

SPANISH AND HISPANIC AMERICAN EXILE FILMS*

MATEI CHIHAIA

ANDREA LUQUIN CALVO

CARMEN GUIRALT

The wars and conflicts of the 20th century in the Spanish-speaking world, such as the Spanish Civil War and the Franco dictatorship that followed it, or the civilian and military coups that installed authoritarian governments in various Latin American countries, forced numerous filmmakers, screenwriters and others working in the film industry into exile to escape political repression and persecution. In the film industries of the countries that welcomed them, many of these individuals found both an opportunity to continue their artistic work and a way of discovering and experimenting with forms of expression that could capture and convey the exile experience. Moreover, many were able not only to develop an aesthetic expression of that experience, but also to present a political position that vindicated the place of the exile in collective history, while at the same time elucidating and denouncing the political events that had forced them to leave their home.

This issue of *L'Atalante*, "Hispanic and Spanish American Exile Films", presents research on the

filmic forms adopted by these artists. "Exile films" here refers not only to films with a thematic focus on exile and the events that caused it, but also to films addressing this issue that were made specifically by exiles. In this sense, it is possible to distinguish a kind of "auteur cinema" that offers an articulation of the exile condition, beyond the scope of a globalised film industry that since its inception has been relatively unreceptive to such experiences. This category is evident in the selection of works explored in most of the articles contained in this monograph. At the same time, exile films present the stories, signs and signifiers proposed by Spanish and Hispanic American writers for film creations, either directly addressing exile and/or the political event that caused it, or locating the exile experience in the background of the narrative. The experiences of Spanish Republican exiles, for example, can be found in screenplays by María Teresa León Goyri and Rafael Alberti, Luis Alcoriza, and Jorge Semprún. Also worth highlighting are the reflections of exiled authors

such as Max Aub, Silvia Mistral, José de la Colina and Emilio García Riera, who use theory or criticism in their analysis of different films or cinematic movements as a visible context in which to interpret exile and/or take a political position. The Spanish exiles of 1939 would be followed years later by various exiles from different Hispanic American countries developing parallel film histories, with directors such as Raymundo Gleyzer, Gerardo Vallejo, Patricio Guzmán, Angelina Vázquez, Jeanine Meerapfel and Lita Stantic.

EXILED ARTISTS HAVE USED THE CINEMATIC LANGUAGE OF BOTH FICTION AND DOCUMENTARY FORMS TO CONSTRUCT AESTHETIC FORMS THAT CAN CONVEY THE EXILE EXPERIENCE OR INTERPRET THE POLITICAL, HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL CIRCUMSTANCES OF THAT EXPERIENCE

Exiled artists have used the cinematic language of both fiction and documentary forms to construct aesthetic forms that can convey the exile experience or interpret the political, historical and social circumstances of that experience. Examples include the films *On the Empty Balcony* (*En el balcón vacío*, Jomí García Ascot, 1962), *Dialogues of Exiles* (*Diálogos de exiliados*, Raúl Ruiz, 1975), *It's Raining on Santiago* (*Il pleut sur Santiago*, Helvio Soto, 1975), *Esta voz entre muchas* [*This Voice Among Many*] (Humberto Ríos, 1979), *Gracias a la vida (o la pequeña historia de una mujer maltratada)* [*Thanks to Life, or the Little Story of a Mistreated Woman*] (Angelina Vázquez, 1980), *Presencia lejana* [*Distant Presence*] (Angelina Vázquez, 1982) and *The Sidewalks of Saturn* (*Las veredas de saturno*, Hugo Santiago, 1986).

While the situation of exile lends itself to a project of historical memory, it also offers an opportunity to explore the contemporary situation

of a condition that places its victims between two communities, on journeys between different languages, spaces or eras. For this reason, this corpus also includes films that aim to establish a dialogue with the society of the country that the exiles had to leave behind or with their host countries, as a way of proposing the conditions for their integration, their possible return or the circumstances that kept them in exile, such as *The Young and the Damned* (*Los olvidados*, Luis Buñuel, 1950), *Eran unos que venían de Chile* [*They Were the Ones Who Came from Chile*] (Claudio Sapiaín, 1986), *A Place in the World* (*Un lugar en el mundo*, Adolfo Aristarain, 1992), *Roma* (Adolfo Aristarain, 2004) and *Partidos, voces de exilio* [*Parties, Voices of Exile*] (Silvia Di Florio, 2022).

Moreover, no study of exile films would be complete without a consideration of the extension and/or reappropriation of their filmic forms by the so-called “second- and third-generation exiles”, as well as the relationship of these exiles with subsequent generations of filmmakers in the countries from which they came and, amid the complexity of all exile experiences as reflected in this issue, the representation of exiles in the films of the host country. The first of these dimensions is explored in the “Dialogue” section, which contains an interview with Laura Alcoba, author of the novel *The Rabbit House* (2008), the product of her childhood memories of Argentina’s civic-military dictatorship, and Valeria Selinger, who made a film adaptation of the novel under the Spanish title *La casa de los conejos* (2020).

