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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Leaving one’s native country for an unfamiliar setting and culture can easily be a life changing event, “often a traumatically” altering one (Totoricagüena xvi). Migration has always existed in societies and will not cease to occur any time soon. Spain experienced turbulent times in the twentieth century, suffering through a civil war, constant changes in government and social structure, and a dictatorship that lasted nearly four decades. This instability accounted for waves of emigration, causing varying consequences in Spaniards’ lives abroad in migration and also at home. In the last half of the century, particularly from the 1970s to the 1990s, the nation’s patterns of migration underwent drastic changes.

The Allied victory of World War II left Spain ostracized and isolated, the country having been “technically neutral” but “actively favour[ing] the Axis” (Hooper 14). The country’s Axis sympathies were also noticeable since its government was modeled after Italian and German fascism and even incorporated the Nazi salute until it was discontinued at the end of the war in September 1945 (Carr 720). Another decisive blow from the global community was the United Nations’ decision to exclude Spain from the organization upon its creation, as well as exclusion from any aid from the Marshall Plan (Hooper 15). Thus, Spain under General Francisco Franco began as an autarkic country, cut off from the rest of the world. Raymond Carr clarifies that as a response to the “world of scarcities” after the war, other European nations reacted with their own short-lived policies of self-sufficiency, but for Spain, it was not a “temporary expedient, but […] the proper and permanent policy,” “a philosophy of state” (740). However, that
situation became an impossibility for Spain’s economy, and in the 1950s Franco eased his autarkic policies and began the process of opening Spain back up to the rest of the world, immediately affecting the nation’s society and its citizens’ migration trends.

In the early 1960s, an “escalating demand for unskilled labour in the core economies north of the Pyrenees” created a wave of mass emigration of Spanish citizens looking for higher income not possible in their own country (Corkill, Harrison 35). Part of Spain’s “economic miracle” was a result of the decrease in unemployment “relieved by the safety valve of emigration to the factories and farms of France and Germany” (Carr 724). The Spaniards’ northern migrations led them to earn much more money than they would have earned at home, and the Spanish economy was aided by the money the migrants would send back to Spain, as well as the sudden increase in tourism revenues Spain experienced in that time period, but the country was far from being a developed nation at the level of its European neighbors. Spaniards attained better living conditions, but they were still considerably lower than their more developed neighbor countries, and Spaniards abroad lived as second-class citizens while they worked jobs that did not require much skill or education, such as manufacturing, metallurgy, restaurant, and construction occupations (Corkill, Harrison 37).

After Franco’s death in 1975, the Spanish economy further integrated itself into the global community. In 1986, the European Union accepted Spain as a member, a largely symbolic measure that demonstrated a definite end to the former isolationism and autarkic government. By that time, migration in the country shifted as “Spain was transformed from a net exporter of population to a net importer” (Corkill, Harrison 38). In the 1960s and 1970s, Spanish migration patterns were those of third world countries.
Spaniards traveled to the same places and with the same reasons as the less developed nations of northern Africa (Corkill, Harrison 37), but by the 1990s and 2000s Spain finally joined the ranks of its highly developed European neighbors, and its migration also differed little from theirs. Spanish literature and film that depict these decades show the country’s waves of migration, displaying the causes and how it affected the migrants and their communities.

This study focuses on contemporary Spanish literature and film, ranging from the 1970s to the 2000s, covering the drastically fluctuating migration trends in Spain across these decades, but due to space constraints, only a few selected works are examined. There are many available studies on Spanish migration, but the majority of them focus on prior history. Reports exist over the “economic failure at home” that caused emigration in the nineteenth century (Hatton, Williamson 45), and Sandra Barriales-Bouche explains how “los estudios sobre el exilio republicano de 1939 acaparan la mayor atención por parte de los críticos” (10), but more recent emigration is examined in this case. Furthermore, most of the works on the topic are historical and social investigations, but studies within the context of literature and film are rare. And although there are countless publications on past Spanish writers, from the Golden Age to the early twentieth century, there are a limited number of studies on the contemporary authors and directors which I include in this thesis. The works that are analyzed are Coto vedado (1985) by Juan Goytisolo, ¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe! (1971) by Pedro Lazaga, El hijo del acordeonista (2003) by Bernardo Atxaga, Yoyes (2000) by Helena Taberna, Carlota Fainberg (1999) by Antonio Muñoz Molina, Kasbah (2000) by Mariano

The first half highlights Spanish migration that occurred during the last years of the dictatorship in the 1960s and 1970s when a mass wave of emigrants traveled to northern Europe for work. The migrants’ experiences are also compared to common international characteristics of migration as specified by various researchers. Coto vedado, Juan Goytisolo’s memoirs, shows how the author’s migration was out of the norm for the time period, as opposed to the Spanish experiences in ¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe!, which exhibit an example of the typical Spanish emigration of the time and how the migrants’ lives changed abroad. The third chapter provides examples of two cases of involvement in the terrorist group ETA and the subsequent necessity of fleeing Spain as fugitives and the inability to return to a previously normal life, even after the amnesty declared in 1977. Most of the migrations in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 are a result of the intense political atmosphere of the time. Politics and francoism are major themes of the works in those chapters, and the presence of actual historical events are an important part of the plot, such as the censorship under Franco, policies in the Basque Country, and the ETA amnesty of 1977. Yoyes is based on the life of a real ETA leader. But the politically charged tone of these works disappears in the ones of the last chapters.

The migrations in Chapters 4 and 5 take place after Franco’s death and when Spain’s economy stabilized and reached the level of other highly developed nations. Sonia McKay’s research states that the reasons for many migrants’ decisions to leave their country are “primarily economic” (20). The second chapter shows a clear example of this, but in the last chapters the novels and films show Spaniards leaving for other
reasons as they no longer feel the economic pressure of the 1960s. The social and political tones of the works of the first half of the study disappear and are replaced by a sense of adventure, romance, loneliness, and friendship in the novels and films of the second half. The fourth and fifth chapters illustrate how Spanish migration in the 1990s and 2000s has completely changed from its recent past and how it relates to the new social and economic policies of the country. In addition, Chapters 4 and 5 explore examples of Spanish citizens who travel to countries of equal or lower development. This differs from the first half where the migrants depart to more dominant countries at the time: Germany, France, and the United States. Thus the analysis ends with cases of emigrants who depart modern first-world Spain for other first-world countries, and in one case for the less developed country of Morocco. This results in contrasting views the characters show towards the citizens of their host-country that differ from the first chapters. Spain’s literature and film show how Spanish migration is a distinguishing feature of the nation’s contemporary history and how the emigration trends were entirely transformed in the span of just three decades.
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CHAPTER 2

Spanish society changed drastically as a result of General Francisco Franco’s victory in the Spanish Civil War. After the tumultuous war, power changed hands from a left wing government with socialist, communist, and anarchist influences to a radical right wing under Franco where “[i]deological purity was carefully watched over by security agencies,” so it went from one extreme to the other (Carr 699). Some considered this a salvation while others saw it as nearly four decades of repression and extreme control of every aspect of daily life, and the literature and film that depict this era show the contrasting viewpoints. Also, it is noteworthy that during the regime a large amount of Spaniards migrated to other various European and American countries, and the representation of this migration also displays the different perspectives of society under Franco. For example, Juan Goytisolo’s autobiography Coto vedado (1985) provides many details of his exile and why he chose to leave his country, which greatly differs from the emigration in Pedro Lazaga’s film ¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe! (1971).

As a constant critique of Franco’s dictatorship, many various themes are found in Coto vedado. It traces Goytisolo’s rejection of his Spanish identity from childhood to adulthood, where he becomes an outspoken critic of his country’s fascist regime. He distances himself as far away as possible from the stereotypical Spanish male citizen, defined under Franco’s society by the “idea of the ‘stud’” who displays “protective paternalism” (Antón 207-208). Some critical studies of Coto vedado analyze the construction of Goytisolo’s distinct identity, and his sexuality is another frequent topic of
analysis, as well as its genre as autobiography. However, analyses of the self-exile he details in *Coto vedado* are rarer. It is of significance because like his uncommon identity under Franco’s society, his emigration was also out of the ordinary. Sociologist Robin Cohen points out several fundamental characteristics of migration and diaspora: a “dispersal from an original homeland, often traumatically,” “an idealization of the supposed ancestral home,” “a return movement,” “a strong ethnic group consciousness,” and among others “a troubled relationship with host societies” (180). However, these common characteristics do not apply to Goytisolo’s distinctive experience. The emigration experience Goytisolo narrates in *Coto vedado* is atypical of Spain’s migration trends under Franco, and of general characteristics of exile.

The causes of Goytisolo’s emigration presented in *Coto vedado* are uncharacteristic of the usual trend of the period. “During the late 1950s and most of the 1960s large numbers of Spaniards emigrated to Germany and France as guest workers” due to the higher standard of living in those countries (Ames 8). Hence, financial reasons were a key cause of emigration during the time Goytisolo left Spain, yet economics had nothing to do with his departure. His family and he never had monetary problems. The book begins with an account of his aristocratic lineage, opening with his wealthy great grandfather who owned land and slaves in Cuba, and his entire family lived comfortably, including Goytisolo, who was supported by his father throughout his entire upbringing. Goytisolo even felt comfortable deceiving his father by making him think he was enrolled in law school and continuously studying law, while in fact he worked on his novel and his own creative writing. His father would notice him busy at work and ask, “El Derecho Civil debe de ser muy interesante, ¿verdad, hijo?,
musitaba antes de eclipsarse; y yo, fingiendo salir de un profundo ensimismamiento en los minuciosos requisitos del dominio enfitéutico, afirmaba que sí, que efectivamente lo era” (Goytisolo 162). The fact that he felt no remorse about taking his father’s money under false pretenses reveals that there were no extreme economic woes in the family, which was the main cause of many to flee the country.

Not only were Spaniards finding work in France and Germany, but it was work that “their own nationals were unwilling to fill” (Ames 8). These were lower paying jobs of lower status and unskilled labor, but this common trend of Spanish emigration during Franco’s regime also did not apply to Goytisolo’s case. In fact, the opposite occurred. Goytisolo was invited to France and offered a translation of his first novel by a prestigious translator. He was revered by the intellectual community in France, and he impressed the publisher Dionys Mascolo at their meeting: “Mascolo sorbía mis palabras con expresión enfervorizada y, al concluir nuestra charla, expresó deseos de verme de nuevo” (Goytisolo 259). His prestige in France allowed him to avoid the undesirable jobs most immigrants acquired.

Furthermore, another frequent cause of emigration was a “forced political exile” (Totoricagüena 10), but this was not the reason for Goytisolo’s departure, either. He left Spain voluntarily, without any threat or force, and he was fully aware of that. He refers to his exile as, “Mi exilio voluntario” (Goytisolo 220). Literary critic Abigail Lee Six confirms that “Goytisolo was never expelled in the first place or forbidden to return” (80). His novels were eventually banned in Spain, and “he felt nervous on crossing the border, lest the police harass or even arrest him,” but that never happened and “he enjoyed freedom of movement” in Spain (Six 80). Also, his homosexual tendencies
conflicted with the military codes that made “homosexual behavior punishable by law,” which “formalized what was once a sin into a law” (Lee 152). Goytisolo does not state his sexuality as a reason for his decision to leave Spain, but it is one of many of Franco’s repressive and exclusionary policies that Goytisolo despised about his society, which led him to develop “desamor a España” (Goytisolo 276).

Thus, none of the usual causes of Spanish emigration of the era nor any listed by Cohen applies to Goytisolo. Rather, he emigrates because of Spain’s severe censorship and the society’s artistic and intellectual containment. Historian Raymond Carr clarifies that

Franco himself believed that with “decent clothes,” football matches, and TV […] the working class would have no cause for complaint. […] The flaw in his argument was that, once satisfied with the consumer goods of the West, Spaniards became increasingly aware of the shortage of the political goods their neighbours enjoyed. (725)

One of those important “political goods” was the lack of censorship. Goytisolo continuously states his frustrations with Spanish society, “donde el debate y libre confrontación de ideas habían desaparecido con la guerra civil” (246-247). The life of a nonconformist and writer like Goytisolo would be close to impossible under those circumstances, so he had to leave in order to carry out his artistic goals and for his work to flourish. His work was censored in Spain, showing the impossibility of his desired career there. Also, not only was he a writer, but he was extremely interested in politics, “mi vehemencia política” (Goytisolo 259). His political interests were directly against Franco’s dictatorship, which he constantly attacks in Coto vedado, and since “attacks on
the government or the principles of the Movement entailed fines and imprisonment” (Carr 707), his ambitions were impossible without reprehension in his mother country. And the freedom he longed for did not disappoint him in France. He immediately describes the openness and vibrant artistic expression of ideas, “los huéspedes que acogía en su piso debían […] poseer una refinida sensibilidad a las artes” (Goytisolo 208). This environment was what he desired in Spain, and its absence was the cause of his emigration.

Moreover, the experiences Goytisolo describes while in exile are also atypical of the common trends. Anthropologist Oriol Pi-Sunyer observes that “exile not only involves drastic changes in personal and collective life, but generally an extreme reduction in rights and statuses” (153). But again, Goytisolo’s experience abroad as portrayed in Coto vedado is the contrary. His life did not go through any “drastic change”; instead he continued doing almost exactly what he did in Spain, only more intensely. He found new intellectual discussion groups like the ones he was part of in Spain, and he continued to write with various support networks. Rather than a change in his customary lifestyle, there was only an intensification of it, now that he did not have to hide his activities from his father or the government. Instead of secretly discussing the repression of the government, an illegal activity in Spain, he helped publish articles on the topic in France. Nor was there a “reduction of rights” and status, as Pi-Sunyer mentions as typical when living in exile (153). As mentioned before, Goytisolo was invited to France and appreciated there. His insider’s view of the dictatorship was extremely valued in the leftist communities who also critiqued Spain under Franco, so they felt lucky to have him in the country. Mascolo, the French publisher who
interviewed Goytisolo, also felt fortunate for his presence. Goytisolo later finds out that Mascolo said right after the interview, “Éste es el español que esperábamos desde hacía tiempo” (Goytisolo 259). Thus, contrary to the norm, Goytisolo’s status rose in exile. The expected “troubled relationship” with the host society Cohen speaks of was reversed (180); Goytisolo’s conflictive relationship existed in his mother country, and it was relieved when he emigrated.

