes back with a vengeance” (Rushdie 1982: 8).

In his essay book *Imaginary Homelands*, Rushdie explains the concept, describing it as the appropriation of the colonizer's language, territory, techniques and cultural symbols, and he concludes using the example of the English language:

What seems to me to be happening is that those peoples who were once colonized by the language are now rapidly remaking it, domesticating it, becoming more and more relaxed about the way they use it [...]. The children of independent India seem not to think of English as being irredeemably tainted by its colonial provenance. They use it as an Indian language, as one of the tools they have to hand. (Rushdie 1991: 64)

Also, in *Imaginary Homelands*, particularly in his magnificent essay on Günter Grass, Rushdie brings to light his idea of the 'migrant (as a) metaphor'. Arguing that even cultural agents who seem to conduct their lives within the context of their mother tongue and their nation, are forced to deal with radical shifts and alterations due to political, ideological and historical changes, he describes how Grass had to take part in the recreation of his language after it had been discredited and destroyed by fascist rhetoric of the Hitler regime, and he classifies Grass as a migrant in his own language. On this basis, Rushdie expands his ideas:

[...] the migrant is, perhaps, the central or defining figure of the twentieth century. [...] And this is what makes migrants such important figures: because roots, language and social norms have been three of the most important parts of the definition of what it is to be a human being. The migrant, denied all three, is obligated to find new ways of describing himself, new ways of being human. [...] migration also offers us one of the richest metaphors of our age. The very word metaphor, with its roots in the Greek words for bearing across, describes a sort of migration, the migration of ideas into images. Migrants – borne-across humans – are metaphorical beings in their very essence; and migration, seen as a metaphor, is everywhere around us. We all cross frontiers; in that sense, we are all migrant peoples. (277-79)

On this basis, I would like to point out to three examples in which we can find an implicit or explicit conjunction between reflecting the new immigration situation to Spain and the historical emigration from Spain, whether due to political reasons, the dream or the pressure to escape strangling socio-cultural structures or economic causes.

1. Manu Chao: "Clandestino" (1998)

Firstly, I would like to use the song "Clandestino" by Manu Chao as an example of denouncing the Western gesture of declaring African and Latin American people coming to Northern metropolises to find work as 'illegals'. "Clandestino" was the title song of Manu Chao's first solo album released in 1998.

The lyrics are in Spanish, the language of José Manuel Chao's parents who departed into exile in Paris as opponents of the Franco regime. The artist was born in 1961 in France and, of course, educated in French. Therefore, singing in Spanish could be seen as an act of re-appropriation of his parent's language. In particular, the expression in the chorus "*Me dicen el clandestino / Por no llevar papel*", "They call me the clandestine / For not bringing paper with me", could be understood as a sly act of

vengeance through writing back. *Los papeles*, papers, would be the usual term for “documents”. The use of the word in the singular form could be an allusion to the French *papiers*, which is also used in plural to mean documents. In the French pronunciation, the difference between singular and plural cannot be heard, whereas using the singular *papel* in Spanish leads to other connotations. In combination with the indefinite article, one would probably think of a sheet of paper (*¿Tienes un papel? ¿o un papelito?*), and without any article, one might even think of toilet paper, *papel higiénico*. “No hay papel”, is an expression I know well from Spanish public toilets. Consequently, we may take the use of *papel* as an implied French influence on the Spanish lyric to stage the artist’s own migration background, and simultaneously as an exposure and a harsh mockery of the inhuman legal situation of distinguishing between people with and without papers.

2. Carmen Jiménez: *Madre mía, que estás en los infiernos* (2008)

The second example, the novel *Madre mía, que estás en los infiernos* (Mother of Mine Who art in Hell, 2008) by the Andalusian writer Carmen Jiménez, takes the migrant as a metaphor in order to show the potential of socio-cultural change that people can gain by first becoming borne across geographical borders and then finding the strength to overcome hindering moral orders within their own society.

In 2007, the novel won the “Café Gijón” Prize. The protagonist, Adela, is a woman from the Dominican Republic who comes to Spain without documents. Adela has left her three children behind. Some of her family members are already living in Madrid, for example her cousins, who are working there as domestic servants. During the first days in Spain, they hide her in their tiny rooms in the houses of their employers and try to find her domestic work, but Adela refuses, claiming that she wouldn’t waste her education by now cleaning other people’s houses. She still rebels when her cousins try to explain the situation:

–Escuchen: en mi casa de Coa he dejado a tres chicas de servicio al cuidado de mis hijos. [...] Yo no voy a trabajar de interna.

–¡Ah, la niña creída! Escucha tú, Flaca. No tienes papeles, así que nadie te dará empleo de otra cosa –argumentó Leo.

–Olvídate, muchacha. Si no eres española no te contratarán en ninguna oficina ni despacho –la apoyó su hermana. Aquello parecía una conspiración.

–Además, trabajando como interna tendrás una habitación –añadió Leo.

–Alquilaré un apartamento –repliqué obstinada. Leo rió como si yo hubiera dicho la cosa más disparatada del mundo.

–Óyeme bien: aunque tengas trabajo, nadie te lo alquilará. No alquilan a la gente como nosotras. Sólo a españoles.

–Y en el servicio doméstico no se cobra mal: unas sesenta mil pesetas al mes. ¿Cómo, si no, mandarás dinero a tus hijos? –apostilló mi prima.

–Intentaré conseguir otro empleo. (Jiménez 2008: 28)

–Listen: in my house in Coa I have left three housekeepers to care for my children. [...] I won’t take a job as a domestic worker.

- Ay, fancied girl! You should listen, slight one! You don't have papers, so nobody will give you another job –Leo argued.
- Forget it, girl. If you are not Spanish, they won't contract you in any office or agency – her sister supported her. This seemed like a conspiracy.
- Besides, as a domestic worker you'll have a room.
- I'll rent an apartment –I persisted. Leo laughed as if I would have told the biggest flap-doodle.
- Read my lips: even if you would have work, nobody would rent anything to you. They don't rent to people like us. Just to Spaniards.
- And you don't gain badly: some 60.000 pesetas monthly. How will you, otherwise, send money to your children? –my cousin assisted.
- I'll try to find another employment. (may translation)

This scene is meant to give the reader a notion of the extreme dependencies of illegal domestic workers on what their employers think is best; it is a condition without rights, with long working hours and few days off. On top of that, the women are not only condemned to be invisible in public, but also at home. They are pressed into servants' uniforms and asked to refrain from expressing their individuality. Their employers don't want to be bothered with their personal stories, and the female employers in particular don't want any risk for their husbands' peace of mind. When Adela is discovered by the employer of her cousin, she is sent off right away with the hysteric cry: “Joder... ¡Tenemos una modelo en casa!” (26), “Shit, we have a model in the house!”

Consequently, Spain does not seem to be the right place for Adela and in addition to feeling sorry for her, the reader also wonders what she might have thought Spain would be like. She seems to confirm the prejudices of the easygoing Latino attitude towards life without planning and thinking too much. Furthermore, why did she leave her children to the care of her housekeepers, if obviously not because of the only commonly accepted reason that she couldn't provide for them in any other way than by working in Spain?

The answer is revealed by some flashbacks in which Adela remembers when she filed for divorce from her husband because he betrayed her with other women. However, her husband, a decorated general, did not accept that anyone, much less a woman, his own wife, was revolting against his authority, and from that time he abused her with moral pressure, physical violence, violation and even threats to kill her. Adela therefore did not plan to move to Spain for the usual reasons of employment, but was fleeing from home, and Spain became a place where she can insist on her right to divorce and benefit from gender equality of the contemporary Spanish State. As her husband follows her, Adela reports him for domestic violence and the Spanish police restrain him from doing more harm to her.

When Adela tries to let her children come, she faces further difficulties. Her mother, who had pushed her into marriage with the wealthy general, has meanwhile dismissed Adela's housekeepers and taken over her grandsons to use them as hostages for her own agenda. The first thing she does when she speaks with Adela on the telephone is remind her about the high costs of child care:

- No se preocupe. Le enviaré dinero pronto. ¿Fue Rubén al dentista? Tienen que ajustarle los *brackets*, si no, se le dañarán los dientes...
- M'hija*, apenas te oigo...

- Mamá –dije alzando la voz. El hombre que atendía el locutorio me miró con reproche - Póngame con Rubén. Alguien cerró la puerta de mi cabina.
 –Lo siento, pero no se oye.
 –Mami. Pásele el teléfono a Rubén.
 –No te oigo, Flaca. Manda dinero pronto. Cuídate. Besos a las sobrinas... (31)

In English, the conversation goes like this:

- Don't worry. I'll send you money soon. Did Rubén go to the dentist? They have to adjust his brackets, otherwise he will get toothache...
 –My daughter, I hardly hear you...
 –Mom –I raised my voice. The man who attended the call centre looked at me with reproach. Somebody closed the door of my cabin.
 –I'm sorry, but I can't hear you.
 –Mommy, pass me to Rubén.
 –I can't hear you, slight one. Send money soon. Take care. Hugs for the nieces... .

We find out that Adela's problems basically stem from a very controlling cultural mentality back home, where men are used to be the undisputable authority whereas women are used to get the best for themselves out of their daughters and daughters-in-law by various forms of manipulation. According to Jiménez, the general theme of her novel "is planting the necessity of rebelling against biblical, social and cultural orders that tell you that you have to honour your parents and to respect your husband" by all means (2008a, my translation).

After countering her husband, Adela returns home to her mother, who has fallen ill and dies shortly afterwards. Nevertheless, the next manipulative move Adela faces cannot come quickly enough: At the funeral service, a neighbour falls into trance claiming that the spirit of the deceased mother has entered her body and speaks through her. She accuses Adela of having been a bad daughter and says she would curse her eternally if she did not take care of her partner, the old Cuchito. This time Adela does not try to escape the new psychological violence, but takes revenge by casting a curse herself:

Yo, Adela Guzmán, la maldigo aquí y ahora, junto a su tumba, por cantarme estúpidas canciones de gallos blancos después de que Pinuco abusara de mí; [...] por echarme en brazos del general Reinaldo Unzueta, que maldito sea mil veces; por sus palizas y las palizas que permitió que Cuchito propinara a mis hijos; por no pagar su colegio durante mi ausencia; por quedarse con mi dinero; por su mezquindad... Por todo eso y mucho más; yo la maldigo, madre. (253)

I, Adela Guzmán, damn you here and now at your grave for singing me stupid songs after Pinuco had abused me; [...] for pushing me into the arms of the general Reinaldo Unzueta, who should be damned a thousand times; for your punches and the punches that you allowed Cuchito to give to my children; for not paying their school fee when I wasn't here; for pocketing my money; for your abuse... For all this and much more; I damn you, mother.

Jiménez' story sets to make the reader see that migration, especially the migration of women – and statistics say that in many cases, it's mostly women who emigrate from

Latin America – does not exclusively exist due to overwhelming economic reasons. It can also be an attempt to escape traditional socio-cultural structures that expect women in particular to submit themselves to the orders of their parents, brothers and husbands.

Showing that Jiménez' protagonist Adela finds the strength to challenge those structures after her migration experience, after being borne across the geographical borders, also raises the implicit question about how Spain could rethink its sons and daughters who after emigrating returned home. There has been little reflection about how they might have helped to overcome the paralyzing socio-cultural structures.

Excursus – Juan Valera: *La venganza de Atahualpa* (1878)

One examination can be observed in the film *Poniente*, on which I will later focus. A very rare and interesting historical example can be found in the play *La venganza de Atahualpa* (*The vengeance of Atahualpa*) by Juan Valera, published at the end of the 19th century, in 1878. Sabine Fritz analyses this drama, which was written by Valera without the intention of bringing it to the stage, as a play that “criticises for the first time the unjust behaviour of the conquerors [of Peru] and presents a final in which heaven punishes the conquerors and not the supposed tyrant Atahualpa” (Fritz 2009: 249, my translation).

This interpretation, which frees the last king of the Inca Empire from his traditionally negative image, also represents – and this is something I find just as remarkable – a negative perspective of the repatriates, the men who came back home ten years after the taking of Peru. As Fritz puts it:

Presentan ejemplos típicos de los hombres marginados de la sociedad que dejaron España para buscar en el ‘Nuevo Mundo’ lo que el viejo les negó. (Fritz 2009: 246)

They present typical examples of the men who were marginalized by the society and who left Spain to search in the ‘New World’ what the old world refused them.