The approach adopted for this monograph draws from the ideas of the Spanish exiled philosopher María Zambrano, who uses the term *lugares de pensamiento* (“places of thought”) (1991; 2007) to describe those symbolic spaces that enable individuals to encounter the world and reflect on their relationship with it. For Zambrano, thought is found not only in philosophy but in the territory covered by all forms of art, as it is through and in the various artistic manifestations that we can

NO STUDY OF EXILE FILMS WOULD BE COMPLETE WITHOUT A CONSIDERATION OF THE EXTENSION AND/OR REAPPROPRIATION OF THEIR FILMIC FORMS BY THE SO-CALLED “SECOND- AND THIRD-GENERATION EXILES”, AS WELL AS THE RELATIONSHIP OF THESE EXILES WITH SUBSEQUENT GENERATIONS OF FILMMAKERS IN THE COUNTRIES FROM WHICH THEY CAME AND, AMID THE COMPLEXITY OF ALL EXILE EXPERIENCES AS REFLECTED IN THIS ISSUE, THE REPRESENTATION OF EXILES IN THE FILMS OF THE HOST COUNTRY.

find personal meaning in the world. This means that in the development of what Zambrano calls “poetic reason” (1993), philosophy itself needs to rediscover poetry—from which it had once been separated—in order to give a full account of reality. The reflection proposed here on Spanish and Hispanic American exile films is founded from the outset on the recognition of cinema as a “place of thought”. In this way, following theorists such as Gilles Deleuze (1984; 1987), cinema is understood to be an instrument of thought, capable of constructing and conveying concepts through the construction of the spaces and times of the moving image. María Zambrano herself hints at this when she describes Italian neorealist cinema and Charlie Chaplin’s acting as practices that are not only artistic but also philosophical (Luquin Calvo, 2022; Chihaiia, 2023).

Moreover, the adjectives “Spanish” and “Hispanic American” are used here based on an understanding of a form of “thought in Spanish” that unites all those who share this language, and with it a way of thinking that has been expressed more powerfully in essays, art or literature than in conventional philosophical discourses or systems. Indeed, the unique nature and possibilities

of philosophy in the Spanish language constituted a reason for Spanish Republican exiles to reflect on its limitations and potentialities, contributing to the formation of an “Ibero-American” community of thinkers (Sánchez Cuervo: 2019).¹ The aim of this monograph is therefore to identify a community which, in addition to sharing the same language, adopts a particular way of thinking in cultural terms about exile, particularly in its artistic expression. In his 1978 essay on exile and literature in Latin America, Julio Cortázar describes exile as a “universal theme” that “is a constant today in Latin American reality and literature, starting with the countries of the so-called Southern Cone and continuing with Brazil and more than a few Central American nations” (1994: 163). Exile can thus be defined as a fact or condition present throughout Latin America, while also being a constant in the history of Spain since its very formation as a nation (Abellán, 2001). At the same time, its presence has been reflected in countless literary and artistic meditations on the phenomenon. Over the past century, cinema has added specific forms of its own for depicting a cultural reality that has been contemporaneous with it, while more traditional ways of expressing the exile experience have continued, with Remedios Varo’s paintings, the poems of Ida Vitale and the stories of Julio Cortázar standing alongside the cinematic narratives mentioned above.

In this context, as Cortázar himself suggested, it is undeniable that literature in Spanish has demonstrated itself to be a “place of thought” for exiles on both sides of the Atlantic. Numerous literary works can be identified that document the complexity of different cases of exile—both in Spain and Latin America—and there is a profusion of studies exploring the aesthetic approaches adopted by the so-called “exile literature” produced by exiles themselves or by “second- and third-generation exiles”, whose work is sometimes analysed based on the notion of “post-memory” (Sarlo, 2005; Hirsch, 2021). This concept

is often found in film theory dealing with exile cinema (Barril 2013; Quílez Esteve, 2015). However, despite its significant role as a form of artistic expression throughout the 20th century and in the specific moments when the aforementioned exile phenomena occurred, cinema has not received the same level of scholarly attention as a “place of thought” that literature has. Thus, for example, at the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War, the presence of avant-garde movements can be identified in the work of filmmakers such as Luis Buñuel, developing alongside theories about the role of the documentary film and its usefulness as a propaganda tool. The key role played by cinema in the Spanish Civil War is documented in *Catálogo general del cine de la Guerra Civil* (Del Amo, 1996) and studies such as those by Vicente Sánchez-Biosca (2006), which not only provide extensive lists of films made during the conflict but also identify the political messaging in the films of those years. But perhaps the significance of this role would be more clearly demonstrated with an illustration. The writer Max Aub was working with André Malraux on the film *Days of Hope* (*Espoir*, Sierra de Teruel, André Malraux, 1945), based on Malraux’s novel *LEspoir* (1937), at the time the Spanish Republic finally collapsed. Aub, Malraux and the whole film crew crossed the French border in January 1939, and thus managed to save the film, which was ultimately completed in France. Like many other Spaniards, Aub would go into exile in the Americas, where numerous Spanish filmmakers enriched the film industries of the countries that received them. Another example can be found in the period of the 1960s and 1970s, which was marked by the emergence of film organisations and movements that had a strong presence throughout Latin America, especially among filmmakers in Chile and Argentina during the rise of the dictatorships that forced them into exile. It was at this time that the political potential of cinema as a force for revolution was being recognised all over the world (Amado, 2009). In this

context, filmmaking collectives such as Cine Liberación, formed in Argentina in 1966, understood filmmaking as an “instrument-weapon-work” in aid of the revolutionary struggle (Amado, 2009: 28), leading the country’s military commanders to recognise “theatre, film and music” as “a terrible weapon of the subversive aggressor” (Zarco, 2016: 25).