Another irregular characteristic of Goytisolo’s exile in Coto vedado was his desire for a permanent residence abroad. He specifically states that “mi propósito de vivir fuera de España seguía vigente” (238), while usually Spanish “emigration to other countries of Europe was a temporary affair” (Longhurst 19). But Goytisolo explicitly states his desire to permanently leave Spain on several occasions. At one point, he comments on the time he had to return for Spain’s mandatory military service, and in a passage that changes to second person narrative, he recalls, “tu obsesión al ahorcar el uniforme era alejarte lo más pronto posible de España” (274). He was already living in France, and he specifies that he only did the obligatory military service in order to avoid problems in the future, and the first thought at the start of his service is his wish to leave the country. Cohen’s characteristic of a “return movement” of exiles is also absent (180). His brief return to Spain is an unwanted chore, not any kind of desire. Goytisolo also brings up the fact that in 1956, his residence in Paris was “de forma definitiva” (209). In his entire autobiography, there is not a single trace of nostalgia for his mother country. None of his experiences in exile creates a longing to return to Spain. He attained success in everything he searched for, such as his professional work, acceptance in the
community, and an important romance which shall be discussed later. Thus, Goytisolo did not have the usual “traumatic” exile Cohen suggests (180).

In addition, *Coto vedado* does not display the conventional effects an immigrant tends to undergo. Robin Cohen’s observations explain that living in diasporas causes people to create an “idealization of the homeland” (180), which once more never occurs with Goytisolo. His autobiography is a constant critique of Franco’s government, but also of Spanish society and its history in general. For instance, he does not depict his aristocratic heritage in a positive manner. Instead of focusing on his great grandfather’s successful businesses in Cuba, he highlights the specific fact that he was a slave-owner and that he made his fortune by taking advantage of others. “*Coto vedado* begins with the destruction of the myth of Goytisolo’s family shield and lineage” (Lee 175). Not only does Goytisolo not idealize his homeland and past, but he rejects and destroys it. In fact, he declares that his family history used to be idealized, but attempts to alter that vision when he states, “lo del escudo y nobleza eran producto de la desbocada fantasía paterna” (10). His idealized past is nothing more than a delusional “fantasy” to him, and that does not change once he departs from his homeland.

Instead of nostalgic feelings for his idealized past, he thinks of his Spanish upbringing as a destructive factor. Randolph Pope comments that “*Coto vedado* turns at last to Goytisolo himself to prove there how family and nation have corrupted his original pure self” (17). For Goytisolo, his exile was a salvation from his corruptive environment, while it is generally the other way around. Usually, exile has a “pain of displacement” that is relieved by the return home (Pi-Sunyer 153). However, for Goytisolo the pain was at home in Spain, and his self-exile was an intense liberation of what he suffered under
Franco’s Spanish society, when the country was under “un régimen anacrónico, esterilizador y arbitrario que aborrecía con todas mis fuerzas” (Goytisolo 255). *Coto vedado* was written in the 1980s after the dictatorship had ended, but Goytisolo still does not illustrate Spain in any positive manner or feel any nostalgia for his motherland.

Apart from the absence of any idealization of Spain while in exile, Goytisolo further destroys his Spanish identity with his strong desire to take up the culture of his host country of France, “[u]n deseo intenso de adaptarme a Francia, de embeberme de su cultura y su lengua” (Goytisolo 211). He embraced every aspect of the French culture, and he never mentioned an attempt to preserve his Spanish heritage. His romance with Monique Lange also shows his preference for a non-Spanish femininity. Under Franco, the Sección Femenina de Falange “offered a representation of the ideal Spanish woman in which she should ‘appear soft, sweet, kind natured.’ It was a passive and submissive image” (Antón 206). Goytisolo notices that Lange is the exact opposite of the traditional Spanish women that grew up around him, whom he also characterizes by a “tradicional pasividad y frigidez” (268). She actively sought after him to go to the beach and on other outings, and she even visited him in Spain when he had to return for a brief period. And of importance to Goytisolo, she challenged him intellectually. Her striking difference from his own culture’s version of a passive ideal woman was a main reason he loved her; “in a country where the repression of women by men has been so extraordinarily severe” (Hooper 165), Goytisolo says about Monique that “nunca la has querido tanto ni te has sentido tan orgulloso como entonces de sus cualidades de arrojo e independencia” (268).
Finally, Pi-Sunyer also suggests that living in exile frequently brings about “the destruction of critical networks of family, work, and community” (153). As usual, this does not apply to Goytisolo in *Coto vedado*. Goytisolo already had very few networks to begin with in Spain. As far as family, he recounts the death of his mother at an early age during the civil war, and he always had a distant relationship with his father. Throughout the entire narrative, he never mentions a positive memory of his father, or even an emotionally memorable one. The only instances of a relationship between them in his autobiography relate to his father’s economic support, but other than that he describes him as a close-minded staunch supporter of Franco and all of his policies that stood against everything Goytisolo believed in. Hence, there was little or no family network that could disintegrate because of his emigration, and he was aware of that. He mentions that “la noción de familia ha dejado de significar algo para mí desde hace años” (23). His work network had the opposite effect due to his emigration. It was in part because of his exile that his professional career came to fruition. In France he had open and available support that was extremely difficult to obtain in Spain, and the nature of his work would have been nearly impossible under Franco’s rigid censorship, especially because of his strong interest in politics. Also, the discussion groups he was part of in Spain began to disappear, so the destruction of his work networks was not taking place in a foreign country, but in his own. He created a new family network with his future wife Monique Lange, and his career network reached new heights that were impossible in his former country.

The wave of Spanish emigration during Franco’s dictatorship in the 1950s and 1960s is in accordance with people who have studied migration patterns such as Robin
Cohen and Oriol Pi-Sunyer. That is why the exile Juan Goytisolo describes in his autobiography is significant. It goes against every standard experience of the kind. Financially well off, and with an easily attainable future as a lawyer, his emigration was never a necessity. It was the great difficulty he had in finding intellectual and artistic fulfillment in Franco’s highly controlled society. Especially as a creative writer, it was something unbearable for him, and he was fortunate to have the option to leave. Not that it was impossible for there to be quality literature under the oppressive dictatorship, because writers such as Carmen Laforet, Miguel Delibes, Carmen Martín Gaite, and many others produced celebrated novels that subtly critiqued the Spanish society in which they lived, but Juan Goytisolo’s literature became something that would have been impossible had he not left Spain.

While the emigration experience Juan Goytisolo describes in his autobiography *Coto vedado* is highly atypical, it is a unique case and not all cases of migration are portrayed in the same manner. For instance, in Pedro Lazaga’s film *¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe!* the central theme of migration agrees with the trends pointed out by sociologist Robin Cohen and anthropologist Oriol Pi-Sunyer. There are very few critical analyses of Lazaga’s films, and especially of *¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe!* However, the movie has significant cultural value. *Estoy hecho un chaval* is another film by the same director that also shows Spanish migration to Germany, but I chose to analyze *¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe!* because unlike *Coto vedado* and *Estoy hecho un chaval*, it also displays a case of the mass emigration that occurred particularly in rural Spain in the 1960s and 1970s (Carr 750). Many social and historical phenomena that occurred in Spain are shown in this film, such as the unprecedented increase in tourism and the
mass emigration of Spaniards to other European countries. In contrast to *Coto vedado*, *¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe!* presents experiences of migration in accordance with the habitual patterns.

In *¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe!* the emigration only is due to financial reasons, in accordance with the standard tendency during the 1950s and 1960s in Spain. And as stated earlier, due to its higher standard of living with many low-income jobs unwanted by its own citizens, Germany was one of the principal targets of Spanish migrants of the period (Ames 8), and in the film, it is the destination of every single emigrant character, as implied in the title. When Angelino returns to his rural home of Peralejos, the first thing he talks about with the village is the outstanding economic situation in Germany and its modern lifestyle. The value of German currency compared to the Spanish astounds his friends, and they immediately begin to ponder the possibilities of what they could accomplish by working temporarily in Germany, so economic reasons are the main motivation for many to emigrate. German women are another incentive for Pepe and a few other people, but the main purpose behind migrating lies in monetary goals. They think of the “money they could never have earned at home” (Ames 8). Miguel and his wife María have the specific plan of earning enough money to build a gas station on a new highway in Spain, and Pepe’s goal is to make enough money to buy a large herd of cattle, so in both cases they leave their country with the mentality that it would take too long or would be impossible to acquire their monetary goals in Spain.

Furthermore, Pepe and the other Spaniards’ experiences as migrants in Germany follow the typical tendencies of emigrations and life in exile. Contrary to Goytisolo in *Coto vedado*, life abroad creates a “drastic change in personal and
collective life," which is considered to be the more standard case under the circumstances (Pi-Sunyer 153). For example, the motif of the clocks represents how their life is now dominated and organized by a strict schedule, completely different from their rural life in Peralejos. As soon as Pepe arrives in Germany, a repetition of shots of many clocks and clock towers begins, which also shows the prominence of their new culture’s adherence to this rigid organization. Confused as to why his residence manager is ringing a bell to signify dinner, Angelino must tell Pepe that “aquí todo va a golpe de campana.” In contrast, when Pepe rings the church bells in the beginning of the film, most of the citizens choose to ignore the call to church, which brings about minimal consequences. But Angelino warns Pepe that if he misses the call to dinner in Germany he is left without food. Additionally, the amount of time spent working in Germany astonishes Pepe. He exclaims upon his arrival “¿es que aquí en Alemania no se descansa?” Once he acquires work, he is surprised that he must have several jobs at all hours of the day and night. The pace of work is also different as he can barely keep up as a dish washer, which is completely different from the slow paced rhythm of his former life in Peralejos. John Hooper notes that migrants like Pepe, “[a]ccustomed to measuring time in hours, they were suddenly expected to think in minutes” (21). And all of these lifestyle changes also instantly transform Pepe. Upon his arrival, he is incredibly excited to see the German women at his residence. He is highly energetic, telling the girls he is “españolito fuerte, toro,” and it takes a sleeping pill the women sneak into his drink to calm him down. However, after only one day of work, the German women want to spend time with him, but he is now utterly exhausted and prefers to
sleep rather than stay awake with the women he was so eager to see before. This disappoints them and prompts them to say that Pepe is now “no españolito, no toro.”

As Pi-Sunyer suggests, an “extreme reduction of rights and statuses,” regularly occurs to immigrants (153) and it is visible in the migrant workers in ¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe! Right away, Pepe learns he has fewer rights and will only be able to obtain certain jobs because he went to Germany without the required legal paperwork. Also, the Spaniards in Lazaga’s film took the jobs that Germans “were unwilling to fill but that were attractive to people from poor farming […] villages in Spain” (Ames 8). They all took jobs that required little or no education and that were of lower esteem, such as dish washers, waiters, and factory workers among other similar occupations. The lowering of status culminates in Pepe’s eventual purposely humiliating job where he models in his undergarments displaying his extremely hairy body to crowds of laughing people. He does not search for this job; instead he is scouted for it. The fact that it takes effort to find someone for this position and that Pepe is reluctant to accept it demonstrates that it is a very undesirable job of lesser distinction, and it takes a desperate Spanish migrant worker willing to sacrifice his dignity and status to take it. Pepe certainly does feel ashamed, as shown by his immediate departure when his girlfriend unexpectedly visits and sees him there. Pepe is “lured to Germany with false promises” and finds “that Spanish workers in Germany often live in ghettos [and] that jobs are more demanding than in Spain” (Besas 99). His inferior living conditions and jobs of menial labor result in a lowering of his status.

Like most cases of guest-work, the emigration in Lazaga’s film is a “temporary affair” (Longhurst 19). They go to Germany with a goal to accomplish, and a return to
Spain is part of the plan. As one character mentions, “todos venimos pensando en volver,” whether it is for Pepe’s cattle, or the gas station Miguel and María plan to construct. Germany is only a stepping stone for a long term plan that involves a future in the mother country, and Cohen’s emigration element of a “return movement” is clearly visible (180).

The only exception is Don Emilio, who has confidently ruled out the possibility of returning. However, he has numerous nostalgic memories of his former home, and Pepe notices that Don Emilio chokes up when thinking about Spain. Hence, Don Emilio still has a deep emotional attachment to Spain, but simply does not act on his strong desire to return, unlike Goytisolo, who despised Spanish society and never expressed any aspiration to go back. Eventually, the return to Spain becomes Pepe’s most intense objective. He realizes he has never spent a Christmas away from home, and the climax of the film consists of Pepe’s many attempts to find a way back to his country. He faces many obstacles and suffers throughout his efforts to reach his goal, until in a rather *deus ex machina* a bus that happens to be heading to Spain drives up and lets him climb aboard. The emigration in *¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe!* is never intended to be permanent, and the return to the homeland becomes the central theme of the film.