The protagonist Cuéllar is already expected with unease by his fiancée Laura who is newly engaged, this time to the nobleman Don Fernando. Laura therefore has a personal reason to avoid a meeting with Cuéllar since she broke her promise to him. She even turns to the priest claiming that she would rather go to the monastery than to face Cuéllar. She says:

Además, padre, ¿quién fía en juramentos ni en promesas de éstos que vuelven de Indias? A vezados a tratar con gentiles, a prometer y no cumplir, tal vez se figuren que también somos indios y no cristianos, y no cumplan lo que prometen. Prometido tuvo la libertad Atahualpa, comprándolo con casi todo el oro que poseía; entregó el oro, y, en vez de cumplirle la promesa, le guardaron cautivo y le dieron afrentosa muerte.” (792f., quoted in Fritz 2009: 247)

Besides, father, who would trust in vows or promises of those who come back from the Indies? Since they got used to treat with pagans, to promise and not to accomplish, maybe they figure out that we are also Indians and not Christians, and do not accomplish what they have promised. Promised was freedom to Atahualpa, bought with almost all of the

gold he possessed; he delivered the gold and instead of accomplishing the promise, they kept him captive and killed him in a most humiliating way.

When Cuéllar challenges Don Fernando to a duel, he even insults the priest who wants to hold him back, and Don Fernando kills Cuéllar with the words:

Yo no peleo por venganza, sino por necesidad, por seguridad y por justicia. Vénguese de ti, por mi mano, los indios del Perú y el inca Atahualpa. (828-829, quoted in Fritz 2009: 247)

I do not fight for revenge, but for necessity, for security and for justice. The Indians of Peru and the Inca Atahualpa are taking revenge through my hand.

First and foremost, it is a noble gesture of Valera to restore an honourable image of the Peruvian people and their last Inca king after 350 years of denigration, but at the same time, the play expresses deep disdain and denial of the repatriates. It seems that they are seen as a challenge to the structures, hierarchies and norms of the society. After once having been borne across the territory of the native rules and norms, the repatriates are considered a dormant danger because they could question the given “natural” and unchangeable order, namely that everything at home was without problems. In this sense, the homecoming is seen as a second act of rebellion after going away and leaving the sphere of influence of the domestic rules and norms. As Laura and Don Fernando put it, the home-comers are no longer regarded as trustworthy and have to be fought against out of necessity, security and justice.

Nevertheless, this suspiciousness of the repatriates is more likely a by-product in Valera’s play from 1878. At that time, the aim to give a more accurate image of the historic Inca king was also an attempt to improve the relations to the Latin American countries that had achieved their independence from Spain. It was perhaps easier for the Spanish audience to accept this new positive image of Atahualpa by retaining the consented dislike against the repatriates.

3. Chus Gutiérrez: *Poniente* (2002)

What is more implicitly shown in the play *The vengeance of Atahualpa* from the 19th century is finally dramatized as the central theme in the movie *Poniente* from the beginning of the 21st century. Here, the story of rejecting the repatriates is interwoven with the aversion towards the new phenomenon of illegal work immigration. The director Chus Gutiérrez situates her film in Almería, an Andalusian town known for its large fruit and vegetable production in greenhouses that started to cover the Spanish south like a sea of plastics. One motive for the plot exposed in the movie is the reference to the racist riots in El Ejido, a small town in the Almería region, in February of 2000. In the course of these riots, the local population attacked Moroccan immigrant workers and destroyed their dwellings for days without being held back by the police.

The protagonists of *Poniente* are Lucía (Cuca Escribano), a single mother who had moved to Madrid after the tragic death of her first daughter and her husband’s running off to America, and Curro (José Coronado), a son of Almería labour

emigrants who never felt at home in Switzerland and returned to the land of his fathers. ‘Curro’ resembles the term for ‘hard work’ used regionally in Latin America, so that ‘hard worker’ might be more of a nickname, and we do not get to know the character’s real name. Lucía, Curro and the illegal immigrants who came to work in the greenhouses are treated with rejection by the local population. The locals claim their exclusive right to love and to own the Almerían soil. They refuse to accept different ways of life and feel offended by Lucía, who starts to run her inherited greenhouse in an unconventional way. She treats the illegal farm workers in a more collegial manner. Curro, who is working as accountant in the greenhouses of her cousin Miguel, falls in love with her and thinks about working for her. Overall, the film emphasizes the love and feeling of belonging to the soil of the region and its landscape. Of course, Lucía’s cousin Miguel (Antonio Dechent) and the local population have always loved their native soil, but we learn that it is the grand affection towards the same land that made Lucía and Curro come home and that this feeling also arises in the immigrants. In one central scene, Curro and the Berber immigrant Adbembi (Farid Fatmi) are sitting at the seashore where they are dreaming of opening a beach bar which they would call *Poniente* (00:47f.). ‘*Poniente*’ resonates the Arabic term for the ‘West’, echoing the historical times of the Middle Ages, when the Iberian Peninsula formed the Western part of the grand Islamic empires. At the same time, ‘poniente’ and ‘levante’ have become the Spanish terms of the two winds that determine the climate at the Mediterranean coast.

The people in the Southern Andalusian region use to comment in their daily conversations about whether the wind is ‘poniente’ or ‘levante’, to a point that it is almost part of their common greeting. In their dream of a *Poniente*-bar that will be open to everybody, Curro and Adbembi are thus at the same time reminding the Almeríans of the Moorish part of their own history and inscribing themselves into the local common language and the landscape that informs it. Even in the final scene of rioting locals who batter and burn down the dwellings of the immigrants, we find this strong affective inscription into the local discourse by those that the locals would like to keep away. In that final scene, Lucía pleads to Curro, who was almost beaten to death, to count the waves of the sea in order not to lose consciousness. This cry is also determined by the surrounding landscape, for Lucía could not have asked him to count the waves of the sea in order to stay alive in her Madrid or in his Switzerland. At the same time, while affectively trying to appropriate or re-appropriate the land, the repatriates are bringing in memories that were torn out of the local discourse. Lucía brings back the memory of her drowned daughter, and Curro and Adbembi are remembering, while sitting on the beach and dreaming about their bar, that they, too, have roots in this territory, returning to mind that each of them has ancestors that came from here:

Curro: Tienes suerte de tener raíces.

Adbembi: Tus raíces son mis raíces. Nuestros ancestros fueron los mismos. España fue un país berebere durante muchos siglos. (00:47)

Curro: You are lucky to have roots.

Adbembi: Your roots are my roots. Our ancestors were the same. Spain was a Berber land for many centuries. ()

Adbembi is referring to the Arab epoch of Al-Andaluz between the 8th and 15th centuries, remembering that it was not only a time of more or less peaceful coexistence of Christian, Jewish and Moslem civilizations, but also with other cultures like the Northern African Berber culture.

This period found its end with the Christian Reconquering and the Catholic homogenization that has shaped the Spanish national identity as a Christian nation to a great extent.

In their dream, Adbembi and Curro are re-appropriating in a different, non-exclusive way, with their *Poniente*-bar that would welcome everybody – natives, immigrants, repatriates and tourists – a territory where they *too* both have roots, to which they feel related and that they would like to share in a new way.

The movie offers this new concept of an open society without exclusion due to origin – as a dream – on the one hand, and points out the consequences of blocking and closure on the other. It echoes the historic events of the Christian Reconquering and the expulsion of the non-Christian population at the end of the 15th century by showing the opposition of the locals to the re-appropriation of the land by people with other cultural backgrounds at the beginning of the 21st century and by staging the destructive consequences of this jealousy. We find Lucía's cousin Miguel willing to chase Lucía away; he burns down her greenhouse and blames the illegal immigrants, who had started a strike for better wages, of having committed the burning. By burning down Lucía's greenhouse, not only does he kill his own son who was hiding from him in it, he also sets off frenetic violence from the locals against everybody and everything that differs from their traditional way of life.

This is manifested in their cry “moors out”. The riot leaves everybody in grief and the land wasted. The immigrants, far from being all “moors”, leave the country. Adbembi is shown leaving the Andalusian region with a melancholic look back that echoes the descriptions of the last Arab king of Granada when he was forced, in 1492, to leave his land as it is narrated, for example, by Antonio Gala in *The Crimson manuscript* (1990) and by Salman Rushdie in *The Moor's Last Sigh* (1995). In Rushdie's description of the leaving of the defeated king Boabdil we read: “He departed into exile [...] bringing to a close the centuries of Moorish Spain; and reining in his horse upon the Hill of Tears he turned to look for one last time upon his loss, upon the palace and the fertile plains and all the concluded glory of al-Andalus... at which sight the Sultan sighed [...]” (Rushdie 1995: 80).

The song at the end of the film that follows the scene of the immigrants' departure and Adbembi's melancholic look back expresses this same sadness, and at the same time, it implies that the loss of the sense of belonging to one territory might open up a chance for a broader sense of belonging:

No tengo ni patria ni equipaje / soy de ningún lado como el sol / echo mis raíces en el aire
/ y cada estrella es mi nación. (1:25)

I neither have a fatherland nor do I have luggage / I am from nowhere like the sun / I
strike my roots in the air / every star is my nation.

Also, if we look at it closely, this song does not only relate to the leaving immigrants but also to the ones who stay. In the wasted land it is not only Lucía and Curro who are lacking stable roots now, but also Miguel and the native population, at least in Sulman Rushdie's conception of the migrant as metaphor. In his essay on Günter Grass, he claims that a profound disruption of the socio-cultural norms and beliefs within a territory can also lead to the experience of migration, because, after ruin and desolation, there no longer exists any tradition from which one can derive his or her identity. The film's sad ending can therefore still be seen as a 'writing back'. The claim of the repatriates and immigrants to stay and to re-appropriate their ancestors' soil in a different way had driven the local population into xenophobic ferocity and into the self-discrediting of their roots, language and social norms. By their violent reaction they revealed that those roots and social norms they claimed as their tradition carried a long historic trace of violence and racist exclusion. The language had been spoiled by slogans such as "Moors out". So, in Rushdie's concept, the natives whose roots, language and social norms are discredited in this way will be obligated, like the migrants, to find new ways of describing themselves and new ways of being human.

Thus, in the analyzed examples, the migrants and the repatriates are shown to be a challenge to traditional, exclusive, hierarchical and/or simply unjust socio-cultural structures. Those who have the experience of 'borne-across humans', as Rushdie terms the migrants, those who cannot define themselves within a given set of characteristics such as stable roots, socio-cultural norms and language, question by their presence, different memory and way of life, the idea of naturalness and irreversibility of the local traditions and structures – and urge for a more dynamic and open form of society for the 21st century.

Bibliography

- Chao, Manu (1998). *Clandestino*. ARK 21 Records. Español en los siglos XVIII y XIX", in: Wilfried Floeck / Sabine Fritz (eds.). *La representación de la Conquista en el teatro español desde la Ilustración hasta finales del franquismo*. Hildesheim: Olms, pp. 229-252.
- Focus Migration *Spanien* http://www.focus-migration.de/Spanien_Update_08_2.54_20.0.html (online 15.03.2016).
- Fritz, Sabine (2009). "La justificación de la muerte del Inca Atahualpa en el teatro. Goytisolo, Juan /Sami Naïr ([2000] 2001). *El peaje de la vida*. Madrid: Aguilar.
- Gutiérrez, Chus (2001). *Poniente*. Olmo Films.
- Jiménez, Carmen (2008). *Madre mía, que estás en los infiernos*. Madrid: Siruela.
- Jiménez, Carmen (2008a). Entrevista 29.1.2008, in: <http://www.esmadrid.com/es/cargarAplicacionVideo.do?texto=carmen&identificador=14861> (online 15.03.2016).
- Migration-info (2006). *Länderprofil: Spanien*. <http://www.migration-info.de/artikel/2003-12-18/laenderprofil-spanien> (online 15.03.2016).
- Rushdie, Salman (1982). "The Empire writes back with a vengeance", in: *The Times*, 3.7.1982: 8.
- Rushdie, Salman (1991). *Imaginary Homelands*. New York: Viking.
- Rushdie, Salman (1995). *The Moor's Last Sigh*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Valera, Juan ([1878] 1995). *La venganza de Atahualpa*, in: Margarita Almela (ed.). *Juan Valera. Obras completas I. Cuentos, narraciones inacabadas, traducciones, teatro*. Madrid: Turner, pp. 769-829.

Jochen Mecke

University Regensburg

THE AGONAL PRINCIPLE: AESTHETICS OF INTRA- AND INTERMEDIALITY

1. The Janus Face Of Modernity: Pure And Impure Aesthetics?

From the viewpoint of intermediality, there are two tendencies of intermedial aesthetics in modern art and literature which seem to be diametrically opposed to each other.

