

Memory and Modernity in Democratic Spain: The Difficulty of Coming to Terms with the Spanish Civil War

Jo Labanyi

Spanish and Portuguese, New York University

Abstract The essay argues that modernity is best understood not as the cultural expression of capitalist modernization, but as a particular set of relations of present to past. It examines the varying attitudes toward the violent past of the civil war that have characterized Spain since the Franco dictatorship and continuing to the present day. The obsessive memorialization of the Nationalist war dead throughout the Franco dictatorship led, at the time of the transition to democracy, to a desire to break with the past; it was not, as is often argued, a determination to forget, but a decision not to let the past affect the future. Thus attempts toward the end of the Franco dictatorship to deal cinematically with this violent heritage were followed by a ten-year gap, until the appearance in the mid-1980s of a number of novels and films representing the civil war and their escalation since the late 1990s to create a memory boom, which has resulted in the publication of a large number of testimonies. The essay questions whether trauma theory, which has been so important in Holocaust studies, provides an adequate model for understanding the belated appearance of these memories, arguing that the reason is more likely to be a previous lack of willing interlocutors. Nevertheless, it concludes that the present urge to recount every detail of the past is less effective in communicating the horror of the war and its repression than are those accounts—in film at the end of the dictatorship and in fiction in the mid-1980s, with occasional more recent examples—which acknowledge the difficulty of narrativizing the violent past as well as the importance of transgenerational transmission.

This essay will explore the intersection of two issues: the relationship of memory to modernity and the memorialization of the Spanish civil war in literature, film, and testimonies produced in Spain since the mid-1970s. The connection between these two issues is important, since Spain's history from the Enlightenment on has tended to be evaluated, by historians and literary scholars alike, in terms of a certain model of modernity based on capitalist modernization, which supposedly was realized perfectly in the countries of northern Europe. The result has been an assumption that the modern history of Spain has been marked by a failure to achieve modernity—an assumption explicitly articulated by the title of Eduardo Subirats's classic cultural analysis of the beginnings of Spanish modernity, *La Ilustración insuficiente* [*The Insufficient Enlightenment*] (1981).¹

In recent years, particularly since 2000, when the academic journal *Daedalus* published a monographic issue titled *Multiple Modernities* (Eisenstadt 2000), the notion that there is only one model of modernity, represented by the nations of northern Europe, has been challenged by cultural historians of those parts of the world relegated to marginality by such a model. In the Hispanic field, a key example is Julio Ramos's study of nineteenth-century Latin America, *Divergent Modernities* (2001). However, the notion of "multiple modernities" does not in itself avoid the problem of supposing that certain models of modernity—those represented by the hegemonic Western nations—are superior to others. So long as modernity continues to be defined in terms of capitalist development, it presupposes a teleological scheme which, although it may evolve at different speeds, in some cases going via fascism or socialism,² nevertheless has as its inevitable goal the

1. Subirats's analysis is an eloquent expression of the intellectual position adopted by Spanish liberals who have argued that the remedy to Spain's lack of political and economic stability in the modern period is the adoption of northern European philosophical, political, and economic models. The insistence of such liberal analysts on Spain's failed modernity has tended to encourage two divergent responses: a fatalistic belief that Spain's "belatedness" is irremediable or a desire for fast-track modernization that sees the Spanish past as something to be relegated to oblivion as fast as possible. Paradoxically, the idea of Spain's failed modernity has been perpetuated also by the political Right in Spain—dominated by the church, industrialists, and the landowning oligarchy—which has argued that this failed modernity is the source of Spain's moral superiority to the nations of northern Europe. For an excellent analysis of the historical construction and evolution of the pro- and anti-European positions, see Juliá 2004. Shubert (1990) and Cruz (1996) have argued convincingly that the fact that Spain did not develop a substantial middle class, defined in economic terms as an entrepreneurial bourgeoisie, until well into the twentieth century does not mean that Spain had not, already by the mid-nineteenth century, become a society in which liberal, bourgeois ideals had become the norm. In other words, Cruz and Shubert argue, it is possible for a country to be modern in cultural terms without having achieved capitalist modernization.

2. See, for example, Ben-Ghiat's (2001) analysis of Mussolini's Italy as an example of what she calls "fascist modernities" (in the plural). In his controversial book *The End of History*

establishment of global capitalism. Against this assumption, I would like to suggest that it might be more useful to think about modernity—whether in Spain or elsewhere—in terms not of capitalist modernization but of attitudes toward the relation of present to past.³

This unhinging of the term *modernity* from that of *modernization* supposes a view of modernity based on cultural rather than economic factors. What interests me in such a model of modernity is that it allows us to move away from the assumption that modernity requires a rupture with the past. The notion of progress, central to the liberal philosophy which has underpinned modernity, was based on the idea of a necessary rupture with a stable order based on birthright, in favor of a new mobility based on merit, incarnated in the “self-made man” who was able, through his own efforts, to break with origins and create new wealth.⁴ For liberalism is the philosophy of capitalism. As Walter Benjamin (1983: 172) noted, Baudelaire was a brilliant analyst of modernity because he perceived how it depended on a capitalist order based on fashion: that is, on ever-faster cycles of built-in obsolescence. A problematic by-product of this notion that modernity requires the jettisoning of the past is that it supposes that any desire to preserve the past is by definition reactionary; in other words, that conservation is politically conservative.⁵ And yet the cultural history of modernity is full of writers and artists who have expressed an attachment to the past or have protested against the compulsory obsolescence required by modernity, without necessarily being conservative in political terms.

The relevance of this discussion for my argument is that any model of modernity based on the capitalist idea of compulsory obsolescence has no place for memory. However, if we view modernity not in terms of capitalist development but as a particular set of attitudes toward the relationship of present to past, it becomes possible to elaborate a conception of modernity that, while it accepts the importance of moving on and continues to believe in the possibility of creating a better future, is also respectful of the need to acknowledge the past. I say “set of attitudes” in the plural because, while the past history of European modernity has mostly been based on the sup-

and the Last Man (1992), Fukuyama argued that, with the fall of the former Communist regimes of the Soviet bloc, history had reached its ultimate goal of the establishment of global capitalism.

3. I thank my former French cultural historian colleague at the University of Southampton, Jackie Clarke, for her insightful thoughts on this issue.

4. For an account of the cultural impact of liberal philosophy in nineteenth-century Spain, see Labanyi 2000: 31–87.

5. For a brilliant philosophical discussion of the binary “reactionary”/“progressive” as a product of modernity, see Moreiras 2004.

position that the past must be left behind, it has also produced a significant body of cultural work based on the celebration and elaboration of memory. It is no coincidence that it has been under late modernity⁶—in the last decades of the twentieth century—that, as the political master narratives of progress were called into question, memory has reemerged as a major topic of intellectual discussion.⁷

The relationship of the dictatorship of Generalísimo Francisco Franco (1939–75) to modernity is a vexed question. The regime has generally been seen as rejecting modernity since its nationalist rhetoric attempted to mask the regime's illicit status, as one born of military rebellion against the democratically elected Second Republic, by claiming to represent a return to mythical origins, which the Republic had supposedly betrayed.⁸ In fact, the regime emerged out of an uneasy military alliance (which adopted the label "Nationalist") between traditional landowners, the church, monarchists, big business, and fascism. While the first three (and particularly the first two) had a vested interest in clinging to the past, the last two were advocates of technological modernization (and, in the case of fascism, of a certain kind of social modernization within totalitarian structures). All of these factions were, however, united by their common dislike of the Republic, instituted in 1931, because of its attempts to better the economic and legal positions of the working classes and women (as well as its concession of autonomy to Catalonia).⁹ This Nationalist alliance, which rebelled against the Republic in 1936 and came to power on its military victory in 1939, was driven by a desire to negate the Enlightenment belief in universal human rights precisely in order to implement capitalist modernization to the maximum benefit of the dominant classes through the use of slave labor (political prisoners) and state-controlled unions. For this reason, the historian Michael Richards (1998) has argued, controversially but convincingly, that the Franco dictatorship should be seen as an example of conservative modernity and not as a break with modernity as such.

This conservative modernity translated ideologically into a contradic-

6. I use the term *late modernity* rather than *postmodernity* because I am arguing for a version of modernity that is able to acknowledge the past while continuing to work for a better future. This is very different from the ludic relativism assumed by the term *postmodernity*.

7. For an excellent overview of recent debates on memory, see Radstone 2000; Radstone and Hodgkin 2006; Hodgkin and Radstone 2006.