Also in line with Cohen’s observations of exile, the film displays a slightly “troubled relationship” with the host country (180). This can be seen in the restaurant scene right after Pepe’s arrival in Germany. A culture clash immediately presents itself upon his entrance to the restaurant. Instead of a warm welcome from his friend Angelino, a waiter there, he tells Pepe to order something or he will be kicked out, which confuses and offends Pepe. The case is completely different in Peralejos, where, as
one of the first scenes shows, everyone would hang out at the tavern without the need to purchase anything, an extremely more relaxed atmosphere compared to the German restaurant in the city. The fact that he must either order food or wait outside for Angelino is a foreign concept for him, which he finds insulting. Pepe goes through what many other Spanish emigrants experienced; the “result in many cases […] was shock. Not in the metaphorical but the literal sense of the word – the most common symptoms were insomnia, listlessness and breathlessness” (Hooper 21). Pepe does not suffer insomnia, but he becomes lethargic and later does not care about anything but returning to Spain as he can barely handle the work load and lifestyle of Germany.

Moreover, ¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe! exhibits the characteristic effects of life as an immigrant. Unlike Goytisolo’s vision of his Spanish homeland in Coto vedado, Lazaga presents an “idealization” of the mother country, the more frequent occurrence (Cohen 180). This begins on Pepe’s first night in Germany when he takes out food brought from Spain during dinner at the residence mainly occupied by Spaniards, triggering nostalgic feelings. Food “is replete with meanings, tastes, and memories,” (Pi-Sunyer 158) and in this case they are memories of an idealized Spain. As soon as Pepe presents the food, everyone abandons their German dinner and enthusiastically dives into Pepe’s food. Cristina Sánchez-Conejero mentions that “food is used in the present as a fetish that reinvents a nostalgic past –a past that is often itself a construct,” a phenomenon referred to as “ethnic fetishism,” (230) which is precisely what occurs in this scene. They all create a nostalgic and idealized vision of their mother country they have not visited in a long time, in a few cases many years. Sánchez-Conejero also adds that “this ‘ethnic fetishism’ is not devoid of racist attitudes” (230). There is no racism in
the film, rather it is xenophobia as Pepe does not even bother tasting the German food; disgusted and having never tried the food before, he takes one quick sniff and instantly decides to eat his preferred Spanish food.

Whereas Goytisolo sees Spain as a corruptive atmosphere, Lazaga furthers his idealization of Spain by doing the opposite. Peralejos is depicted as an environment of innocence. Pilar, Pepe’s girlfriend, is one of the few who argue from the beginning against travelling to Germany. She sees Pepe’s desire to go to Germany and his goal to build a cattle ranch not as opportunity, but as greed. She reminds him that he has everything he needs in Peralejos. She points out that he has never been hungry, without clothes, or without community at home, expressing that there is no point in migrating to Germany. Pepe’s suffering at the end is only alleviated by his return to his home, therefore showing that Pilar has been right all along. Pepe’s time in Germany brings mostly negative results. This purity and hospitality of Spain are contrasted with Germany, portrayed negatively as a place where people take advantage of others. For example, Germany takes advantage of the cheap labor provided by the immigrants, and the German woman who seduces Pepe deceives him. She is only looking for a hairy man to work the humiliating job in the display case. Thus, in Lazaga’s version of Germany money is placed over individuals, which is also exemplified in the restaurant scene where Pepe must purchase something or leave. María also puts money above her own health when she decides to keep working during her pregnancy against the doctor’s recommendation. This is brought to light when Don Emilio says, “un hijo vale más que una gasolinera,” and Miguel realizes that they must leave Germany. Furthermore, the cinematography also aids in idealizing Spain. The shots of Peralejos
are of vast open spaces and bright colors. The cinematography always shows Pepe lounging around in luscious grass fields under a shining sun. In contrast, the images of Germany show congestion and close spaces, with a prevalence of grays and darker colors. Many elements work together to idealize the migrants’ mother country.

Additionally, in accordance with Pi-Sunyer’s analysis of population displacements, a “destruction of critical networks of family, work, and community” occurs to the characters in ¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe! Communication nearly breaks down between the Spaniards in Germany and Peralejos. This is evident by the way news always arrives late. The resident who takes charge of correspondence between the two countries is excited to tell the others that Pepe is planning to go to Germany, only to find out that he has already arrived as the resident delivers the news. Also, telephone calls between Spain and Germany barely work and cost a fortune, creating even more barriers to communication. In order for Miguel and María to save their family and keep their Spanish heritage alive, they realize they must leave Spain. Don Emilio lets them know that, “si no se van ahora, ese hijo no les dejará irse nunca.” Finally, Don Emilio is the example of lost connections due to his migration, and that is the main reason he is so reluctant to return. He declares, “yo no puedo volver. Es que no sabría adónde ir. Se me han muerto todos. [...] Entraría [...] como un extraño. No me conocería nadie.” That is why he eventually advises Miguel and María to return home, to avoid losing every network and connection to Spain as he did.

While the theme of emigration is key in both Coto vedado and ¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe!, the characters react in completely opposite ways. Before leaving Spain, Goytisolo was already disillusioned with the country and rejected every aspect of
Franco’s society through his political ideas and artistic endeavors, so his experience in exile turned out to be enormously different from the norm. Pedro Lazaga, on the other hand, was more in line with Franco’s society, and he even fought against the Soviet Union in World War II as part of the Blue Division (España De 139). Thus, the Spanish emigration he portrays follows what are considered the standards of the time, which include a much more idealized representation of the country left behind, as well as a necessity to return to the mother country, traits absent in Goytisolo’s *Coto vedado*. Goytisolo and Pepe were lucky to have the option to return to Spain whenever they could because not all cases of migration have that opportunity. Literature and film from the Basque Country show instances of forced political emigration, which never occurred in *Coto vedado* and ¡*Vente a Alemania, Pepe!*  

**Works Cited**


CHAPTER 3
THE TRANSITION TO DEMOCRACY IN THE BASQUE COUNTRY: EL HIJO DEL ACORDEONISTA (2003) BY BERNARDO ATXAGA AND YOYES BY HELENA TABERNA

With the death of Franco came the transition to democracy, completely transforming the country’s government from an authoritative dictatorship to a constitutional monarchy when elections were held in 1977, and a constitution was approved in 1978. The country continued to develop and finally joined the European Union in 1986. “This is the optimistic story of the Spanish conquest of democracy. However, if we tell this same story from the Basque point of view, the narrative would be quite different” (Ludger 34). While a large number of Spanish citizens celebrated the transformation, many Basque citizens complained that little had changed since Franco’s regime. In 1976, five Basque workers on strike were shot and killed, and the region’s “Day of the Fatherland” celebration was forbidden, so events like these caused many Basque citizens to doubt that the political situation had changed (Ludger 35). Among those who thought that way was the Basque nationalist group Euskadi Ta Askatasuna, or ETA, a terrorist organization formed during Franco’s regime with the goal of Basque independence from Spain (Woodworth 3). Especially under Franco’s oppressive secret police, many ETA members fled Spain; some were eventually able to return, while others left their home forever. The novel El hijo del acordeonista (2003) by Bernardo Atxaga, and the film Yoyes (2000) by Helena Taberna demonstrate examples of migration due to the Basque conflict during and after Franco’s dictatorship.
As a contemporary *bildungsroman* novel set in the Basque Country, *El hijo del acordeonista* presents a unique story with many elements of possible examination, but due to its relatively recent publication, there is not a large quantity of critical analyses on the novel. Some articles have analyzed the postmodern characteristics, such as its metanarrative aspect. The construction of the past in the narrative, the dichotomy of the urban versus rural world, and the portrayal of ETA are other topics of others’ literary examination of Atxaga’s novel, but migration and exile are major themes that have been investigated less. The protagonist, David, goes through two major emigrations. First, he flees to France as a wanted member of ETA, and after ETA members received a general amnesty in 1977, he permanently moves to the United States, and his departures from Spain deeply affect him and many people around him. The migration in *El hijo del acordeonista* dramatically changes David’s and other characters’ lives, preventing them from ever returning to the life they once had.

The main cause for David, Agustín, and Joseba’s migration to France was their membership in ETA.¹ They became enemies of the state as they joined a terrorist organization, where they had a goal of changing their current political circumstances. For example, they carry out their mission to distribute Marxist pamphlets at a shipyard in San Sebastián, which currently does not seem like such a reprehensible act, but in their time it was a “perilous enough activity in a state patrolled by Franco’s trigger-happy police” (Woodworth 36). In another instance, David and his companions receive orders to bomb a tourist destination at a Spanish beach: “el turismo era en aquella época la base de la economía del estado español, por lo que atacar al sector era atacar a la

¹ ETA is never directly stated as the terrorist group they join, but evidence in the novel as well as many articles suggest that it is ETA.
dictadura” (Atxaga 457). Raymond Carr confirms that “the tourist invasion [...] became [...] a necessity of economic survival” for Spain in that time (762). So as active combatants against the government, they are forced to reside in Mamousine, France.

This is contrary to the previous chapter of this thesis because Juan Goytisolo and Pepe were not forced to leave Spain. They were not involved in any illegal activities, and had the option of returning to their country at any moment. David, on the other hand, is a fugitive in hiding who faces consequences if he goes back. “Mere membership of an opposition group could carry a twenty-year jail sentence” (Woodworth 38), so residence in Spain for David was illegal while affiliated with ETA, and this immediately changed his life. For instance, he lost his first love, Virginia. David recalls that “cuando pasé a la clandestinidad, Virginia hizo lo único que podía hacer, y que la razón que me dio cuando la llamé desde París era incontestable: ‘No quiero volver a verte. Ya tuve bastante con la desgracia de mi marido’” (Atxaga 460). He had been in love with her for years, and when they were finally closer than ever, she leaves him due to his dangerous involvement with ETA and subsequent migration. Also, attending his beloved mother’s funeral was a risky venture. She died while he was living in Mamousine under ETA, and since everyone in Obaba knew about his terrorist connection he could have easily been apprehended, so he had to go incognito. He was present, but distant. He could not speak with anyone there, an incredibly hard task since he had not seen his childhood friends and relatives in years. Simply speaking to his father was a great risk as well as a shock to his father. This is in striking contrast to his life before his migration.
His second and permanent emigration, to California, also changed his life forever, and was the result of his return from France and prison. The common “destruction of critical networks of family, work, and community” as a result of migration is absolute for David (Pi-Sunyer 153). When he was released from prison after the amnesty of 1977, he lost every connection he had in Spain, leaving him nothing in his mother country. His mother was the only family member he had a close relationship with, and he no longer had the connection he once had with all of his friends: “comprendí que había sido yo el que se alejó de ellos, abandonándolos, y no al revés, como pensé en un principio” (Atxaga 460). Furthermore, David also carried the stigma of a former terrorist, which kept him from forming any new networks: “cuando salí en libertad, las cosas siguieron igual. Entraba en un bar, y la gente miraba hacia otro lado” (Atxaga 466). Finally, he also lost all support from ETA after he told authorities about his uncle’s hideout the organization used: “el colectivo de presos políticos, acusándome de traidor y echándome la culpa de la caída, me expulsó de la comuna y me condenó al ostracismo” (Atxaga 461-462). They considered him a traitor, so in addition to losing all support from the organization, his safety was constantly threatened by them. David mentions that ETA did not tolerate betrayal, “era algo que la organización no perdonaba” (Atxaga 446). Thus, the emptiness he had in Spain caused him to go to the United States, where he had the capability of creating new networks and a new life, which he did with his wife Mary-Ann.

In addition, David’s experiences in migration also greatly altered his life. While in Mamousine, David realizes that he has missed significant moments of his life, and that

---

2 Joan Botella, Richard Gunther, and José Ramón Montero mention that grants of amnesty were declared in 1977 for political prisoners, which included ETA members charged with violent crimes (84).
he has distanced himself from the people that matter most. He is aware of a change in himself—“percibí un cambio en mi personalidad”—and he finds himself constantly thinking about his mother and unconsciously picking up some of her habits:

Me quedé sorprendido, pues las palabras me salieron de la boca tal como las hubiese pronunciado mi madre […]. En fin de cuentas, pensaba mucho en mi madre. Sufría por ella […]. Algunas veces, entraba en una cabina y la llamaba; pero no conseguíamos hablar dos minutos seguidos, ella se echaba a llorar. Aquello era muy negativo para mí […]. Pasaban los días, y el espíritu de mi madre se fue apoderando de mí (Atxaga 422).

While in France, he realizes how much she means to him, and how much of an influence she has on his life, and he missed the last moments of her life. Agustín and Joseba notice the great distress this causes him, as well as his drastic change in personality. In the section “Confesión de Triku,” in which the narration changes to Agustín’s point of view, Agustín details David’s transformation after the death of his mother. “Ramuntxo,” which was David’s nickname in the organization, “estaba muy afectado por lo de su madre, y cuando le pedimos que cogiera el acordeón él se negó con tanta vehemencia que se nos hizo difícil insistir” (Atxaga 447). David’s change is not only apparent to himself, but those around him also see a visible change in him. Furthermore, David had shown reluctance to play the accordion for his friends in the past, but had never refused, especially not “vehemently.” In the same section, Agustín also recalls that “Ramuntxo se inquietaba porque no sabía qué canciones estaban de moda en España” (Atxaga 448). He directly states that his distance from Spain causes him further anxiety than would normally be there if he were still home. Robin Cohen’s
characteristic of a “traumatic” exile appears in David (180). After leaving Spain, he becomes a different person.

Moreover, David’s life after emigrating from Spain significantly differs from before. For instance, in Stoneham Ranch, David suffers a loss of his Basque culture. Literary critic Ignacio Barbancho declares the same idea: “David experimenta duras pérdidas,” which include “su lengua y sus costumbres” (85). The great distance between Obaba and California is one of the reasons for his loss of culture. He cannot easily go back to the Basque Country to revive his culture since the Atlantic Ocean separates him from his native country. Also, Stoneham Ranch is secluded from any major cities: “es un lugar apartado [...] de las grandes urbes norteamericanas” (Barbancho 85). Thus, an even smaller chance exists for any contact with others of Basque heritage. Furthermore, David is aware of his loss of Basque culture. When Joseba visits him in Stoneham Ranch, he reminds David, “hoy es San Juan. ¡El día de mi santo! ¡Un día muy especial en el País Vasco!” (Atxaga 31). However, David had forgotten about that very special day and admits to his new, more American identity, “Es verdad. A mí se me ha pasado. Me estoy volviendo muy americano” (Atxaga 31).

