Imprisonment and the Deterritorialization of Exile in Max Aub

Brian Davisson
Mississippi State University

Abstract: From the time of his imprisonment following the Spanish Civil War, Max Aub's literary production focused on the effects of exile, as well as the nature of imprisonment by the state. In his poetry and plays, he writes this space of imprisonment as being as severe as exile, allowing him to construct imprisonment as an extension of, and not as distinct from, exile. This article describes Aub's attempts to deterritorialize the experience of exile, as a means of re-inscribing the notion of a homeland in spatial terms.

Keywords: Aub, Max – Exile - 20th century Spanish literature – Deterritorialization – Imprisonment - Space

The exodus of Spanish Republicans following the Civil War was so massive and convoluted for those affected, with over 400,000 people crossing the border into France and many relocated to concentration camps throughout both mainland France and North Africa, that Francisco Caudet refers to it as "El laberinto de la diáspora," drawing both from Gerald Brenan's historical work *The Spanish Labyrinth* and Max Aub's cycle of novels *El laberinto mágico* (Caudet 71-73). Max Aub is a fitting choice from which to draw inspiration regarding this exodus, as both his life and his work demonstrate the complications and contradictions of exile and the sense of imprisonment that it brings. He furthermore provides a clear sense of how exile feels like a punishment imposed by one's home nation, as the state managed to exert physical control over his person following his departure from Spain in 1939. After his arrival in Paris to complete work with André Malraux on the film *L'Espoir*, he was imprisoned multiple times in Paris (in Roland Garros), Vernet, and Nice, then finally brought to the prison camp in Djelfa in French Algeria, where he remained interred until 1942, [1] largely on the accusation of the Franco government that he was a

[1]See Naharro-Calderón, p. 100-01, for an explanation of the circumstances of Aub's imprisonments.

communist subversive working to undermine the Vichy government.[2] His condition as a French prisoner charged in effect by the Spanish government created a sense of imprisonment by the two nations he could claim as his homeland at that time, as he was born in Paris and had lived in France until the age of 11 before moving with his family to Spain at the outbreak of World War I. Through this series of circumstances, Aub's early exilic works portray not only the consequences of exile, but likewise the condition of imprisonment and its effect on the individual's understanding of his or her connection to the national space.

Aub's early exilic works create strong points of conflation between exile and imprisonment, as conditions that separate the individual from the idea of a homeland, regardless of the specific point of physical habitation. Here Deleuze and Guattari's concept of deterritorialization, in which the individual assumes an ontological relationship to the State, while the signs of affiliation with the State take on new, abstract meanings, underscores the struggles of the individual in the modern world. They write: "the State commences (or recommences) with… an act of territoriality through the fixing of residence…. But the State operates by euphemisms. The pseudo territoriality is the product of an effective deterritorialization that substitutes abstract signs for the signs of the earth" (*Anti-Oedipus* 196). This is to say that any relationship established with the state is rooted in signs that are themselves abstract substitutes for more concrete concepts of identity. The individual's relationship with the state is thus permanently fraught with shifting signs that indicate fleeting and abstract meanings. The individual in exile, cut off from the direct control of state apparatuses (though by no means escaping them completely), faces a further deterritorialization from the concrete territory of the state, thus separated first through physical contact with the territory, and then through the abstract markers of meaning that link the individual to the state.

It is evident, thus, that exile is a profoundly deterritorializing occurrence, yet Aub's literary production during the first decade of his exile reveals not only conflicts in his sense of freedom and the consequences of removal from the nation, but also his ability even to deterritorialize the terms of exile as a response to the psychological demands of his exilic experience. He writes the space of imprisonment as one that is functionally as severe as that of exile, and likewise undermines the discourse of exile as painful for those remaining within the national sphere just as much as those living outside of it. The discourse of exile in Aub's early exilic works is ultimately a turn toward expressing the disruption of nationalism and the value of place and origin, and a

[2] Aub's experiences in this cycle of accusations and imprisonment is treated thoroughly in his fiction. Along with the events surrounding his internment in Djelfa, related in the works included in this article, he portrays in largely autobiographical form the conditions in Roland Garros and Vernet in his drama *Morir por cerrar los ojos* and the screenplay based on that play titled *Campo francés*. Manuel Aznar Soler's edition of Aub's *Diarios*, published in 1998, provides facsimiles of many of the documents related to Aub's imprisonment and release by the French government, as well as Aub's petitions for release and visas for travel through the United States and to Mexico.

strategy of undermining and functionally deterritorializing both the concept of the nation of origin and the writing of exile as a means of adapting to the outcome of his removal from a point of origin, the Spanish nation, which was both adopted and constructed as absolute in his mind.

The punitive reach of totalizing national structures

The link between exile and imprisonment is evident historically, as well as through Aub's literature, and provides one of the leading factors motivating the need to engage with exile from a dictatorial regime. Imprisonment at times appears as a threat leading to the decision to depart one's nation; in other cases it precedes the moment of departure, effectively consolidating the individual's determination that he or she is incapable of continuing to live within that national sphere. It is crucial to indicate in either case, however, that any determination on the part of the individual to depart is hardly an alternative circumstance to a forced expulsion on the part of the ruling government. This is to say, echoing the statement by Amy Kaminsky in her work *After Exile*, that "'Voluntary exile' is… an oxymoron that masks the cruelly limited choices imposed on the subject" (9). Exile is a choice that in many cases is no choice at all; the subject faces the impossibility of residing in the nation of origin and the possibility of residing elsewhere. By extension, imprisonment, or its mere threat, serves in essence as an exiling act on the part of the government, that seeks to silence the individual and remove him or her from the intellectual and social territory of the nation, just as a physical expulsion would accomplish, demonstrating the means by which imprisonment offers no true alternative to exile for the individual. Both conditions would thus lead to the nation-state attempting to assert control over the first of Sebastiaan Faber's definitions of cultural hegemony, "which implies a 'conquest' not only of the state and economic structures, but also of the cultural field of civil society" (*Exile* 35).