1.1 The purity of intramedial aesthetics of modernity

The first tendency was described by Clement Greenberg in his well-known essay “Towards a Newer Laocoon”, written in 1940. Greenberg states: “Purity in art consists in the acceptance willing acceptance, of the limitations of the medium of the specific art.” (Greenberg 2000: 68). Even though Greenberg considered this kind of purity by the media rather a surrender than an aesthetical performance (Greenberg 2000: 68), he took into account the reference of an art to its own medial and material conditions as a possible source of aesthetic innovation¹. The most striking example for this tendency is, perhaps, the modern revolution of painting that deliberately renounces figuration in order to reduce the picture to a composition which consists principally of colours and forms and, thus, instead of hiding the revolution exposes its own raw material².

And, indeed, at nearly the same time as painting discovers abstraction poetry renounces signification and sense and exposes its very materiality, in Dada’s famous “negro” and “bruitistic” poems, as we can observe in the following poem by Hugo Ball:

ombula
take

1 In fact, for Greenberg, this willing acceptance corresponds to a “progressive surrender to the resistance of its medium.” (Greenberg 2000: 68).

2 Wassili Kandinsky tells of his discovery of abstract painting in a well-known anecdote: When he came back home to his atelier in the evening, he saw a figural painting that he had made in a special sunlight so that the objects disappeared, leaving a painting that consisted of a mere play of colours and forms:

“Schon in München wurde ich einmal durch einen unerwarteten Anblick in meinem Atelier bezaubert. Es war die Stunde der Dämmerung. Ich kam mit meinem Malkasten nach einer Studie heim, noch verträumt und in die erledigte Arbeit vertieft, als ich plötzlich ein unbeschreiblich schönes, von einem inneren Glühen durchränktes Bild sah. Ich stutzte erst, dann ging ich schnell auf dieses rätselhafte Bild zu, auf dem ich nichts als Formen und Farben sah und das inhaltlich unverständlich war. Ich fand sofort den Schlüssel zu dem Rätsel: es war ein von mir gemaltes Bild, das an die Wand gelehnt auf der Seite stand. Ich versuchte den nächsten Tag bei Tageslicht den gestrigen Eindruck von diesem Bild zu bekommen. Es gelang mir aber nur halb: auch auf der Seite erkannte ich fortwährend Gegenstände und die feine Lasur der Dämmerung fehlte. Ich wußte jetzt genau, daß der Gegenstand meinen Bildern schadet.” (Kandinsky 1913/1980: 38)

bitdli
 solunkola
 tabla tokta tokta takabla
 taka tak
 Babula m'balam
 tak tru – ü
 wo – um
 biba bimbél
 o kla o auwa
 kla o auwa
 la – auma
 o kla o ü
 la o auma
 klinga – o – e – auwa
 ome o-auwa
 klinga inga M ao – Auwa
 omba dij omuff pomo – auwa
 tru-ü
 tro-u-ü o-a-o-ü
 mo-auwa
 gomun guma zangaga gago blagaga
 szagaglugi m ba-o-auma
 szaga szago
 szaga la m'blama
 bschigi bschigo
 bschigi bschigi
 bschiggo bschiggo
 goggo goggo
 ogoggo
 a-o –auma
 (Ball 1993: 69).

We encounter the same principle of aesthetical reduction of literature to its material and medial basis in other currents of modern poetry such as in the style of surrealist automatic writing. Thus, the following lines, written in automatic writing and taken from André Breton's and Philippe Soupault's 'Les Champs magnétiques' are no longer exclusively determined by the expression of sense³:

Prisonniers des gouttes d'eau, nous ne sommes que des animaux perpétuels. Nous courons dans les villes sans bruits et les affiches enchantées ne nous touchent plus. À quoi bon ces grands enthousiasmes fragiles, ces sauts de joie desséchés ? Nous ne savons plus rien que les astres morts ; nous regardons les visages ; et nous soupirons de plaisirs. Notre bouche est plus sèche que les pages perdues ; nos yeux tournent sans but, sans espoir. Il n'y a plus que ces cafés où nous nous réunissons pour boire ces boissons fraîches, ces alcools délayés et les tables sont plus poisseuses que ces trottoirs où sont tombées nos ombres

3 Evidently, the passage cited above neither consists of pure non-sense either. In reality, the non-intentional and unexpected combination of words is not pure sound, but an unusual combination of significations, which contains new semantic possibilities and new meanings. It is only due to the success of surrealist auto-interpretations and their loyal acceptance of the surrealist vulgate by literary criticism – with the notable exception of Michael Riffaterre's work on surrealist metaphor (1983: 202-220) – that these new possibilities were eclipsed for a very long time.

mortes de la veille. Quelquefois, le vent nous entoure de ses grandes mains froides et nous attache aux arbres découpés par le soleil. Tous, nous rions, nous chantons, mais personne ne sent plus son cœur battre. La fièvre nous abandonne. Les gares merveilleuses ne nous abritent plus jamais : les longs couloirs nous effraient. Il faut donc étouffer encore pour vivre ces minutes plates, ces siècles en lambeaux. Nous aimions autrefois les soleils de fin d'année, les plaines étroites où nos regards coulaient comme ces fleuves impétueux de notre enfance. Il n'y a plus que des reflets dans ces bois repeuplés d'animaux absurdes, de plantes connues.

(Soupault/Breton, « La glace sans tain », 1971: 27).

In French poésie sonore or poésie littérale, this principle goes even further, because words are subordinated to the production of acoustic effects. Consequently, literature seems to record sounds that obviously do not make sense. This demonstrates a sequence from Bernard Heidsieck's acoustic poem "Vaduz":

autour de Vaduz	il y a des Suisses
autour de Vaduz	il y a des Autrichiens
	autour de Vaduz il y a des Allemands
	il y a autour de Vaduz des Tyroliens
	il y a des Saxons
il y a autour de Vaduz des Bavaoises	
il y a autour de Vaduz des Silésiens	des Tchèques
il y a autour de Vaduz des Slovaques	
il y a autour de Vaduz des Magyars	il y a des Slovènes
	il y a des Ligures
	des Vénitiens
	des Italiens

(Bernard Heidsieck. *Vaduz* 2007: 19)⁴

In all these cases the materiality of the signifier becomes dominant. We experience the presence of the "revolution of poetic language" (Kristeva 1974), which reverses the hierarchy of sense and sound, signified and signifier, information and noise. Instead of sensations, sentiments, landscapes or ideas, poetry begins to expose its own material ground, its own medial basis. We can even find this principle of intramedial aesthetics applied at work in the modern novel. Claude Simon, for example, uses the ambiguity of the material signifier in order to give his story a new direction:

[...] je me rappelle ces prés où ils nous avaient mis ou plutôt marqués ou stockés : nous gissions couchés par rangées successives les têtes touchant les pieds comme ces soldats de plombs rangés dans un carton [...] J'avais lu que les naufragés les ermites se nourrissaient de racines de gland et à un moment elle le prit d'abord entre ses lèvres puis tout entier dans sa bouche comme un enfant goulu c'était comme si nous nous buvions l'un l'autre [...]. (Simon 1960: 244f.)

In the cited paragraph, Claude Simon goes from one epoch to another, from a scene of war to a scene of love, by using the polysemy of the word "gland" with the objective

4 Jean-Pierre Bobillot has analyzed the literal poetry as a poetic principle that connects the early modernity of Arthur Rimbaud with the late modernity or post-modernity of a Bernard Heidsieck (Bobillot 2003).

to develop a new line of the story. Consequently, instead of being written according to pre-existing types of characters or story lines, the traditional conception of the story is deconstructed and a new story is composed by the materiality of a linguistic or novelistic signifier itself. In all these cases, literature and art refer to their own medial conditions, to their own mediality⁵. I suggest we reserve the term “intramediality” to this kind of reference of a work to its own medial and material basis⁶. However, we have seen that intramediality does not limit itself to the mere reference of the literary work to its own medial conditions, but corresponds to a powerful and productive aesthetical principle which uses the constraints of the medial and material basis as a source of literary innovation.

1.2 Intermedial aesthetics of modern literature

Furthermore, the example of Claude Simon’s novels, or the French New Novel in general, illustrate another side of modernity which seems to contrast sharply with the tendency outlined above. These current mixes deliberately different media, adopting elements, techniques and structures of one medium within another. Thus, Claude Simon, Alain Robbe-Grillet or Michel Butor literally apply the aesthetical program formulated by the narrator of Christopher Isherwoods “Good-bye to Berlin”: “I am a camera, with its shutter open, quite passive, not thinking” (Isherwood 1994: 7). The most striking example of the new “camera-eye”- or “montage”-techniques borrowed from cinema might be found in the early novels of Alain Robbe-Grillet, such as in *La Jalousie*, where the traditional narrator seems to be substituted by a camera:

Le boy fait son entrée par la porte ouverte de l’office, tenant à deux mains la soupière pleine de potage. Aussitôt qu’il l’a déposée, A... lui demande de déplacer la lampe qui est sur la table, dont la lumière trop crue — dit-elle — fait mal aux yeux. Le boy soulève l’anse de la lampe et va porter celle-ci à l’autre bout de la pièce, sur le meuble que A... lui indique de sa main gauche étendue.

La table se trouve ainsi plongée dans la pénombre. Sa principale source de lumière est devenue la lampe posée sur le buffet, car la seconde lampe — dans la direction opposée — est maintenant beaucoup plus lointaine (Robbe-Grillet 1958: 22).

For Clement Greenberg such an adoption of various medial techniques by one medium is tantamount to an abandonment of modern purity. In a second essay, written

5 For a more detailed analysis of Simon’s time techniques see Mecke (1990).

6 In other approaches, the term of intermediality means a quite different thing – the singular reference of film to a literary work, for example (cf. Rajewski 2002: 69ff.). Indeed, one could say that what we would normally categorize as “intertextuality” is, metonymically, also a case of intermediality. Nevertheless, the term seems to be unclear or even mistaken, because the medium does not play any role in this kind of relationship, at all. It stays in the background only, whereas in the examples cited above the medial dimension constitutes the focus of reception.

30 years after “Towards a new Laocoon”, this time on the aesthetics of the Sixties, he criticizes this tendency to be a confusion, randomness and decadence of modern aesthetics:

Everything conspires, it would seem, in the interests of confusion. The different mediums [!] are exploding: painting turns into sculpture, sculpture into architecture, engineering, theatre, environment, ‘participation’. (Greenberg 1968: 97f.)

Nevertheless, Greenberg’s judgement seems a little astonishing, because the intermedial strategies he criticizes are already characteristic of modernity itself; not only of its alleged decadence in the Sixties. Thus, at the same time as it reduces significations to signifiers, words to sounds and the form of poetry to the medium, the intramedial aesthetics of Dadaistic bruitism obviously situates itself in an intermedial context, because it transcends the realm of sense and signification and tries to record, like the new media of mechanical reproduction of reality as photography, gramophone and film, the “real” as something that does not necessarily make sense. Hereby, recalling its very own genuine medial possibilities, poetry paradoxically realizes the medial principle of another medium at the same time.

2. Towards a definition of medium, intra- and intermediality

2.1 The dialectics of medium and form

In order to clarify the notions of intra- and intermediality, it might therefore be helpful to remember the basic distinction between medium and form proposed by Niklas Luhmann. According to Luhmann, media are characterized by a loose connection of their elements, whereas forms possess a strong connection between their components (Luhmann 1985: 168). Accordingly, all the noises that can be heard in a determined space are loosely connected, because we can hardly name any rules that would control their combination. The human language, on the contrary, distinguishes itself from this background of loosely connected elements that constitute its medium, by a closer connection according to the rules of phonetics, semantics and grammar. Thus, the noises constitute the medium of the language as their form.

The advantage of this quite simple and somehow minimalistic definition is its capacity to explain why media are normally invisible. It is just because they consist only of weak and loose connections that are normally covered up by the more dense and strong connections between the elements of form. Generally, we don’t notice the noise anymore, when someone begins to speak, as we only hear the words and the message conveyed by them.

A further advantage of Luhmann’s definition is that it permits us to explain the dynamics of the media, because, according to Luhmann forms as such can become the medium of other forms. This is the case, for instance, when language, already itself a form, becomes the medium of poetry, a form which is already generated by some more specific semantic, syntactic, rhythmic and phonetic connections.

In the light of Luhmann's definitions, we can also understand the specific ambivalence of the term "medium" more precisely. It can, indeed, mean both, the material support, that is to say the medium in the stricter sense, and by metonymy, the semiotic system or the "form" that it conveys. Hence, the word "film" means the "medium" that consists of the loose connection between the different images recorded on celluloid as well as the "form", i.e. the semiotic system of film with its shots, camera perspectives and cutting principles. In order to clarify the difference, we can say that the "medium" corresponds to the material support of communication, whereas the "form" is constituted by the sign system it transports. Nevertheless, when we speak of media in the general sense of media of communication, we normally refer to both the medium and the form, the material substrate and the semiotic system that the former transports. And, very often, we use the notion even in a further sense, applying the term of medium to the context in which forms are produced and received, i.e. to the categories and institutions of medial communications. Thus, literature consists of a certain medium, the printed letters of the Gutenberg Galaxy, but also of certain categories of the literary system such, as for instance, authors, readers, texts and messages and institutions like libraries, bookshops and public lectures⁷.