Also, his daughters Liz and Sara show little interest in learning his father’s language or about his culture. He has attempted to teach them, and they know a small amount, but sometimes when he speaks in Euskera to them, they respond: “Shut up! Don’t speak Basque to me!” (Atxaga 387). David’s daughters do however play a game where they write a word in Basque on a paper and bury it as if it were a funeral; David does this to help them learn his language, but even if they were to eventually learn the language and more about their Basque heritage, it would be from an outsider’s
perspective, so they would not fully understand the culture the way David does. In addition, David dies when his children are still very young, before they learned much of their father’s ethnicity. Hence, future generations of his family will no longer carry his Basque culture.

Another effect of David’s migration is the idealized vision of his former home he creates. His life in Spain is lost, and Obaba becomes nothing more than a romanticized childhood fantasy. This can be seen in part in the format of the narrative. The main narration of *El hijo del acordeonista* is a book written by Joseba after David has passed away; it is a re-imagining based on David’s memoirs that were written long after he left Spain, and the descriptions of Iruain and his childhood memories are glorified. Iruain is described in the following manner: “Era un pequeño valle verde, bucólico, que parecía destinado a acoger a los ‘campesinos felices’ de Virgilio,” and most descriptions of Iruain are similar (Atxaga 81). Many Basques living outside of their country “tend to idealize their homeland as a pristine niche” (Totoricagüena 19), in this case demonstrated by descriptions of David’s former home. Barbancho adds that David “muere antes de planear siquiera la vuelta a Obaba, de modo que solo queda de su localidad natal y de su pasado un relato de ficción, un espacio y un tiempo construidos únicamente con el lenguaje” (n. pag.). David is aware of this and cynically confesses that “la realidad es triste, y que los libros, hasta los más duros, la embellecen” (Atxaga 480). That is precisely what his memoirs do. David has created another idealized reality of his mother country, and he can never go back to his previous life. Loss and regret are major themes of *El hijo del acordeonista*. It took time for David to realize that when he left Obaba he abandoned his home and the most important people in his life, losing time
and moments he can never get back. His time spent in France with ETA changed his life forever and ultimately led to his new life in Stoneham Ranch.

Rebirth is another theme of the novel. David’s success and eventual happiness in his second emigration is not an isolated case. When Joseba is freed from prison after the amnesty, he decides: “Escribiría a Papi una carta con la confesión y me marcharía al extranjero. Pero, antes que yo, fueron mis amigos los que se marcharon” (Atxaga 469). Without even consulting each other, all three came up with the same decision to leave Spain. “Triku volvió a nacer en Montevideo”; it directly states that Agustín was “reborn” in Uruguay, running a successful restaurant, “uno de los mejores restaurantes de la ciudad” (Atxaga 469). Joseba became a successful writer who travelled the world, from Cuba to Morocco, never losing his energetic spirit. David strives unsuccessfully to forget the pain of his past: “Parece que no hay manera de librarse del pasado” (Atxaga 443). But he continues to tell Mary Ann that his new life has also brought him happiness: “Porque he podido comparar mi vida de entonces con la que he disfrutado después de encontrarte a ti” (Atxaga 443). His life ends on a positive note, which unfortunately cannot be said of all similar cases, such as the life of Dolores González Catarain, also known as Yoyes.

Migration is also a significant theme in Yoyes, and like El hijo del acordeonista, it has not been explored as much as other topics. The film is based on real events, principally the life of Dolores González Catarain, the first female to hold a leadership position in ETA, although some changes were made in the film. For instance, in reality she had a son, but she has a daughter in Taberna’s portrayal of her life. The few critical studies that exist on the film analyze the representation of ETA, the gender identities,
and other important elements. Yet, Dolores’s constant and significant emigration is an important subject of less attention. Dolores’s migration as portrayed in Yoyes irreversibly altered her life.

Dolores’s prominent status and activities in ETA were the main cause of her life-changing emigration. As mentioned earlier, simply being a member of an opposition group against Franco could result in many years in prison, but “leaders of such groups,” like Dolores, “risked sentence of death” (Woodworth 38). Like David in El hijo del acordeonista she also did not have the option of residing in Spain without risking arrest, especially since the authorities knew who she was and where she lived. At the beginning of the film, her brother is dragged from their home in the middle of the night in order to try to get information on her whereabouts. Also like David, she actively challenged the dictatorship and sought to change the political situation of the Basque Country, which eventually forced her to migrate. Furthermore, the GAL became another source of tension that forced her to migrate farther away from her home. The GAL, or Grupos Antiterroristas de Liberación, was an organization that carried out a “dirty war against ETA, which would involve kidnapping, misuse of public funds, torture and murder” (Woodworth 7). They would also cross the border to carry out missions, and various scenes in the film show their violent behavior. Many ETA members thought the French Basque Country was a safe haven, but that guaranteed safety was lost. Dolores was safe from the GAL threat in Mexico and later in Paris, but that also meant she was much farther from her culture and her beloved family.

Moreover, Dolores’s life was vastly different during her exile. First, her migration disconnected her from her family. She was a continent away in Mexico from them when
she resided in Mexico, and later in Paris she was separated from her daughter who stayed with her family in Spain. The distance between Dolores and her family affected them both. When she arrives in Paris and first sees Joxean, she asks about her family and he responds: “Contentos de que hayas vuelto.” However, Dolores looks down and responds in a melancholy manner: “Todavía no he vuelto. Sólo estoy más cerca.” Her situation troubles her, and she acknowledges that she is not where she wants to be.

Furthermore, while she is torn from her family, she also gives up her own personal life for the cause. The first time she goes to France, still a member of ETA and before she goes to Mexico, a local friend pressures her to go out on a date with a friend of hers. Dolores refuses and continues to work on her reading. But her friend insists: “vives como una monja. Sacrificas tu vida. La pones en juego por los demás, como si les debieras algo.” Like David who gives up his childhood love, Virginia, for a political cause, Dolores also gives up a life of her own, refusing to have any romance or personal relationships in her life. In fact, initially she looks down on that kind of life. Joxean tells her that he wants nothing more than to be happy with Dolores, but she responds: “no pienso conformarme con una felicidad pequeña burguesa.” At that moment she considers that she would be simply settling for something less, although later when she returns home she wants nothing more than to attain that simple lifestyle and happiness.

In addition, Marsha Kinder notes that

exile breeds a ‘hybridity’ that ‘involves an ambivalence about both the original and the host cultures, thereby leading to the creation of a slipzone of
indeterminacy, [...] a state of unbelonging, in effect a condition of freedom, nomadism, homelessness, or vagrancy—even opportunism’ (279). This is the exact state in which Dolores finds herself. Her “freedom” and “opportunism” lies in the fact that she can go study in Mexico and France with little consequences. She has very few commitments, only to her daughter whom she sends away to her family in the Basque Country, which gives her the opportunity to work on her doctoral degree. On the other hand, instability dominates her life as well. She finds out that her refugee status has expired in 1980, so she will not be able to obtain a scholarship in France, which ruins her plans of studying in France. Hence, her residence status is now also very uncertain. She knows she can study in France, but has no idea how to obtain financial support. Her expired refugee status further limits the jobs and opportunities she can acquire in France. The “indeterminacy” Kinder describes defines Dolores’s life at that moment.

Her constant travel shows signs of “nomadism” and further instability. She travels from the French Basque Country, to Mexico, and then to Paris, never settling anywhere. This affects her daughter as well. She grows up away from her Basque culture, and when she finally arrives in the Basque Country her grandmother must make an effort to teach her Euskera. Dolores knows she wants to go back to Spain; as mentioned earlier, she tells Joxean in Paris that “sólo estoy más cerca,” but has no idea how and when she will return, and that uncertainty does not allow her to put down roots anywhere and live the simple life she eventually desires. Finally, when she does return to Spain, her situation does not improve. After many years, she has accomplished her goal of returning home to her family, but still has no plan in mind. After unsuccessfully job
searching, she jokes: “he estado pensando en poner un anuncio, ‘ex-terrorista cuidaría ancianos por las mañanas.’” Her long exile did not allow her to form a secure career, so even though she is finally back home, she still cannot obtain the stability she wanted. This is also similar to David’s case, where his return to Spain did not lead to a steady life, either.

Finally, upon Dolores’s long desired arrival home, she quickly finds out that her exile brought life changing consequences. After her extensive absence, Dolores wants nothing more than a normal life, but it proves to be impossible. “For the protagonist of Yoyes, the greatest difficulty is to overcome the extreme visibility of her public persona, which resurfaces time and time again despite her efforts to silence and hide it” (Rodríguez 164). As soon as she returns, she mentions her only plan is to look for a job, but ETA immediately seeks her out. Koldo, an ETA leader and friend of Dolores, insists she return to the organization, and Dolores must refuse after several attempts from Koldo to persuade her. Even her own brother brings up the topic. During her first family dinner since her return, after she states that she simply wants to search for a job, her brother also adamantly insists she return to the armed struggle. He brings up the fact that many people still consider her an icon: “Tú aquí tienes una responsabilidad. Mucha gente te admira.” But that strong admiration and public status eventually lead to her death.

The film shows how the manner in which she was allowed to return to Spain also complicated her situation. She takes part in the “policy of selective amnesty, referred to as reinserción social, or ‘social re-integration’” (Clark 93-94). It was a policy designed specifically for people like her, former political opponents who wanted to start a normal
peaceful life in Spanish society, but ETA did not allow this smooth transition. The “principal reason for the failure of social reintegration was the fear of reprisals from ETA” because they incorrectly assumed that the participants received amnesty for giving information about the organization to the authorities (Clark 162). As much as she wanted to, Dolores was not able to hide her involvement in the program. The information was leaked to the press, and the newspapers publicized her return on the front page. Dolores’s ordinary life would now be impossible. She became subject to constant harassment, from ETA and others. In one instance a woman stops Dolores in the street to insult her after she tells her that her husband died in an ETA attack.

Dolores’s new media attention makes it impossible for her to escape her past. Additionally, ETA also accuses her of talking to the authorities, and she is subject to aggravation from the terrorist organization as well. In one scene Joxeian paints over graffiti that calls Dolores a traitor. Her new brand as a traitor ultimately triggers her death: “clandestine groups frequently make an effort to establish mechanisms of social sanction, and even of physical coactions to impede any disagreement with their conduct” (Rodríguez 165), and in this case Dolores’s “social sanction” was assassination. She was not forgotten during her time away from Spain, and the method she used to return resulted in her murder.

Similar to David, Dolores also realizes she has missed significant moments in life due to her migration. When Koldo attempts to persuade her to return to the organization, she replies at one point: “fueron siete años, los mejores de mi juventud y los entregué a la organización.” She is fully aware that she sacrificed her youth for a political cause and can never get it back. In another instance, when she is finally back
home, she tells Joxean: “Cuando miro a tu estantería me doy cuenta que yo he perdido todo por el camino. La mayor parte de mis libros han quedado por ahí. Biarritz. En México.” But she does not only talk about books; Dolores also symbolically refers to her life. She knows she has lost everything and that the best years of her life were given to an organization that did not accomplish its goals, and her involvement produced continuous years of migration that have created her stagnant life in Spain.

The cases of migration in El hijo del acordeonista and Yoyes share various similarities. Both are examples of emigration due to membership in ETA, and it results in the same manner. The protagonists in both works end up realizing that they left behind what mattered most, and eventually learn that things can never be the same. David does not even have family left in Spain, and so he leaves to start a new life in the United States. Dolores also sees how difficult it is to start again back home, and dies before she can resolve her situation. Both feel a strong connection to their mother country; David constantly reminisces about Obaba, and recreates his former home in California: “Three Rivers es idéntico a Iruain, pero sin pasado” (Barbancho Galdós n. pag.); Dolores’s goal was always to return home to the Basque Country. They cherish many memories of their mother country, and are always conscious of their Spanish and Basque identities despite their necessity to flee. However, the next chapter of this thesis explains how that strong connection to their original home and the necessary migration disappear in future generations.
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CHAPTER 4


The death of Francisco Franco and the end of his thirty six year rule was met with celebration and optimism for the future, but the transition to democracy and a new society was neither completely smooth nor immediate. Street demonstrations continued for years and a coup d’état was attempted in 1981, but by the late 1980s the nation was well into its rapid socioeconomic rise and higher standard of living. Up until the late 1950s Franco attempted to create a “centralist, autarkic, […] and isolated state” (Corkill 49), but this later proved to be economically impossible and Spain would later open its doors to the rest of the world. By the 1990s, many “who have grown up since the end of the dictatorship are baffled, and even annoyed, by the way in which foreigners continue to refer to the country in which they live as ‘post-Franco Spain’ almost twenty years after his death” (Hooper 73). The nature of Spanish emigration also changed dramatically in accordance with the country’s situation, which the literature and film that depicts this era demonstrates. Two noteworthy examples are the novel Carlota Fainberg (1999) by Antonio Muñoz Molina and Mariano Barroso’s film Kasbah (2000). Just like in the previous chapters of this thesis, the protagonists of these works are Spaniards who live abroad, the United States and Morocco in this case. But this chapter explores how as Spain evolved after Franco’s death, so did the nature of the country’s migration, as demonstrated by the novel Carlota Fainberg and film Kasbah.