Although the connections between literature and cinema may offer rich and meaningful opportunities for a reflection on exile, the periodisation and historical methods used to analyse exile literature are not entirely analogous to the study of exile films. This is not only because of the need to take into account the differences between literary creation and filmmaking—the latter being a collective process subject to very different patterns of production and methods of distribution to its audiences (Rodríguez, 2012)—but also because of the particular aesthetic techniques adopted in exile films, whose dynamics all bear specific similarities. For Rodríguez (2012),² for example, the literature on Spanish Republican exiles was characterised from the beginning by a direct reflection on the war, the Republican defeat and the diaspora, until these literary reflections gave way to cinematic depictions in the 1960s. It is important to note that it is precisely in this period that “the notion of ‘authorship’ in cinema and the independence of filmmakers emerged in Free Cinema and the French New Wave, of which, for

ALTHOUGH THE CONNECTIONS BETWEEN LITERATURE AND CINEMA MAY OFFER RICH AND MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITIES FOR A REFLECTION ON EXILE, THE PERIODISATION AND HISTORICAL METHODS USED TO ANALYSE EXILE LITERATURE ARE NOT ENTIRELY ANALOGOUS TO THE STUDY OF EXILE FILMS

example, the members of the Nuevo Cine Mexicano group always considered themselves admirers,” which would facilitate “the production of more personal and innovative works” (Rodríguez, 2012: 164). The film *On the Empty Balcony*, with a screenplay by María Luisa Elío Bernal, is a good example of this (Castro de Paz, 2017; Lluch-Prats, 2012), as although it did not reach a mass audience, it paved the way for auteur cinema on exile in the Southern Cone, which has received considerable critical attention.

On the other hand, Julieta Zarco (2016) points out that the absence of filmed images of the repression of Argentina’s last dictatorship—a deliberate omission as a political strategy—set the standard for films on exile in Argentina. Considering that the image is the central component of cinematic storytelling, Argentine filmmakers opted for the creation—in Sandra Raggio’s words—of “non-existent frames”, initially with a particular focus on testimonial accounts in an effort to create “representations of what until that time had been unrepresentable” (2016: 23).

In this sense, the documentary would also play a vital role in Chilean exile cinema. In her study of Chilean documentaries (2005), Jacqueline Mouesca asserts that between 1973 and 1983 alone, Chilean filmmakers made 178 films in exile, at least 99 of which were documentaries (Pivk, 1984a). As Mouesca points out, “the filmmakers who went into exile very quickly showed signs of trying to rebuild their careers,” beginning “furtively, and then reaching rates of production so surprising that in the first ten years of exile the figures exceeded any other similar previous period in the history of Chilean cinema” (2005: 100). Zuzana M. Pivk describes how this film production was proposed from the outset as “a Chilean cinema of resistance”, which only eventually evolved into a “cinema in exile” while still retaining its dimension of “cultural resistance”, a point that must be borne in mind when studying these films (1984: 21). These documentaries were made

with two objectives, directed toward the present and the future, drawing on the communicative potential of film but also on its ability to render a suitable, intersubjective image of historical experience. Such films thus constitute a “cinema of denunciation and rescue of a collective memory” (Pivk, 1984: 22).

Another question that needs to be considered is the “return” of Chilean literature and film from exile. For José Miguel Palacios, “exile” and “return” are two words invariably associated with that “outside” or “liminal” status characteristic of the exile condition, based on which the necessary repatriation of exile film archives is proposed (Palacios, 2022: 32). The “return of the archives” involves a range of cultural and political contexts that in the case of exile films are also related to practices of transnational location, cataloguing and exhibition (which today include digitalisation and/or inclusion in festivals and film libraries) inherent in film stock. All of this makes the conditions of this “return” of film archives from exile more multifaceted and complex than those of literary archives.

While bearing in mind the possible intersections and divergences between the theoretical and working conceptions of exile literature and exile cinema, film theory has also reflected on films and exile based on a number of conceptual frameworks that need to be taken into account in this study. One category used in research on films and exile is the concept of “migrant cinema”, considering exile as a movement that can be understood essentially as a population displacement, although different from economic emigration due to its political and/or ideological motivations (Piñol Lloret, 2020). The exile can thus be described as a “political emigrant”. Two issues related to this conceptualisation must not be overlooked. The first is that the notion of migrant cinema is associated with the film industries of countries with large migrant communities, most of whom are economic migrants (as evidenced by the use of terms such

as “migration film”, “immigration cinema”, “banlieue-films” or “migrant cinema” itself). The focus of this category is therefore on the way the host country names and conceptualises the displaced individual or communities residing in its territory. Thus, although the term may be helpful as a common framework for understanding questions about exiles’ “foreigner” status in host societies and the social and legal issues that this status entails for displaced persons, it cannot fully capture the exile experience (Solanes, 2016). The crux of this experience lies in the involuntary nature of exile and the exiled person’s inability to return due to the threat of violence that the notion of “migrant cinema” may not account for.

Another concept emerging from the research on cinema and exile is the notion developed by Hamid Naficy in *An Accented Cinema: Exilic and Diasporic Filmmaking* (2001). For this author, “accented cinema” is the product of postcolonial historical displacements and of the cultural hybridisation characteristic of postmodern spaces. The creators of this type of cinema maintain a “double consciousness”, as they create their works based on their own experience—as displaced subjects—while at the same time taking other cinematic traditions as references, such as the exilic and diasporic traditions³ that preceded them (Naficy, 2001). In “accented cinema”, two types of filmmakers or film styles converge: “diasporic filmmakers/films” and “exiled filmmakers/films”. These categories can tell us about filmmakers who share the commonality of living outside their homelands, leading them to work performatively in the interstices of the social and cinematic practices of these spaces (Naficy, 2001). However, there are also important differences between the two categories. While “exiled filmmakers/films” are marked by the political situation that gave rise to the exile’s displacement, “diasporic films” would not necessarily have this characteristic, since the displacement may have arisen for economic, colonial or imperial reasons. In this way, the exile