2.2 The negativity of intramediality

Despite this more general notion of medium, the distinction of medium and form that we have developed above may help to clarify several aspects of intra- and intermediality. Thus, intramediality principally comprises all those techniques by which forms refer to, signify or simulate their own media. Nevertheless, the application of Luhmann's definition to intramediality poses a serious problem, because it is not clear how forms can simulate their own media, whereas the latter are normally invisible in the frame of their forms. Taking into account the definition given above, a look on the examples of modern intramediality makes us notice that forms evoke the existence of their media by the means of destruction of all kind of closer connections. Accordingly, the Dadaistic and Surrealistic violation and destruction of the stronger grammatical, morphosyntactic and phonetic connections (see above) foreground the loosely connected acoustic elements and make them appear in this negative way as the medium of language. In the same way, the deviant spatial dispositions of words in Guillaume Apollinaire's "Calligrammes" reveal the linear condition of writing:

7 This definition comes close to Friedrich Kittler's "Aufschreibesysteme" – a term lent to the madman Daniel Friedrich Schreiber – ("systems of writing": Kittler defines them as "technologies and institutions that allow a given culture to select, store, and process relevant data." (Kittler 1990: 369).

La Cravate et la montre

LA CRAVATE
 DOU
 LOU
 NEUSE
 QUE TU
 PORTES
 ET QUI T'
 ORNE O CI
 VILLAGE
 OTE- TU VEUX
 LA BIER
 SI BRESH
 REX

COMME L'ON
 S'AMUSE
 EN
 les
 heures

et le
 vers
 dantesque
 luisant et
 cadavérique

le bel
 inconnu

les Muses
 aux portes de
 ton corps

l'infini
 redressé
 par un fou
 de philosophe

semaine

Tircis

la
 beau
 Mon
 cœur
 té
 de
 la
 vie
 pas
 se
 l'enfant la
 dou
 leur
 de
 mou
 rir

la main

(Apollinaire 1965: 192)

The same procedure applies to modern painting, when it reduces the semiotic system of figurative representation with its codes of central perspectives and vanishing points to a mere combination of form and colour.

In all these cases, the medial strategy consists of destroying the “form” of a well-defined semiotic system with strong connections between its elements in order to have the materiality of the “medium” itself emerge. Of course, the medium is not really represented; rather, it is suggested in a merely negative way by the destruction of the strong connections between the elements of form. Yet, as we have seen, it is not possible to represent media directly, because they are always covered up by the forms they convey. Thus, modern works of art refer to their own medial bases by emphasizing the difference between medium and form. Dadaistic “brutism” destroys the form of the poem and makes appear its medium as and by the difference to poetry as a sign-system. Thereby, the medium is not directly shown, but more likely simulated or suggested as the difference of its form. Thus, we can observe that the only way for media to appear in an intramedial way is by negativity. Moreover, it emerges that already intramedial aesthetics is somewhat agonal, because the relation between medium and form is determined by an internal conflict. Henceforth, it appears that modern “purity” is not as pure as it seems. It clearly does not consist of a mere self-reflection of an art on its medial foundations, but already presupposes a difference and an agonal relation between material support and semiotic system.

2.3 Intermediality as reference to another medium

If intramediality already turns out to be based on negativity, we can suppose that this might a fortiori be the case for intermediality. If we take the probably most reductive and therefore consensual definition of intermediality, and define it as the relation between two different media (Rajewski 2002: 13), we can find this general kind of relationship between two media in different aspects. Thus, the adaption of literary works to cinema might already constitute such a kind of intermediality in a wider sense, even if it is not perceptible for spectators who have not read or even known the novel that inspired the film. But in this special case, the reference to the other medium functions in a merely metonymic way, because the concrete work serves as a *pars pro toto* for its medium.

A more obvious type of intermediality is illustrated by the so-called camera-eye-techniques of the French *Nouveau Roman*:

C'est à une distance de moins d'un mètre seulement qu'apparaissent dans les intervalles successifs, en bandes parallèles que séparent les bandes plus larges de bois gris, les éléments d'un paysage discontinu : les balustres en bois tourné, le fauteuil vide, la table basse où un verre plein repose à côté du plateau portant les deux bouteilles, enfin le haut de la chevelure noire, qui pivote à cet instant vers la droite, où entre en scène au-dessus de la table un avant-bras nu, de couleur brun foncé, terminé par une main plus pâle tenant le seau à glace. La voix de A... remercie le boy. La main brune disparaît. Le seau de métal étincelant, qui se couvre bientôt de buée, reste posé sur le plateau à côté des deux bouteilles. (Robbe-Grillet 1958: 51f.)

The paragraph cited above does not refer to one single movie, but to the medium of film itself. The reduction of the narrator to a mere instance of exact and precise description and the reduction of the focalization to pure vision emphasizes the boundaries of the narrative text, because the exclusion of all subjective commentaries and personal visions of the hero makes the medial condition of literature appear as a symbolic medium that, conventionally, conveys sense.

3. The agonal principle of intra- and intermediality

3.1 Theatre and radio play

As we have seen, the intermedial relationship between cinema and literature was productive and fruitful in the case of the *Nouveau Roman*, because it stimulated the discovery of new aesthetic possibilities. Yet in the history of media we can also find examples of intermedial relationships that impede a new medium to discover its own aesthetic possibilities. This is, for instance, the case in the early years of radio production in France. At that time, radio plays were conceived as “theatre for blind people” (“theatre pour les aveugles”) which was one of the reasons, beside economic and technical limitations, why the aesthetic possibilities of the new acoustic genre were extremely restricted (Richard 1948: 94). The conception of theatre as an aesthetic model

condemned the radio play to a conception that insisted on its imperfection and defectiveness:

Le Théâtre scénique étant au cinéma, ce qu'est une figure de la troisième dimension au regard d'une figure de la seconde, le Théâtre radiophonique serait-il le Théâtre à une dimension? (Germinet 1925: 11). [...] Le théâtre radiophonique doit être, au théâtre déjà connu, ce qu'un croquis ou une affiche sont à une œuvre picturale finie, pour laquelle on a tenu compte que l'observateur a tout le loisir d'examen possible (Germinet 1925: 17).

This obstructive intermediality could even adopt such absurd forms as the simple broadcasting of pure play performances, where the listener in front of the radio could very often not even understand what was happening on the scene, because he was not capable of seeing the gestures and mimics of the actors. Thus, this kind of intermediality between radio theatre play reduced the aesthetic possibilities of the new medium and fixed its limits for a long time, until another intermedial relation, this time to novel and film, contributed to the creation of new radio play techniques.⁸

The example of the early theatre play illustrates that the relationship between different media is agonal in the sense of competition or quarrel. It is due to this principle that intramedial aesthetics very often implicate an intermedial dimension, as well. When we reconsider, for instance, the case of non-figurative painting in the light of intermediality, it becomes apparent that it is not merely self-referential and intramedial, but determined by an agonal relation to other media. In fact, the refusal of figuration can only be really understood, if we take into account the medial context in which it takes place. Obviously, the concentration on the genuine medial forms of colour and form is partly due to the fact that the media of mechanic recording, such as photography and later on film, had assumed the task of mimetic representation of reality.

Thus, painting reacts in an idiosyncratic way by excluding the domains where photography and film excelled. In this case, the intermedial relationship does not correspond to an attraction, a connection or a hybrid form, but, on the contrary, it is constituted by difference, distinction and repulsion. Consequently, this type of intermedial relationship is clearly agonal. Here we find, in the relation between two media, a sense of distinction or an "anxiety of influence" that is quite analogue to the one Harold Bloom has examined in his books on *Anxiety of Influence* (Bloom 1973) and *Agon: Towards a Theory of Revisionism* (Bloom 1982). Without any doubt, Bloom's theory is based on the personal relationship between literary fathers and their followers, but we can transpose the structure of "agon" to the relations between media, as well. As in the case of poetic creation, where agonistic competition and struggle with forebearers is a necessary condition for poetic creation. In the case of media, the agon can also produce the liberation from ancient duties and functions of art and contribute to the discovery of new possibilities and aesthetic forms by the reflection on their own material and medial conditions.⁹

8 For a more detailed discussion see Jochen Mecke (2011: 173-199).

9 This might constitute a difference between poetic and intermedial agonism, as, for Bloom, the search for poetic originality is in reality pretentious, because it is already undermined by the mere relation to the forbearer and can therefore never be completely realized.

3.2 Cinema and literature

However, even in the case of a positive connection or integration of one media by another, there might be a concealed agonal relationship. This is the case, for instance, for the author policy adopted by the *Nouvelle Vague*. Interestingly, at the same time as the French New Novel begins to apply film techniques to literature (cf. above), the film starts to take over the categories and techniques of the literary system. What happens in this type of intermedial relationship is quite complicated. At first sight, the author policy and, later on, the aesthetical practice of the *Nouvelle Vague* consist in the adoption of the categories, that is to say the “form” of literature to the medium of film.

The most spectacular part of this practice is evidently based on the transposition of the characteristics of the literary author, such as the intention to produce a certain sense and an individual and recognizable style or a personal vision to the director of a film:

Le film de demain m'apparaît donc plus personnel encore qu'un roman, individuel et autobiographique comme une confession ou un journal intime. Les jeunes cinéastes s'exprimeront à la première personne (Truffaut 1987: 248).

The film is thereby considered as the expression of personal intentions of its director and must be judged according to these intentions. As Jean-Luc Godard puts it in his criticism of a film by Nicholas Ray: “Il faut juger ,The True Story of Jesse James’ sur les intentions” (Godard 1989: 112). Consequently, the critics of the *Cahiers du cinéma* make interviews with film directors, asking them about the techniques they employed, the intentions and personal vision they had when making a specific film.¹⁰

In their articles, the young critics furthermore tried to interpret the filmic image which, from the traditional point of view, had been considered as mechanical reproduction of what was happening before the camera, as a symbol that was able to convey a certain sense. This is the case in the very often frequently subjective interpretations which the new critics made of films and film scenes in order to profile the personal vision of the author.

In the following film comment, François Truffaut, after having explained that the heroes, a couple of young outcasts on the run, were obliged to break a control barrier, gives a good example for symbolic interpretation:

Lorsque la voiture forcera un premier barrage de police, une balle qui aurait atteint Joan vient percer une boîte de lait condensé : le lait, c'est la pureté et leur pureté protège momentanément nos héros (Truffaut 1987: 90).

Furthermore, in the theory and the practice of the author policy, the director of a film is promoted to its author, the spectator becomes its interpreter and the filmic image, instead of just reproducing mechanically a real or invented scene, conveys complicated messages. Due to the critical discourse of the author policy, the film gets a profoundness he had never reached before, at least in the theoretical and critical discourse on

¹⁰ See, for instance, the anthology of those famous film interviews by André Bazin et al.: *La politique des auteurs*. Paris: Étoile 1972.

film. The director, until then considered as a simple tradesman, and despite the fact that he really was an employee of the Hollywood Studios, became an author provided with a certain recognizable style – like Howard Hawks, for example – one of the most appreciated authors of the Young Turks of the *Cahiers du cinéma*.

According to Alexandre Astruc, modern cinema is capable of using the camera like a pen; it is able to express personal thoughts and emotions:

Le cinéma est tout simplement en train de devenir un moyen d'expression, ce qu'ont été tous les autres arts avant lui ... en particulier la peinture et le roman. Il devient peu à peu un langage, c'est-à-dire une forme dans laquelle et par laquelle un artiste peut exprimer sa pensée exactement comme il en est aujourd'hui de l'essai du roman. C'est pourquoi j'appelle ce nouvel âge du cinéma celui de la caméra-stylo (Astruc 1948 in: Siclier 1961: 26f.).

The era of the “camera-stylo” had begun. From now on modern films are supposed to be the artistic expression of subjectivity: „Un metteur en scène possède un style que l'on retrouve dans tous ses films, et ceci vaut pour les pires cinéastes et leur pires films”. (Truffaut 1987: 247). Due to this discursive transformation, the director becomes an artist with a recognizable style. Later on, when the young critics became themselves directors, their practice of film-making was obliged by the same principles: using the camera as a pen and using image and sound in the same way a writer uses letters in order to express a personal vision by a personal style of filmmaking.

The most striking example of such a personal vision is probably Jean-Luc Godard's first film *A bout de souffle*, with jump cuts, quick camera-pans which produce blurred images, camera pans, the direct look to the camera, the direct address to the spectator and other means of distancing which unmask the cinematographic illusion; all these techniques destroy the conventional code of traditional cinema and serve as signs of a personal film style.