Carlota Fainberg portrays Spanish life in a manner completely different from much of the overtly critical literature that depicts Franco’s regime, like Coto vedado and
*El hijo del acordeonista. Carlota Fainberg* takes place in the 1990s, but apart from its chronology, it is a good example of the different social atmosphere in which Spaniards lived, and how their migration patterns altered. Because of its relatively recent publication, there has not been a large number of critical analyses on it, but the novel has significant cultural value as it portrays Spain’s changing situation in a post-Franco and much more globalized world. Spain’s new socioeconomic status in the 1990s and different political atmosphere after Franco’s death is reflected in the migration in *Carlota Fainberg*.

Spain’s status as a developed first-world nation since the late 1980s changes the nature of Spanish emigration, as seen in *Carlota Fainberg*. When the Spanish government ceased its isolationist policies, migration was affected. At the end of Franco’s rule, Spain was “a modern consumer society” but the “process of integration of the Spanish economy into the international, especially European, economy, […] was to culminate in Spain’s formal incorporation into the EC [European Community] in 1986” (Longhurst 23). Spain’s place in the European and global community is seen by the two principal characters’ occupations. Marcelo Abengoa’s career as a “Strategical Advisor” takes him all over the world; he tells the protagonist Claudio that “[l]os españoles estamos comiéndonos el mundo” as his job takes him to other countries in Europe, the United States, and Asian countries like Thailand and Indonesia (Muñoz Molina 29-30). Abengoa shows that Spaniards are not only participants in global affairs, but as a “Strategical Advisor” they also influence foreign business. He is also aware of the relatively recent expansion of Spain’s presence outside its borders. Claudio narrates: “En la última década, [Abengoa] explicó, no sin una fatigosa abundancia de vacuos
tecnicismos empresariales, la compañía había llevado a cabo una expansión sólida y gradual fuera de España” (Muñoz Molina 33). Claudio’s presence in the United States also shows the loss of Spain’s former policies of isolationism. His occupation and residence in Pennsylvania is nothing out of the ordinary.

Furthermore, after joining the European Union in 1986, “as economic and social conditions have become more favorable domestically, significantly fewer Spanish citizens have moved abroad to find employment” (Marr 105). This can be seen with Claudio, who is the only Spaniard in the fictional Humbert College’s Spanish department. Several nationalities make up his diverse department, but there is not a community of Spaniards. Abengoa was extremely excited to find another Spaniard at the airport, showing that he also does not come across many others in his travels. This is completely different from the case of ¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe! which takes place a few decades earlier, where a large number of Spanish citizens lived and worked together. They had their own community, and new Spanish migrants continuously came and went to the residence where they stayed. But Claudio never mentions a single other Spaniard he has come in contact with other than Abengoa since he left Spain three years before.

Spanish emigrants’ occupations are also of a much higher socioeconomic status in Claudio’s era. In the 1950s and 1960s when millions of Spaniards left their country to find work abroad, especially Germany, France, and Switzerland, they worked “jobs their own nationals were unwilling to fill” (Ames 8). As seen in ¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe!, these included menial low paid manual labor positions such as dish washers, factory work, window washing, late night work, and others. But Carlota Fainberg presents a
completely different experience in a new era. Matthew Marr explains that contrary to the country’s situation in the 1960s and 1970s, many Spanish emigrants have “gone on to find academic employment outside of Spain and, in particular, at North American research hospitals, laboratories, foundations, libraries, and universities” (108).³ That precisely describes Claudio’s migration experience. He has a doctoral degree and teaches at an American college. His life revolves around his academic work and there is no evidence of any kind of economic trouble for him. In fact he mentions: “tengo casi pagado el mortgage de mi casita” (Muñoz Molina 173). Furthermore, Abengoa’s occupation also has nothing to do with manual or unskilled labor. He travels around the world “seleccionando hoteles más o menos en crisis, anticuados o mal gestionados, adquiriéndolos con toda clase de precauciones financieras y aplicándoles inmediatamente planes rigurosos de rehabilitación y viabilidad, de downsizing y uplifting” (Muñoz Molina 33). His work requires an education and entails significant responsibilities, completely different from Spanish emigrants’ labor of the past.

In addition, globalization is more prominent in Spain after Franco’s death, also seen in Claudio’s migration experience. Ho Hon Leung and Matthew Hendley define globalization as “technological change that compresses time and space[,] globalization destabilizes and delegitimizes the nation-state, globalization moves in tandem with regionalization, and its development is uneven” (2). They elaborate and specify that in globalization, nations “become borderless, and the communities become ethnically and linguistically diverse” (4), and this linguistic diversity is clear in Claudio’s constant³ The first wave of Spanish intellectual emigrants in the twentieth century occurred during the civil war and afterwards as a result of it, due to their political beliefs. They too found work as professors and writers in the United States and other countries. Such figures include Pedro Salinas, Luis Cernuda, Rafael Alberti, Jorge Guillén, Joaquín Casalduero, and others.
mixture of Spanish and English. Throughout the entire novel he inserts words in English into his narration without interruption. For instance: “El del señor Abengoa, era, desde luego, decididamente helpless” (29). English words never cease to appear in his Spanish discourse, and he rarely brings attention to them. In accordance with globalization, his languages become mixed, but he notices he is sometimes out of date with the evolution of his native language. In another case, he says: “ya estaban instalados, o apalancados, como se dice ahora en España” (Muñoz Molina 25). He must remind himself of current trends instead of naturally picking them up.

Abengoa’s speech has also been altered by the effects of globalization by his use of ejecudinglish. John Hooper explains that as Spain began its integration into the European and global community, “young businessmen recruited by the new foreign companies picked up their employers’ habits and attitudes” and a “new breed of ejecutivos began to emerge […]. Their speech, liberally sprinkled with English words and phrases, became known as ejecudinglish” (20), which is the case for Abengoa. He works for “Worldwide Resorts,” an English name even though it is a Spanish company. Claudio notes Abengoa’s code switching: “la fascinación de los empresarios y ejecutivos españoles por el idioma inglés” (Muñoz Molina 29). Thus, Abengoa and Claudio’s migration in a global and modern Spain changes their speech behavior.

Moreover, the Spanish migration in Carlota Fainberg differs from that of Franco’s regime because it is no longer out of necessity. In the 1990s, the case was “entirely dissimilar to that of the million plus Spanish workers who fled the hunger, poverty, and cultural oppression endemic to their homeland during the Franco years” (Marr 110). Previous chapters mentioned how Juan Goytisolo details the “cultural oppression” Marr
speaks of, and how that led him to leave Spain. In ¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe! many characters must leave the poverty of Peralejos in order to reach their goals, and El hijo del acordeonista and Yoyes show examples of criminal migrants fleeing from persecution. However, none of these examples apply to Claudio in Carlota Fainberg. “The new peninsular traveler of the recent novel is, in fact, an intellectual and often a visiting professor of Spanish: a protagonist with a privileged social standing who is, by nearly all measures, a cosmopolitan voyager by choice and formal invitation” (Marr 110), which is exactly Claudio’s situation. He was not forced to go to the United States and, as Marr details, Claudio leaves Spain “by choice.” His career as a professor of Spanish literature was not an impossibility in Spain, and no evidence suggests he could not find work there. Claudio does not escape poverty or leave for any political reasons; his departure from Spain was his own choice and not a matter of necessity.

Contrary to just a few decades before, there is an absolute absence of politics behind the motivation of migration in Carlota Fainberg, which also reflects Spain’s modernity. John Hooper describes the political atmosphere in the 1990s: “‘Spaniards,’ in the opinion of an El Mundo editorial, ‘look at the Franco era as if from an enormous distance…his memory has been blotted out of the collective present. It now serves as a point of reference for almost no one” (73). Likewise, Francoism has nothing to do with Claudio and Abengoa’s lives and migrations, and Spanish politics are completely absent in the novel. Once again, this is different from literature and film depicting Franco’s society like Coto vedado, which constantly critiques Franco’s government. In El hijo del acordeonista, the civil war and Franco’s policies in the Basque Country haunt the protagonist David, and in Yoyes, the opening shot is a portrait of Franco, instantly
setting the political tone. In contrast, Franco’s thirty-six year rule is never mentioned in *Carlota Fainberg*. In this case, as in modern Spain, politics and Franco are a matter of “irrelevance” (Hooper 73). The only visible politics are of the “culture of political correctness endemic to the contemporary American university” (Marr 118), but none of the conflicts or themes in the novel are related to Spanish politics or its fascist past under Franco that affected so many.

The first person narrative of Claudio’s point of view also suggests the absence of political influence. The reader is constantly aware of Claudio’s thoughts, and there is minimal dialogue from other characters. So, the lack of any reference to Franco or Spain’s political past shows that he is not emotionally scarred by the past. His inner conflicts and desires have to do with his loneliness, passivity, and career endeavors, such as his desire to obtain tenure, as opposed to the conflicts portrayed in *Coto vedado* and *El hijo del acordeonista*. These are other first person narratives which constantly make references to Franco and his government’s policies, and the inability of the narrators to ever move past that phase of their lives exhibits their emotional scars due to the political turmoil. Claudio also has his own emotional anxiety, but Franco and Spain’s past have nothing to do with it.

However, while Spain’s rise to a first world socioeconomic status is reflected in Claudio’s life in Pennsylvania, there are also several negative aspects of his contemporary migrant life. For example, after three years without returning to Spain, Claudio becomes a foreigner in both of his countries, the United States and Spain, not feeling a strong attachment to either. Not only does he lose many of his Spanish customs, but he begins to look down on them and see them as strange, even offensive:
Uno se va haciendo poco a poco a la vida de aquí, y cuando vuelve a España ya encuentra algo upsetting que las mujeres se pinten los labios y se pongan tacones y minifalda para hacer el shopping en la mantequería de la esquina, o que las chicas acudan a la junior high maquilladas como gheisas, con corpiño, o top, según creo que llaman a esa prenda innegablemente turbadora (Muñoz Molina 48-49).

Also, throughout his long conversation with Abengoa, Claudio consistently highlights many of his Spanish tendencies that now bother him. He initially feels uneasy around Abengoa: “He perdido la costumbre de las invitaciones tan efusivas como desordenadas que suelen hacerse en España, y [Abengoa] me pone nervioso” (Muñoz Molina 27-28). Due to his long absence from Spain, these traits he recognizes from his mother country are no longer natural. If they were, he would not point them out and distinguish them; it would be nothing out of the ordinary. But after his long residence in another country, he feels estranged and foreign to what he sees as Spanish characteristics and now views them with unease.

Not only does he lose his Spanish customs, but he begins to show preference towards his host-country’s lifestyle; he is “fuertemente influenciado por los hábitos americanos” (Navarro Gil n. pag.). When Abengoa offers to pay for his drink, Claudio thinks: “¿No es mejor el práctico hábito anglosajón de dividir una cuenta a partes iguales, suprimiendo así el peligro de quedar en deuda, o de pagar en exceso?” (Muñoz Molina 28). Instead of simply accepting Abengoa’s offer, he worries about the consequences and rationalizes the better way to go about the transaction in his mind. Again, he points out Abengoa’s offer to pay as a Spanish habit which he no longer
But he also never fully feels attached to his new country either. After several years, instead of seeing Pennsylvania as his home, he still thinks to himself, “vivo en el extranjero” (Muñoz Molina 64). While he no longer believes in many Spanish practices, he also continuously identifies American habits he cannot get accustomed to. This ranges from smaller issues like drink servings to more significant matters; while getting a shot of whisky in Buenos Aires, he immediately thinks “[n]i que decir que la ración de whisky era mucho más generosa que en América” (147). But Claudio also suffers loneliness, a major theme of the novel, and he has not made any lasting friendships or relationships. He mentions that on the weekends, “a veces me encierro, el viernes a mediodía, terminada la última clase de la semana, con la certeza de que no hablaré con nadie hasta el lunes siguiente” (Muñoz Molina 22). His marriage ended in divorce, and his only true friend, Mario Said, returned to Argentina, so other than his career, he does not have any strong connections to his new country.

Furthermore, Claudio’s colleagues place stereotypes upon him due to his Spanish nationality. Claudio comments: “Otro descubrimiento del español en América es que ha de cargar resignadamente sobre sus hombros con todo el peso intacto de la Leyenda Negra” (Muñoz Molina 24). Morini, the Latin American chair of the department, constantly places that identity on Claudio. When Morini calls him in for a meeting to inform him that he will not receive tenure, Morini tells him: “crees que no me sentía intimidado ante una persona como tú, tan macho español, tan blatantly heterosexual,” and he continues, “el viejo machismo español no se rinde” (Muñoz Molina 168-169). However, plenty of evidence suggests the contrary to Morini’s accusations of Claudio’s “machismo.” In fact, one of Claudio’s weaknesses is his passiveness. Sandra Navarro
Gil also comments that Claudio “es un personaje tímido y solitario […], e invita a la pasividad” (n. pag.). During Claudio and Abengoa’s long conversation at the airport that makes up the first half of the novel, Claudio hardly ever says a word. He sits passively as a spectator listening to Abengoa’s long discourse, with minimal participation.

When Ann Gadea Simpson Mariátegui attacks his presentation at the conference in Buenos Aires, Claudio does not fight back or show the slightest resistance. He simply allows her to dismantle his entire presentation over Borges’s sonnet “Blind Pew” that he treasured dearly. Cladio later exclaims to himself: “¡Y yo no me había defendido, no había contestado nada, ni una palabra!” (Muñoz Molina 146). Claudio also mentions that similar to Morini, Simpson Mariátegui “me había acusado más o menos de complicidad hereditaria, en mi condición imperdonable de español, con las cárcceles de la inquisición, con el genocidio de las poblaciones indígenas” (Muñoz Molina 142). His passive personality and loneliness refutes Morini’s claim that he is “macho […], blatantley heterosexual,” full of “machismo” (Muñoz Molina168-169). Ultimately, this negative stereotyping affects his career as Morini rejects Claudio’s request for tenure and instead gives the post to Mariátegui Simpson. “That Mariátegui and Morini categorize Claudio in colonialist terms is, of course, the death of his career” (Marr 121).