film implies a relationship of loss, estrangement and nostalgia in relation to the exile filmmakers’ homeland, leading to the prioritising of a more personal vision of their experience in their work: “As partial, fragmented and multiple subjects, these filmmakers are capable of producing ambiguity and doubt about the taken-for-granted values of their home and host societies. They can also transcend and transform themselves to produce hybridized, syncretic, performed or virtual identities” (Naficy 2001: 13). On the other hand, the work of diasporic filmmakers tends to have a more “vertical”, “horizontal” and “multisited” character, involving not only the country of origin but also other compatriot diasporic communities located elsewhere. In this way, “diasporic cinema” focuses more on expressing the collective experience of displacement; therefore, films in this category are “expressed less in the narratives of retrospection, loss and absence or in strictly partisanal political terms” (Naficy, 2001: 14-15).

Both the concept of “accented cinema” and its subcategories of “exile cinema” and “diasporic cinema” offer useful points for reflection on the relationship between cinema and exile in terms of marginalisation and difference (Naficy, 2001) in the “outside” space that characterises every migration experience. However, it is important to acknowledge that these theoretical conceptions are founded on a postcolonial perspective (Naficy’s study focuses on filmmakers from the Middle East and North Africa) and on the notion of the subaltern proposed by Gayatri C. Spivak. Indeed, Naficy is quick to point out how “accented cinema” gives subjects the opportunity to recover their right to speak, opening up the possibility of representing displaced communities (Naficy, 2001).⁴ This postcolonial framework intersects in some ways (but diverges in others) with the decolonial perspective developed in Latin American countries, which has its echo in Latin American cinema (Satarain and Wehr, 2020). It is a perspective involving a dialogue with colonial thought directly

intertwined with the construction of European modernity, in a historical process that would not culminate with the independence of Latin American nations. There are also important differences in the directions of the exile journey in these countries, which do not necessarily follow the “colony-metropolis” trajectory that is so central to postcolonial film studies. For example, in 1939 most Spanish exiles went to Latin America, while Latin American exiles sought refuge not only in Spain but also in other European countries, in the United States, or in many cases even in other Latin American countries—most notably Mexico, a country that granted asylum to numerous exiles from many different countries over the course of the 20th century.

Another concept of film theory often applied to the study of cinema and exile is the notion of “transnational cinema”. This idea, associated with the collective identity of the nation established by its creators (Higbee and Lim, 2010; Shaw and De La Garza, 2010), echoes both the practices of national film industries and the textual aspects of the films they produce. In this respect, in relation to the distribution and production flows that feed the global film industry, it is worth noting the strong tradition of transnational cooperation among the different national film industries dealt with in this issue, which share a common market due to their shared language. Thus, despite the usefulness of the term, it is important to point out that the adjective “transnational” does not necessarily cover the complexity of the fact of exile as “being outside”, given the expansion or subversion of the very idea of the nation implicit in this concept. Consequently, the paradox represented by the historiography of “exile films” arising from their development “outside” the spatiotemporal context of the nation-state with which they are identified, together with the significance of their recovery and identification as a source of memory and/or testimony, is one of the focal points of this issue’s “(Dis)Agreements” section. The reflections

of Mónica Villaroel, Guillermo Logar, Melissa Mutchinick, Luis Iborra and Olga Sánchez Tapia reveal the complexities of this dimension, as well as the legacy of these films and their influence on contemporary productions dealing with exile.

Thus, although exile films may share various features with “accented”, “migrant” or “transnational” cinema, in reality they defy any classification framed according to the hegemonic modes of understanding the relations constructed around the concept of “the national”. In this sense, for José Miguel Palacios, the frameworks for understanding the “exile film” expand its boundaries even beyond the transnational, dislocating it from any given territory (2015), as a film made outside the space of the nation-state, that is, as “cinema *in* exile”. In other words, these are films made both *in* exile and *about* exile (Palacios, 2022). Thus, for example, films produced secretly inside the country itself or made by the filmmakers upon their return to the nation could be included in the “exile film” category (2022).⁵ By pushing the boundaries of the “national”, these films are effectively “out of place, irrespective of the location of the subjects of exile and the cultural artefacts” (Palacios, 2022: 32). In this sense, exile films might be classified as a form of “postnational cinema” that takes into account the most recent discursive and institutional changes in film production (Satarain and Wehr, 2020), although because of their transhistorical

ALTHOUGH EXILE FILMS MAY SHARE VARIOUS FEATURES WITH “ACCENTED”, “MIGRANT” OR “TRANSNATIONAL” CINEMA, IN REALITY THEY DEFY ANY CLASSIFICATION FRAMED ACCORDING TO THE HEGEMONIC MODES OF UNDERSTANDING THE RELATIONS CONSTRUCTED AROUND THE CONCEPT OF “THE NATIONAL”

dimension and their origins in the 20th century, they also represent an experience that is completely out of place in a postnational era characterised by globalisation.

Without overlooking the fact that every exile is the product of expulsion from the nation-state for political reasons, it can be argued that “exile films”, existing in this “outside” space, articulate geographical, generational, cultural and political encounters that transcend national subjectivities and communities, constituting a problem for a nationally constructed film historiography as they go beyond its traditional categories. This exploration of Spanish and Hispanic American exile films thus aims to reflect on the complexity of exile films, focusing on the aesthetic and expressive potential of the cinematic image as a philosophical and aesthetic “place of thought”, a site of political, historical and democratic memory that acquires the force of its enunciation precisely through its construction as a space “outside the frame” capable of questioning the hegemonic modes of representation.