In concrete terms, both exile and imprisonment correspond to what Foucault terms the "discipline-blockade." This is a punitive social structure that he describes in terms relating to its prison-like aims: an "enclosed institution, established on the edges of society, turned inwards towards negative functions: arresting evil, breaking communication, suspending time" (209). If some separation is possible between exile and politically-motivated imprisonment, one could always point to the presence or absence of the physical prison, and to the location of said structure. Certainly the exile is free to wander within the space of exile (though with potential limitations), while the prisoner remains enclosed and geographically within the national territory, yet there exist numerous cases of exiles writing of feelings of confinement, as though exile itself

indicates a reflection, or perhaps inversion, of the imprisonment that was either threatened or experienced within the home nation.[3]

As an extension of the punitive forms of social coercion, Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari claim that the nation-state regulates homogeneity through what they term "abstract machines." These elements of power attempt to unify the individual with the nation, by establishing binary claims of identity. This enforcement of binarism allows the individual to comprehend his or her role within the nation as a consequence of belonging or non-belonging, and thus allow the nation to fundamentally exist as a totalized whole, composed of all of those that pertain to that sphere. This form allows the nation to persist without any permissible space for those claiming a partial belonging: once the individual is established as part of the nation, then he or she persists in that position indefinitely, unless expelled completely. As punishments, exile and imprisonment both function as abstract machines of this totalizing desire, tools that remove the heterogeneous individual from the intellectual space of the nation, and thus allowing all those remaining to exist as a unified ontological whole. The employment of the abstract machine is ultimately predicated on the form of capitalism that the state exists to perpetuate, and in consequence the machine becomes a regulator of a system that is designed as self-reinforcing. The citizens of the state are allowed no freedom to dissent from the economic form, and thus through their absolute relationship to the nation, help it to reinforce its role as a regulator of its own system. They write:

> Not only are [nation-states] constituted in an active struggle against the imperial or evolved systems, the feudal systems, and the autonomous cities, but they crush their own "minorities," in other words, minoritarian phenomena that could be termed "nationalitarian," which work from within and if need be turn the old codes to find a greater degree of freedom…. It is in the form of the nation-state, with all its possible variations, that the State becomes the model of realization for the capitalism axiomatic. (*A Thousand Plateaus* 456)

The modern state thus requires totality as a consequence of the capitalist impulse, and must in turn regulate outliers, or minority groups, that threaten to work against the economic impulses of the state, and by their definition, toward increased freedom.[4]

The state's use of punishment against the intellectual is carried out as an extension of this normalizing impulse, and works by destabilizing the existence of the

[3] Jordi Gracia's *A la intemperie* provides an indication of how this structure was complicated in the case of Spain, as he focuses on the relative intellectual freedom of exile in comparison with those writers still residing in Franco's Spain.

[4] In the case of Franco-era Spain, as well as numerous other countries, this manifests in a clear way in terms of regionalisms, in particular in Cataluña, Valencia, or Galicia, as a homogenous notion of Spain as effectively Castilla is dictated by the central government.

individual within the state's territory. This process of normalizing the relationship of the individual to the state occurs within the split between territorialization and deterritorialization, and bears on exile as a marker of the state's ability to determine the relationship between the individual and the nation of origin. As Sophia McClennen writes, citing Steven Best and Douglas Kellner's analysis of Deleuze and Guattari: "deterritorialization opposes territorialization, where the first is the 'unchaining of both material production and desire from socially restricting forces' and the latter is 'the process of repressing desire by taming and confining its productive energies" (61). When the state removes the individual from its territory (whether physically or symbolically), the process deterritorializes the individual by restricting his or her ability to destabilize the political and economic social structure. This process, however, is marked by its belatedness: the need to separate the individual from the territory generally follows the individual's prior decision to seek out greater freedom, and in this sense, the imprisoned or exiled person is already deterritorialized from the ideological apparatus of the state prior to imprisonment or exile. In connecting deterritorialization to the structures of discipline imposed by the state, this condition can be seen as not merely a reflection of the separation of the individual from the control of the state, but rather as a process by which the state actively removes the citizen, and in response, through which the individual might be capable of subverting the discourse of control imposed upon him or her.