The end of Spain’s autarkic society and its socioeconomic success in the 1990s is visible through many ways, such as the migration represented in Carlota Fainberg. Claudio and Abengoa, like most contemporary emigrant Spaniards, left Spain by choice rather than necessity as it was during the 1950s and 1960s. Franco has become an afterthought, and he does not haunt Claudio like he haunts characters like David in El hijo del acordeonista. Migrants from modern Spain also no longer have to work menial
labor jobs that pay low wages. Now there are examples of working professionals like Claudio and Abengoa, representatives of modern Spain.

Spain’s rise into the developed world is also seen in films. One of many examples is Kasbah (2000) by Mariano Barroso, where the theme of international migration is established in the opening narration: “Éste es el paisaje que han estado viendo mis ojos cada día. Cada mes. Cada uno de los cinco años que he vivido en un país que no es el mío. Si es que los países son de alguien.” I chose to analyze this film over others because it shows an example of Spanish migration to Morocco. All other cases of Spanish emigration in this study analyze Spaniards who travel to more or equally developed nations, but Kasbah presents an example of a Spanish citizen in a third world country, and his more dominant position changes his experience and mindset. Spain’s increased socioeconomic status in the 1990s and its political openness is reflected in the migration in Kasbah.

Spain’s relatively recent first world status affects the characters’ migration experiences. For instance, the nation ceased its autarkic policies during Franco’s regime, but it was not until after his death that Spain was fully accepted into the global community, and as mentioned earlier, it was the 1986 accession into the European Union that solidified its integration. In Kasbah, one of the very first images is a sign that reads: “Sociedad Hispano_Arabe [sic] de Manganeso,” and this illustrates Spain’s relationship and involvement in other countries, unlike the time under Franco’s isolationist atmosphere. The protagonist, Mario, has an occupation in Morocco, where he oversees and manages operations and negotiates business at a large firm. He is not an undocumented Spanish migrant, like Pepe is in ¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe!, so
Mario’s legitimate post at the Spanish company in Morocco exhibits Spaniards’ higher accessibility to the rest of the world.

Just like in Carlota Fainberg, the emigrant Spaniards in Kasbah also have employment of a higher status than was the case in the 1950s and 1960s. Mario is not stuck doing unwanted low-wage labor, but rather his father gave him a high position in the company. In one scene, Mario negotiates a business deal with two clients regarding ninety tons of magnesium. Managing such a large amount of raw material with international businessmen requires education and sufficient training, which none of the Spanish migrants had in ¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe!, but Mario’s more prominent position shows Spain’s increased standard of living. Furthermore, before Spain’s socioeconomic status rose to the level it reached in the late 1980s and 1990s, Spaniards would leave Spain for more developed countries at the time, like Germany and France, but Kasbah shows how Spain is now the more dominant country in some cases. Mario leaves first world Spain to work in the less developed country of Morocco. Mario is the one giving orders to the Moroccans who work for him, while before, as seen in ¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe!, it was the poor Spaniards who took orders from the foreigners, and if any resisted, plenty of other Spanish emigrants were ready and willing to take their place. But Mario is the one in the position of power.

Mario’s high salary as an emigrant also differs from the past. In the 1960s, the Spaniards who worked abroad would typically send “back about a quarter of their earnings to swell the deposit accounts of their homeland” (Hooper 20), but Mario lives comfortably and has plenty of disposable income. For a large portion of the film he uses his money as a solution to his problems, and gets frustrated when it cannot solve the
issue. When he hits a family’s goat with his car, his only attempt to make peace is by handing the family cash, but they only throw it on the ground. So he lives well enough to risk being reckless because he believes his money can solve whatever problem he may encounter, an unheard of luxury for most Spanish migrants during Franco’s regime.

Furthermore, the effects of globalization are also visible in the migration in *Kasbah*. The diversity of languages in Mario’s life shows this. In the course of the film, he works through three different languages: Spanish, French, and Arabic. He does not know Arabic, but Brahim, someone who works in his office, becomes his interpreter. However, Mario’s complete lack of knowledge of the language after five years in Morocco becomes a problem in his unexpected situation, the search for his sister, Laura. He must completely depend on Brahim and trust him. They meet with several Moroccans who Brahim says have information. Mario does not understand a word during the meetings, and Brahim deceives Mario along the search, costing him valuable time. In a globalized world, Mario’s reluctance to learn his host-country’s language brings negative consequences. Additionally, María Cristina Montoya states that a “global person who lives in this system [globalization] is required to have some degree of assimilation to the promoted common value system and language” (67), and this applies to Mario’s situation. Brahim guides Mario through his country’s “value system,” the one he must rely on in order to find his sister. Since Mario is unfamiliar with the customs, Brahim instructs when to tip locals for information regarding the whereabouts of Laura, and his knowledge of the process which stolen cars go through in Morocco is the only lead Mario has. And after Mario parts ways with Brahim, with almost no knowledge his surroundings, two supposed mechanics injure him and hijack his car,
and he is later stabbed and left to die in the desert until Brahim rescues him. Mario needed knowledge of Morocco’s value system in order to reach his goals, and for his survival.

However, Mario is conscious of his mother country’s higher standard of living, which gives him a sense of superiority and distrust in his less developed host-country. Soon after his sister’s disappearance Mario becomes paranoid and desperate, and police arrest him after he attacks a vendor who he believes is responsible for Laura’s supposed kidnapping. And when thrown in jail, Mario exclaims: “¡Avisen a la embajada! ¡Les digo que despareció una chica española!” He emphasizes the fact that she is Spanish, suggesting a Spanish person’s case is more valuable than a local’s. Mario’s sense of distrust is also seen when Brahim asks Mario if he wants to take a break from driving, but Mario does not accept his help. Mario spent the entire previous day driving, but due to his lack of trust of Moroccans he makes his life more difficult by refusing simple help from Brahim, who is well aware of Mario’s attitude. When Brahim first approaches him, Mario warns that he should not lie to him, and Brahim responds: “¿Por qué engañarte? Españoles siempre piensan que nosotros engañamos. Brahim no engaña. Primo no engaña. Españoles engañan.” Mario has different beliefs at the end, but this transformation shall be explained further ahead. Spain’s higher standard of living leads Mario to have feelings of superiority.

Moreover, the migration in Kasbah, as in Carlota Fainberg, is not a matter of necessity. Mario was not forced to go to Morocco. He accepted the job his father gave him.

---

4 John Hooper notes that racism still exists in modern Spain, but in an unconscious level; for instance, he mentions that press reports tend to almost always specify someone’s race when it is not relevant to the issue in any way, and “moro” is a commonly used derogatory word that describes people of a dark complexion (443).
him and he chose to leave Spain. Also, there are no external factors that require him to stay there. He simply waits the necessary time for his transfer to the main office in Spain, so nothing but stable employment keeps him in Morocco. Contrary to the main trend just a few decades earlier, he does not escape or avoid “hunger, poverty, and cultural oppression” (Marr 110). Alix, a recent Spanish migrant in Morocco who befriends Mario, leaves Spain for her own personal reasons: “Me vine aquí para olvidar lo de mi hijo, y me he despertado a golpes. Y ahora ni hijo, ni trabajo, ni familia, ni nada.” She acknowledges that she does not have anything left in Spain, but she is also not forced to leave. She migrates by choice and not by necessity.

Mario and Alix reflect post-Franco society. In Morocco they are accepting of the foreign, culture, though for Mario it takes time and their willingness to travel back and forth between countries also echoes Spain’s end of autarky. On the other hand, the antagonist, Rodrigo, represents Spain’s fascist past under Franco. In his introductory scene, a shot inside his truck shows a picture a Franco, explicitly revealing his ideology. Ironically, even though he lives in Morocco, he is also an isolationist, reminiscent of Spain’s past. He explains to Rodrigo that he first went to Morocco for military duty, but he has never left. He shows no willingness to return, as opposed to Mario and Alix. Rodrigo continues to tell Mario: “Tú y yo somos iguales. A los dos nos han dejado tirados. Pero no necesitamos a nadie. ¡Que se jodan!” His attitude of absolute self-reliance mirrors Spain’s former reluctance to integrate itself into the European community, until giving up its autarkic policies late into Franco’s regime. Mario on the other hand gives up that kind of thinking, learning that he and Brahim must rely on each other to reach their goals.
Rodrigo also believed in racial purity, much like Franco’s society that “took on a xenophobic character and sought to legitimate the rejection of all things considered to be ‘foreign’” (Corkill 49-50). Rodrigo’s hatred and gruesome violence towards Arabs, as well as his disgust of Laura’s romantic relationship with Driss, a Moroccan she met in Spain, demonstrate his bigotry. Rodrigo has a moral objection to their relationship, stating: “Este moro se ha metido donde no debía.” He later adds, “Qué mierda de gente sois. ¿No os importa que este hijo de puta se tire a una de nuestras hijas? A mí sí, y va a pagar por ello.” His intolerance ultimately causes his death. Mario finds out that Rodrigo’s father was an Arab and he confronts him with this information. That fact torments Rodrigo, which he vehemently denies before killing himself. Rodrigo’s death due to his intolerance and isolationism conveys the impossibility of that kind of mindset in an increasingly globalized world, a fact which Spain also had to come to terms with as well. At the time of Franco’s death it was “apparent to all but the tiny minority that came to power known as Franco’s ‘bunker’ that the regime’s hopes of achieving economic development with minimal social emancipation had been both unreasonable and illusory” (Longhurst 23).

Finally, Mario goes through a significant metamorphosis reflective of Spain’s own transformation after Franco’s death. As mentioned earlier, Mario has an attitude of superiority and mistrust toward his host-country, but his mentality changes. What started as strictly business and suspicion ends in genuine friendship and mutual respect. Mario forgives Brahim for deceiving him and attends his daughter’s wedding, and Brahim saves Mario from dying in the desert. Also, the film begins with Mario narrating that Morocco was a country that “nunca había pensado visitar, ni siquiera
como turista. El sueño de todo este tiempo era volver a casa. Y el momento había llegado.” His bright red shirt contrasts with all the other colors of the desert, giving the impression that he does not fit in, precisely Mario’s belief at the moment. He feels he does not belong and he declares that his only desire for the past five years has been to leave Morocco.

But this also changes. He later tells Brahim: “También tengo una hermana. Muy guapa, rica, lista, y que está perdida en este país, como yo.” Mario is geographically lost, but he also refers to his future in the country. Returning to Spain was once his only certainty, but he expresses doubt for the first time, saying he is “lost.” His return becomes even more uncertain when Alix asks if he will go back to Spain, and now Mario only shrugs his shoulders. And in the closing scene, Mario narrates: “Algún día volveré a ir al país que ahora abandono. Quién sabe cuándo. Si encuentro una razón puede ser hoy mismo,” that reason being Alix. His final words of the film are the opposite of what he says in the beginning, “mañana desaparezco y no vuelvo a pisar este país.” Mario gradually learns to open himself up to many possibilities he did not always think possible. He eventually embraces the other culture, bringing him the happiness and connections he sought after, with Brahim and Alix. Spain also opened its society up to possibilities Franco once thought should be avoided, but it led to Spain’s socioeconomic rise and higher quality of life.

Carlota Fainberg and Kasbah both present a completely different version of Spain than earlier films like ¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe! Among the many distinctions are the migrations the characters go through, a large part of it due to Spain’s greatly increased economic development since the 1970s. As seen in Carlota Fainberg and
Spanish emigration in the 1990s was no longer a matter of necessity as it was before. Claudio, Mario, and the other Spanish characters who depart Spain do not flee any political turmoil or economic hardship, and their socioeconomic status is equal to or higher than their community in their new host-country. With a much higher education and domestic stability, the new Spanish emigrants seen in Carlota Fainberg and Kasbah no longer have to work unwanted and unskilled jobs they once very willingly accepted. Spanish migration today continues to be a matter of choice as Spaniards continue to expand their horizons, finding themselves in places and situations once thought unimaginable.
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CHAPTER 5


Despite an attempted coup d’état in 1981, ETA presence, and the tragic terrorist bombing of 2004, Spain continues to be a stable highly developed nation that has gone through many peaceful transitions of power between opposing parties since the end of the dictatorship. Historians William Griffin and Julia Ortiz-Griffin assert that in 1999, when Spain converted its official currency to the Euro, “for a nation that had been a virtual outcast only three decades before, Spain had come a long way” (20). The country has integrated itself into the global community. The 1960s slogan of “Spain is Different,” “launched […] to attract tourists to an ‘exotic’ destination, with interesting local customs and traditions differing from the European norm,” (Kelly 30) is now irrelevant as the modern Spanish identity becomes increasingly indistinguishable from its European neighbors. Juan Madrid’s novel Restos de carmín (1999) and Isabel Coixet’s film Map of the Sounds of Tokyo (2009) demonstrate this new character of the nation through their protagonists who emigrate from Spain.

Literary critic John Macklin lists Juan Madrid as one of the most distinguished writers of the novela negra, a style that “confronts the brutal reality of modern urban crime” (50) and focuses on “areas that are sordid, ugly and unpleasant” (53), and Restos de carmín fits that description. It takes place in New York City, one of the world’s most important financial centers, yet focuses instead on lower class neighborhoods riddled with drug dealers, violence, and corrupt police officers and authority. Most of the critical analysis on Juan Madrid focuses on his career as a novelista negro and the
majority also examines his previous novels, especially \textit{Días contados} (1993). In \textit{Restos de carmín} the protagonist is a Spaniard who recently moved to New York, and his experience as an immigrant is a major element of the story. In addition, the characteristics of his emigration also suggest certain information about Spain’s current socioeconomic position and history. \textit{Restos de carmín} shows how Spain’s migration patterns have completely changed in less than half a century.