THIS EXPLORATION OF SPANISH AND HISPANIC AMERICAN EXILE FILMS AIMS TO REFLECT ON THE COMPLEXITY OF EXILE FILMS, FOCUSING ON THE AESTHETIC AND EXPRESSIVE POTENTIAL OF THE CINEMATIC IMAGE AS A PHILOSOPHICAL AND AESTHETIC “PLACE OF THOUGHT”, A SITE OF POLITICAL, HISTORICAL AND DEMOCRATIC MEMORY THAT ACQUIRES THE FORCE OF ITS ENUNCIATION PRECISELY THROUGH ITS CONSTRUCTION AS A SPACE “OUTSIDE THE FRAME” CAPABLE OF QUESTIONING THE HEGEMONIC MODES OF REPRESENTATION

The articles in this Notebook section, focusing on Spanish, Chilean and Argentine exiles, examine this place of thought in specific contexts, exploring many of the aspects outlined very briefly in this introduction.

The first two articles, “The Politics of Mysticism and the Mexican Baroque in the Spanish Republican Exile Film: *El cantar de los cantares* [Song of Songs] (Manuel Altolaguirre, 1959)” and “Intra-history and Memory of the Spanish Internal Exile in *The Spirit of the Beehive* (El espíritu de la colmena, Víctor Erice, 1973): A Vision from the Perspective of María Zambrano”, revisit the dual dialogue of the Spanish Republican exile experience, first with the cultural tradition of Mexico, the host country, and then with internal exile within Spain. Both the cinematic reading of Manuel Altolaguirre’s *El cantar de los cantares*, analysed by Mari Paz Balibrea, and María Zambrano’s analysis of *The Spirit of the Beehive* presented by Jorge Valle Álvarez, attempt to establish the political dimension of intertextuality and to reconstruct the experience of a divided historical memory.

The decades of the 1970s and 1980s were marked by an intense engagement with auteur cinema, whose dimensions are explored in the following three articles, all of which deal with films by exiles from the Southern Cone. “‘Humbly, the Group Responded’: Organic Intellectualism, Exile and Biopolitical Production in the Cine de la Base Film Collective” by Agustín Rugiero Bader and Lázaro Cruz García takes the case of Raymundo Gleyzer and the Cine de la Base group to track the history of a form of militant cinema that challenged traditional authorial approaches by prioritising horizontal collective processes. On the other hand, Pablo Calvo de Castro and María Marcos Ramos’s article “*Reflexiones de un salvaje* (Gerardo Vallejo, 1978), an Exercise in Memory from an Exile Perspective” examines a self-referential cinematic approach that chooses a *lieu de mémoire*—the director’s grandfather’s hometown in Spain before he emigrated to Argentina—to talk about

the filmmaker's own exile through the remote experience of another subject, allowing for comparisons and contrasts. The last two decades of the 20th century saw the emergence of new filmic forms not only in terms of their approach to exile but also through their adoption of feminist perspectives. Violeta Sabater's article, "Female Subjectivities from a Distance: A Comparative Study of Three Films of the 1980s and 1990s by Latin American Women Filmmakers", analyses three Latin American films directed by women, exploring exile, migration and the traumas provoked by dictatorships from an autobiographical perspective. Sabater's study highlights the displacement of the identities of the directors and their characters, who articulate what has been silenced. The films of Angelina Vázquez, Jeanine Meerapfel and Lita Stantic reveal feminine subjectivities intertwined with their personal experiences and historical contexts.

In recent decades, these concerns about authorship have been taken up again from a post-memory perspective that considers the interaction of film and archives. In this respect, Ana González Casero's "Archival Migrations and 'Poetic Nomadism' in *El eco de las canciones* (Antonia Rossi, 2010)" extrapolates subjective experience and explores the notion of a community of memory through the analysis of a first-person documentary that integrates multiple voices. And finally, Robert Arnau Roselló's study, "Memory(ies) Drawn: The Representation of Exile in the Animated Documentary: *Josep* (Aurel, 2020)", establishes a dialogue between the authorship of the illustrator (Josep Bartolí) and the filmmaker (Aurélien Froment, alias Aurel) that sheds light on the memory and postmemory of exile. Like the other films analysed, *Josep* highlights the intertextual construction of the document and the dialectic between author and community. All of the articles featured here offer a reflection on the "how" of filmic storytelling, which acts as a watermark for this place of thought. The two cate-

gories of "cinema from exile" and "cinema about exile" become one in this place, which is both the starting point and the final objective of a reflection that is always political and always metafilmic.

By way of conclusion, it is worth highlighting some new questions raised in the articles and materials contained in this Notebook that may be worthy of future research on exile films:

The archival policies discussed in some of the contributions, which are especially problematic in the case of films created in a few regional contexts, should be recognised as both a theoretical and a practical concern. How should we conceptualise the necessary recovery of memory in these exile films? And how can we bring this memory into the present through public or institutional policies?

The relationship between cinema and gender, which is discussed in several contributions to this issue, is always an important question in reflections on exiled subjects. A theory of intersectionality can support a consideration of the diversity of exiles, together with the different filmic constructions of subjectivities and communities. How does this intersectional approach broaden the perspective, or provide new perspectives, on the study of exile films and exile itself? How can this intersectional and gender perspective be integrated fully into our research?