8. For analysis of the appeal to a myth of origins in Francoist ideology, see Labanyi 1989: 35–41. In her major study of the moral values imposed by the Franco dictatorship, Martin Gaité (1987: 17–37) stresses its cult of the past.

9. Autonomy was granted to Catalonia in 1932 and to the Basque Country in 1936, two months after the Nationalist uprising. Discussions on Galician autonomy were aborted when the region fell to the Nationalists in the first few days of the civil war.

tory attitude to the past. On the one hand, in order to satisfy the antimodern factions that supported it, particularly the church, the regime's ideology was based on an exaltation of the premodern values of the fifteenth-century Catholic kings who united the nation by driving out religious heterodoxy (Jews and Muslims) as well as sponsoring Spain's early modern empire in the Americas. On the other hand, the regime adopted a typically fascist rhetoric, justifying its violence as a break with the past necessary to a national "rebirth," proclaiming itself the "New State" and restarting the calendar from Triumphal Year One (1939). As the regime's foundational moment—the instrument for wiping the historical slate clean—the civil war was obsessively memorialized, exclusively from the victors' point of view, throughout the thirty-six years of dictatorship (see Aguilar Fernández 1996: 61–208). The Franco regime's obsession with memorializing the "Nationalist crusade" (as the civil war was renamed) ensured that the transition to democracy¹⁰ which took place after Franco's death in 1975 was, by way of reaction, characterized by a desire to break with this violent past. It has become a commonplace that Spain's transition to democracy was successfully implemented thanks to the "pacto del olvido" (pact of oblivion) whereby all political parties agreed to forget the civil war in order to reach consensus.¹¹ Santos Juliá (1999: 11–54) has argued that the "pacto del olvido" was not a decision to forget the past, but a decision not to let it shape the future. As he notes, there was no forgetting, for since 1975 historians have produced a vast output documenting the wartime reprisals (those which took place in the Republican zone as well as the much more extensive and systematized extermination campaign organized by the Nationalists) and its follow-up during the Franco dictatorship, particularly in the period 1939–51.¹²

10. The period known in Spanish as "la transición" is generally seen as lasting from Franco's death in 1975 to the election of the Socialist government in 1982. The negotiation of the political transition was effected by politicians from within the Franco regime, notably Gonzalo Suárez, who, as head of the newly founded center right party, Unión de Centro Democrático (UCD, or, Union of the Democratic Center), became prime minister after the first democratic elections in 1977, successfully negotiating through parliament the 1978 democratic constitution.

11. The historian responsible for institutionalizing this notion is Aguilar Fernández (1996). The alleged "pact of oblivion" of the transition, enshrined in the 1977 amnesty law which pardoned all political crimes (including those of the Nationalist forces in the war and those of the ensuing dictatorship), has become a major target of criticism in the recent campaigns to exhume the victims of the Francoist repression buried in unmarked mass graves (see Armengou and Belis 2004: 243–51). The existence of a "pact of oblivion" during the transition is taken for granted in recent studies of collective memory and cultural representation in contemporary Spain (for example, Colmeiro 2005: 18–22).

12. The most thorough investigation of the wartime and postwar repression estimates the

I suggest that the “pact of oblivion” has become such a commonplace because it allows the transition to be seen as a break with the past, masking—conveniently for both political Right and Left—the fact that it was effected by politicians from within the former Francoist state apparatus. It was crucial for the interested parties to see the transition as a break with the past, not only in order to claim that Spain was freeing itself from nearly forty years of dictatorship, but also in order to claim that the country was making a “leap” into modernity—something which, as noted above, is conventionally seen as requiring a rupture with the past. This “leap” into modernity was understood primarily in cultural terms, for accelerated economic modernization had already been implemented under the dictatorship; particularly so after the rise to power in 1959 of the Opus Dei technocrats, who opened the Spanish economy up to Western markets.¹³ The economic boom of the transition period, lasting to the mid-1980s, was thus a continuation of that previously experienced in the later decades of the dictatorship. The break marked by the transition was cultural in the sense that Spaniards engaged in a frantic process of catching up with lifestyles seen as the hallmark of Western modernity (Graham and Labanyi 1995: 315–20, 326–30, 408–10). Such lifestyles were conceived as requiring the excision of all reference to the past. Thus the Socialist government of 1982–96 launched a public relations campaign to market abroad Spanish cultural products—for example, the films of Pedro Almodóvar—that promoted a view of Spain as a young, brash, ultramodern nation that outdid its European neighbors in its iconoclasm.

Some outstanding films made in the last years of the dictatorship—Victor Erice’s *El espíritu de la colmena* (*The Spirit of the Beehive*) (1973), Carlos Saura’s *Cría cuervos* (*Raise Ravens*)¹⁴ (1975)—did tackle the repressive past, and historical studies of the civil war were written throughout the post-

number of those executed during the war in the Republican zone at around 50,000 and in the Nationalist zone at around 100,000; postwar executions by the dictatorship are estimated at a further 40,000, the last being a few months before Franco’s death in 1975 (Juliá 1999: 407–13). The figures for victims of Republican repression are likely to be accurate, since deaths were registered; those for victims of Nationalist repression are likely to be an underestimate, since they either went unrecorded (in the early months of the war) or (from late 1936) were attributed to causes—e.g., “hemorrhage”—that masked the violence.

13. In 1959 members of Opus Dei secured key ministerial positions. From this date, they issued a series of five-year plans designed to implement fast-track capitalist modernization on an unprecedented scale (in the 1960s Spain’s economic growth rate was greater than that of any other country except Japan). Opus Dei, founded by the Spaniard Escrivá de Balaguer in 1928, is a lay Catholic organization devoted to furthering a mix of fundamentalist Catholicism and neoliberalism by placing its members in key positions of state power (Graham and Labanyi 1995: 262, 423).

14. The title refers to a Spanish proverb: “Raise ravens and they will peck your eyes out.”

dictatorship period. But few films¹⁵ and almost no fiction writing¹⁶ dealt with the subject in the first ten years after Franco's death, when the promotion of an outrageous hypermodernity prevailed. The mid-1980s, however, saw the appearance of two major novels on the civil war: these were first novels by young writers born in the mid-1950s (Julio Llamazares, Antonio Muñoz Molina), able to adopt a more detached stance toward the topic, and—as we shall see—driven by a genealogical imperative to transmit to future generations tragic events experienced by their elders. Films on the war also began to appear regularly from the mid-1980s; key examples are Jaime Chávarri's *Las bicicletas son para el verano* (*Bicycles Are for Summer*) (1984), Carlos Saura's *¡Ay Carmela!*¹⁷ (1990), and Vicente Aranda's *Libertarias* (*Anarchist Women*) (1995). Contrary to the situation with the novel, these films were the work of established directors (Aranda was born in 1921, Saura in 1932, Chávarri in 1943) seemingly driven by a nostalgic desire to romanticize the Republic. Since the late 1990s, escalating after 2001, there has been a flood of novels and collections of testimonies on the wartime and postwar repression as well as a significant number of fiction films and documentaries. Among these, this essay will discuss the novels *O lapis do carpinteiro* (*The Carpenter's Pencil*) by Manuel Rivas (1998a; written in Galician), *Soldados de Salamina* (*Soldiers of Salamis*) by Javier Cercas (2001), and *La voz dormida* (*The Sleeping Voice*) by Dulce Chacón (2002). It will also discuss the fiction films *Silencio roto* (*Broken Silence*) (Armendáriz 2000) and *El espinazo del diablo* (*The Devil's Backbone*) (del Toro 2001) as well as the film version, by David Trueba (2003), of Cercas's novel *Soldiers of Salamis*. Brief mention will be made of a small number of edited volumes of testimonies and documentary films.

This recent memory boom needs to be set in the context of the wider debates on “historical memory” (the term used in Spain to refer to the memory of the Republic and Francoist repression) that have occupied the Spanish public sphere at the start of the twenty-first century. The process of “digging up the past” has been literalized since 2000 by the excavation of mass graves containing the bodies of victims of the Francoist repression during and after the war, undertaken by the Asociación para la Recuperación de la Memoria Histórica (ARMH; Association for the

15. After Jaime Camino's *Las largas vacaciones del 36* (1976), another film on the war did not appear until Jaime Chávarri's *Las bicicletas son para el verano* (1984) and Luis García Berlanga's *La vaquilla* (1985).