If the state's actions in deterritorializing the individual underscores the inability of that person to act within the homogeneity of the national space, then the intellectual working from the left against these structures can be seen as motivated by these same desires: to protect the freedoms of the nation from the political forms that destabilize it (variously fascism, authoritarianism, militarism, etc.). As an individual actor, the intellectual largely seeks freedom over totality, in effect working against the abstract machines of the state, and thus has no need for the homogeneity sought by the state.[5] Introducing deterritorialization into the conflicts of exile, however, inverts the control of the state as a marker of power, and in a sense the intellectual breaks free from deterritorialization by reterritorializing his- or herself to new discourses. This inversion of control arises through the act of exile specifically: once the individual is severed from the physical space of the nation, then the state ceases to maintain control over that individual. The exiled person subsequently gains a degree of autonomy and agency beyond the national border by reterritorializing, or constructing a new ontology within the available signs that exist outside the earlier national sphere, and would thus be free to undermine the state through whatever means possible. Exile thus has the potential to work against the state in two ways: by removing the individual from the process of territorialization, thus losing control of the repression of the individual; or forcing the

[5] Edward Said works through the nuances of the intellectual's place in a homogenized, nationalized society in *Representations of the Intellectual*, in particular in the first two lectures: "Representations of the Intellectual" and "Holding Nations and Traditions at Bay."

individual into a deterritorialized state, leading to that individual's greater ability to seek freedoms from the state, even while physically absent. Applied to exile, deterritorialization and territorialization are hardly opposing binary discourses, but instead form (rhizomatic) points of connection to the nation that work to cohere or fragment the national structure as dictated by the individual's response to state power.

Aub and the totalized homeland

Foucault's construction of the "discipline-blockade" (and by extension the "discipline-mechanism," which "must improve the exercise of power by making it) lighter, more rapid, more effective, a design of subtle coercion for a society to come" (209), is intriguing in terms of exile, as the state's control over the individual can be seen as fragmented through the disciplinary process. The exile essentially escapes the state's control in a physical manner. This does not necessarily remove the individual from state control entirely, as the psychological effects of a repressive regime are fully capable of following the individual outside of his or her home nation. In any case, any of the liberties associated with exile arrive with the caveat that they are not absolute, even when escape from dictatorship or other politically-motivated forms of repression are achieved. This fact is not lost in the case of Aub, for whom the distance achieved from Spain did not lead to the absence of state control.

In describing Aub's place within the larger body of Spanish Republican exiles, Faber writes: "Aub se distingue de sus compañeros exiliados por su refinada conciencia… no sólo de lo que implica el exilio en términos éticos, sino también de los trágicos dilemas asociados con este deber moral" ("Max Aub, conciencia" 16). This label of Aub as the "conciencia del exilio" is quite apt regarding his ability to present highly nuanced situations that largely avoid judgment of his characters within his literary works, and that understand the divergent points of view of his contemporaries within his personal correspondence and diaries. It is not at all surprising when considering the complexity and nuance of his own exilic experience, that he discovered the nuance of his literary creations through the experiences of his own life. Reading his diaries and noting his literary production following his internment in Djelfa, Aub seemed to think on very few topics without coming to terms with them in some manner through his exile. This hardly places him apart from many of his contemporaries, several of whom felt exile to be a defeating circumstance. And it is equally important to notice here that while Aub did display a highly refined sense of what exile meant to him and his fellow Republican exiles, this position emerges largely as a consequence of the greater experience with exile that occurred over the final thirty years of his life, and was by no means a part of the discourse of exile with which he engaged during the initial years of his displacement.

During the Civil War, his later nuanced views of artistic production and the position of the intellectual were largely absent, and he understood the war as an

immediate threat to the ontology of Spain. He would write in 1938, in the introduction to his "Teatro de circunstancias," a collection of theatrical works treating the Civil War and the breakdown of society immediately prior to its outbreak:

> Si existe algún escritor español en cuya obra no haya repercutido la guerra abominable que nos ha sido impuesta, o no es escritor o no es español. Se pudo defender en algún tiempo pasado que el mantenerse alejado de las luchas sociales o internacionales era una posición moral altiva y en consonancia con ciertas teorías que reivindicaban muy alto el espíritu; el tiempo es otro, nuestros años con de lucha, y el que no lucha muere o está muerto sin saberlo. No sostengo aquí "que el que no esté conmigo está contra mí", sino que los que no están ni con los unos ni con los otros inexisten, y lo que no existe, mal puede sobrevivir. (*OC VII-A*: 227)

This introduction was composed in Barcelona, where Aub lived through the conflict, and is hardly a difficult position to comprehend when considering the severity of the war and the schism it created within Spain. The use of the Civil War as an absolute marker of historical experience provides a clear temporal break in the nation's history, and likewise separates Aub's output in his young adulthood from his more mature exile literature. Here his description of the struggle for the nation works through an absolute ontological relationship between the Spanish people and their country, through its insistence on connecting history, nationalism, and aesthetics. As an intellectual on the left, opposed to the hyper-nationalistic policies of the *Falange* or the politics of Franco, calling the totality of the nation into question and calling out those who attempt neutrality reveals a breakdown in the nation that would grow more severe with the experience of exile. While Aub claims here that the intellectual's task is to make a choice, regardless of what that choice might be, his position is in effect that this choice is ontological: Spanish identity depends on the writer's display, at least unconsciously, of a response to the war in his or her literary production.

A shift from the ontological connection between the nation and the ideology of its inhabitants followed Aub into the initial stages of his exile, and emerges in the poetry he wrote while interred in Djelfa, between November 1941 and September 1942. In a poem titled "Tres años," dated 2 February 1942 and published in the collection *Diario de Djelfa* two years later, he indicates a theme that would resurface in the writings from his final decade of his life, of the variability of national existence:

> […]
> Tres años de noche, tres años de campos, tres años de Francos.
>
> Tres años que España está borrada del mapa.