As a necessary form of recognition, research is needed into the legacy or inheritance of exile films beyond exile itself. Can we find qualities of these types of films in the work of contemporary filmmakers? How do they deal with contemporary exile phenomena? One way to approach this question is from the perspective of the memory/postmemory dialectic.

The transnational/postnational perspective and the comparison of exiles from different countries calls for a film theory that can explain the similarities and divergences in a Hispanic American cultural space in terms of

the concept of “situated cinema” or “accented cinema”, as a chronotope that goes beyond the postcolonial or the diasporic, understood from decolonial and critical perspectives.

All these lines of research reflect the complexity entailed in studying exile films. It is hoped that this monographic notebook may offer a contribution to this broad and still largely unexplored field of knowledge. ■

NOTAS

- * This monograph has been coordinated with the support of Bergische Universität Wuppertal’s Open Access Publication Fund, with funds from the German Research Foundation (DFG).
- 1 The framework proposed here is not intended to gloss over the fact that this common linguistic-cultural space is also a site of diverse and conflicting experiences given that it is shared, as Reyes Mate (2021) explains, by both conquerors and conquered. In this regard, it is essential to acknowledge the imposition of the Spanish language both within Spain itself and beyond it, effectively pushing the alternative systems of meaning it has silenced out of the frame. This conception of Spanish thought must also take into account its own limits, as well as the violence, injustices and interpellations it has enacted, as described in the decolonial theory of thinkers such as María Lugones, Ochy Curiel, Yuderlys Espinosa Miñoso and Aníbal Quijano.
- 2 Rodríguez posits a number of historiographical problems that arise in discussions of “a culture of exile” (developing the theme of exile both by exiles themselves and by others) and “culture in exile” (produced exclusively in exile) in a collective art like cinema, which moreover is shaped by an industry that generally leaves little room for “authorial and individual” expression. The possibilities for the development of this kind of expression are much greater in literature. For the full recognition of Spanish film industry professionals who were forced into exile in 1939, it is important to note that many were unable to address

the issue of exile in their films for various reasons, many of which were related to the conditions of the national film industries where they were working. Rodríguez points out the need for a historiography of Spanish exile cinema that is more conducive to the construction of a history of the contributions made by exiles to the film industries of their host countries in each of the various fields related to filmmaking. The full historiographical coherence of this study depends not only on considering the intersectional factors that conditioned artistic creation in exile, but also on researching a wide range of areas: the practice of the filmmaking profession by Spanish Republican exiles, the “peninsular condition” conveyed by directors and producers in their collaborative projects, and the exile experience perceived or projected in certain films or their storylines (Rodríguez, 2012). The research here focuses on this last dimension.

- 3 Diaspora here refers to a situation of perpetual displacement.
- 4 The incorporation into “accented cinema” of “ethnic cinema” (Naficy, 2001: 15)—a category not exclusive of exile or diasporic cinema—places emphasis on portraying the lives of the communities or ethnic groups in the country where they reside. This type of cinema would thus not only be a means of representing a community but also an instrument of resistance with the ability to create new narratives.
- 5 In this way, based on the Chilean case, Palacios Argues that “there is an interweaving of the ‘exile film’ with the historical development of the ‘Chilean exile’ experience, and it stresses the instability inherent in the exile condition, which is irreducible to a single position” (2022: 32).