16. One collection of short stories set in the war—Juan Eduardo Zúñiga's *Largo noviembre de Madrid* (1980)—appeared during this period.

17. The film takes its title from a famous Republican civil war song—a recycled version of an earlier song from the 1808–13 war of independence against Napoleonic occupation.

Recovery of Historical Memory).¹⁸ The ARMH was refused state financial support by the conservative Popular Party government (1996–2004), whose leader, José María Aznar, is the grandson of a leading Spanish fascist. The present Socialist government, which was returned to power in 2004 under the leadership of José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero, whose Republican grandfather was shot in the civil war by the Nationalists, has taken a more sympathetic stance. It set up a commission to address the rights of victims of the wartime and postwar repression. The commission's proposed law—published on July 28, 2006—does not provide state financial aid for the exhumations, but it requires local authorities to facilitate them, and also encourages local authorities to remove monuments and street names dedicated to perpetrators.¹⁹

Also relevant to an understanding of the current memory boom is the emergence of a new wave of right-wing historical revisionism. This phenomenon dates back to 2003, when the conservative Popular Party government was expressing its hostility to the work of the ARMH. These revisionist works are authored by popular historical writers and not by academic historians.²⁰ Their common argument is twofold. First, they argue that the civil war was provoked by the Republic (this argument, pre-

18. See the ARMH's Web site, www.memoriahistorica.org. The ARMH was founded in 2000 by Emilio Silva in the process of exhuming and identifying (via a DNA test) the body of his own grandfather, murdered by the Nationalists in 1936 and buried in an unmarked grave.

19. The text of this proposed Law Recognizing and Extending the Rights of Victims of Violence and Repression during the Civil War and the Dictatorship can be accessed on the ARMH's Web site, www.memoriahistorica.org. Its publication was preceded and followed by massive indignation in the right-wing press (see the daily *ABC* for the two weeks starting July 24, 2006). In fact, while Deputy Prime Minister María Teresa Fernández de la Vega, who headed the commission, stated in parliament that the proposed law was aimed at removing the numerous monuments and street names that still publicly commemorate Nationalist perpetrators, the text—in an attempt to placate the Right—asks for the removal of monuments and street names that commemorate “one side in the war.” This wording instantly proved problematic, with a report in *ABC* on the following working day (July 31, 2006) that the mayor of Ávila had responded to the proposed law by ordering the removal of a statue recently erected to “Republican womanhood.” This proposed law was debated in the Spanish parliament in February 2007.

20. This wave of historical revisionism started to attract public attention when Pío Moa's *Los mitos de la guerra civil* (*The Myths of the Spanish Civil War*) became a best seller in 2003. In fact, Moa had been publishing attacks on pro-Republican accounts of the civil war since 1999. Moa admits to being a repentant former member of the Spanish Communist Party and of the Marxist-Leninist terrorist organization GRAPO (Grupos de Resistencia Antifascista Primero de Octubre) (founded in the last months of the dictatorship and responsible for kidnappings and bombings until 2002). Other popular historical writers who have contributed to this right-wing historical revisionism are César Vidal, Francisco Olaya Morales, José María Zavala, and Daniel Arasa. The works of all these writers are widely promoted in bookstores.

sented as new, was in fact the standard version of the war promoted by the Franco dictatorship). Second, they argue that there has been a cover-up of Republican crimes by the left-wing historians who, since 1975, have set out to document the previously silenced Francoist repression. The result has been a “memory war,” with professional historians (and journalists) responding by unearthing further dimensions of the Francoist repression.²¹ The vituperative rhetoric of the historical revisionists threatens to turn this “memory war” into a competition to establish which political side has the greater claim to victimhood.

In what follows, I would like to isolate some key issues arising from the memorialization of the civil war and its repressive aftermath in Spanish cultural production of the democratic period. More precisely, my start date will be 1973, two years before the end of the dictatorship, since this is the date of the first, and probably still the most significant, film on the war’s repressive effects: Erice’s *The Spirit of the Beehive*. I shall start by identifying a strand of cinematic and literary texts which strike me as especially effective in their treatment of the war through the motif of haunting, which operates through suggestion rather than statement. I shall then discuss a different strand of texts which, since the mid-1980s, have attempted a realistic reconstruction of the war. I shall argue that this second set of texts, in its attempt to recount the “facts” with maximum verisimilitude, raises a series of problems about the memorialization of a difficult past.

The reason for the adoption of the haunting motif in both Erice’s *The Spirit of the Beehive* and Saura’s *Raise Ravens* was, at a practical level, the continued existence of censorship, which required indirect forms of expression. In 1973, the year *The Spirit of the Beehive* was made, hard-line repression and censorship returned to Spain in the wake of the assassination of Admiral Carrero Blanco, Franco’s prime minister and presumed successor, by the terrorist organization ETA (Euskadi Ta Askatasuna, Basque for Basque Homeland and Freedom). *Raise Ravens* was made in early 1975, as Franco lay dying, and was not authorized for release till January 1976, two months after his death.²²

Set in 1940 (one year after the end of the civil war), as we are told at the film’s start, *The Spirit of the Beehive* depicts the child protagonist Ana’s insistence on facing the horror represented by the monster in James Whale’s

21. See, for example, Rodrigo 2003; González Duro 2003; Torres 2003; Hernández Hologado 2003; Armengou and Belis 2004; Espinosa Maestre 2005; Cenarro 2006. Paul Preston’s book on the Francoist repression, likely to be a definitive study, is expected in spring 2008.

22. The reason given for banning the film was its representation of Ana’s military father as an adulterer (D’Lugo 1991: 137).

1931 film *Frankenstein*, which haunts her after the film has been shown in her village. As critical studies of the film (Evans 1982; Kinder 1993: 128) have noted, the monster stands as an allegory of the violence of the civil war and its repressive aftermath, which Ana's parents do not want to talk about and which in 1973 the censorship did not allow Erice to tackle directly. At the end of the film, little Ana refuses the doctor's injunction to forget the horror she has indirectly witnessed (the shooting by the police of the fugitive she had befriended) and goes out to face the night, summoning the monster to appear to her. In so doing, Ana breaks with the traumatized silence into which she has fallen as a result of her experiences—and which marks her parents throughout the film.

A similar haunting by a dark past that cannot be talked about is depicted in *Raise Ravens*. Its child protagonist—another Ana, played by the same child star, Ana Torrent—refuses to accept that her mother, abused by her military father (whose fascist past is mentioned), is dead. While on the one hand Ana appears to be a classic trauma victim, visited by reenactments of a painful past, on the other hand she voluntarily summons up the apparitions of her dead mother, just as Ana in *The Spirit of the Beehive* persisted in summoning up Frankenstein's monster. At the end of *Raise Ravens*, however, Ana goes out into the sunny, modern outside world, apparently freed from the haunting by the past that has possessed her for the film's duration. This ending implies that the cure for trauma is to leave the painful past behind. Ana's concluding embrace of modernity is signified by her skipping happily past giant advertising hoardings: this is the traditional "happy end" of the modernization narrative.

I shall return to the issue of trauma toward the end of this essay. At this point I should like to note Elizabeth Jelin's (2003: 51, 64–66) observation, in her book on the memory of past dictatorship in Argentina, that, in order to work through political trauma, distance is necessary. As Jelin notes, this requires a younger generation to come on the scene which, unencumbered by the previous generation's internalization of terror, is willing and able to engage with the difficult stories of past violence. The different solutions to trauma posed by Erice and Saura may be related, at least in part, to the fact that whereas Erice was born after the war (in 1940, the year in which *The Spirit of the Beehive* is set), Saura (born in 1932) was a child during the war and, because his father worked in the Republican Ministry of the Interior, experienced its effects at close hand (D'Lugo 1991: 13). Although *The Spirit of the Beehive* was made two years before *Raise Ravens*, Erice is thus able to adopt a second-generation perspective, in favor of confronting a painful past which those who lived through the war found hard to deal with. Having experienced the war as a child, Saura takes a halfway

position: in favor of probing the painful past but with the goal of leaving it behind.