Tres años que vivimos más abajo del mundo,
Erramundos.
Tres años de Sahara
–todo el mundo es Sahara, menos España–.
Tres años de sangre, tres años de podredumbre, tres años
de muerte, tres años de hambre.
Tres años que muerden, tres años que roen.
Febrero del treinta y nueve.
Tres años de muerte. (*OC I*: 112)

Death and inexistence here provide a counterposition to ontological existence. Just as a response to the Civil War indicates one's absolute connection to the nation in his writings during the war, here death and inexistence provide absolute and metaphorical means of understanding the loss of Spain. Much of this struggle continues in the poem "Salmo CXXXVII," from April 1942. Here the threat to Spain again plays out as one of existence against death, though here death likewise carries with it the infiltration of persons who at one time were ontologically connected to the nation, yet now that tie has been severed:

¡Extranjeros, vosotros
que dormís en nuestras camas!
¡Españoles nosotros,
polvo y tierra de España
extranjeros
en las arenas del Sahara!
[…] (*OC I*: 148)

Aub's understanding of Spain can thus be seen as quite similar to the vision that emerged during the war. As in the introduction to the "Teatro de circunstancias," the effects of the Civil War are only felt by those who may still claim some sense of Spanish identity, though those individuals ostensibly now live outside the immediate territory of the nation. Andrés Pau addresses this same idea in relation to Aub's theater, writing that for Aub, "quienes han permanecido en España no sólo desconocen su pasado –que no les interesa– sino que no saben nada de aquellos que marcharon tras la guerra" (512).

Within the claims made on the nature of Spanish identity in the pieces cited above, Aub engages in a process that shows a largely totalized vision of the nation, while simultaneously showing how exile breaks that totalized nation in geographic terms. The geographic separation from the nation is essential, and reveals itself more poignantly in "Salmo CXXXVII," as those who inhabit the nation are presented as being less Spanish than the exiles residing in North Africa. Aub here presupposes a totalized nation composed of its ideologically-determined exiled and imprisoned

population, linked to the territory of the nation as a metonymic construction tied to the sands of the Sahara, and thus decenters Spain in terms of its population. If the nation is capable of being understood in such totalizing terms, however, Aub severs this totalization geographically through the discourses of exile and imprisonment, which through his own incarceration in Djelfa are impossible to separate in a fundamental manner. To extend this line of thought to a point of resolution helps to reveal where Aub breaks with a totalization of the nation: if Spain can be totalized by simply restoring the population of Djelfa to its geographic space within the nation, then one must likewise presuppose the absence of the still-ideological "forasteros" living in Spain. In effect, such a move would rewrite the Civil War, as the fragmentation of the conflict and the loss of life cannot be merely erased by restoring the exiles to their homeland.

The deterritorialization of exile

Aub's output following his release from Djelfa is remarkable for its ability to rewrite the nature of exile outside of the geographic structure normally associated with it. Geographic separation from the nation distinguishes the exile from the political prisoner, despite both figures being unwelcomed in the cultural space of the nation, yet in Aub's early exilic works this difference is minimized in terms of comprehending the individual's relationship to his or her homeland. Instead of simply revealing the exile as deterritorialized, he in turn deterritorializes the nation through his exile. Even with the first of his novels concerning the Civil War, *Campo cerrado* (1943), Aub cannot reveal the collectivity of the immediate prewar context of Spain through the novel's protagonist Rafael López Serrador, and must attempt instead to collect the diverse elements of the nation's social structure through frequent narrative asides, tracing the lives of other characters. Aub separates the protagonist from himself as well, writing Rafael as a young man who, like Aub, is from the Valencian countryside near Segorbe, yet who aligns with the *Falange* in a seemingly casual fashion, not driven by ideology so much as carried away by the competing political positions that exist in Barcelona. It is ultimately telling in this regard that Rafael does not even die through the conflict, but rather of typhoid in a Barcelona hospital. In effect, the central conflict that runs through the cycle of novels cannot encompass the totality of life and death that Spain experienced during its most violent conflict.

Deterritorialization emerges here as a decentering of the individual in response to the social and economic structures of modernity. By extension, it is accompanied by a shift in the markers of totality that would otherwise allow the individual to align with the territorialized structure of the nation-state. The individual requires an ideological relationship to the nation in order to accept the totality projected by the political apparatus of the nation. Yet with the consequences of exile, and the disconnect of the individual from the ideological sphere of the nation, that individual must reckon with a nation that is no longer totalized for him or her. This disruption of totality might

emerge in terms of spatial, linguistic or cultural relations, and must confront the nation in fragmented terms. Deleuze and Guattari remark in their study of the works of Kafka that the decentered individual can only engage language that "is affected with a high coefficient of deterritorialization" (*Kafka* 16). Here Deleuze and Guattari's revelation of the deterritorialized writer's fundamental need to engage his or her displacement through literature is informative in the case of Aub, for whom geographic and cultural fragmentation formed a key part of his lived experience.