The causes of Spanish emigration in \textit{Restos de carmín} differ from those of just a few decades ago. For instance, Federico, the Spanish protagonist in Madrid’s novel, does not leave Spain out of economic necessity. Previous chapters here have detailed how over a million Spaniards were forced to emigrate from Spain in order to find work abroad due to financial needs (Hooper 20), which was the case demonstrated in \textit{¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe!}. Even in \textit{Kasbah}, in post-Franco Spain, Mario still lived in Morocco purely for work-related reasons at first, as he had no interest in the culture. So, in the past Spanish migrants had their livelihood and future stability at stake; if the migrant workers in \textit{¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe!} did not go to Germany then they could not obtain their goals of having a cattle ranch, a gas station, or economic security, and in \textit{Kasbah}, if Mario did not work in Morocco then he would not be transferred to Spain as he desired more than anything else. On the other hand, Federico’s financial security and future livelihood is not at stake with his migration to New York. He already had a secure occupation and life in Spain, and at one point it is mentioned: “A la mierda sus colegas que torcieron la sonrisa cuando él les comunicó que se iba a Nueva York a probar suerte, a cambiar de vida” (Madrid 92). Contrary to the migrants of the past, he emigrates from Spain for personal goals and for a change of lifestyle, “a cambiar de
vida.” This differs from Pepe and Mario’s cases where they resisted a change of lifestyle in a foreign country through their reluctance to learn about their host-country’s culture.

In another instance, Federico thinks: “¿Qué le contaría a su hermano cuando volviese a Madrid con las manos vacías? ¿Y a su madre o a sus amigos? ¿Que había ido a Nueva York para nada?” (Madrid 242). Thus, the only thing he has at stake is his own pride. His migration was not a means of survival or economic stability; rather he left with artistic and personal endeavors as he lived comfortably enough in Spain to do so. Moreover, the cause of Federico’s migration had no political or social reasons, also different from many cases of the past. During the Franco regime, many political opponents faced repercussions if they returned, which was the situation in Yoyes and El hijo del acordeonista. But Federico’s residence in New York was completely voluntary and he had the option of returning any time he wanted. Also, a “return movement” is a common characteristic among many recent migrants (Cohen 180), and it applied to Spain in the 1970s, but this also changes in Restos de carmín. Pepe and his Spanish community in Germany, as well as Mario in Kasbah, initially left their country with the intention of returning, but Federico’s future plans of residence are ambiguous. His departure was sudden, and his future is uncertain: “¿Y si se quedaba a vivir en Nueva York definitivamente?” (Madrid 93). He makes plans to return to Spain, but they are due to his complications with a brutal drug dealer, and not nostalgic feelings for his mother country or a longing to return to his home and family.

Furthermore, Spain’s current position as a developed first-world country has also changed migration from the past. Spaniards living abroad are no longer treated as second class citizens. As also mentioned in previous chapters, Spain’s economy was
much less developed than many of its northern European neighbors in the 1960s and 1970s, so Spanish migrants worked low paying jobs the host-country’s own citizens were reluctant to take (Ames 8). However, the Spanish economy has drastically improved and “one commentator has argued, ‘[a] solid case can be made for including Spain in the G8’s elite club of the wealthiest industrialised nations and renaming it G9.’ The basis for such a claim lies in the fact that Spain’s economy ranks eleventh in the world,” a status that in 1986 “would have been widely dismissed as absurd” (Heywood 387). So, Federico does not spend his entire day working menial labor jobs as the migrants did in ¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe!. He spends much of his time in intellectual groups discussing current events and literary theory. “Federico no cabía en sí de gozo. Se sentía un igual, parte de un grupo de intelectuales y artistas. El sueño que había acariciado al llegar a Nueva York. Al fin era uno de ellos” (Madrid 104). He depends on his artistic endeavors for support and to pay off his debts. Although he later finds out he was wrong to do so, he still never takes a menial labor job like many of his illegal Latin American immigrant friends, who are in fact second class citizens like Spanish migrants used to be in northern Europe. However, Federico does end up dealing drugs like his friends from less developed countries, but “[v]ice and corruption at all levels of society” is a major characteristic of Juan Madrid’s fiction (Craig-Odders 71). Thus, it is not just the lower marginalized class that is involved in illegal activities in Madrid’s novels.

The end of Spain’s isolationist policies has also affected migration. Federico displays an interest in New York’s minority cultures, particularly the Hispanic culture. He states his purpose in the United States: “estoy preparando un libro de fotos sobre los hispanos” (Madrid 44). Throughout the novel, Federico actively seeks people from
different Latin American countries, coming into contact with people from Puerto Rico, Argentina, Mexico, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Argentina, Guatemala, and El Salvador. He shows a genuine interest in their culture as he interviews them and studies audio tapes their families send to the United States. Federico also plans to write a novel about Latinos in New York, so he wants to make the characters as authentic as possible: “en la novela quiero que los personajes hablen como ellos hablan de verdad. Y necesito saber cómo lo hacen” (Madrid 36). This greatly contrasts with ¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe! where Pepe had no interest in German culture. He refused the food and was very reluctant to learn any of the language. Federico not only knows English, the language of his host-country, but he also immerses himself in various New York communities.

Sonia McKay notes that most international migrants tend to come from “regions and nations that are undergoing rapid change and development” (16). This was precisely the case in Spain in the 1960s and 1970s, but now that Spain has stabilized its economy and government, Spaniards are no longer emigrating in the high numbers they once did. Hence, the Spanish migration in Restos de carmín only includes the isolated case of Federico. He comes into contact with a great number of people from Guatemala, El Salvador, and Cuba, less developed countries that fit McKay’s description. But there is not a large Spanish migrant community in the novel, unlike in ¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe! and El hijo del acordeonista, when Spain had not yet reached the level of economic development and stability it has today. McKay also states that migrants tend to move to the countries closest to their native nation (15). Again, this is seen in examples of past migrations in ¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe!, Coto vedado, and El
hijo del acordeonista where the principal characters migrate to other European nations. But Federico leaves Europe and crosses the Atlantic Ocean to New York. As Spain transformed into a highly developed country in the last decades of the twentieth century, so did its migration patterns.

Moreover, while Spanish identity is a major theme in many works in the past that present Spanish migration, it is nearly nonexistent in Restos de carmín. In every other novel in this analysis, Coto vedado, El hijo del acordeonista, and Carlota Fainberg, the characters are constantly reminded of their Spanish identity and it plays a large part in their lives. Cristina Moreiras Menor explains how Spain’s past is a source of lifelong “trauma” for many characters in late twentieth century Spanish literature:

[T]rauma is conceived not as a symptom of the unconscious, but rather as a symptom of history; the traumatized subject either carries the weight of an intolerable history or is trapped both in the past and in the present, becoming the symptom of a history that the subject cannot possess in its totality. […] Authors such as Bernardo Atxaga, […] Antonio Muñoz Molina, […] Juan Goytisolo, […] approach Spanish reality from this historiographic (and therefore traumatic) position. Their works appear to reflect on reality from the place of trauma (137). However, this does not apply to Federico in Restos de carmín where he feels no trauma or suffers any anxiety because of his nationality and the past of his country. Certain people in El hijo del acordeonista and Coto vedado leave Spain in order to escape their past and cope with an identity that haunts them, but writers such as Madrid “produce texts that not only reject any traces of history but also fail to articulate a desire that might serve as a driving force of their narratives” (Moreira Menor 138). Federico’s
departure from Spain had nothing to do with the past or unrest with his identity. He specifically mentions that he leaves to try his luck as an artist in America, “probar suerte” (Madrid 92). His Spanish identity has no influence on the plot or his decisions, and the narrative is primarily driven by external conflicts. On the other hand, internal conflicts, especially distress over their Spanish identity, are prevalent in the Spanish migrants in Coto vedado, El hijo del acordeonista, and Carlota Fainberg. They still constantly think of their roots while residing in other countries, but Restos de carmín hardly gives any significance to the character of Federico’s nationality, although others do not fail to point it out: “Es español, de España. Muy interesting, ¿verdad?” (Madrid 57). But it is not a major aspect of the novel.

Restos de carmín does not criticize Spanish identity or portray it in a negative manner as done in Coto vedado; rather it is simply absent in Juan Madrid’s novel. Like most of his other works, “the individual is detached from the world. The view is not so much negative as disinterested” (Macklin 57). So Federico’s relationship to his nationality is irrelevant in the novel. It does not affect the plot or the protagonist’s decisions in any way. John Hooper notes how Francoism, the main cause of trauma for many in the past, is now seen from an “enormous distance” and has become an “irrelevance” (73), just like Federico’s Spanish identity. It is no longer a burden for newer generations of Spanish emigrants, nor the source of trauma due to Spain’s tumultuous past.

In less than half a century, Spain completely transformed itself and its global image, and Juan Madrid’s novel Restos de carmín shows an example of how Spanish migration also changed along with the country. The protagonist is able to afford to move
across the ocean simply for a change of lifestyle, “a cambiar de vida,” (Madrid 92) while only thirty years prior to that most Spanish migrants moved to their neighbors in northern Europe as a means of survival. The country’s economy has grown to one of the largest in the world, eliminating the need over a million Spaniards felt in the past to go abroad to support their families. The political situation has also stabilized, and the repression that haunted so many during the dictatorship is becoming insignificant for newer generations. Spaniards can now afford to take more risky and adventurous migrations, taking them farther away from home and enabling them to explore new cultures.

Isabel Coixet forms part of a new generation of Spanish filmmakers that strives to go beyond Spain and reach a global audience. Núria Triana Toribio specifies that many Spanish comedies of the 1950s and 1960s were distinctly Spanish, as they would “rely on adding excess to the tradition that locates the Spanishness of the national cinema in its costumbrismo” (48). But Coixet’s films “can not be considered ‘Spanish’ because they are of equal interest to an international audience regardless of geographical barriers and viewer nationality” (Sánchez-Conejero 339). So in a new cinema that looks beyond its borders, the presence of a Spaniard, David, in Tokyo in Coixet’s most recent film Map of the Sounds of Tokyo is significant. Her film is also important for this analysis because it shows an example of Spanish migration to Asia, farther away from Spain than any other example in this study, containing further implications. The Spanish migration in Map of the Sounds of Tokyo shows how the country’s migration patterns have drastically changed since the 1970s.
The reasons for David’s emigration in *Map of the Sounds of Tokyo* are different from the common causes of Spanish emigration thirty years prior, and Coixet’s film has many similarities with *Restos de carmín*. Just like Federico’s, David’s migration was not a matter of necessity. Nothing in particular forces David out of Spain, and in one instance he calmly tells Ryu: “I came here. That wasn’t any big deal. I like this city. I always wanted to live here in Tokyo. When I was a kid, I loved everything Japanese. Cartoons, food, pictures, films. I don’t know why. And the adventure has been…” Also as in Juan Madrid’s novel, there is nothing at stake in David’s migration to Japan. He directly declares that his migration to Tokyo stems from a childhood fascination with the culture, so he merely fulfills his own sense of adventure. His romantic relationship with Midori, until she commits suicide, is another cause of his residence in Japan. He does not have any plans to return to Spain until Midori’s unexpected death, so he also does not display any concern for returning to his homeland. Thus, there is no evidence of any goals he strives to accomplish while living in migration, contrary to the past when most Spaniards living abroad had very specific fiscal goals and the intention of returning.

Moreover, research shows that for many migrants departure from their native country tends to be “traumatic” (Cohen 180). This was the case for Spain in the past which can be seen in *El hijo del acordeonista* and *Yoyes* where the migrant characters left their homes and families the overnight and later express the distress that their decision that scarred them for life caused them. But that does not apply to David’s much more recent emigration from Spain. He explains his reason for leaving Spain while completely calm and composed, and he explicitly says that it “wasn’t any big deal.” The protagonist in *El hijo del acordeonista* had a hard time talking about his native home
and departure, but in this film’s case, David does so indifferently. His different attitude towards his migration is due to completely different circumstances of his exodus.

Furthermore, Spain’s highly developed international status in the twenty-first century produces a new migration that differs from its relatively recent past. Also like Federico in Restos de carmín, David does not live as a second class citizen. He does not travel to Tokyo to ease any economic hardship, especially since he lives in the one of the most expensive cities in the world located on the other side of the globe. As mentioned earlier, Sonia McKay specifies that most migrants will travel to the countries nearest to their nation of origin (15), but her research refers to less developed areas of the world, no longer applicable to present day Spain. And, unlike the migrant workers in ¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe!, David does not work a low paying manual labor job. In fact, he runs an expensive wine store, a position that reflects the economic progress his country has made since the 1970s.

In addition, “[s]ince the end of the Franco era, Spaniards have been carrying out the business of ‘integration,’” so Spain is “no longer an unknown quantity, a strange place surrounded by fanciful exotic images” (Griffin, Ortiz-Griffin 129). Hence, David’s residence in Tokyo is not a matter of extreme rarity or shock, but again that was not the case just a few decades ago in the 1970s. Traveling to Germany, in the same continent, was a life changing event and an extravagant incident that caused commotion, celebration, and even some disapproval in ¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe!. And some migrants, such as Pepe, refused to adapt to the new culture, staying in the bubble of the Spanish community abroad. But the end of Spain’s isolationist society is evident in the migration shown in Map of the Sounds of Tokyo. Whereas the Spaniards in ¡Vente a
Alemania, Pepe! received jubilant farewells, David’s extremely farther migration to Japan “wasn’t any big deal,” as he stated. When Spain opened up its economy to the rest of the world, it also opened up the opportunity for its own citizens, like David, to travel. Unlike Pepe, David adapts to his new country’s culture. There are some small issues adapting to the new culture; for instance he states: “after having been here for three years, I still can’t get used to having sushi for breakfast.” But there are no signs of discomfort or disorientation to the point where he cannot live there. In the film, he never feels any nostalgia for his native country or speaks of missing his home, so as a modern Spanish migrant he demonstrates a higher capability of adapting to cultures outside his own. “The Spain of today is once again asserting herself in the world, not with the irresistible rush of a pent-up force, but with a mixture of eager curiosity and rational aspiration after her long isolation” (Griffin, Ortiz-Griffin 129). David acts upon the “curiosity” he felt as a child towards Japanese culture, and due to Spain’s relatively recent high level of development, he is more capable than ever of doing so.