The generational issue is important in the case of Spain, since the Franco dictatorship lasted for thirty-six years. Two new generations were thus born during its time span. For the whole of this period, censorship forbade any mention of the civil war that was sympathetic to the Republic, which was persistently vilified. In its first two decades in particular, the regime systematically instilled fear and shame into the Republican losers.²³ The first novels to engage with the forcibly silenced memory of Republican victimization in and after the war appeared nearly fifty years after the civil war (in the mid-1980s): they were written by young writers born two decades after the war (in the mid-1950s). The novels to which I refer are Julio Llamazares's *Luna de lobos* [*Wolf Moon*] (1985), which tells the story of the postwar resistance fighters in the Cantabrian mountains; and Antonio Muñoz Molina's *Beatus Ille* (1986), whose student protagonist sets out to research a "disappeared" Republican writer. In both cases, there was a personal motivation for the authors' interest in probing memories of the past at a time when the Socialist government was promoting hedonistic youth culture. Llamazares was born in a remote Leonese village, later submerged under the waters of a reservoir built in the Franco years, in an area where tales of the rural guerrilla fighters who waged war on the Franco dictatorship until 1951 were kept alive by oral transmission. Llamazares (1997) has told how, in *Luna de lobos*, he set out to salvage this oral inheritance, threatened with extinction by the modernizing process. Muñoz Molina's love of literature was fired by his father, a landless laborer in the rural south who learned to read through the Republic's literacy campaigns and who so valued books that, when his landowning boss's estate was burned by anarchists at the start of the civil war, he risked his life to salvage the remains of its library. It was from the charred pages of these salvaged books that Muñoz Molina learned to read as a child (Muñoz Molina 1993).

For both these writers, as these authorial declarations make clear, novel writing was from the start an exercise in historical witnessing. It is productive to relate this impulse to what Marianne Hirsch (1997) has called "postmemory": the experience of those who grew up overshadowed by their parents' memories of traumatic events. If Muñoz Molina was motivated to write by his father's experiences under the Republic and in the civil war, Llamazares took upon himself the responsibility to keep alive the memories of a figurative family: his childhood village community.

23. For analysis of the internalization of fear and shame by those defeated in the war and their children, see Cenarro 2002 and Armengou and Belis 2004.

Hirsch's book *Family Frames: Photography, Narrative, and Postmemory* focuses on the role of family photos in transmitting an unspeakable past across the generations (specifically, in the context of Holocaust survivors). Both Llamazares and Muñoz Molina wrote later novels—*Escenas de cine mudo* (*Scenes of Silent Cinema*) (1994) and *El jinete polaco* (*The Polish Rider*) (1991), respectively—which revolve around a younger generation's exploration of the historically embedded stories that lie behind family photographs from the past. Family albums also played a key role, as the silent transmitters of an unspoken past, in Erice's *The Spirit of the Beehive* and Saura's *Raise Ravens*. As Hirsch (1997: 9) notes, family photos are particularly evocative traces of the past since they engage us in an "affiliative look": that is, the family members in the photo summon us to return their gaze in an act of mutual recognition. The "affiliative look" provoked by family photos also reminds us of the importance of the private sphere in keeping alive the memory of what cannot be discussed in public.

The haunting motif through which the child protagonists of *The Spirit of the Beehive* and *Raise Ravens* engaged with the past recurs in Llamazares's and Muñoz Molina's novels of the mid-1980s. Both *Wolf Moon* and *Beatus Ille* hand down a silenced past to their readers by exploring stories of the "living dead." In *Wolf Moon*, the rural guerrilla fighters are symbolically converted, through sustained patterns of imagery (including the novel's title), into werewolves who live by the light of the moon, referred to repeatedly as the "sun of the dead." This last image embodies the process of transgenerational transmission, since the narrator-protagonist learned it from his father as a child. The resistance fighters compare themselves explicitly to the "living dead," emerging from their underground hiding places only after dark. Their story is threatened with extinction by the last surviving resistance fighter's expulsion from his family's memory at the end of the novel—but, in relaying his first-person narrative to contemporary readers, the novelist is keeping him (and his already dead comrades) alive. At the end of *Beatus Ille*, the protagonist meets in the cemetery, as if emerging from the grave, the Republican writer Solana, whom he has been researching. Although officially declared dead after the war, Solana turns out to have lived through the dictatorship in hiding. Indeed, in a final postmodern twist, we discover that Solana, far from being the dead object of the protagonist's study, is the author of the novel that we are reading, in which the protagonist sets out to research his story.

Haunting is also central to Muñoz Molina's *The Polish Rider* (1991), where the secrets of the past hinge on the wax effigy of the mummified corpse of an unknown woman who, in the nineteenth century, was punished for her amorous transgression by being walled up and left to die. Not only

was this story passed down to the protagonist as a child, but the unknown woman turns out to be one of his ancestors, literally affiliating him with the past. A similar affiliation with the past is produced by the chest of photographs inherited by the protagonist's girlfriend from her Republican war-hero father. Both the wax effigy and the photographs function as *revenants* resuscitating the past in the present.

The haunting motif—dramatizing the afterlife of the past in the present—recurs in the novel *The Carpenter's Pencil* (1998b) by Manuel Rivas, also born in the mid-1950s. The novel tells the story of the odyssey—through a series of Francoist jails and into exile—of a Galician Republican doctor, Daniel da Barca. This account is dictated to the narrator—a thug previously employed in the Francoist repressive apparatus—by the carpenter's pencil, inherited by him from the Republican artist he had executed in the civil war after Galicia's fall to the Nationalists. The voice of the dead carpenter—which speaks to the narrator via the carpenter's pencil which he wears behind his ear—thus shares responsibility for the narration. In a key passage which illustrates this theme of the past's afterlife in the present, da Barca talks of the “dolor fantasma” (phantom pain) which continues to be felt after a limb is amputated. As da Barca puts it: “Dicen que es el peor de los dolores. Un dolor que llega a ser insoportable. La memoria del dolor” (They say it is the worst kind of pain. A pain that becomes unbearable. The memory of pain) (Rivas 1998b: 119; my translation). At the end of Rivas's novel, the Nationalist thug narrator gives the carpenter's pencil to the Portuguese-speaking African prostitute who has been the recipient of his narration in an affiliative transmission of the past to a contemporary victim of history.

The haunting trope becomes explicit with the Mexican filmmaker Guillermo del Toro's choice of a literal ghost story as the narrative format of his Spanish/Mexican co-production about the Spanish civil war, *The Devil's Backbone* (2001). In this film, a group of Republican orphans meets the demands of the ghost of their former companion Santi by killing his murderer Jacinto, a former inmate of the orphanage, who is working for the Nationalists. This act of reparation may bring peace to Santi's unquiet corpse, but it does not mean that the past ceases to haunt the present. For the film ends with the appearance of a new ghost: that of the Argentine science teacher at the Republican orphanage, Dr. Casares, killed when Jacinto blows up the building. The film's closing image shows the ghost of Dr. Casares standing guard over the orphanage's burned-out shell as the surviving orphans limp off into an unknown future. The filmic narrative is, in fact, framed at the beginning and end by the voice-over of Dr. Casares's ghost (which we only recognize as such when we see his ghost at the end

of the film), constructing the whole film as his retrospective account from beyond the grave. This opening and closing voice-over comprises a philosophical reflection on the question “What is a ghost?” One of the answers given is that a ghost is unfinished business. This implies that the destruction of the Republic by the Nationalists is unfinished business demanding the attention of future generations.

The film’s suggestion that reparation (in this case, the punishment of the murderer) does not mean laying the past to rest in the sense of relegating it to oblivion is reinforced by its penultimate image. As the trussed-up body of Jacinto sinks to the bottom of the water tank into which the orphans have thrown him, sending him down to be claimed by the unquiet corpse of Santi (previously thrown into the tank by Jacinto), Jacinto’s childhood photographs (which he was clutching when killed) float to the surface. The photographic image is thus shown to function as an afterlife of the past, literally resurfacing in the present. Jacinto has no respect for photographs, because he wants to eradicate his destitute past as an orphan by achieving material gain. When he finds in the safe at the orphanage not the gold he is seeking but a bundle of his childhood photos, one of his Nationalist accomplices exclaims: “Eso es todo. Recuerdos, fotografías, una mierda” (That’s all. Mementoes, photos, shit; my translation). The Nationalists, represented in the film by Jacinto and his accomplices, are thus, in line with Michael Richards’s analysis, depicted as the representatives of capitalist modernity for whom future profit requires the destruction of the past. By contrast, the Republicans—embodied in the film by the orphans, who meet Santi’s demands for reparation, and by Dr. Casares, whose ghost stands guard over the orphanage’s ruins at the end—are depicted as representing a version of modernity that engages with past injustice and regards ruins as something to be cherished.