Aub's engagement with literature was unquestionably central to his identity, and in terms of the deterritorializing process he employed this literature as a means of using exile to destabilize Spain as a geographic space. This can be seen in his poetry from Djelfa, as well as through his constant engagement with discourses of exile throughout his literary career. The struggle between the historical and social reality of Spain and the identity of the exiled national subject emerges in the early works of his exile following his arrival in Mexico in 1942. In his 1944 drama *Tránsito*, he writes exile as an experience that is future-laden and disrupting to the family structures of those suffering the aftermath of the conflict. The work is presented as taking place in 1947, three years after its publication, which according to Silvia Monti "indicaría con toda claridad que Aub no tenía mucha confianza en la posibilidad de un retorno a España en breve" (18). Aub here uses the charactonym of the title character's identity to show the protagonist's attempt to find solace in the arms of a Mexican woman whose presence reminds him constantly of his wife Cruz who remains in Spain. The work revolves around the protagonist Emilio's attempts to reconcile his memories and reconstruct a life in another country as he realizes that he can no longer have the life he desired in Spain. To this extent, Aub works through the paradigm of "destierro/transtierro," showing the attempt of the exiled individual to come to terms with geographic separation from the home nation through cultural replicas of the previously-inhabited space.[6] This space is ultimately untenable for Emilio, as he continues to desire a life with his wife and son, which marks this transition as nearly impossible at this point, as Aub seems to foresee his own difficulty in resolving it even three years after composing the play.

For Emilio, the separation from Spain is likewise difficult to resolve through its implications for his view of the ontological connection between the individual and the

[6] María Paz Sanz Álvarez's article "Vivir en España desde la distancia" is helpful in laying out the distinction between "destierro" and "transtierro" in the case of Aub. She distinguishes between the desterrado, who understands his or her predicament in terms of residing in a different nation, separate from the nation of origin, and the transterrado, for whom "el exilio en tierras hispanoamericanas le hacía sentirse más como en 'casa', fundamentalmente porque todo el mundo hablaba su misma lengua" (164). José Monleón provides a more hermeneutic approach to the terms: "El destierro es un substantivo cerrado, estático, inexorable; en cambio, el transtierro es una herida, un equipaje sin abrir, siempre para salir hacia otra parte. El desterrado es un personaje más sereno, que espera que el plazo se cumpla; el transterrado es un enfermo que mira y remira hacia su tierra, que la espía desde lejos, que la lleva dentro de él, que se siente trasplantado a un medio que no es el suyo" (77).

nation. He remarks in a dreamed conversation with Cruz on the breakdown of this relationship:

> EMILIO: …Antes, el hijo de un carpintero sabía que sería carpintero. El hijo de un español, español.
> CRUZ: ¿Y ahora?
> EMILIO: Ahora… ¿Qué será el hijo de un alemán? ¿Qué será el hijo de un fabricante? ¿Qué será el hijo de un joyero?
> CRUZ: Siempre habrá alemanes, fabricantes, joyeros o albañiles.
> EMILIO: Pero no los predestinados. Lo serán otros, los que habían nacido para distinto fin…. Mi hijo ya no es mi hijo, el que hubiese sido mi hijo. ¿Qué seré la semana próxima? (*OC VII-B* 84)

Emilio's exile is disruptive through its ability to shift the inherent identities associated with one's point of origin and family circumstance. This is tellingly not only of consequence for the individual immediately exiled, but also of the future sense of self-recognition and social recognition tied to those affected by the exile. His separation from his son Pedro, apparently a *maqui* still fighting in Spain whose fate remains unknown to Emilio, interrupts his ability to understand the condition of his family, to which Cruz responds that he should have a child with Tránsito. Such a child, however, would live with an identity separate from that of either Emilio or Pedro; Pedro can insist on his Spanish lineage, while Emilio lives with, at best, a "transterrado" identity. The child of Emilio's exile, of his "tránsito" to Mexico, would exist with a connection to Mexico and not to Spain, thus separating the child from Emilio.

Tránsito is furthermore telling in the representation of Emilio's imagination, which switches frequently between his recognition of Cruz and the presence of Tránsito on the stage. Emilio is able to live a strained life surrounded on different levels by the two family structures available to him, one in Mexico and one in Spain. His memories of his wife and son as well as his attempt to justify his presence in Mexico to Cruz, who makes little attempt to dissuade him from continuing in Mexico as he is, reveal the breakdown in his identity as torn between two national spheres, but with no clear ability to reconcile them. His conversation with his friend Adolfo, a fellow exile who desires to return to Spain, indicates this split. Adolfo claims that it is his memories that call him back to Spain; Emilio responds: "Me daría vergüenza pensar así" (88). This is of course an ironic statement, as the entire play revolves around his inability to disconnect from his memories of Spain. Yet even with these memories, his ability to return to a Spanish territorial space to hold discourse with his wife is not absolute. He cannot, however, find the means to converse with Pedro, even through his imagination. His lingering doubts as to whether his son is still actively fighting the regime, in jail, or been killed, places his identity in doubt for Emilio, and even Cruz's claims as to his condition are not consistent, first declaring him killed and then stating that he escaped from

government troops. In Emilio's imagination, he sleeps through his son's appearance to Cruz at the play's close, dying in her arms, as she attempts to rouse her husband with words that speak to the absolute nature of his situation: "¡Despierta tú, Emilio! ¡Emilio, óyeme! ¡Estás soñando! ¡Despiértate! Estás en México, en tu cama, con TRÁNSITO. Vuélvete, revuélvete; tócala, tócala; date cuenta. España está lejos. Lejos, tras el mar" (93). His separation from Spain is clearly not absolute, as his memories attest, yet his dream of the death of his son carries the markers of this trauma. The distance from Spain has severed his ability to construct the relationships he desired with his family, and his attempts to fill those gaps with substitutes in Mexico fail to satisfy his emotional needs.