REFERENCIAS

- Abellán, J. L. (2001). *El exilio como constante y como categoría*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.
- Amado, A. (2009). *La imagen justa: cine argentino y política (1980-2007)*. Buenos Aires: Colihue.
- Barril, C. (2013). *Las imágenes que no me olvidan: cine documental autobiográfico y (pos)memorias de la dictadura militar chilena*. Santiago: Cuarto Propio.
- Castro de Paz, J. L. (2017). *Cine y exilio. Forma(s) de la ausencia*. Santander: Shangrila.
- Chihaia, M. (2023). Sueño y realismo del cine en María Zambrano: a veinte años de su recepción crítica. *Cuadernos Americanos*, 186, 179-200. Retrieved from <http://www.cialc.unam.mx/cuadamer/textos/ca186-179.pdf>
- Cortázar, J. (1994). *Obra crítica*. Madrid: Alfaguara.
- Del Amo, A. (ed.) (1996). *Catálogo general del cine de la Guerra Civil*. Madrid: Cátedra/Filmoteca Española.
- Deleuze, G. (1984). *La imagen-movimiento*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Deleuze, G. (1987). *La imagen-tiempo*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Higbee, W., Lim, S. H. (2010). Concepts of transnational cinema: towards a critical transnationalism in film studies. *Transnational Cinemas*, 1(1), 7-21. Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1386/trac.1.1.7/1>
- Hirsch, M. (2021). *Marcos familiares, fotografía, narrativa y posmemoria*. Buenos Aires: Prometeo.
- Lluch-Prats, J. (ed.) (2012). *En el balcón vacío. La segunda generación del exilio republicano en México*. Madrid: AE-MIC.
- Luquin Calvo, A. (2022). Amparo, agonía y fracaso de un payaso: María Zambrano ante el espejo fílmico de Charles Chaplin. *Aurora*, 23, 46-56. Retrieved from <https://revistes.ub.edu/index.php/aurora/article/view/38906>
- Mate, R. (2021). *Pensar en español*. Madrid: CSIC.
- Mouesca, J. (2005). *El documental chileno*. Santiago: LOM.
- Naficy, H. (2001). *An Accented Cinema: Exilic and Diasporic Filmmaking*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Palacios, J. M. (2015). Chilean Exile Cinema and Its Homecoming Documentaries. In R. Prime (ed.), *Cinematic Homecomings: Exile and Return in Transnational Cinema* (pp. 147-168). New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Palacios, J. M. (2022). Exile, Archives, and Transnational Film History: The Returns of Chilean Exile Cinema. *The Moving Image*, 22(2), 29-58. Retrieved from <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/887026>.
- Piñol Lloret, M. (2020). *Europa como refugio. Reflejos filmáticos de los exilios españoles (1939-2016)*. Barcelona: Universidad de Barcelona.
- Pivk, Z. M. (1984a). Cronología del cine chileno en el exilio 1973 / 1983. *Literatura chilena, creación y crítica*, 10(27), 15-21. Retrieved from <http://www.memoriachilena.gob.cl/602/w3-article-77947.html>
- Pivk, Z. M. (1984b). Una trayectoria de la resistencia cultural. *Literatura chilena, creación y crítica*, 10(27), 22-23. Retrieved from <https://www.memoriachilena.gob.cl/602/w3-article-77941.html>
- Quílez Esteve, L. (2015). Éticas y estéticas de la posmemoria en el audiovisual contemporáneo. *Historia Actual Online*, 38(3), 57-69. <https://doi.org/10.36132/haov0i38.1198>
- Rodríguez, J. (2012). Los exiliados republicanos y el cine (una reflexión historiográfica). *Iberoamericana*, 12(47), 157-168. <https://doi.org/10.18441/ibam.12.2012.47.157-168>
- Sánchez-Biosca, V. (2006). *Cine y Guerra civil española. Del mito a la memoria*. Madrid: Alianza.
- Sánchez Cuervo, A. (2019). *Pensar en español en tiempos de oscuridad: el exilio filosófico de 1939*. In M. Aznar Soler and I. Murga Castro (coords.), *1939. Exilio republicano español* (pp. 581-585). Madrid: Ministerio de Justicia.
- Sarlo, B. (2005). *Tiempo pasado. Cultura de la memoria y giro subjetivo. Una discusión*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI.
- Satarain, M., Wehr, C. (eds.) (2020). *Escenarios postnacionales en el Nuevo Cine Latinoamericano: Argentina-México-Chile-Perú-Cuba*. Munich: Akademische Verlagsgemeinschaft München.
- Shaw, D., De la Garza, A. (2010). Introducing *Transnational Cinemas*. *Transnational Cinemas*, 1(1), 3-6. Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/cited-by/10.1386/trac.1.1.3/2?scroll=top&needAccess=true>
- Solanes, J. (2016). *En tierra ajena. Exilio y literatura desde la «Odisea» hasta «Molloy»*. Barcelona: Acantilado.

INTRODUCTION

Zambrano, M. (1991). *Algunos lugares de la pintura*. Madrid: Acanto.

Zambrano, M. (1993). *Filosofía y poesía*. Madrid: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Zambrano, M. (2007). *Algunos lugares de la poesía*. Madrid: Trotta.

Zarco, J. (2016). *Treinta años de cine, política y memoria en la Argentina, 1983-2013*. Buenos Aires: Biblos.

SPANISH AND HISPANIC AMERICAN EXILE FILMS

Abstract

This article establishes the theoretical and conceptual framework that guides the study of the filmic forms of Spanish and Hispanic American exile films, referring to films with a thematic focus on the experience of exile and the events that gave rise to it, made by exiled filmmakers themselves. This complex field of study extends to the work of exiled screenwriters who have also explored this subject and to the reappropriation of their work by “second- and third-generation exiles” and by filmmakers in the host nations or in the countries the exiles were forced to leave behind. Based on the idea of cinema as a “place of thought” and of a shared cultural framework, the article discusses methodological differences between the study of exile in film and in literature, as well as the categories of film theory most commonly used to analyse these types of films, highlighting the limitations of these frameworks in addressing the phenomenon of exile within the Spanish and Hispanic American context. This reflection serves as an introduction to the articles and sections comprising the Notebook, while also positing some future lines of research that emerge from this work.

Key words

Exile cinema; Exile; Transnational; Postnational; Archives; Memory.

Authors

Matei Chihaia has been the Chair of Romance Literature at Bergische Universität Wuppertal since 2010. He has also been a visiting professor at various universities, including Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar in Quito, Ecuador, and Universidad Nacional de La Plata in Argentina. Since 2011, he has been co-editor of *Diegesis: Interdisziplinäres E-Journal für Erzählforschung/Diegesis: Interdisciplinary E-Journal for Narrative Research*. From 2020 to 2024, he co-directed the international research network “The Literary and Philosophical Legacy of Spanish Exile in Mexico”, supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG). He is also one of the editors of the collective book *Caminos Cruzados. Filosofía y literatura del exilio español en América Latina* (Iberoamericana, 2023). Contact: chihaia@uni-wuppertal.de

CINEMATOGRAFÍAS DEL EXILIO HISPÁNICO E HISPANOAMERICANO

Resumen

Este artículo establece el marco teórico y conceptual que guía el estudio sobre las formas filmicas de las «cinematografías del exilio hispánico e hispanoamericano», entendidas como el conjunto de películas que, por su temática, se centran en el hecho del destierro y los sucesos que lo provocaron y, a su vez, fueron llevadas a cabo por las propias personas exiliadas. En la complejidad de su comprensión, la materia se extiende al trabajo de guionistas exiliadas y exiliados que también trataron esta temática y a la reappropriación que realizan de estas obras y personas las «segundas y terceras generaciones del exilio» y las y los cineastas de las naciones de acogida o de los países que tuvieron que abandonar. Partiendo de la idea del cine como «lugar de pensamiento» y de un marco cultural común, se discuten las diferencias metodológicas del estudio del cine y la literatura del exilio y las categorías de la teoría cinematográfica con las que se suele abordar el estudio de estas cinematografías. Se muestran, así, las limitaciones de estos marcos respecto al propio fenómeno del exilio y dentro de un ámbito hispánico e hispanoamericano. Esta reflexión sirve como presentación de los artículos y secciones que componen el cuaderno, así como de algunas líneas de investigación que se desprenden de este trabajo.