This version of modernity echoes Walter Benjamin’s (1992: 245–55) messianic notion of history, in which the seeds of the future are to be found by salvaging from the ruins of the past the potential that was prevented from finding realization. A further image of this Benjaminian conception of history is provided by the jars of preserved aborted fetuses in Dr. Casares’s laboratory, one of which—aborted because of its deformed backbone—gives the film its title. The recurrent images of this deformed fetus in its amber liquid are echoed by the virtually identical images of the unquiet corpse of Santi at the bottom of the water tank. This allegorical ghost story contains a serious message about the need for a kind of modernity—represented in the film by the Republic—that engages with the past rather than regarding it as something to be eradicated.

In contrast with the films and novels I have mentioned so far, which rep-

resent the civil war and its repressive aftermath indirectly through the trope of haunting, the vast majority of the cinematic and fictional re-creations of the civil war and its aftermath which have appeared since 1990 have been concerned to give a realistic account. The many testimonies that have also appeared since the late 1990s, whether in book form or as audiovisual documentaries, by definition adopt a documentary stance. This means that, while the first group of texts focuses on the haunting presence of the violent past in the present, forcing us to confront issues of transgenerational transmission and to recognize that the war's unquiet legacy continues to matter, those texts which opt for a realistic or documentary format attempt instead to transport us back to the past. The attention to verisimilitude has the effect of reinforcing the difference of the past from the present, with the result that, at the end of the viewing or reading process, we feel a sense of relief on returning to a present free from such barbarism. The realism thus produces a sense of rupture with the past. In order to achieve this realism, films such as Chávarri's *Bicycles Are for Summer* (1984), Saura's *¡Ay Carmela!* (1990), Aranda's *Anarchist Women* (1995), or Armendáriz's *Broken Silence* (2000) adopt a heritage-movie style in their meticulous attention to period costume and decor. Aranda's film in fact starts with documentary footage of the war, which dissolves into the fictional narrative. As Andrew Higson (1993) has noted, the heritage movie tends to produce a sanitized version of the past through its aestheticization of *mise-en-scène*, which can create a nostalgic vision. Chávarri's film reduces the war to a nostalgic recreation of bourgeois adolescent sexual awakening. The three later films, despite their representations of violence, romanticize the Republicans: in the case of *¡Ay Carmela!* and *Anarchist Women*, as representatives of a free-spirited eroticism; in the case of *Broken Silence*, as lost rural community.²⁴

The documentary format of the testimonies (written and audiovisual) that have proliferated in recent years likewise plunges the reader or viewer directly into the past. This immediacy is the main attraction of collections of testimonies such as Jorge Reverte and Socorro Thomás's *Hijos de la guerra (Children of War)* (2001) and Carlos Elordi's *Los años difíciles (The Difficult Years)* (2002). The same is true of such documentary films as Jaime Camino's *Los niños de Rusia (Children of Russia)* (2001), which interviews former child evacuees from the civil war who were sent to the Soviet Union; and Javier Corcuera's *La guerrilla de la memoria (Memories of the Resistance)*²⁵

24. Other films that adopt a heritage-movie style in order to represent the civil war as a tale of lost rural community are José Luis Cuerda's *La lengua de las mariposas (Butterfly's Tongue)* (1999) and Imanol Uribe's *El viaje de Carol (Carol's Journey)* (2002).

25. The Spanish title has a double meaning, referring also to the memory process as a resistance struggle.

(2002), which interviews former resistance fighters who fought the Franco dictatorship until 1951. As with the hyperrealist films just discussed, one emerges from this immersion in the past with a sense of relief that things like this do not happen today. These recent testimonies—some of them originally broadcast on radio (*The Difficult Years*) or television (*Children of Russia*)—are important for making the public aware of the sheer amount of silenced memories that have lain dormant or untold for over sixty years. The best of the audiovisual testimonies—I include here *Children of Russia* and *Memories of the Resistance*—do, through their use of close-ups that capture minute facial gestures, transmit a sense of the continuing painfulness of the memories that are recorded. But the printed collections of testimonies often threaten to swamp the reader with their detailed verbalizations, leaving no space for reflection. By far the most eloquent testimonies included in Elordi's *The Difficult Years* are those where listeners to his radio program, instead of producing their own written accounts, have simply sent in the farewell letters written to them from prison by their Republican fathers on the eve of their executions. This leaves it to the reader to imagine the emotions of all those concerned.

The least effective volumes of testimonies are those that present the reader with such an accumulation of accounts of atrocities that they blur into an indistinguishable mass. This is especially problematic given the attempt by the editors of several of these recent volumes of testimonies, including the two mentioned here, to avoid accusations of partisanship by mixing accounts of victims on both political sides. While it is crucial that we hear the voices of both sides, it is also important, if we are to deepen our political understanding of the war, that it be made clear which accounts are by victims of Nationalist violence and which are by victims of Republican violence. Reverte and Thomás's introduction to their volume *Children of War* (2001: 13) declares that they have chosen to mix testimonies by survivors on both sides in order to show that the suffering was the same in each case. Despite the editors' humanitarian intentions, this encourages readers to attribute the atrocities of the war to some kind of abstract (or specifically Spanish) inhumanity, eliding the very clear political issues that were at stake on both sides.

There has to date been no attempt to gather the testimonies of perpetrators—whether Nationalist or Republican. To my knowledge, the issue of perpetrators has been tackled by only two novels. One is Rivas's *The Carpenter's Pencil*, already discussed, which has a Nationalist perpetrator narrate the story of its Republican hero. The first-person narrative provides a subtle insight into the psychology of an uneducated peasant whose only chance of exercising any agency is by doing the dirty work of the vic-

torious Nationalists. The novel's layering of voices, with the perpetrator-narrator's account dictated to him by the pencil of the Republican carpenter he had killed, focuses the reader's attention on the telling in the present moment rather than on the past events recounted. By contrast, Javier Cercas's *Soldiers of Salamis* (2001) adopts the docufable (fictionalized documentary) format. The fact that Cercas, born in 1962, was only thirteen at the time of Franco's death perhaps gives him the distance to feel able to tackle the story of how a leading Spanish fascist, Rafael Sánchez Mazas, who held office under the Franco dictatorship, survived a Republican firing squad in the civil war. However, the novel also represents its author-narrator as massively ignorant of the civil war, which means no more to him than the battle of Salamis between the ancient Greeks and Persians (hence the novel's title). Set in the present, the novel charts the author-narrator's attempts to identify and locate the unknown Republican soldier who let Sánchez Mazas escape. The novel's treatment of this controversial topic attracted huge press coverage, making it a phenomenal best seller (twenty-nine editions in its first two years). However, the narrative shies away from tackling Sánchez Mazas's political responsibilities, veering off into an exploration of the unsung Republican who put compassion before military obedience.

David Trueba's 2003 film adaptation of the novel is more successful in this respect, intercutting the fictionalized quest narrative with newsreel footage of Sánchez Mazas's political appearances and including moving interviews with the three Republicans (included as characters in the novel) who, in real life, offered Sánchez Mazas refuge after his escape and who testify to the latter's failure to honor his pledge to help them after the Nationalist victory. Although both novel and film focus on the present-day investigation of the past, they represent the difficulties of reconstructing the past as purely practical (a matter of tracking down the evidence) rather than inherent in the narrativization of a difficult past. As befits their use of the docufable format, by the end all the facts have been unravelled, leaving us with no unfinished business.

The only foray by a woman writer into the docufable genre — *The Sleeping Voice* (2002) by Dulce Chacón, born in 1954 — does not bring the investigation process into the narrative; the huge amount of research conducted by the author is made evident only in the final list of acknowledgments. The novel recounts the stories — often based on real-life testimonies told to the author or published by others — of a number of female political prisoners in Madrid's women's prison after the war and their female relatives. Unlike Cercas, the author does not include herself as investigator in the narrative but allows the fictionalized voices of her characters to speak for themselves

(albeit in the third person). The result is immensely moving because of the narration's immediacy, requiring the reader to empathize with the characters. The novel stresses the importance of transgenerational transmission at a thematic level, through the notebooks which one of the female political prisoners, Hortensia (shot by firing squad after giving birth in prison), bequeaths to her daughter. But by telling the story through the voices of the characters at the time of the events, the novel focuses on reconstructing the past rather than exploring the process of telling these stories in the present.