Tránsito ties closely to the first part of Aub's cycle of plays titled *Las vueltas*, largely through its treatment of territorial and cultural separation from the homeland, as well as the implications of imprisonment. In 1965, when the three separate plays were published together, he wrote an introduction that states:

> Que yo sepa, no he estado en España desde el primero de febrero de 1939. Las obras –o la obra– que siguen, escritas en 1947, 1960 y 1964, suceden allí y, más o menos, en esas fechas. Inútil decir que reflejan la realidad tal y como me la figuré. ¿Qué tienen que ver con la verdad? Daría cualquier cosa para saberlo: por eso las publico.
> Las reúno porque obedecen a un motivo común. Bastará para darles unidad que los mismos actores interpreten los papeles principales de las tres piezas. (*OC VII-B* 181).

The unity of these works is crucial in understanding the interconnection between exile and imprisonment in Aub's output. This is due to his grouping of the first two works of the cycle, *La vuelta 1947* and *La vuelta 1960*, concerning formerly imprisoned individuals who have returned home following release from a politically-motivated imprisonment, only to be recalled to prison by the works' ends, with the final piece, *La vuelta 1964*, exploring he return to Spain of an exiled Republican living in Mexico. *Las vueltas* as a whole is representative not only of the national problem of determining statelessness and nationalism, but also indicates the consequential psychological effects of either circumstance on the individual, following the claim of Manuel Aznar Soler that "El retorno –como la libertad para un prisionero– es una idea recurrente y obsesiva para cualquier exiliado" (283). Both conditions are mutually significant, and Aub's continued effort to work through their meaning is evidenced in his return to the subject in the mid-1960s, both with the final parts of the cycle of plays and with the composition of *Campo francés* in 1960, an updating of his 1944 play *Morir por cerrar los ojos* as a film treatment.

The specific points of comparison between *La vuelta 1947* and *Tránsito* largely conflate the two protagonists, providing on some level the realization of Emilio's

imagination in the latter play in the person of Isabel in the former. Her return to her village following her imprisonment in Valencia is nearly entirely unsatisfactory, as she must deal with the presence of Paca, her husband Damián's lover in her absence, and must likewise work through the dissatisfaction of her husband on her return. Much as with the return of exiled individuals, as appear in *La vuelta 1964* or even Aub's diary of his 1969 trip to Spain, *La gallina ciega*, the return from exile in Aub's work expresses a temporal gap that cannot find resolution, as the place of origin fails to remain static in the exile's absence. This separation is both spatial and temporal, and a constant characteristic of Aub's works concerning the experience of return. In the 1949 story "Librada," Ernesto, imprisoned in the Spain to which he has returned, writes to his wife Librada: "España me hizo la impresión de ser más pequeña de que cuando la dejamos, como si estuviera encogida, o como si hubiera crecido en nuestro recuerdo los años que pasamos fuera de ella, o tal vez porque América es más grande" (*OC IV-B* 187). His return to Spain following exile in Mexico leads to what he deems a return home, yet it is not a home he can recognize in any clear way. Similarly, in *La vuelta 1947*, Isabel returns to find the shift in her family and the ideological separation she feels from those around her, whether her husband's turn to acquiescence in the face of fascist politics or her young daughter's uncertainty and distrust of the label "roja," despite a failure to comprehend its meaning. Her acceptance with returning to prison at the work's close is a return to the point of her separation, yet it likewise emphasizes the gap in her allegiance to either of the realms available to her: political imprisonment and her point of origin. Just as exile marks a schismatic point in the individual's experience, so does imprisonment preclude the individual from ever returning to the space he or she once knew as home.

Isabel's desire to resist Francoist ideology provides the most concrete connection with the exilic literature by Aub during this period, as the nation divides between those accepting of the regime (even if begrudgingly) and those who cannot survive within it in any real way. As she prepares to return to prison, she remarks to Damián: "Ya no sabéis distinguir la verdad de la propaganda… She habla, cada día, de cárceles, de fusilamientos: creéis sentirlo. Pero no. Estáis parados, mudos, ciegos… Sólo reaccionáis cuando os atañe personalmente." She continues later: "Hoy, para vosotros, la falta de libertad, la muerte, no tiene importancia: es lo de siempre. Detuvieron a ése…, fusilaron a aquél… Y dormís tranquilos" (*OC VII-B* 198). The ability to be blind or to forget marks the crucial separation between those still struggling against the regime and those who have accepted it, drawing a clear link to the "extranjeros" in the poetic works of the incarcerated Aub. Through the ideological lens that Aub employs, the breakdown in the national structure cannot be understood within the presence of the political conflict. Thus, the distinction between an exile and a political prisoner is of scant concern. Damián indicates this breakdown through his incomprehension of Isabel's connection to the political left, as well as to his ignorance of the Republican exiles. He remarks: "A lo mejor eres de las que se hacen ilusiones de que los de México

o los de Francia llegarán aquí algún día con el maná. ¡Vas aviada! Aquéllos sólo piensan en hacerse ricos con el dinero que robaron" (193). For as much as Isabel provides a congruent political and exilic position to Emilio in *Tránsito*, Damián appears as the vital consequence, forced to live in a divided family with an unappealing substitute for his absent wife. His opposition to Isabel's current political stance is not determined by his absolute acquiescence to Francoist politics, but rather to his desire to stay out of trouble with the authorities following his own previous and much shorter prison sentence.