The example of Godard's first long shot demonstrates clearly that the most obvious case of intermediality is normally not based on a mere adoption of the medium, in Luhmann's strict sense, but on the transposition of the semiotic system, that is to say the form, from one medium to another. If it is legitimate to call even this kind of relationship between one semiotic system and another “intermedial”, this is the case because it concerns the “medium” in a wider sense, in other words as a combination of medium, forms and institutions. In the example of the *Nouvelle Vague*, it is not the mere “medium” in a stricter sense, but the “form” and “institution” of literature as a semiotic system with certain categories and rules that are transferred to film.

Thus, the intermedial relationship is established by a kind of metonymy. But due to this type of intermedial transposition, what form is in one medium, i.e. a semiotic system, appears by metonymy as a medium in the other one. On the other hand, due to this transposition of categories, the specificity of the filmic medium itself becomes perceptible as form. Thus, the application of literary techniques and categories on film, as a strong connection or form, reveals the looseness of the connections of its own elements.

Thus, at first sight, the aesthetics of the *Nouvelle Vague* seem to be determined by an integrative and merely positive type of intermediality, since the structures,

categories and elements of literature as author, interpreter, narrator, style etc. are adopted by cinema. This generally positive attitude to literature also manifests itself in the refusal of the so-called “pure” cinema and the apology of cinematographic adaptations of literary works.¹¹

In reality, however, this positive attitude is deceptive, because, by their permanent references to literature, the young film critics and filmmakers did not want to illustrate the superiority of literature or the possibility for film in order to gain the prestige of the older medium by adopting its structure. On the contrary, they wanted to prove, as Truffaut pointed out in his *Nouvelle-Vague-Manifesto* “Une certaine tendance du cinéma français”, that film is able to do anything that literature can do and this it can do even better.

This is the real function of Truffaut’s famous polemic against the screenplay writers Jean Aurenche and Pierre Bost and their procedure of constructing filmic equivalences of literary scenes and techniques that they considered as being too complicated for the cinema. But, in reality, Truffaut’s well-known article, which was later regarded as the true manifesto of author policy and *Nouvelle Vague*, polemizes against the belittling of cinema or against the attitude to consider it as the little brother of literature:

Aurenche et Bost sont essentiellement des littérateurs et je leur reprocherai ici de mépriser le cinéma en le sous-estimant. Ils se comportent vis-à-vis du scénario comme l’on croit rééduquer un délinquant en lui trouvant du travail, ils croient toujours avoir fait «le maximum» pour lui en le parant des subtilités, de cette science des nuances qui fait le mince mérite des romans modernes (Truffaut 1987: 219).

As we can see, the intermedial relationship, despite and beside its integrative facade, appears to be agonal at the same time. Thus, the real function of the author policy does not consist of copying the literary model to film, but of liberating cinema from the “prescriptions” of written literary texts, such as the screenplay. Moreover, film tries to even surpass literature in its own domain of subjective expression and individual style. Therefore, the Young Turks of French Cinema claim that the director should write his own script or even, like Jean-Luc Godard for ‘*A bout de souffle*’, even renounce a pre-existing screenplay. Thus, what initially seemed to be an adoption of the categories of another medium, a case of positive integration of one medium into another, actually turns out to be a case of intermedial agony, actually.

Thereby, if we consider both evolutions in literature and film in a kind of stereoscopic vision, we are apparently confronted with a special kind of aesthetic chiasm. This is because whereas literature at the same time begins to adopt cinematographic techniques and abolishes the author in literary theory and practice, cinema, for its own part, adopts literary categories and techniques.

However, when we take a closer look on the very function of this chiasmic and agonal intermediality in the light of the system theory, it becomes clear that, despite of their apparent contradiction, both evolutions follow the same objective or produce the same effect. In order to reveal the essence of this effect, we must clearly distinguish between the interpretations that the young critics and directors of the *Nouvelle Vague*

¹¹ See, for instance, André Bazin’s apology of impure cinema in his article André Bazin, Pour un cinéma impur: défense de l’adaptation (Bazin 1993: 81-106).

themselves gave of their own practice on the one hand, and the objective function of this practice of commenting on movies and making films on the other. Of course, merely considering the interpretations of the author policy that the young critics of the *Cahiers du Cinéma* proposed themselves, the intermedial strategy of presenting the director as a literary author, may appear to be a simple return of the traditional romantic conception of the author as a genius.¹²

Yet if we analyse the objective function of the author policy, instead of repeating the declarations of their promoters, we obtain quite a different result. In fact, in the medial and semiotic system of the cinema, the author has another function than in literature.

In literature, the writer as an author is the one who expresses his own opinions and visions through a literary text that – according to the traditional author theory – is determined by its intentions. In the light of this traditional discourse it might therefore be a quite tautological undertaking to ask an author what he “wanted to say” with his work.

However, obviously, the case of cinema is very different, because here the director has a different role than his homologue in literature. First of all, he is only one creator of the film among others, that is producers, screenplay writers, actors, technicians, cutters and so on. Therefore, it was a counterfactual statement when the young critics postulated that the film was the work of an author:

[...] un film n'est pas plus un travail d'équipe qu'un roman, qu'un poème, qu'une symphonie, qu'une peinture (Truffaut 1987: 234).

Dans l'absolu, on peut considérer que l'auteur d'un film est le metteur en scène, et lui seul, même s'il n'a pas écrit une ligne du scénario, s'il n'a pas dirigé les acteurs et s'il n'a pas choisi les angles de prises de vues [...] (Truffaut 1987: 9).

And, in contrast to a writer, he is very often only an employee of the great studios that entrust him with the making of a film that he has not chosen himself. But it is also in this very case and not only in the omnipotent figure of the early Orson Welles, that the author policy reveals its real function. Thus, Howard Hawks was considered as an author despite his status as an employee of the studios. As he had to direct the transformation into image and sound of a screenplay that had been written by someone else, the only thing he controlled and that could serve him in order to realize a personal vision was image and sound. Transferred to cinema, the literary author therefore functions like an instance that draws the attention of the spectator to the specifically filmic dimensions of image and sound. He, thus, induces the spectator to pay attention to the specifically filmic medium and the filmic signifier. In this respect, he has a quite similar function to the death of the author in literature that also attracts the attention to the literary signifier itself.

¹² And, indeed, critics very often interpret the author policy as a conservative revolution in film theory that introduces in cinema an obsolete concept of the author, whereas literary critics like R. Barthes announce his death. This might also be the reason why some critics see the contribution of the *Nouvelle Vague* to French cinema in a very negative way, see *Death and rebirth of the author* (Mecke 1997).

But the principal point in this kind of chiasm is that, in both cases, the function of the intermedial relationship is agonal. Thus, the abolition of the author in literature and the adoption of cinematographic techniques like montage or visual perspectives or neo-behaviouristic description oppose themselves to the dominant symbolic structure of the literary medium, whereas the introduction of the author in film contests the dominance of screenplay, story and characters in order to give more importance to the filmic signifier as image and sound. Thus, both movements coincide in the foregrounding of the artistic medium and its signifier and in the agonal principle of intermedial aesthetics.

3.3 Novel and hyperfiction

The same principle is at work when we consider another intermedial relationship. This time between literature and hyperfiction. Whereas modern literature, according to the agonal principle of aesthetics, tries to transcend its own medial limitation of linearity by adopting or better anticipating hyperfictional structures, hyperfiction, on the contrary, creates forms of linearity in order to transcend the conditions of non-sequential or better multi-linear hypertext structure.

Thus, in his second novel, *L'emploi du temps* (1957), Michel Butor breaks up the classical linear way of telling a story from beginning to end, thereby destroying the archeological and teleological foundations of the story itself. In this point, Butor coincides with Julio Cortázar's novel *Rayuela* (1963), where the reader can also decide whether he wants to read the novel in a linear order, indicated by the sequence of the top of the pages, or if he prefers to practice non-linear reading of other chapters, as suggested by the indications at the bottom of the pages. Jacques Derrida goes even further: in his book *Glas* (1974) he destroys the linear structure of the page itself by presenting his text divided into two columns that have to be read alternately or simultaneously.

In all these cases, the linear structure of the story with a clear beginning and ending is destroyed and replaced by a hypertextual multi-linearity. In the discussions on hyperfiction, the novels mentioned above are considered as a real anticipation of hypertextual techniques (Landow 1997: 35f.).

However, if we examine Butor's or Cortázar's intramedial strategy more closely, it becomes apparent that the specific aesthetic effect of their techniques is due to the fact that they introduce non-linear strategies [Wh.] of narration in a linear context in order to transcend the boundaries of the conventional narrative code or sign-system. Of course, we have to differentiate between the material and medial conditions of reading. The pure materiality of the book is spatial and non-directional. We can open a book where we want, look at the pages in the order we like, and even gaze at the lines beginning at the bottom and going up to the top. As we can see, the sequentiality of the book is due to the combination of the materiality of the medium and the medial technique of reading. Thus, the multi-sequential aesthetics of Butor's or Cortázar's experimental novels use the non-linear material structure of the medium against the linearity of the semiotic system.

The same agonal principle is at work in hyperfictions. Hyperfictions are created in the medium of hypertexts, consisting of textual nodes and links between these nodes. But in contrast to the literary text, in hypertext the text passages of the nodes are not linked in a linear way so that the material and semiotic conditions of the medium are non- or rather multi-linear. The link-structure of computer hypertext provides the possibility of connecting the nodes in many different ways.

Yet if we take a look on some hyperfictions, it emerges that their aesthetical strategy often consists in a subversion of the multi-linearity of their own medial condition. Thus, in his hyperfiction *Condiciones extremas* (1998) Juan B. Gutierrez uses summaries of the story that give a background and an orientation to the reader and constitute an aesthetic tension to the hyperlinks of the hyperfiction that are transversal to the linearity of the story and move the reader directly into different epochs of the story, concretely to the years 1998, 2050 and 2090 and the corresponding events in the lives of the characters.

The same agonal intermediality and aesthetic tension can be encountered in other hyperfictions, such as Jaime Alejandro Rodriguez Ruiz's *Gabriella Infinita* (2000). Here, sequential structures, as for instance numbered chapters or other suggestions of linearity subvert the multi-linearity of the hyperfictional form. Thus, also in the case of the intermedial relationship between literature and hypertext, we are confronted with a perfect chiasm.

Whereas in the literary medium agonal intra- and intermediality consists of subverting the linear structure of its narrative form, in the hypertextual medium linear techniques reconfigure sequential forms and thus, create a counterpart to the multi-linearity of the medium.

Consequently, we have seen that the intra- and intermedial strategies of modern and postmodern novels, films or hyperfictions are very often determined by an aesthetical principle that is clearly based on an agonal conception: modern poetry obtains its most innovative and fruitful effects by an agonal relation of its form to its own medium and to the media of mechanic reproduction of reality.

As for the new novel, intramedial deconstruction of its narrative form and intermedial adoption of cinematographic techniques observe the same principle that we can encounter in the relation between literature and hyperfiction, as well. In all these cases agonal aesthetics is at work.

Bibliography

- Apollinaire, Guillaume (1913-1916/1965). *Calligrammes*, in: Guillaume Apollinaire, *Oeuvres poétiques*. Paris: Gallimard, pp. 163-314.
- Astruc, Alexandre (1948). "Naissance d'une nouvelle avant-garde: la caméra-stylo" in *L'Écran Français*. no 144. 30.8., cited in: Jacques Siclier (1961). *Nouvelle Vague?* Paris: Cerf.
- Ball, Hugo (1993). "Totenklage", in: Waltraud Wende-Hohenberger (ed.). *Dada Zürich, Texte, Manifeste, Dokumente*. Stuttgart: Reclam 1993.
- Bazin, André (1958/1992). *Qu'est-ce que le cinéma?* Paris: Les Editions du Cerf 1997.
- Bazin, André et al. (1972). *La politique des auteurs*. Paris: Étoile.