It should be clear from the comparative survey above that—with the exception of certain recent texts such as *The Carpenter's Pencil* and *The Devil's Backbone*—there has been an overall move from the use of the trope of haunting, which characterized the films made at the end of the dictatorship and the novels written in the mid-1980s, to a preference for realist and documentary formats. This overall move has coincided with the change from a lack of interest in the memorialization of the civil war to the present memory boom. Curiously, this memory boom has not translated into an increased interest in the workings of memory but into an assumption that the past can be unproblematically recovered. This sentiment is expressed in the phrase “recuperación de la memoria histórica” (recovery of historical memory) that has, since the creation of the ARMH in 2000, become obligatory when referring to the need for present-day Spaniards to engage with the unresolved legacy of the civil war and the ensuing repression.²⁶ In other words, what is tending to become lost with the current memory boom is a sense of the difficulty of articulating the traumatic impact of past violence.

Discussion of trauma has, of course, dominated the extensive scholarship on the Holocaust.²⁷ Trauma entails a blocking of memory and thus an inability to construct a coherent narrative. Unable to master the past through conscious recall, the trauma victim becomes the prisoner of involuntary reenactments of the traumatic event, which start to manifest themselves, in fissured form, at a later date. The cure for trauma is the successful narrativization of the violent event, such that the person who suffered it is able to situate himself or herself in relation to it as an agent and not as a thing stripped of personhood (van Alphen 1999). The psychiatric treat-

26. I do not mean here to hold the ARMH responsible for the unthinking use of this phrase but, rather, the public figures who use it as a slogan without considering its implications. Indeed, the ARMH's excavation of mass graves from the Francoist repression has started to trigger an interest, on the part of anthropologists, in the blocking of grief which the relatives of the victims have endured (see Ferrándiz 2006).

27. See, for example, Caruth 1995, 1996 and LaCapra 1996, 2001.

ment of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), however, has been criticised for offering war veterans a medically sanctioned narrative that too easily explains away the horror of the violence that has been suffered (or indeed perpetrated) by them.²⁸ The implication of this criticism is that an adequate cure for trauma is one that does not, in the process of making the traumatic event manageable, sanitize its horror. For this reason, films like *The Spirit of the Beehive* and *The Devil's Backbone*, which draw on the horror genre, are—in my view—more successful in dealing with a traumatic past than those films, novels, and testimonies that adopt a realist or documentary mode, precisely because they acknowledge the horror—that is, the “unspeakable.”

I do not want to imply that the current proliferation in Spain of literary, cinematic, and testimonial memorializations of the civil war is in itself a bad thing, for the silencing of Republican memories under the Franco dictatorship and the subsequent desire of democratic Spain to break with its violent past have indeed prevented the public acknowledgment of countless stories of injustice. The problem is, rather, the assumption that it is enough to recover what happened and that the recovery process is unproblematic. It is perhaps understandable that, in a country that has seen nearly forty years of dictatorship, there should have been a tendency to suppose that, once censorship was removed, the stories of a terrible past could be articulated without difficulty. But it is only by capturing the resistances to narrativization that representations of the past can convey something of the emotional charge which that past continues to hold today for those for whom it remains unfinished business.

I should, however, like to note some dangers inherent in this argument. There is a risk that, in foregrounding the resistances to narrativization, we mimic—and perpetuate—the trauma victim's inability to assimilate the past rather than facilitating the process of working through it. The influential Chilean cultural critic Nelly Richard (2004: 27–29) has argued for the need to avoid suture—the overcoming of traumatic narrative rupture through the production of a seamless account—in representations of the legacy of the dictatorship of Augusto Pinochet. Significantly, Richard argues this in the context of her critique of the Chilean transition to democracy, which, unlike the Spanish democratic transition, did institute official mourning rituals for those who disappeared under the previous dictatorship. However, in Richard's view, this was done in Chile in order to lay the past to rest as quickly as possible, so that it could be conveniently

28. See, for example, Quintais's (2001) discussion of the medical treatment of veterans of the Portuguese colonial wars in Africa.

forgotten. At the same time, there is an important similarity between the Chilean transition to democracy, as analyzed by Richard, and that which occurred in Spain: in both cases, the democratic regimes continued the neoliberal policies of the free-market economy that had previously been instituted under dictatorship. As noted at the start of this essay, the capitalist market economy is predicated on the production of the ever-new and the compulsory obsolescence of the old. Richard makes this point, but she also advocates avant-garde cultural forms that deal with the legacy of the Pinochet dictatorship by breaking with testimonial realism and instead opting for an aesthetics of rupture that mimics the workings of trauma. This aesthetics of rupture represents the psychic aftereffects of the dictatorship, leaving the past events beyond narrative. While in many ways this indirect representation of the past through its aftereffects echoes the use of the trope of haunting discussed above in relation to Spanish cultural production, it differs from it in its stress on rupture, as against the emphasis in haunting on affiliation with an unspeakable past: ghosts summon us to take responsibility for the past by intervening to correct its injustices. In proposing an aesthetics of rupture, Richard explicitly argues for cultural forms that keep open the wounds left by the dictatorship, restaging the trauma rather than resolving the narrative fractures through the production of a coherent narrative. Her argument is understandable, given the haste with which the Chilean democratic transition attempted to close those wounds. Still, one cannot help wondering whether her aesthetics of rupture, which mimics the involuntary blocking out of the past that results from trauma, does not in fact echo the rupture with the past encouraged by the capitalist economy, which she also denounces.

We might take further this similarity between the rupture which characterizes traumatic narrative (the involuntary blocking out of the past) and that which results from the market economy (based on the requirement to discard the old for the ever-new) and ask whether trauma—beyond its production by specific acts of violence, of which the Holocaust is the extreme example—is endemic to models of modernity that are based on capitalist modernization. To phrase this question differently: does capitalist modernity's stress on the new and on the obsolescence of the past produce a traumatic relationship to the past, which prevents us from establishing an affiliative relationship with it? If this is the case, there would appear to be a need to redefine modernity in such a way as to produce a nontraumatic relationship to the past, in which we acknowledge that we are its heirs. In the context of contemporary Spain, such a proposition would mean elaborating a form of democracy that is able to acknowledge the legacy of the violent past (while reflecting critically on its lessons) rather than repudi-

ating it. In terms of artistic expression, we may note that the democratic period in Spain did see an aesthetics of rupture, which Cristina Moreiras-Menor (2002) has taken as the expression of unresolved traumas left by the dictatorship: but this occurred precisely in the literature of the transition period that turned its back on the past and in many cases celebrated the neoliberal market. By contrast, those novels and films analyzed here that resort to the trope of haunting seem to me to have achieved a productive balance between acknowledgment of the past and a desire for change through their understanding that what matters about the past is its unfinished business, which requires critical reflection and action in the present. Such a mode of representation accords with Richard's advocacy of cultural forms that represent the traumatic aftereffects of dictatorship—rather than documenting the past events that caused them—but without opting for an aesthetics of rupture that perpetuates the severance of connection with the past.

In arguing for an aesthetics of haunting, instead of rupture, as a way of dealing with a traumatic past, I would like to ask what trauma might mean in the case of survivors of the repression of the Spanish civil war and its aftermath. There were no doubt genuine trauma victims in the sense (outlined above) that the term has acquired in relation to Holocaust survivors. But in the testimonies that have appeared in Spain since the late 1990s, there is no evidence of any traumatic blocking of memory; on the contrary, the eyewitnesses appear to have perfect recall. What we do find is hesitation about whether or not to talk about the repression and of course a delay of around sixty years in bringing these memories into the public domain. There are ready political explanations for this hesitation and delay, given the vilification which the losers in the war—and their descendants—had to endure during the dictatorship followed by the lack of interest in their stories during the transition to democracy. One of the dangers of trauma theory is that it can encourage an emphasis on the internal psychic mechanisms that are responsible for blocking recall of the traumatic event, deflecting attention from political explanations. In the case of the Francoist repression, the resistances to narrativization have clear political causes. The testimonies of repression that have appeared in Spain in recent years do not suggest a biological inability to register the event at the time but habits of silence induced by decades of repression and a lack of willing interlocutors, which become hard to break. For this reason also, an aesthetics of haunting, which listens to the voices from the past that have not previously been allowed a hearing, seems more appropriate in the Spanish case than an aesthetics of rupture, which is predicated on the classic notion of trauma as the blocking of recall.