Finally, while Spanish identity is a key aspect in previous examples of Spanish migration in fiction, it is absent in Map of the Sounds of Tokyo. Plenty of evidence suggests that Isabel Coixet chooses to use universal themes: “it has been stated by more than one author that her career avoids any stable engagement with a particular national identity which may be prioritized over the needs of her stories” (Triana Toribio 54); Map of the Sounds of Tokyo is no exception. First, the film’s language demonstrates this. The two principal characters, David, a Spaniard, and Ryu, a Japanese, converse in English, neither one’s first language. That choice of language is one way the film avoids a definitive nationality. Cristina Sánchez-Conejero explains that
Coixet is part of a new generation of Spanish filmmakers whose works often consists of “movies shot in English, and moreover includes a director’s personal mark that is not always strictly related to the exploration of Spanish cultural topics” (338-339).

Additionally, David and Ryu’s Spanish and Japanese nationalities are not necessary for the film’s universal story. It takes place in the specific city of Tokyo, but the story could have also taken place at any other fish market in the world. Coixet herself mentions in the DVD commentary: “Yo desde luego no me senté a escribir, pensando ‘voy a escribir una historia en Tokio.’” David’s Spanish nationality is not necessary for the film’s plot, either. He hardly shows any traits that mark him as Spanish. In one instance, as he watches Ryu slurp a bowl of ramen while he silently eats his, he tells her: “I know, I know. You’re supposed to be noisy eating ramen, but it’s ill mannered in Spain.”

However, Europe and Western societies in general eat silently. It is not an exclusively Spanish habit, further adding to the universal nature of Coixet’s film.

David’s dialogue also explicitly declares the universal setting of the film: “All this rubbish about the difference between the Japanese and the rest of the world. We aren’t so different. Men are the same jerks in all countries.” David specifies the increasingly universal nature of modern Spanish men, which greatly contrasts with the past. When Pepe is in Germany in Pedro Lazaga’s film, he uses his Spanish identity as a way to distinguish himself and attract women. He makes sure the women from the residence know he is an “españolito fuerte, toro.” But over thirty years later, David, the new Spanish emigrant, asserts that he is no different from the Japanese or the rest of the world. The “Spain is Different” slogan Pepe tried to take advantage of in Germany no longer applies to David. Spanish identity was a prevalent characteristic of Spanish
emigrants in the past, but in “the words and work of Coixet we discern ambivalence
towards nation, language and […] the way in which they can pigeon-hole a filmmaker
within his or her own national cultures” (Tirana Toribio 62).

As in Restos de carmín, Spain’s turbulent past is no longer a source of distress in
Map of the Sounds of Tokyo. Certain characters in ¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe!, Yoyes,
and Kasbah suffer because of their connection to their past and their nation, and
therefore Barry Jordan lists Coixet as part of a new generation that “shows little sign of
following any prescriptive political or cultural agenda. Indeed, the young directors of the
1990s appear not to be burdened by the weight of the past or the need to settle any
political or ideological scores” (75). The only weight David carries is due to Midori’s
suicide: “I tried to understand her. I swear I tried. But nothing was enough for Midori.” As
part of Spain’s new universal cinema, the film’s conflict is caused by emotions, death,
and guilt, feelings all regions of the world can relate to. Francosim is completely
unrelated to the film’s conflicts. Other than coming from Spain, David’s past is unknown,
but it is also irrelevant. His history with his country’s past does not affect any of his
choices. Rather they are his relationships with Midori and Ryu and the resulting
emotions that guide his decisions, contrary to the past where a connection to Spain and
a Spanish identity deeply affected Spanish emigrants’ lives. In El hijo del acordeonista,
David and Joseba feel compelled to tell the story of their tormenting past that later
guides several life-altering decisions, such as writing their memoirs or moving to
California, but David from Map of the Sounds of Tokyo, the current Spanish migrant,
shows no sign of trauma. The only information revealed about his childhood is the love
he had for Japanese cartoons, food, and films.
Present day Spanish migration, as presented in *Restos de carmín* and *Map of the Sounds of Tokyo*, illustrates a completely different experience from just a few decades ago. In Juan Madrid’s novel and Isabel Coixet’s film the Spanish emigrant protagonists leave Spain for the sake of adventure and a different lifestyle. They do not leave in search of a better lifestyle, rather a different lifestyle. Unlike before, the purpose of their migration is not to acquire money in a more developed country, especially in the present where “'Africa begins at the Pyrenees' is […] heard less often now as Spain becomes a full-fledged and increasingly respected member of the European Union and NATO” (Ames 7), joining the first-world ranks of the United States and Japan. In addition, Federico’s and David’s migration experiences are much more individualistic. Not only do they not interact with any other Spaniards in their host-country, but they leave for their own personal goals and reasons, not sending back any earnings to support a family at home in Spain as was commonly done in the 1960s and 1970s (Hooper 20). Spain’s astounding development and increased socioeconomic status since the end of the dictatorship is reflected in the migration in *Restos de carmín* and *Map of the Sounds of Tokyo*.

Many other currently less developed nations have the migration patterns Spain used to have. It is not rare for Cubans and North Africans to endanger their lives trying to cross the sea in homemade rafts in order to reach the United States and Europe in search of a better life. Thousands of Mexicans continue to cross the border into the United States to work and send money back to their families who stayed behind, similar to Spanish emigrants’ experiences a few decades ago. Spain’s transformation into a first-world country shows the possibility of the improvement third-world countries can
attain, where citizens no longer leave their country out of necessity, but rather to explore other cultures and be a part of the global community as an equal member.
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CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION


The majority of Spanish emigration from the 1950s to the 1970s under Franco was out of economic necessity, and the migrants tended to travel to the close proximity of their northern European neighbors. From 1961 to 1973 the number of Spaniards who left the country to find work abroad reached over a million, and their exposure to other countries resulted in shock as they “had to come to grips with new concepts like credit cards and complicated machines like dishwashers” (Hooper 20-21). The common Spanish emigrants during this time were “economic migrants in search of higher wages” (Corkill, Harrison 37), but this starts to change in the 1980s, and by the 1990s Spaniards no longer leave their country as a means of economic survival. By then, it is
no longer the phenomenon where a mass number of Spaniards leave for more
developed nations such as France, Switzerland, and Germany.

Matthew Marr explains that recent literature shows how the new Spanish
emigrant usually holds “a privileged social standing” and is “by nearly all means, a
cosmopolitan voyager by choice and formal invitation” (110). Spaniards no longer
emigrate in a desperate search for higher income since their country’s economy
drastically improved and domestic conditions stabilized, eliminating the need to find
work elsewhere. Emigration has not disappeared in Spain, but the new migrants do not
seek a more prosperous lifestyle outside their borders, rather a different lifestyle. A
majority of international emigration occurs in “regions that are undergoing rapid change
and development,” (McKay 16) such as Spain in the 1960s and 1970s as its economy
was being restructured, but this is no longer the case. The country’s economy has
become one of the largest in the world and has maintained stability, also seen in its
political environment since power has peacefully switched between opposing parties on
more than one occasion. Thus, Spain’s international migration now differs little from that
of its highly developed European neighbors and first-world countries, which is reflected
in its literature and film.

Pedro Lazaga’s film ¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe! shows the common
characteristics of his country’s emigration of the era. The protagonist, Pepe, joins a
large community of Spaniards in Germany looking for higher wages they could not find
in their native Peralejos. Pepe and all his Spanish friends in Germany work low paying
manual labor jobs that require little skill and education. Furthermore, similar to El hijo
del acordeonista and Yoyes, the migrants leave Spain with the intention of returning,
and in their migration they idealize their mother country. The migrant characters in these works feel a strong attachment to Spain and develop nostalgic feelings in their absence. Thus, in these cases a return becomes the emigrant characters’ strongest desire. They leave family, friends, and a country they cherish, and their return is a major element of the story. However, Juan Goytisolo’s memoirs *Coto vedado*, where he details his migration to France, provide an account of a different experience from the norm at the time. When he leaves Spain, he never wants to return. He does not feel the attachment to his country that the migrants feel in ¡*Vente a Alemania, Pepe!* | *El hijo del acordeonista* | and *Yoyes*. No nostalgic feelings develop during Goytisolo’s absence from Spain. He has a very distant relationship with his family, so he does not feel he is abandoning anything, contrary to the cases in ¡*Vente a Alemania, Pepe!* | *El hijo del acordeonista* | and *Yoyes*. Also opposed to the common trend, Goytisolo’s status rises in France where he is held in high esteem by the literary community and where leftists value his critique of Francoist Spain. He is not an economic migrant that has to resort to low paid manual labor.

Along with *El hijo del acordeonista* and *Yoyes*, Goytisolo’s *Coto vedado* presents a very critical view of Spain under Franco. Politics are a major aspect in these cases and a motivation for the characters’ migrations. In these three works, the protagonists’ Spanish identities and their country’s past is a source of trauma that never ceases to exist. But in more recent examples of Spanish migration in novels and film, the inner conflict caused by Spanish identity and Spain’s fascist past is not present, as can be seen in *Carlota Fainberg* and *Kasbah*. These provide an example of emigration in a more modern Spain that has integrated into the rest of the world, definitively ending its
autarkic era under Franco and creating a different migration experience. Claudio and Mario, the protagonists of Carlota Fainberg and Kasbah, work high status occupations abroad that need an education. They travel to work in another country, but not due to a lack of jobs in their own.

Moreover, the topic of Francoism is completely absent in Carlota Fainberg. The dictator is presented as a looming shadow over society in Coto vedado, El hijo del acordeonista, and Yoyes, but in Muñoz Molina’s novel, Franco and Spain’s politics carry no significance. One character in Kasbah, Rodrigo, is influenced by Franco, evident by the picture of the general in his truck, but it is not a major aspect of the film. In these more recent cases of Spanish emigration, political themes are nearly nonexistent. In addition, the deep attachment to Spain and nostalgic feelings caused by the departure disappear in Carlota Fainberg and Kasbah. Kasbah begins with Mario’s intense longing to return, but he changes and at the end becomes ambivalent about returning to his native country. This greatly differs from ¡Vente a Alemania, Pepe!, where the climax revolves around Pepe’s efforts to return, and in El hijo del acordeonista where David thinks of Obaba and idealizes it until his death. Claudio decides to return to Spain in Carlota Fainberg, but it is a sudden decision that is not brought about by strong emotions.

Restos de carmín and Map of the Sounds of Tokyo demonstrate to a further degree Spain’s change in emigration from the 1960s. While it is not a source of trauma as in other cases, Spanish identity and citizenship still play a large role in Carlota Fainberg and Kasbah, but carries almost no weight in Restos de carmín and Map of the Sounds of Tokyo. A few characters are interested in the fact that the protagonist in
Restos de carmin is a Spaniard, but his national identity does not influence the plot in any way. Isabel Coixet has herself declared that she makes a conscious effort to move beyond exclusively Spanish themes in an effort to reach a universal audience. Núria Triana Toribio cites Coixet as saying that the “only way of achieving the survival of cinema […] is by making films for the world, at least for Europe,” and the director has also criticized the Catalan and Spanish film industry for a “lack of universal ambitions and for not attempting to cross borders” (53). Spanish emigration occurs in Restos de carmin and Map of the Sounds of Tokyo, but is irrelevant to the plot, different from examples of previous migration where the departure from Spain is the source of the central conflicts.

In a Spain that has reached socioeconomic levels of developed first-world nations, Restos de carmin and Map of the Sounds of Tokyo present migration for reasons other than economic necessity or for work related motivations. Migration in Carlota Fainberg and Kasbah is not necessary for the Spaniards to sustain themselves, although the migrants still left specifically for an occupation. Restos de carmin and Map of the Sounds of Tokyo show examples of more adventurous pursuits in the protagonists’ residence abroad. The emigrants leave for a change of lifestyle. In Restos de carmin, the Spanish migrant tries his luck as an author among a circle of artists in New York, and in Coixet’s film a Spaniard resides in Tokyo because of a childhood fascination with the country and a romance with a Japanese citizen. In the 1960s and 1970s, the emigrants would sent a large portion of their earnings back home to Spain, but these examples are a much more individualistic experience. They can afford to leave for personal goals and desires now that the purpose of departure from their
country is not to support their family or survive, as it once was. The migrants in these recent cases have a safety net back home in Spain in case their situation does not work out in their host-country, whereas previously the “insatiable appetite for unskilled labour in France, Germany and Switzerland” and resulting mass Spanish exodus was the relief for the nation’s high unemployment (Corkill, Harrison 37). Spain has shown astounding development since the final decades of the twentieth century, evident in the country’s portrayal of migration in its contemporary literature and film.

Under Franco’s autarkic era, Spain was absolutely and destructively independent. Isolation from other nations proved impossible in an increasingly globalized world. Then the country became vastly dependent on its more advanced European neighbors as its economy grew to be largely based on tourism, and the high unemployment was alleviated by the mass exodus of Spanish migrant workers who departed to northern European countries that sought cheap manual labor. But Spain continued to modernize and has reached the first-world status of the neighbors they once relied on. Spaniards continue to emigrate, but no longer solely as a means to put bread on the table.
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