- Bloom, Harold (1973/1997). *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. Oxford University Press 1997.
- Bloom, Harold (1983). *Agon: Towards a Theory of Revisionism*. Oxford University Press: Galaxy Books.
- Bobillot, Jean-Pierre (2003). *Trois essais sur la poésie littéraire: de Rimbaud à Denis Roche, d'Apollinaire à Bernard Heidsieck*. Romainville: Al Dante.
- Breton, André/Philippe Soupault (1971). *Les Champs magnétiques*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Butor, Michel (1957). *L'Emploi du temps*. Paris: Minuit.
- Cortázar, Julio (1963/2008). *Rayuela*. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Derrida, Jacques (1974). *Glas*. Paris: Galilée.
- Germinet, Gabriel (1925). *Théâtre radiophonique. Mode nouveau d'expression artistique*. Paris: Chiron.
- Godard, Jean-Luc (1989). *Godard par Godard: les années Cahiers*. Paris: Flammarion, coll. Champs.
- Greenberg, Clement (1940/2000²). "Towards a Newer Laocoon", in: Francis Francina (ed.), *Pollock and After. The Critical Debate, London and New*, pp. 60-70 [first published in: *Partisan Review*, Vol. 7, Nr. 4 (Juli/August): 296-310].
- Greenberg, Clement (1968/2012). "Avantarde Attitudes". www.sharecom.ca/greenberg/modernism.html. 28.03.2012.
- Gutiérrez, Juan B. (1998). *Condiciones extremas*. <http://www.ucm.es/info/especulo/hipertul/condex.html>. 28.03.2012.
- Heidsieck, Bernard (2007). *Vaduz*. Romainville: Al Dante.
- Isherwood, Christopher (1939/1994). *Goodbye to Berlin*. Stuttgart: Reclam.
- Kandinsky, Wassily (1913/1980), *Die gesammelten Schriften I: Autobiographische Schriften*. Bern: Benteli Verlag.
- Kittler, Friedrich A. (1990). *Discourse networks 1800/1900*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, Deutsches Original: Friedrich Kittler (1985). *Aufschreibesysteme 1800/1900*. München: Fink.
- Kristeva, Julia: *La révolution du langage poétique*. Paris: Seuil 1974.
- Landow, George P. (1997/2008). *Hypertext 2.0: The Convergence of Contemporary Literary Theory and Technology*. Baltimore/London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Luhmann, Niklas (1995). *Die Kunst der Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Mecke, Jochen (1990). *Roman-Zeit: Zeitformung und Dekonstruktion des französischen Romans der Gegenwart*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Mecke, Jochen (2011). "Hörspieltechniken der Literatur", in: Jochen Mecke (ed.). *Medientechniken der Literatur*. Bielefeld: Transcript. pp. 173-199.
- Rajewski, Irina (2002). *Intermedialität*. Basel: Francke.
- Richard, Roger (1948). "Das Hörspiel in Frankreich", in: *Die Quelle*, Jg. 2, Heft 5: 93-96.
- Riffaterre, Michael (1983). "The Extended Metaphor in Surrealist Poetry", in: Michael Riffaterre. *Text Production*. New York: Columbia University Press. pp. 202-220.
- Robbe-Grillet, Alain (1958). *La Jalousie*. Paris: Minuit.
- Rodriguez Ruiz, Jaime Alejandro (2000). *Gabriella Infinita*. http://www.javeriana.edu.co/gabriella_infinita/principal.htm. 29.03.2012.

Simon, Claude (1960/1982). *La Route des Flandres*. Paris: Minuit.
Truffaut, François (1987). *Le Plaisir des yeux*. Paris: Flammarion.

Cornelia Sieber

Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz

**TRANSMEDIAL ENCROACHMENT AND THE URGENCY OF
THE CONFLICTS OF MIGRATION IN SALVAJES
(CARLOS MOLINERO, SPAIN, 2001)**

Analyzing the movie *Salvajes, Savages*, we find the subject matter of migration and the xenophobic reactions to it in Spanish contemporary society expressed in a quite particular transmedial form. To me, ‘transmedial encroachment’ seems to be the most adequate denomination to describe a set of concrete strategies used in the film *Salvajes*. Here, transmediality is not primarily applied to question our relationship to media or our uses of media and mediated matter.¹ Instead, the intention is to shrink the space of reflection, to take away the distance between the subject and the audience. The effect that is aimed to be incited by this set of strategies is to place us right in the midst of the matter, to intrude, to invade our safe space outside of the scenario and to provoke an immediacy to realize, in this case, the problems and socio-cultural questions of migration in the current Spanish society. We are urged to experience a way of acting without time for measuring all aspects and consequences beforehand in the middle of a changing society and in the midst of ‘manufactured uncertainty’, to borrow the notion from Anthony Giddens and Ulrich Beck.

I prefer to describe the filmic strategies of the movie *Salvajes* as transmedial encroachment instead of referring to them as, for example, medial violence, because the mentioned effect of immediacy is sought via the very filmic capabilities. The film does not problematize the limitations of the medium ‘film’ nor does it try to introduce techniques from other media, but it uses all of its capabilities to encroach upon the sphere of the audience.

In this sense, I would like to explore the movie *Salvajes* directed by Carlos Molinero and released in 2001 as an example of transmediality in the socio-political

1 As Alfonso de Toro emphasized by examining strategies of transmediality in the literary texts of Flaubert and Borges as well as in the “Diary” by Mexican painter Frida Kahlo and performances by Argentinian dramaturge Alejandro Tantanian, transmediality is often used to irrupt and to question the conventions of reception and to create a space of reflection:

Les exemples illustrent assez clairement le fait que le concept de ‘transmédialité’ indique toujours une transgression et une transcendance de l’emplacement médiatique de départ. Par conséquent, c’est aussi une déterritorialisation épistémologique des formes traditionnelles de représentation et de performance due à des changements radicaux de concepts tels que l’objet, la perception, la vue, la réalité, la représentation, le théâtre, le jeu, l’acteur, et ainsi de suite. C’est pour cette raison que la ‘transmédialité’ n’est pas principalement une stratégie de production de signification, mais une stratégie de diffusion et d’émancipation. Elle donne matière à réflexion sur l’artefact comme le cinéma, le théâtre, la peinture, ou le texte; [...]. (de Toro 2013: 169)

context of migration. The movie treats xenophobia in the current Spanish society as a savage, extremely uncivil reflex to exclude cultural heterogeneity. However, by showing not only the extreme violence of a gang of young men that brutally batter an African immigrant, but also the failure and helplessness of such civil and State institutions as the family and the police to prevent these excesses, it puts at least a question mark behind the authoritarian requirement of the State to permit or deny access to the territory claimed to belong exclusively to its citizens. In this sense, the movie questions the fixed distinction between ‘civil’ and ‘savage’, citizen and foreigner and, in consequence, the claim of legal ownership of a territory excluding others as illegal immigrants.

Against this socio-cultural background, transmediality functions, in this movie, first of all, as a type of encroachment of artistic representation upon the immediate experience of the spectator. I would like to point to three specific practices that are employed in order to reduce, or even to remove distances and distinctions.

We find a first important practice of transmediality in this sense, in the way the theatre play *Salvajes* by José Luis Alonso de Santos is adapted to the screenplay of the movie by Carlos Molinero, Jorge Juan Martínez, Clara Perez Escriba and Salvador Maldonado. The screenwriters received the Goya award for the best adapted screenplay in 2001 for their work.

The theatre play broaches the issue of xenophobia as a social problem of contemporary Spanish society by staging two brothers, Raúl and Mario, who live together with their sister in the house of their aunt Berta in the suburbs of Madrid. Since their parents died, aunt Berta has been taking care of her two nephews and her niece, but obviously the three young ones have slipped away from her, none of them has a decent job, the niece is addicted to drugs and the boys spend their time in a street gang drinking and rioting. Xenophobia is one aspect of their completely deviated and senseless acting driven only by an anxiety for abreacting aggression. In the third act of the five-act play we hear Raúl suggesting to his brother:

Raúl: ¿Te vienes? Vamos a buscar al Lobo y a Andrés y nos mamamos un rato. Nos vamos a Parla. [...] Vamos a por heavies y bakaladeros, tío, a darles una mano de hostias... [...] Sólo es para divertirnos un rato, tío. Hacemos una cacería buena, y luego nos venimos pronto y tú te vas a follar a la tía esa si quieres. (Alonso de Santos [1998] 2002: 176-7)

Raul: Are you coming? Let's go to Wolf and Andrés and we get plastered for a while. We go to [the suburb district of] Parla [...] We put heavy metal and bakaladero [music] on, dude, and give a handful of bashes ... [...] It's just to entertain ourselves for a while, dude. We make a good hunting, and then we come back ready and you go and fuck that squaw if you want.

His brother's reply contains one of only three explicit references to the gang's beating of a black man that almost ended with his dead and leads to a police investigation. Mario refuses to join the gang, this time preferring to go to the movies with his potential new girlfriend, a supermarket teller. He says:

Mario: Con el lío que tenemos después de lo del negro... Si encima os pilla en otra la habéis cagado. Además, que estoy harto ya... Coger a un tío, cagado de miedo, e inflarle a hostias... ¡Joder! Una persona es una persona, ¿no? Tengo la cara del negro metida aquí mientras le hinchábamos... ¡sus ojos, coño, aquí dentro! Y si no os quito lo matáis. (177)

Mario: With the trouble that we have after that thing with the black guy... If you are caught in another one, you're screwed. Besides, I'm fed up... To catch a guy full of fear and to thrash him... Shit! A person is a person, isn't he? I have the face of the black guy right here while we are beating him up... his eyes, shit, within here! And if I don't stop you, you kill him.

Thus, Raúl's older brother is shown in Alonso de Santos' theatre play as being deeply haunted by the extreme experience of the violence exercised by him and his gang over the black victim. And he indeed is ready to change his ways. At the end of the play we are informed that he moves to live with his new girlfriend. It is mainly through the words of Mario and his changing behavior that the theatre audience gets to know the victim of the beating. In the other two remarks about the man, his status as innocent victim is underlined. In one instance, also in the third act, aunt Berta takes her nephews to task about the beating, and we witness a quite helpless discussion. When she threatens them that they might be jailed for the beating, Raúl counters:

Raúl: Si no viniera aquí a joder toda esa gentuza, los moros, los negros y su puta madre...

Raúl: If not all of those scalawags would come here, the Moors, the blacks and their whore mother...

And Berta asks back:

Berta: ¡Pero qué te han hecho a ti los moros y los negros, y su madre, animal! ¡Ni los negros ni los blancos! ¡Bestias, que sois unas bestias! Pero bueno, ¿ese pobre hombre, qué os había hecho? (149-50)

Berta: But what have the Moors and the blacks and their mother done to you, animal! Neither the blacks nor the whites! Beasts, you are beasts! But o.k., what did this poor man do to you?

The discussion ends in the helpless act of Raúl and Berta throwing their plates to the kitchen floor. The fourth act brings the third and last reference to the victim of the beating. Berta tries to defend her nephews by sweet-talking the police officer in charge of the case, who has already fallen in love with her when investigating an earlier drug offence of her niece. In this – likewise helpless – instance, Berta claims that her nephews declared the black man to have provoked the beating by bothering them. The police officer asks her:

Comisario: ¿Y usted los cree? ¿Cree de verdad que un pobre negro, que vive de vender tabaco en el metro, se va a atrever a meterse con una banda de vándalos como ésos? [...] desde luego el que no tenía la culpa de nada es ese hombre, al que han dejado medio muerto por la única razón de ser de otro color. Ha venido de Nigeria. ¿Se imagina cuántas calamidades habrá tenido que soportar para llegar hasta aquí, con el único sueño de encontrar un trabajo y poder traer a su familia...? [...]

Lo único que sé es que gente así está mejor en la cárcel que mandando personas al hospital. O al cementerio. (157-8)

Police officer: And you believe them? Do you really think that a poor black guy who lives from selling tobacco in the metro would dare to take on a gang of vandals as those? [...] of course, the one who isn't guilty of nothing is this man whom they have left perished for the one and only reason that his skin is of a different color. He has come from Nigeria. Do you imagine how many calamities he'd have to survive to get here, with the only one dream of finding work and bringing his family over...? [...] The only thing I know is that those folks are better off in jail instead of sending persons to the hospital. Or the graveyard.

This dialogue, too, ends without a satisfying answer for the riot and without proposing a solution; jail is the only answer the police officer could give.

The play ends with the death of Raúl who is killed by his sister's drug dealers, by his sister's detoxification, Mario's decision to move and live with his girlfriend and Berta and the police officer's happy ending of travelling to the South African Cape of Hope. It is a melodramatic or tragic-comic ending. The incurable evil is killed, the regretful Mario and his sister are morally purged and good Berta finds her happy ending with the police officer.

The film's screenplay is a transmedial adaption of the plot, especially for using all technical capabilities of making the presence of the victim of the beating immediate. While the theatre play works with the classical instrument of reporting information about incidents that would be difficult to represent on stage, necessarily reducing the complexity of the instance while narrating it, the movie introduces an actor and gives a physical presence, a name and a biography to the victim of the beating. He is called Omar and performed by Emilio Buale, an actor well-known in Spain for starring in the movie *Bwana* (Imanol Uribe, 1996) and appearing in various television series. Omar already has his family in Spain and he isn't just a poor tobacco street seller.