This point was brought home to me as a result of an incident which occurred the first time I taught a course on the memorialization of the Spanish civil war to final-year undergraduates at the University of Southampton in 1999. After the second class, in which we had discussed theories of mourning, melancholia, and trauma, a student (Natalia)²⁹ came up to me to say that she could now understand why her Spanish grandmother, whose father had been shot by the Republicans in the civil war, had never talked about it in the family. Natalia knew the bare facts from her Spanish mother but otherwise had only two indications of her grandmother's pain. First, she had been brought up never to mention the word *snow* in her grandmother's presence, because it had been snowing when her great-grandfather was taken to his execution. In other words, her grandmother appeared to suffer from a classic traumatic reaction to this memory trigger. Second, when Natalia was nine years old, her grandmother came to her room and gave her a photograph of the bishop of Teruel (beatified by Pope John Paul II), saying she wanted Natalia to have it since he had died with her great-grandfather. Natalia could now understand that, with this gesture, her grandmother was offering her as a gift the past that she could not tell. Natalia conducted a series of oral history interviews with her grandmother as her project for the course over a week in which her grandmother, now eighty-six, told in full for the first time the story of her father's imprisonment and execution. The transcription of the interview shows that Natalia's grandmother had perfect recall of all the details: despite what appeared to be traumatic symptoms (triggered by the mention of snow), this was not a case of a traumatic blocking of narrative, but of no one in her family having before expressed an interest in hearing her story. This suggests that the existence of a strong reaction to a memory trigger, even in a person who has not talked about an experience of violence, should not necessarily be taken as an indication of the presence of a traumatic blocking of memory.

As the story of Natalia's grandmother unravelled, it became clear that it was an especially complicated one: her father had been the Nationalist colonel who surrendered Teruel to the Republicans, as a result of which he was branded a traitor by the Nationalists. Only in 1972 had Natalia's grandmother been authorized by Franco to claim her father's body from its unmarked grave in order to give it a proper burial, on condition that the media not be informed. This meant that Natalia's grandmother had no willing interlocutors on either side in the war, for she was an enemy of the

29. I recount this with Natalia's permission.

Republicans and, for the Nationalists, the daughter of a traitor. This case brought home to me powerfully that we should not assume too quickly that those who do not articulate their stories are suffering from a traumatic blockage of narrative but that the problem may lie with the failure of others to listen.

This incident, turning on the readiness to listen, also made me reflect on the fact that we need to consider the question of what should be done with Nationalist memories of suffering. I am not sympathetic to the claims made by revisionist historians that, under democracy, there has been a left-wing conspiracy that has denied Franco supporters the right to express their memories of the civil war, for not only did the Right have a monopoly over the memorialization of the civil war for the dictatorship's nearly forty years, but there has been no censorship since the Spanish Constitution of 1978, which reestablished democratic freedoms. However, it is true that, as historians have unearthed increasing information about the extent of the Francoist repression, it is difficult to feel sympathy for those who gave this repression their explicit or tacit consent, even though it is clear that in some cases they too have stories of suffering to tell. However, we should perhaps ask whether we should only be interested in the stories of those for whom we feel sympathy. Conversely, we might ask whether expressing an interest in listening to someone's story necessarily supposes that we should—or can—share their suffering. I should like to end by considering what might be an adequate response to stories of suffering on the part of the listener.

The refusal of realist narrative in those films and novels discussed above which use the trope of haunting can be seen as a recognition of the fact that no narrative of atrocities can do justice to the pain of those who experienced such atrocities at firsthand. This seems to me a more ethical position than the assumption, in those texts that opt for documentary realism, that it is possible to re-create for the reader or spectator a direct experience of the wartime and postwar repression as they were lived at the time. We have seen how the delay in producing cultural texts about the war was not only due to the Francoist censorship and the political transition's desire to leave the past behind, but also to the need for younger generations to come on the scene who could tackle the subject with greater detachment. Discussing representations of the suffering of others, Susan Sontag (2004) has argued for the need for a degree of detachment also in the audience. Writing specifically about photographs of victims, she insists that we should, above all, avoid the bad faith of empathy, for it is a delusion for spectators to imagine that they can share the suffering of the victims represented in

the image: “No ‘we’ should be taken for granted when the subject is looking at other people’s pain” (ibid.: 7). Instead, Sontag argues in favor of a response in which emotion is tempered by a reflective distance, thus permitting political analysis. There is a danger, in the texts that are opting for documentary realism, of producing a “feel-good factor” that makes readers or spectators feel morally improved by having momentarily “shared” the suffering represented in the text, without going on to make any connection with the present.³⁰ The texts that avoid realism and focus on the past as a haunting, rather than as a reality immediately accessible to us, retain a sense of the difficulty of understanding what it was like to live that past, as well as making us reflect on how the past interpellates the present. Such an approach is not only helpful in dealing with the suffering of victims of injustice but also, I suggest, opens up a way to deal with the suffering of those whose politics we cannot condone.

The fight to defend the Spanish Republic in the civil war still produces strong emotions among the international political Left, because it is seen as the last European political struggle fought in the name of a passionate belief that it is possible to break with the past in order to create a new future. Ironically, it was this same modern desire to break with the past—albeit one shorn of utopian ideology—that, at the time of the transition to democracy in Spain, produced a desire to relegate the civil war to the past rather than engage with its legacy. It is the late modern loss of belief in the master narratives of progress that, in producing a revival of interest in memory, has triggered the increased cultural memorialization of the civil war in recent years. This same loss of belief in the master narratives of progress has generated, in the Western world at large, a scepticism about all forms of representation and about narrative in particular, which translates into a self-reflexive critical foregrounding of the mode of telling. The films and novels analyzed in this essay which resort to the trope of haunting can be included in this self-reflexive trend, which calls into question the ability of narrative to capture the real.

30. There is also the much worse danger of graphic representations of violence appealing to a morbid prurience on the part of readers or viewers. Such a response is encouraged by the savagery of the deaths of the anarchist militiawomen at the end of Aranda’s *Libertarias*. The jacket blurbs for some recent collections of testimonies also appeal to sensationalist urges that may partly explain the success of such texts. See, for example, the back cover of Zavala 2004, which promises “fusilamientos, violaciones, mutilaciones y decapitaciones, infanticidios, enterramientos de vivos, cadáveres devorados por fieras” (executions, rapes, mutilations and decapitations, infanticides, people buried alive, corpses devoured by wild animals). This book forms part of the current wave of historical revisionism arguing that the crimes of the Republic exceeded those of the Nationalists; its tactic is to produce such strong emotions in its readers that critical reflection is blocked.

This self-reflexive trend is generally referred to as “postmodern” rather than “late modern,” since it is assumed that it represents a break with the modern instead of a particular version of it. But the coincidence of this trend with the turn to memory suggests that it is not effecting a break with the past, but is redefining our relationship to it. The recent interest in memory goes together with the questioning of the ability of narrative to give us the real, since memory is a form of narrative that is notoriously unreliable. What memory can do is communicate the importance of the past in the present—that is, reestablish the affiliative link with the past that capitalist modernization set out to break. Memory does so by representing not the past directly, as realist narrative promises to do, but the effects of the past on the present—its unfinished business. I have tried to argue in this essay that realist narrative, by plunging us into the past, paradoxically makes us experience the past as separate from the present. The trope of haunting, which elides direct representation of the past in favor of the representation of its aftereffects, stresses the legacy of the past to the present: a legacy which—as in most ghost stories—is one of injustice requiring reparation. Haunting requires the present to correct the past at the same time that it establishes an affiliative link with it. It thus provides a figurative analogue for a mode of relationship to the past which retains the modern belief in the possibility—indeed the need—for a better future while also demanding that the memory of the past be honored.

References

- Aguilar Fernández, Paloma
 1996 *Memoria y olvido de la guerra civil española* (Madrid: Alianza).
 2000 *Memory and Amnesia: The Role of the Spanish Civil War in the Transition to Democracy*, English translation of *Memoria y olvido de la guerra civil española* by Mark Oakley (Oxford: Berghahn Books).
- Aranda, Vicente, dir.
 1996 *Libertarias* (Spain: Sogetel/Lola Films/Academy Pictures [Italy]/Era Films [Belgium]).
- Armendáriz, Montxo, dir.
 2001 *Silencio roto* (Spain: Oria Films).
- Armengou, Montse, and Ricard Belis
 2004 *Las fosas del silencio: ¿Hay un Holocausto español?* (Barcelona: Plaza and Janés/Televisió de Catalunya).
- Ben-Ghiat, Ruth
 2001 *Fascist Modernities: Italy, 1922–1945* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Benjamin, Walter
 1983 *Charles Baudelaire: A Lyric Poet in the Era of High Capitalism*, translated by Harry Zohn (London: Verso).
 1992 *Illuminations*, edited by Hannah Arendt (London: Fontana).
- Camino, Jaime, dir.
 1976 *Las largas vacaciones del 36* (Spain: José Frade).