Even for as much as Isabel is forced to work through the separation from her family and her village, and at least pay lip service to the choices made by her husband, so must Damián resolve the consequences of this conflict in the social structure surrounding him. In this same way, the condemned Francisco writes to his wife Gabriela in Aub's 1949 story "Ruptura": "La detenida pareces tú: te apiadas sobre el pobre cadáver de tus treinta días de cama incompartida" (*OC IV-B* 171).[7] Aub's characters in these works lament the consequences of their exiles and imprisonments in terms of the disruption of the family structure, and while his biography helps to indicate his own position on the side of the exiles and prisoners, a clear concern for those on the other side of the geographic and ideological divide is notable. In the end, the consequence of physical separation for the family structure is absolute in so far as it disrupts all parties, and the inversion of the terms of exile or imprisonment shows the breakdown in the former totality of this structure. Understood in terms of exile, the nation is incapable of withstanding the excision of its members, and must come to terms with the consequences of this separation in an attempt to fashion a totality once more.

Aub's focus on internment as a response to exile helps demonstrate his effort to work through the structure of spatial separation and explore the consequences of this removal in other facets of the individual's life. The three plays comprising *Las vueltas* emphasize this concern through a remarkably similar structure, even despite the changes in Spanish politics between the 1940s and 1960s, as Pau indicates of *La vuelta 1960*: "en esta segunda vuelta no hay un atisbo de represión exterio dentro de la viviendas de los ciudadanos, cuestión que muestra la seguridad y confianza que va adquiriendo el poder político" (509). In *La vuelta 1947* Isabel returns from prison to her home, finds it inhospitable for personal and political reasons, and is then informed that she must return to prison. The work's title implies both of these moments of return, and Aub proceeds to utilize this structure twice more, only the third time replacing the prison

[7] Aub's ultimate plan for the *Laberinto mágico* was the publication of all of the corresponding works in two volumes, including the five novels (*Campo cerrado*, *Campo abierto*, *Campo de sangre*, *Campo del Moro*, and *Campo de los almendros*), as well as the film treatment *Campo francés* and multiple stories, including "Ruptura." Along with the thematic parallels explored here, the inclusion of both "Ruptura" and *Campo francés* (though not "Librada") helps to emphasize the significance of imprisonment as a clear manifestation of exile for Aub. For more on his plan for the complete *Laberinto mágico*, see Valeria de Marco's introduction to *Campo francés*, in particular p. 8-13.

with Mexico as a space of exile. Isabel eventually remarks to Damián that: "Me parece que voy a añorar la cárcel. Por lo menos allí podía una hablar de lo que le daba la gana" (187). Though she will inevitably miss her home while confined, that home likewise offers a lack of support and desire for her presence. Within this condition, Aub expresses the fragmentation of the home environment for the exiled or otherwise removed individual; the homeland has moved on, while the exiled individual has remained relatively static. The personal "success" of the exile thus depends in large measure on the ability to compartmentalize the two spheres of the home and the site of removal. This success can be determined in psychological, professional, or myriad other forms, yet continually returns to a severing of the national sphere and the individual's ability to comprehend and cope with this shift.

In diminishing the necessity of the geographic relationship to the nation, Aub in effect de-territorializes Spain in a much more literal form than expressed in Deleuze and Guattari's discursive presentation of the concept. His position as a French-born, adopted Spaniard helps to reassert his cultural and personal connection to the national space, and encapsulates his affinity with a national space that is only somewhat tenable for him, while at the same time demonstrating decentered forms of culture. Aub asserts the consequence of his foreign birth as a link to extra-Spanish social forms, as he was fully conversant in French and German literature and culture, and bore a personal link to Judaism through his mother (though he only embraced his Jewish identity at certain points in his life). In his diaries in 1945, Aub reinforces his cultural position:

> ¡Qué daño no me ha hecho, en nuestro mundo cerrado, el no ser de ninguna parte! El llamarme como me llamo, con nombre y apellido que lo mismo pueden ser de un país que de otro… En estas horas de nacionalismo cerrado el haber nacido en París, y ser español, tener padre español nacido en Alemania, madre parisina, pero de origen también alemán, pero de apellido eslavo, y hablar con ese acento francés que desgarra mi castellano, ¡qué daño no me ha hecho! El agnosticismo de mis padres –librepensadores– en un país católico como España, o su prosapia judía, en un país antisemita como Francia, ¡qué disgustos, qué humillaciones no me ha acarreado! ¡Qué vergüenzas! Algo de mi fuerza –de mis fuerzas– he sacado para luchar contra tanta ignominia. (*Diarios* 128)

This passage is in part a reflection of Aub being somewhat too generous with his background. He opens by claiming that he is from no specific place, yet his entire output following his exile reflects on his often vociferous assertions that he is nothing but a Spaniard. Faber writes that "in a sense he had been an exile all his life" (*Exile* 221), though it might be more precise to claim that the structures of territorialization had shifted on Aub from at least the point of his move to Spain at age eleven, if not during

his childhood in Paris, and had persisted in continually greater forms of instability as his consciousness of geographic and cultural displacement increased through his life. For as much as exile is an implicitly deterritorializing event, Aub's connection to Spain and the idea of Spanish identity presented him with distinct consequences than those faced by most other Republican exiles; the result is a persistent attempt to justify his position as a member of the nation, while at the same time revealing the deterritorialization of exile as a consequence of his own decentered link to his point of origin.