Instead of the Madrilenian suburb, the setting of the movie is Valencia on the Mediterranean coast. Omar and the one brother, not called Mario in the film but Guillermo, are working at the industrial harbor and are both entangled in the secret smuggling of Africans who are brought to the harbor in cargo containers and then transported in other containers to France.

In the course of the argument Raúl finds out that the beating wasn't just because of xenophobic reflexes but because he and the other members of the gang were used by his brother Guillermo who with the xenophobic pretext just wanted to get rid of an inconvenient partner. Guillermo gains a lot of money by using the situation that 'foreigners' from the South are denied free access to Europe and resort to smugglers like him in order to enter the rich continent. Omar's motive to engage in the smuggling is not made explicit. He earns a lot of money as well, but he as an African could also be driven by the wish to make it possible for other Africans to enter Europe. However, he is not innocent and he is not poor precisely because of the legal situation of the separation made between citizens and so-called illegal immigrants.

By introducing Omar as a complex figure, the movie urges the spectator to see the actual socio-cultural conflicts of migration. To that effect, the camera and other film techniques such as sound and editing are used to shrink the distance from Omar. After

the beating, we see the scene in which he is acting through his eyes. Through a head bandage we see five suspects in the room of police questioning, Guillermo amongst them, but Omar doesn't identify him in this situation and informs the police officer only off the record about the incidents. The other scene where Omar is present is the beating itself. Here the film works with extreme close-ups, hectic camera movements, sounds of Omar's heartbeat, loud smashes of punching, tinnitus sounds and a brutal cut to the next scene with the effect that the spectator physically feels the violence and cannot find a safe distance from Omar.

This technique of introducing the victim of the beating as a character, to give him a biography and to even enter his perspective is a transmedial encroachment of the movie upon the argument of the theatre play on the one hand, and upon the audience on the other, it causes intensification of perception and cognition of the theme of migration.

A second technique of transmedial encroachment that I would like to point to, is what the director Carlos Molinero calls "putting bricks in the fourth wall". He refers to the invisible wall between the actors who perform a drama on a theatre stage and the audience. While the stage is a materially closed space to three sides, the fourth wall is only part of the staged play and separates the two spheres of the play on the stage and of the audience in the spectators' seats. The actors act as if they were in a closed world of their own, while for the audience the fourth wall is completely transparent and constitutes the window through which they watch the play. By transforming the theatre play into the movie, Molinero uses the technical capabilities of the medium film to make the fourth wall sensible both for the audience and for the actors as a "wall with holes", thus, as a liminal space of tension, uncertainty and blurred information between the both spheres. Carlos Molinero describes in his short article about Salvajes, "Ladrillos en la cuarta pared", "Bricks in the fourth wall", that, when he filmed the movie, he held back information from the actors about their characters and about the camera position, so that they acted in an uncertainty of how they would be captured for the film. He explains:

La construcción de la pared que llenara de ruido la película también se basaba en planos vacíos de contenido, en gestos que no se entendieran en el contexto en el que estaban, su agotamiento actoral ensuciaba la limpieza de su interpretación con el ruido que yo buscaba con tanto afán. (Molinero 2001: s.p.)

The construction of the wall that would fill the film with noise, was based also on empty planes without content, on gestures that would not be understandable in the context they were placed in, their play acting exhaustion soiled the clarity of their interpretation with the noise that I was so eagerly looking for.

The effect on the spectators is that they share the feeling of uncertainty with the actors when also only understanding part of what is going on through the breaches in the fourth wall. Molinero states:

Por estos boquetes veríamos trozos de los personajes, oíríamos cosas, pero no todo con la misma claridad y nitidez, a veces contemplaríamos la parte trivial de una escena, ocultando los ladrillos la parte esencial de la misma. Esa era mi intención al llevar el guión de

“Salvajes” a película, rodear a esa historia limpia y clara con un muro lleno de agujeros. Hacer que no todas las acciones de los personajes fuera comprensible, que las secuencias no se entendieran ni tuvieran un principio y un fin, que muchas palabras se perdieran por el ruido del exterior, es decir, plagiar la realidad. (s.p.)

Through those breaches we would see parts of the characters, we would hear things, but not everything with the same clarity and acuity, sometimes we would watch the trivial part of a scene, with the bricks hiding the essential part of it. This was my intention when turning the screenplay of ‘Savages’ into a movie, filming this clean and clear story with a wall full of bricks. To make that not all of the actions of the characters would be understandable, that the sequences would not be comprehensible nor that they would have a beginning and an end, that many words would get lost through the noise from outside, so to say, to plagiarize reality.

Plagiarizing reality, augmenting the effect of the real, means, in this case, to blur the delimitation between the separated spheres of the play and the audience, and to encroach into the sphere of the live experience, which lacks the rules of a closed and clear storyline. These blurred delimitations cause the effect of placing the spectator within the burning socio-cultural problems of the current society instead of conceding her or him the privileged position of the uninvolved observer of a play.

We experience together with aunt Berta and the police officer Eduardo the frustration and helplessness in the face of the savage riot of Raúl and his brother, and we are included in the urgency to deal with the rapidly changing society and its growing complexity and diversity without a privileged distance for meditation.

The third technique of transmedial encroachment that I would like to point out, is the passing of genre delimitations. The film follows the genre characteristics of the drama, even when it makes the innovative uses of the technical capabilities of the medium film, as described earlier. But right at the end it breaks from genre conventions. We watch Berta ending her love affair with the police officer Eduardo because of his investigation against her nephews, and we see the police officer going furiously to the harbor to beat up Guillermo. He is extremely frustrated from losing Berta and not being able to arrest Guillermo, since Omar refuses to affirm formally that Guillermo was one of his aggressors. After the beating of Guillermo, the officer hears some noise in one of the containers, he opens it and is thrown down by the fleeing Africans who were locked inside. Eduardo calls Berta and informs his officer colleague, the police arrive with a couple of patrol cars to the harbor, Berta also comes obviously worried about Eduardo and she takes him in her arms. This charming little happy ending for Berta and Eduardo is supposed to mark the end of the film, but we are now given the perspective of a handheld camera that shows the set with the other cameras and spotlights, and that records the instructions shouted to the extras performing as the illegal immigrants in the container. They are instructed not to look at the camera while fleeing from the container in order to make the scene look more spontaneous. The next thing we see is the extras looking right into the camera and talking about themselves, recording their personal reasons for coming to Spain and their point of view concerning the socio-cultural situation of migration. Their testimony superimposes the end credits of the movie and is a claim for a voice of the ones excluded as ‘illegal immigrants’, as extras of the society. With that transmedial encroachment Carlos Molinero stages the

excluded voices, giving the keywords for an open debate over how to constitute truly free and modern societies based on our ideals of equality and liberty. In the utterances that are staged to appear spontaneous and personal, the keywords of the urgent political debate are expressed: economical reasons, fleeing war and violence in the homeland, colonial accountability and the right to pursue happiness in Europe.

Bibliography

- Alonso de Santos, José Luis (1998 [2002]). *Salvajes*. Madrid: Castalia.
- Beck, Ulrich/ Anthony Giddens/ Scott Lash (1996). *Reflexive Modernisierung: Eine Kontroverse*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- Molinero, Carlos (2001). *Salvajes*. DVD. Barcelona: Sogedasa.
- Molinero, Carlos (2001). “Ladrillos en la cuarta pared”, in: Jorge Juan Martínez/ Carlos Molinero/ Clara Pérez Escrivá/ Salvador Maldonado. *Salvajes. Guión de Cine*. Madrid: Ocho y Medio S.L.
- Toro, Alfonso de (2004). “Reflexiones sobre fundamentos de investigación transdisciplinaria, transcultural y transtextual en las ciencias del teatro en el contexto de una teoría postmoderna y postcolonial de la ‘hibridez’ e ‘intermedialidad’”, in: Alfonso de Toro (ed.). *Estrategias postmodernas y postcoloniales en el teatro latinoamericano actual. Hibridez – Medialidad – Cuerpo*. Madrid: Iberoamericana. pp. 106-159.
- Toro, Alfonso de (2013). “Stratégies transmédiales et transculturelles: quelques exemples: Flaubert – Borges – Kahlo – Tantanián”, in: Idem. *Translatio. Transmedialité et transculturalité en littérature, peinture, photographie et au cinéma. Amériques – Europe – Maghreb*. Paris: L’Harmattan, pp. 129-174.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Amaryll Chanady is Full-Professor and former director of comparative literature at the Université de Montréal, Canada. Her main subject of specialization is the intersection between the imaginary (spatial, collective, political) and various types of discourse, including literature and theory, especially in the Americas. She has written about discursive constructions of collective identity, the relation between literature and intercultural dynamics, diasporic subjectivities, and interdisciplinary theories of space and community. Her publications include *Entre inclusion et exclusion. La symbolisation de l'autre dans les Amériques* (Paris: Honoré Champion), *America's Worlds and the World's Americas* (as co-editor; University of Ottawa) and numerous book chapters (Duke UP, Fondo de cultura económica, Universidad de las Américas, U of Minnesota P, Arnold, Rodopi, Bruylant, McGill-Queen's UP) and articles (in *Comparative Literature*, *Localities*, *Québec Studies*, *International Journal of Politics Culture and Society*, *Espace Caraïbe*, *Revista de crítica literaria latinoamericana*).

Wai Chee Dimock is William Lampson Full-Professor of English and American Studies, Yale University. Widely published in American literature, Prof. Dimock is best known for her 2007 book, *Through Other Continents: American Literature Across Deep Time*. Her anthology, *American Literature in the World* (coedited with a team of students) is forthcoming in late 2016. Editor of *PMLA*, and a film critic for the *LA Review of Books*, her essays have also appeared in *Critical Inquiry*, the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, the *New York Times*, and the *New Yorker*.

Dieter Ingenschay is Professor Emeritus for Romanic Literatures (Spanish and Latin American Literatures) at Humboldt-University, Berlin where he had been teaching from 1995 to 2015. He has been invited as Visiting Professor to different Universities (Cornell-University, Ithaca, N.Y., University of Buenos Aires, Pontificia Universidad Católica, Valparaiso, Distinguished Harris Visiting Professor at Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H., and Profesor Invitado Distinguido, Univ. Complutense de Madrid). He was President of the German Association of Hispanic Studies from 1999 to 2003 and General Coordinator of „ProSpanien” (Program of the Spanish Ministry for Culture to promote Investigation on Spain at German universities, now part of HISPANEX). He is co-editor of the Review *Iberoromania* and of the series *Theory and Criticism of Culture and Literature/Teoría y crítica de la cultura y literatua* and *La casa de la riqueza. Estudios de Cultura de España*. Further Memberships: „Georg-Simmel-Zentrum for Investigating the Metropolis” (Humboldt-Univ.), Institute for Transdisciplinary Gender Studies (Humboldt-Univ.), and Center for Jewish Studies. Main fields of work: Postmodernism and Postcolonialism in contemporary Hispanic culture; *Gender and Gay Studies* (in Spain and Latin America); Metropolis and Literature.

Jochen Mecke is Full-Professor of Romance Cultures and Literatures at the University of Regensburg (Germany). He has a Licence (B.A.) in French Literature (University of Aix-en-Provence) and an M.A. in Philosophy, German, and French Literature. He received his D.Phil. degree from the University of Mannheim (Germany) and his habilitation from the University of Heidelberg. He has taught at the Universities of Mannheim, Heidelberg, Greifswald, Passau and Regensburg in Germany and several Universities in France, Spain and England. He was director of a research project and doctoral school on “Cultures of Lying”, as well as dean of the Faculty of Literary, Linguistic and Cultural Studies at the same University and is now director of the Research Center of Hispanic Studies of the University of Regensburg, member of the senate and of the University Council. His main areas of research and publication are French and Spanish Literature of the 17th century, modernity and postmodernism, relations between the media, time in culture and literature, cultures of lying, picaresque novel, nouveau roman and film. He cooperated in different European programs for the promotion of teacher education and had several guest professorships in France and Spain. Some of his recent publications focus on Media Studies, as for instance “Medien der Literatur. Vom Almanach zur Hyperfiction.” (2011), the relationship between Germany and Spain, (Jochen Mecke et al. (ed.) *Deutsche und Spanier: ein Kulturvergleich* (2012), early Spanish modernity (*Discursos del 98: albores españoles de una modernidad europea*, 2012) or on the mediators between Spain and Germany, (ed.) *Entre dos aguas. Kulturvermittler zwischen Deutschland und Spanien*, 2016). Jochen Mecke has been awarded with the “palmas académiques” of the French State.