- 2001 *Los niños de Rusia* (Spain: Tibidabo Films).
- Caruth, Cathy
 1995 *Trauma: Explorations in Memory* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press).
 1996 *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press).
- Cenarro, Angela
 2002 "Memory beyond the Public Sphere: The Francoist Repression Remembered in Aragon," *History and Memory* 14 (1-2): 165-88.
 2006 *La sonrisa de Falange: Auxilio Social en la guerra civil y en la posguerra* (Barcelona: Crítica).
- Cercas, Javier
 2001 *Soldados de Salamina* (Barcelona: Tusquets).
 2004 *Soldiers of Salamis*, translated by Anne McLean (London: Bloomsbury).
- Chacón, Dulce
 2002 *La voz dormida* (Madrid: Alfaguara).
 2006 *The Sleeping Voice*, English translation of *La voz dormida* by Nick Caistor (New York: Harvill Secker).
- Chávarri, Jaime, dir.
 1984 *Las bicicletas son para el verano* (Spain: In-Cine/Jet Films).
- Colmeiro, José F.
 2005 *Memoria histórica e identidad cultural: De la postguerra a la postmodernidad* (Barcelona: Anthropos).
- Corcuera, Javier, dir.
 2002 *La guerrilla de la memoria* (Spain: Oria Films).
- Cruz, Jesús
 1996 *Gentlemen, Bourgeois, and Revolutionaries: Political Change and Cultural Persistence among the Spanish Dominant Groups, 1750-1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Cuerda, José Luis, dir.
 1999 *La lengua de las mariposas* (Spain: Producciones del Escorpión/Sogecine).
- del Toro, Guillermo, dir.
 2001 *El espinazo del diablo* (Spain/Mexico: El Deseo).
- D'Lugo, Marvin
 1991 *The Films of Carlos Saura: The Practice of Seeing* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Eisenstadt, Shmuel, ed.
 2000 "Multiple Modernities." Special issue, *Daedalus* 129 (1).
- Elordi, Carlos, ed.
 2002 *Los años difíciles: El testimonio de los protagonistas anónimos de la guerra civil y la posguerra* (Spain: Aguilar).
- Erice, Victor, dir.
 1973 *El espíritu de la colmena* (Spain: Elías Querejeta Garate).
- Espinosa Maestre, Francisco
 2005 *El fenómeno revisionista o los fantasmas de la derecha española* (Badajoz, Spain: Del Oeste).
- Evans, Peter William
 1982 "El espíritu de la colmena: The Monster, the Place of the Father, and Growing up in the Dictatorship," *Vida Hispánica* 31 (3): 13-17.
- Ferrándiz, Francisco
 2006 "The Return of Civil War Ghosts: The Ethnography of Exhumations in Contemporary Spain," *Anthropology Today* 22 (3): 7-12.
- Fukuyama, Francis
 1992 *The End of History and the Last Man* (London: Hamish Hamilton).

- González Duro, Enrique
2003 *El miedo en la posguerra. Franco y la España derrotada: La política del exterminio* (Madrid: Oberon).
- Graham, Helen, and Jo Labanyi, eds.
1995 *Spanish Cultural Studies: An Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Hernández Holgado, Fernando
2003 *Mujeres encarceladas. La prisión de Ventas: De la República al franquismo, 1931-1941* (Madrid: Marcial Pons).
- Higson, Andrew
1993 "Re-presenting the National Past: Nostalgia and Pastiche in the Heritage Film," in *British Cinema and Thatcherism: Fires Were Started*, edited by Lester Friedman, 109-29 (London: UCL).
- Hirsch, Marianne
1997 *Family Frames: Photography, Narrative, and Postmemory* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Hodgkin, Katharine, and Susannah Radstone, eds.
2006 *Memory, History, Nation: Contested Pasts* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction).
- Jelin, Elizabeth
2003 *State Repression and the Labors of Memory* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press).
- Juliá, Santos
2004 *Historias de las dos Españas* (Madrid: Taurus).
- Juliá, Santos, ed.
1999 *Víctimas de la guerra civil* (Madrid: Temas de Hoy).
- Kinder, Marsha
1993 *Blood Cinema: The Reconstruction of National Identity in Spain* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Labanyi, Jo
1989 *Myth and History in the Contemporary Spanish Novel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
2000 *Gender and Modernization in the Spanish Realist Novel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- LaCapra, Dominick
1996 *Representing the Holocaust: History, Theory, Trauma* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).
2001 *Writing History, Writing Trauma* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press).
- Llamazares, Julio
1985 *Luna de lobos* (Barcelona: Seix Barral).
1994 *Escenas de cine mudo* (Barcelona: Seix Barral).
1997 "Los últimos románticos," *El País*, February 9, 15.
- Martín Gaité, Carmen
1987 *Usos amorosos de la posguerra española* (Barcelona: Anagrama).
- Moa, Pio
2003 *Los mitos de la guerra civil* (Madrid: La Esfera).
- Moreiras, Alberto
2004 "La piel del lobo: Militancias onto-teológicas," *Res Pública: Revista de Filosofía Política* 6 (14-15): 309-31.
- Moreiras-Menor, Cristina
2002 *Cultura herida: Literatura y cine en la España democrática* (Barcelona: Libertarias).
- Muñoz Molina, Antonio
1986 *Beatus Ille* (Barcelona: Seix Barral).
1991 *El jinete polaco* (Barcelona: Seix Barral).
1993 Talk delivered at Instituto Cervantes, London, June 17.

- Preston, Paul
 Forthcoming *The Spanish Holocaust* (London: HarperCollins).
- Quintais, Luis
 2001 "How to Speak, How to Remember: Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and the Portuguese Colonial Wars (1961–74)," *Journal of Romance Studies* 1 (3): 85–102.
- Radstone, Susannah, ed.
 2000 *Memory and Methodology* (Oxford: Berg).
- Radstone, Susannah, and Katharine Hodgkin, eds.
 2006 *Memory Cultures: Memory, Subjectivity, and Recognition* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction).
- Ramos, Julio
 2001 *Divergent Modernities: Culture and Politics in Nineteenth-Century Latin America* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press).
- Reverte, Jorge M., and Socorro Thomás, eds.
 2001 *Hijos de la guerra: Testimonios y recuerdos* (Madrid: Temas de Hoy).
- Richard, Nelly
 2004 *Cultural Residues: Chile in Transition* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press).
- Richards, Michael
 1998 *A Time of Silence: The Civil War and the Culture of Repression in Franco's Spain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Rivas, Manuel
 1998a *O lapis do carpinteiro* (Vigo, Spain: Gerais).
 1998b *El lápiz del carpintero* (Madrid: Alfaguara).
- Rodrigo, Javier
 2003 *Los campos de concentración franquistas: Entre la historia y la memoria* (Madrid: Siete Mares).
- Saura, Carlos, dir.
 1976 *Cria cuervos* (Spain: Elías Querejeta Garate).
 1990 *¡Ay Carmela!* (Spain: XYZ Desarrollos/Ellepi Films [Italy]).
- Shubert, Adrian
 1990 *A Social History of Modern Spain* (London: Unwin Hyman).
- Sontag, Susan
 2004 *Regarding the Pain of Others* (London: Penguin).
- Subirats, Eduardo
 1981 *La Ilustración insuficiente* (Madrid: Taurus).
- Torres, Rafael
 2003 *Heridos de la guerra: Secuelas de la sublevación de Franco* (Madrid: Oberon).
- Trueba, David, dir.
 2003 *Soldados de Salamina* (Spain: Lola Films/Fernando Trueba).
- Uribe, Imanol, dir.
 2002 *El viaje de Carol* (Spain: Sogecine/Aiete-Ariane Films/Take 2000 [Portugal]).
- van Alphen, Ernst
 1999 "Symptoms of Discursivity: Experience, Memory, and Trauma," in *Acts of Memory: Cultural Recall in the Present*, edited by Mieke Bal, Jonathan Crewe, and Leo Spitzer, 24–38 (Hanover, NH: Dartmouth College).
- Zavala, José María
 2004 *Los horrores de la guerra civil* (Barcelona: Random House Mondadori).
- Zúñiga, Juan Eduardo
 1980 *Largo noviembre de Madrid* (Barcelona: Bruguera).