Conclusion

Deleuze and Guattari's turn to Kafka as a representative of the deterritorialized consciousness is ultimately instructive in the case of Aub, for while his works would seem to be too close to the collective consciousness of Spain to fit under the label of a "minor literature," his inability to find stability in the forms of nationalism and culture present in his adopted Spain results in multiple points of inversion of a nationalist-inspired consciousness. If the symbols of language or discourse for Deleuze and Gauttari are in a continual state of deterritorialization, being reterritorialized through the machines of the state, then Aub's exilic production is unique among the output of the Republican exiles through his maintaining the discourse of exile in a position of decenteredness by deterritorializing exile from its connection to a geographic space. In this regard, his literature of exile is simultaneously a literature of imprisonment and a literature of the discipline of the state, seeking the relationship between Francoism as punishment for political opposition, and the effective prison of literature that confronted Aub. He was ultimately faced with no other possible recourse to freedom or to an ideological opposition to the regime that removed him from his homeland. If the onset of exile represented Foucault's "discipline-blockade," then the outcome of exile persists as the "discipline-mechanism," self-reinforcing the discipline of the state, and Aub will not be able to escape the consequences of exile throughout his life.

Aub's entire body of literature is remarkable in this sense, as it appears as a perpetual variation of the theme of and response to exile, whether as precipitated by the Civil War or as experienced in its aftermath. At the same time it is configured by the structure of feeling that rewrites his consistently shifting relationship to Spain, and thus presents an entirely diverse approach to the deterritorialization of the individual in the face of the political machines of modernity. It would be unfair to the other individuals involved in the Republican exile to claim that Aub felt his exile more markedly than his contemporaries, yet there is little question that exile for Aub was a profoundly different experience due precisely to the distinct relationship he had with Spain, and to the uniqueness of his process of entering into that exile. Deterritorialization as a whole responds to the political configuration of modernity, and to the writings of exile necessarily intertwined with the decentering of national origin in the modern age. Exile thus exists as a discourse that must reconcile the deterritorialization of the individual as

a subject of the processes of modernity who subsequently finds the reinscription of his or her relationship to the nation-state in crisis.

WORKS CITED

Aub, Max. *Diarios (1939-1972)*, ed. Manuel Aznar Soler. Barcelona: Alba Editorial, 1998. Print.

--. *Obras completas I: Obra poética completa*, ed. Arcadio López Casanova. Valencia: Generalitat Valenciana, 2001. Print.

--. *Obras completas VII-A: Primer teatro*, ed. Josep Lluís Serera. Valencia: Generalitat Valenciana, 2002. Print.

--. *Obras completas VII-B: Teatro breve*, ed. Silvia Monti. Valencia: Generalitat Valenciana, 2002. Print.

--. *Obras completas IV-B: Relatos II. Los relatos de* El laberinto mágico, ed. Luis Llorens Marzo and Javier Lluch Prats. Valencia: Generalitat Valenciana, 2006. Print.

Aznar Soler, Manuel. "Exilio y retorno en *Tránsito*," in Aznar Soler, Manuel. *Los laberintos del exilio: Diecisiete estudios sobre la obra literaria de Max Aub*. Sevilla: Renacimiento, 2003, p. 283-95. Print.

Caudet, Francisco. *El exilio republicano de 1939*. Madrid: Cátedra, 2005. Print.

Deleuze, Gilles and Guattari, Félix. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lee. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983. Print.

--. *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, trans. Dana Polan. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986. Print.

--. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987. Print.

Faber, Sebastiaan. *Exile and Cultural Hegemony: Spanish Intellectuals in Mexico, 1939-1972*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2002. Print.

--. "Max Aub, conciencia del exilio." *El Correo de Euclides* 1 (2006), p. 16-35. Print.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage, 1977. Print.

Gracia, Jordi. *A la intemperie: Exilio y cultura en España*. Barcelona: Editorial Anagrama, 2010. Print.

Kaminsky, Amy. *After Exile: Writing the Latin American Diaspora*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999. Print.

Marco, Valeria de. "Introducción biográfica y crítica," in Aub, Max. *Campo francés*, ed. Valeria de Marco. Madrid: Castalia, 2008, p. 7-58. Print.

McClennen, Sophia. *The Dialectics of Exile: Nation, Time, Language, and Space in Hispanic Literatures*. West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 2004. Print.

Monleón, José. *El teatro de Max Aub*. Madrid: Taurus, 1971. Print.

Monti, Silvia. "Estudio introductorio," in Aub, Max. *Obras completas VII-B: Teatro breve*, ed. Joan Oleza Simó. Valencia: Generalitat Valenciana, 2002, p. 62. Print.

Naharro-Calderón, José María. "Max Aub y el universo concentracionario de Djelfa." *El Correo de Euclides* 1 (2006), p. 100-07. Print.

Pau, Andrés. "El retorno imaginado y el retorno verdadero." *El Correo de Euclides* 1 (2006), p. 507-515. Print.

Said, Edward. *Representations of the Intellectual: The 1993 Reith Lectures*. New York: Vintage, 1996. Print.

Sanz Álvarez, María Paz. "Vivir en España desde la distancia," in *Max Aub: Veinticinco años después*, ed. Ignacio Soldevila Durante and Dolores Fernández. Madrid: Editorial Complutense, 1999, p. 159-77. Print.