Palabras clave

Cinematografías del exilio; Exilio; Transnacional; Posnacional; Archivo; Memoria.

Autores

Matei Chihaia es catedrático de Literatura Románica en la Bergische Universität Wuppertal desde 2010. Ha sido profesor visitante en la Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar, sede de Quito, y en la Universidad Nacional de La Plata, entre otras. Desde 2011, es codirector de *Diegesis: Interdisziplinäres E-Journal für Erzählforschung/Diegesis: Interdisciplinary E-Journal for Narrative Research* y, de 2020 a 2024, fue codirector de la red internacional de investigación «El legado literario y filosófico del exilio español en México», apoyada por la Fundación Alemana para la Investigación (DFG). Asimismo, es autor del libro colectivo *Caminos cruzados. Filosofía y literatura del exilio español en América Latina* (Iberoamericana, 2023). Contacto: chihaia@uni-wuppertal.de

Andrea Luquin Calvo is a Senior Lecturer accredited by the Spanish National Agency for Quality Assessment and Accreditation (ANECA). She holds a PhD in Philosophy and won the Second Presen Sáez de Descatllar Award and the Max Aub Foundation's Tenth "Hablo como Hombre" Scholarship-Prize. She is the recipient of grants from the DAAD (German Academic Exchange Service) research stay program (Bergische Universität Wuppertal, 2024) and the Valencian government's BEST program (2022). She is the author of the book *Remedios Varo: el espacio y el exilio* (Universidad de Alicante, 2009) and also serves as secretary of the International Network for Studies on Spanish Philosophical and Intellectual Exile (RIEFE). She currently lectures at Universidad Internacional de Valencia (VIU). Contact: andrea.luquin@professor.universidadviu.com

Carmen Guiralt holds a PhD from Universitat de València and a Master's Degree in Film History and Aesthetics from Universidad de Valladolid. She is the author of the book *Clarence Brown* (Cátedra, 2017) and has published scholarly articles on the representation of the Spanish Civil War in classical Hollywood cinema, including "Hollywood and the Spanish Civil War: The Hidden Anti-Fascist Ideology of *Love Under Fire* (1937)" in *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, and "Hollywood y la Guerra Civil española: análisis de sus tres únicas cintas de ficción coetáneas (1937-1938)" in *Estudios Humanísticos. Filología*. Since 2017, she has been teaching at Universidad Internacional de Valencia (VIU), where she is a Senior Lecturer and Academic Director of the Degree Program in Primary Education. Contact: carmen.guiralt@professor.universidadviu.com

Article reference

Chihaiia, M., Luquin Calvo, A., Guiralt, C. (2025). Spanish and Hispanic American Exile Films. *L'Atalante. Revista de estudios cinematográficos*, 39, 7-20.

Andrea Luquin Calvo es doctora en filosofía por la Universitat de València. Acreditada como Profesora Titular por la Agencia Nacional de Evaluación de la Calidad y Acreditación (ANECA), fue ganadora del II Premio «Presen Sáez de Descatllar» y de la X Beca-Premio «Hablo como Hombre» de la Fundación Max Aub. Ha sido beneficiaria del DAAD (Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst) en su programa de estancias de investigación (Bergische Universität Wuppertal, 2024) y del programa BEST de la Generalitat Valenciana (2022). Autora del libro *Remedios Varo: el espacio y el exilio* (Universidad de Alicante, 2009), es también secretaria de la Red Internacional de Estudios sobre el Exilio Filosófico e Intelectual Español (RIEFE). Actualmente, es profesora en la Universidad Internacional de Valencia (VIU). Contacto: andrea.luquin@professor.universidadviu.com

Carmen Guiralt es doctora por la Universitat de València y Máster en Historia y Estética de la Cinematografía por la Universidad de Valladolid. Autora del libro *Clarence Brown* (Cátedra, 2017), ha publicado artículos académicos sobre la representación realizada por el cine clásico de Hollywood de la Guerra Civil española, tales como «Hollywood and the Spanish Civil War: The Hidden Anti-Fascist Ideology of *Love Under Fire* (1937)», en *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, o «Hollywood y la Guerra Civil española: análisis de sus tres únicas cintas de ficción coetáneas (1937-1938)», en *Estudios Humanísticos. Filología*. Desde 2017, ejerce como docente en la Universidad Internacional de Valencia (VIU), donde es Profesora Titular y directora del Grado en Educación Primaria. Contacto: carmen.guiralt@professor.universidadviu.com

Referencia de este artículo

Chihaiia, M., Luquin Calvo, A., Guiralt, C. (2025). Cinematografías del exilio hispánico e hispanoamericano. *L'Atalante. Revista de estudios cinematográficos*, 39, 7-20.

Edita / Published by



Licencia / License



ISSN 1885-3730 (print) / 2340-6992 (digital) DL V-5340-2003 WEB www.revistaatalante.com MAIL info@revistaatalante.com