Gabriele Piszcz-Ramirez is Full-Professor of American Studies and Minority Studies at Leipzig University. She received her Ph.D. from the University of Leipzig with a study on the translation of Stephen Crane stories. Her postdoctoral dissertation (*Habilitation*) investigated Mexican American cultural productions and was published as *MexAmerica: Genealogien und Analysen postnationaler Diskurse in der kulturellen Produktion von Chicanos/as* [*MexAmerica: Genealogies and Analyses of postnational Discourses in the Cultural Production of Chicanos/as*, Winter 2005]. She was a Visiting Scholar at UC Berkeley in 1998–99 and a guest lecturer at the Stanford Center for Comparative Studies in Race and Ethnicity in 2009. From 2009–2010 she taught at the Institute of American Culture and Cultural Theory at Groningen University. Her current research focuses on the role of race and ethnicity in the United States, migration, and early Inter-American Studies. She is particularly interested in ethnic popular cultures, Border Studies, and changing concepts of ethnicity. Recent publications include the co-edited volumes *The Americas in the Nineteenth Century: Inter-American Perspectives on US Literature* (2008), *Transmediality and Transculturality* (2013), *Of Fatherlands and Motherlands: Gender and Nation in the Americas / De Patrias y Matrias: Género y nación en las Américas* (2015), *Selling Ethnicity and Race. Consumerism and Representation in Twenty-First-Century America* (2015), and *Hemispheric Encounters: The Early United States in a Transnational Perspective* (2016).

Michael Rössner is since 2019 Professor Emeritus at the LMU University of Munich for Romance Literatures, where he has been full Professor as of 1991. Teaching and lecturing at the Universities of Salzburg and Innsbruck and the Vienna University of Economics (Austria); the Universities of Queretaro (Mexico), Concepción (Chile), Buenos Aires (UBA) and Tucumán (Argentina), and the UFRGS in Porto Alegre (Brazil). Joint editor of the journal *Iberoromania*, as well of the book series TCCL (Theory and Criticism of Culture and Literature) (Publisher: Olms) and JWR (Publisher: Böhlau). Full Member of the Austrian Academy of Sciences, Member of the *Accademia degli Incamminati* (Italian Art Academy), Member of the Austrian PEN Centre, Chair of the European Pirandello-Centre, Director of the Institute for Culture Studies and History of Theatre of the Austrian Academy of Sciences. Editor and translator of the edition of Luigi Pirandello's work in German, of a *History of the Latin American Literatures in German* (Metzler, 1995, ²2002 and ³2007); several publications on literary and cultural theory and related subjects as *Auf der Suche nach dem verlorenen Paradies* (1988); *Literarische Kaffeehäuser. Kaffeehausliteraten* (1999); "*¡Bailá! ¡Vení! ¡Volá!*": *El fenómeno tanguero y la literatura* (2000); *Renaissance der Authentizität? Über die neue Sehnsucht nach dem Ursprünglichen* (together with Heidemarie Uhl, 2012); *Translatio/n. Narration, Media and the Staging of Differences* (together with Federico Italiano, 2012); *Inszenierung und Gedächtnis. Soziokulturelle und ästhetische Praxis* (with Hermann Blume, Elisabeth Grossegger and Andrea Sommer-Mathis, 2014), *Narrated Communities - Narrated Realities. Narration as Cognitive Processing and Cultural Practice* (with Hermann Blume and Christoph Leitgeb, 2015).

Cornelia Sieber is Full-Professor of Spanish, Portuguese and Latin American Cultural Studies at the Faculty of Translation, Linguistics and Cultural Studies of the Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz at Gernersheim since 2011. Before that, she was assistant professor at the University of Leipzig. She is co-editor of *Nación y migración: España y Portugal frente a las migraciones contemporáneas* (ed. with V. Abrego and A. Burgert, Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 2015), *Cuerpos extra/ordinarios. Corporalidad como interfaz de fuerzas materiales y simbólicas* (ed. with C. Gronemann and A. López-Labourdette, Barcelona: Linkgua, 2016) and some volumes published at Olms, amongst others, *Fiestas infinitas de máscara. Escenificaciones de masculinidad y feminidad en México* (ed. with C. Gronemann, 2012) and *Estrategias autobiográficas en Latinoamérica: Géneros – Espacios – Lenguajes* (ed. with P. Imbert and C. Gronemann, 2010). Her investigation focus is on cultural translation, transcultural dynamics and questions of gender, i.a.

Alfonso de Toro is Professor Emeritus at the Department of Romance Languages and Literature at the University of Leipzig and Director of The Ibero-American and Francophone Research Centre of the same University since 1993 after he has taught at the Universities of Kiel and Hamburg from 1978 until 1992. His publications, published in more than twelve languages, deal with theater, narrative, and poetry in France, the Maghreb, Spain, Latin America, and Italy; as well as with literature and culture, Post-Modern, Post-Colonial theories as well Hybridity and Diaspora theory. He has given more than three hundred lectures, works shops and courses in Europe, USA, Latin

America, in Israel and in the Maghreb. Under his last publications can be mentioned: (Ed. mit J. Tauchnitz) (2019); (Ed. with R. Ceballos): *Frida Kahlo 'revisitada'. Estrategias transmediales – transculturales – transpicturales en la obra de Frida Kahlo* (2014); *Nouvelles diasporas: Hospitalité et appartenance. Expressions maghrébines* (Vol. 13, Nr. 1, 2014); *'Translatio'. Transmediality and Transculturality in Literature, Painting, Photography, Movie (The Americas – Caribbean – Europe – Mahgreb)* (2013); *Epistémologies. Le Maghreb*. (2009; second Edition 2011); *Dispositifs autobiographiques et historiques Epistémologies transversales. Expressions maghrébines* (Vol. n°, 2011); *Borges infinito. borgesvirtual* (2008). Alfonso de Toro is “Corresponding Member of the Chilean Language Academy Abroad” and he has been awarded with the “Gabriela Mistral decoration with the Rank of Great Officer” and with the title of “Officier dans l’ordre des Palmes académiques”.

In der Reihe PASSAGEN sind zuletzt folgende Bände erschienen:

Band 9: János Riesz, « **Astres et Désastres** » – **Histoire et récits de vie africains de la Colonie à la Postcolonie**
2009. 397 S. ISBN 978-3-487-13577-9

Band 11: **Passagen: Hybridity, Transmédiatité, Transculturalidad.**
Herausgegeben von *René Ceballos, Claudia Gatzemeier, Claudia Gronemann, Cornelia Sieber, Juliane Tauchnitz*
2010. 571 S. mit einigen Abb. ISBN 978-3-487-14288-3

Band 12: Véronique Porra, **Langue française, langue d'adoption. Une littérature « invitée » entre création, stratégies et contraintes (1946-2000).**
2011. 309 S. ISBN 978-3-487-14539-6

Band 13: **Les lieux d'oubli de la Francophonie**
Herausgegeben von *Danielle Dumontet, Véronique Porra, Kerstin Kloster und Thorsten Schüller.*
2015. VI/228 S. ISBN 978-3-487-15240-0
E-Book (pdf) ISBN 978-3-487-42130-8

Band 14: **L'Atlantique littéraire: Perspectives théoriques sur la constitution d'un espace translinguistique.**
Herausgegeben von *Jean-Marc Moura und Véronique Porra.*
2015. VI/229 S. mit 2 Abb. ISBN 978-3-487-15262-2
E-Book (pdf) ISBN 978-3-487-42141-4

Band 15: **Eros, Family and Community.**
Herausgegeben von *Ruth Fine, Yosef Kaplan, Shimrit Peled und Yoav Rinon.*
2018. 278 S. ISBN 978-3-487-15455-8
E-Book (pdf) ISBN 978-3-487-42223-7

Band 16: **Räume und Medien in der Romania. Espaces et médias dans les cultures romanes. Spațiu și medii în culturile romanice.**
Herausgegeben von *Sabine Krause und Heide Flagner.*
2018. 254 S. mit 55 Abb. ISBN 978-3-487-15659-0
E-Book (pdf) ISBN 978-3-487-42235-0

Band 17: Ines Bugert, **Qu'est-ce qu'un auteur maghrébin? Globale Autorschaft bei Kebir Ammi, Yasmina Khadra und Assia Djebar.**
2019. 463 S. mit 24 z.T. farbigen Abb. ISBN 978-3-487-15726-9
E-Book (pdf) ISBN 978-3-487-42251-0

TKKL – THEORIE UND KRITIK DER KULTUR UND LITERATUR
UNTERSUCHUNGEN ZU DEN KULTURELLEN ZEICHEN
(SEMIOTIK-EPISTEMOLOGIE-INTERPRETATION)

TCCL – TEORÍA Y CRÍTICA DE LA CULTURA Y LITERATURA
INVESTIGACIONES DE LOS SIGNOS CULTURALES
(SEMIÓTICA-EPISTEMOLOGÍA-INTERPRETACIÓN)

TCCL – THEORY AND CRITICISM OF CULTURE AND LITERATURE
INVESTIGATIONS ON CULTURAL SIGNS
(SEMIOTICS-EPISTEMOLOGY-INTERPRETATION)

In der Reihe sind zuletzt folgende Bände erschienen:

Band 61: Annegret Richter, **Geschichte und Translation im kolonialen Mexiko. Eine Untersuchung ausgewählter historischer Schriften von Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl, Diego Muñoz Camargo und Hernando Alvarado Tezozomoc.**

2015. 260 S. ISBN 978-3-487-15352-0

E-Book (pdf) ISBN 978-3-487-42156-8

Band 62: **La paradoja como forma literaria de la innovación. Jorge Luis Borges entre la tradición judía y el hipertexto.**

Herausgegeben von *Corinna Deppner*.

2018. 167 S. mit 15 Abb. ISBN 978-3-487-15656-9

E-Book (pdf) ISBN 978-3-487-42241-1

Band 63: **Jorge Luis Borges.**

Viajes y tiempos de un escritor a través de culturas y sistemas.

Herausgegeben von *Margherita Cannavacciuolo, Alice Favaro, Susanna Regazzoni*.

2018. 172 S. mit 21 Abb. ISBN 978-3-487-15647-7

E-Book (pdf) ISBN 978-3-487-42250-3

Band 64: **La narración entre lo fantástico y la posmodernidad.**

Adolfo Bioy Casares y Julio Cortázar.

Herausgegeben von *Michael Rössner, Daniel Graziadei*.

2020. 162 S. mit 10 farbigen Abb. ISBN 978-3-487-15383-4

E-Book (pdf) ISBN 978-3-487-42277-0

Band 65: Carola Heinrich, **Was bleibt? Zur Inszenierung von Gedächtnis und Identität im postsowjetischen Kuba und Rumänien**

2020. 210 S. ISBN 978-3-487-15847-1

E-Book (pdf) ISBN 978-3-487-42279-4

- TPT – THEORIE UND PRAXIS DES THEATERS
UNTERSUCHUNGEN ZU DEN KULTURELLEN ZEICHEN
(SEMIOTIK – EPISTEMOLOGIE – INTERPRETATION – GESCHICHTE)
- TPT – TEORÍA Y PRÁCTICA DEL TEATRO
INVESTIGACIONES DE LOS SIGNOS CULTURALES
(SEMIÓTICA – EPISTEMOLOGÍA – INTERPRETACIÓN – HISTÓRIA)
- TPT – THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THEATRE
INVESTIGATIONS ON CULTURAL SIGNS
(SEMIOTICS – EPISTEMOLOGY – INTERPRETATION – HISTORY)

In der Reihe sind zuletzt folgende Bände erschienen:

Band 24: La representación de la Conquista en el teatro latinoamericano de los siglos XX y XXI.

Herausgegeben von *Verena Dolle*.

2014. XXXII/370 S. ISBN 978-3-487-15185-4

Band 25: Espacios urbanos en el teatro español de los siglos XX y XXI.

Herausgegeben von *Cerstin Bauer-Funke*.

2016. VIII/474 S. ISBN 978-3-487-15401-5

E-Book (pdf) ISBN 978-3-487-42172-8

Band 26: Anabel García Martínez, El telón de la memoria.

La Guerra Civil y el franquismo en el teatro español actual.

2016. 500 S. ISBN 978-3-487-15422-0

E-Book (pdf) ISBN 978-3-487-42183-4

Band 27: Espacios en el teatro español y latinoamericano desde el siglo XIX hasta la actualidad.

Herausgegeben von *Cerstin Bauer-Funke, Manfred Tietz, Wilfried Floeck*.

2018. 191 S. ISBN 978-3-487-15697-2

E-Book (pdf) ISBN 978-3-487-42244-2

Band 28: Crisis y creatividad en el teatro español y latinoamericano del siglo XIX al siglo XXI.

Herausgegeben von *Cerstin Bauer-Funke*.

2020. 388 S. mit 65 Abb. ISBN 978-3-487-15743-6

E-Book (pdf) ISBN 978-3-487-42261-9

