UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

Mis(s) Education:

Locating Female Subjectivity and Resistance in the Spanish University

A thesis submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree

Master of Arts

in

Spanish Literature

by

Amanda Birmingham

Committee in charge:

Professor Martin Luis-Cabrera, Chair
Professor Pamela Radcliff
Profeseor Rosaura Sánchez

2008

The thesis of Amanda Birmingham is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication on microfilm and electronically:

Chair

University of California, San Diego

2008

Dedicated to Dr. Soñia Riquelme
1945 – 2008

"¿Qué ha de aprender una chica en la universidad?
Ir por el mal camino, el mal camino y nada más"

– Abuela Lucia, Julia

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend my most sincere gratitude to the people many who have helped make this project a success; Thank you Dr. Martin-Cabrera for your patience and invaluable guidance as chair of my committee. To Mom, Dad and Jeremiah – you are not just family, but my best friends and I thank you for always nurturing my imagination and reminding me what opportunities an education can provide. To Tony, thank you for your unyielding encouragement throughout this long process – I love you and can not wait to marry you. And to Tina and Nicole, thank you for your advice about life before and after the M.A. thesis defense. The list of those contributing to this project is infinite and even if not listed here, you know you who you are. I appreciate and am indebted to you all!

ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

Mis(s) Education:
Locating Female Subjectivity and Resistance in the Spanish University

by

Amanda Birmingham

Master of Arts in Spanish Literature

University of California, San Diego, 2008

Professor Luis Martin-Cabrera, Chair

This project uses Althusserian concepts of interpellation and subject formation with Foucaultian notions of power and discourse to explore the university space under the Francoist regime as represented in three novels by Spanish women writers; Nada by Carmen Laforet (1945), Julia by Ana Maria Moix (1968) and El mismo mar de todos los veranos by Esther Tusquets (1978). By taking up the case of female protagonists who bring their search for identity to the university, I argue that the scholar identity serves as a site of resistance to the ideological hold of the state, where through a subversive learning process under a female pedagogue, the university experience serves as a public framework by which the protagonists produce knowledge of the exploitative power relations governing women's social position. Analysis of these literary works shows the process of performing the female scholar identity as one rupturing the

hegemonic status of National-Catholic ideology by facilitating the protagonists' unlearning of themselves as the means of reproduction in service to the modern state. These findings also identify patriarchal morality and classist restrictions on women as interrelated factors in the subjugation of women.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS

Spanish literature has never suffered a dearth of female authors, but with few exceptions, until recently their contributions to the Spanish canon have gone largely unrecognized. Only after the Civil War did Spanish women begin to gain visibility in the traditionally male-dominated sphere of literary production (Molinaro 13). Even then, women authors who found publishers willing to print their work subjected their creations to oppressive censorship by the state and patriarhcal social norms purporting diminutive female intellectual capacities, leaving literature written by women to be "judged inferior, ignored or marginalized into a subcategory established solely on the basis of gender" (13). However, since the death of dictator Francisco Franco in 1975, and the slow process towards liberalizing gender relations initiated thereafter, Spanish women writers have been attracting the increasing attention of critics at home and abroad.

The novels to be treated in this project, Nada by Carmen Laforet published in 1945, Julia by Ana Maria Moix published in 1969 and El mismo mar de Todos los Veranos by Esther Tusquests published in 1978, are three such cases. Within the growing emphasis on women writers, these works have been the topic of numerous critical studies: Marsha Collins, for example, links the form of Nada with a search for identity while Elizabeth Ordóñez emphasizes the importance of the family paradigm in the novel as a reflection of Spain's post-civil war social values (Johnson 249). Approaches to Moix, like those of Bush and Levine, include the concept of doubling and struggle between silence and discourse (Levine Spanish 344-5). And although the most recent of these authors to publish her first novel, Tusquets has already inspired

much scholarship, like that of Bellver, Molinaro, and Levine who read her works against established literary canons and ideologies of power (Servodidio Spanish 502).

However, despite the myriad of approaches to the texts, there exists a significant lack of studies treating the role of the university in these novels and how it plays into intersections of power, knowledge, resistance and the subsequent (changing) female subjectivities within that space. Including the university space in critical analysis is imperative to our understanding of the Spanish female experience as presented in literature because that institution of leaning served as an ideological battleground throughout twentieth century Spain; as a site in which resistance to the regime's totalitarian revisionist project came into direct contact with forces designed to instill and perpetuate conservative National-Catholic ideology imposed by the state (Gómez 53). In an effort to correct that gap in existing criticism, the novels of this project have been chosen primarily on the common thread of female protagonists whose interface with the university frames their shared concerns of female voice, identity and alienation during key stages in the Spanish dictatorship and democratic transition.

Furthermore, while Laforet, Moix and Tusquets have each been recognized individually for her contribution to the body of Spanish literature, to my knowledge, this combination of their works has not yet been studied together. The benefit in doing so is the ability to observe how the common concerns of the protagonists and representations of the university they attend compare across the thirty-three year historical trajectory in which they were written. A second benfit in treating Nada, Julia and El mismo mar as a triad is the opportunity to disabuse the prevelance of a debilitating literary trend Margarent Jones has identified in works of female noveleists

of the later post-war years. According to Jones, in lieu of earlier novels that present political history as macrocosms for the personal histories of their protagonists, the result of which locates said protagoisnts in situations that transcend "lo personal (sea nacional, social, existential o universal)," female novelists of the later post-war years have abandoned preoccupation with social protest for exhaulted individualism:

> No hay las mismas preocupaciones socials de reforma o de protesta ante la injusticia del mundo. La novela se interioriza y el enfoque se reduce al tamaño del individuo: problemas particulares suplantan al antiguo interés social. La presentación es más bien intimista, concentrándose en un individuo único y su perspectiva sobre la vida…La rebelión de la nueva heroína no pasa de lo personal. ("Compromiso" 132-3)

The egotism of this later generation, she finds, occludes the narrative space to reflect on the historical moment of production. But by studying Nada, Julia and El mismo mar together, we see that what these texts share in content is also what makes them exceptions to the trend Jones outlines.

The search for self is central to each of the novels (as it is imperative to explore the self as a site of rebellion since the internalization of ideology through processes of subject formation is precisely what aids in making hegemony so elusive), but that search for self is framed by interface with public institutions. And as we will see, the protagonists do rebel within *lo personal*, yet contrary to the perceived limitations such rebellion has for social protest, the protagonists do so by occupying public spaces of learning, a strategic setting that facilitates a parallel narrative of student resistance and changes within the university climate of the historical moment. Thus, instead of a generational trend of authors substituting critical social commentary for "una nueva promoción femenina" focused on the body and the individual, we find the authors of

these particular works to to be directing social commentary in multiple directions: inwards to the private sphere *and* outwards to public spaces where the processes of subject formation in the novels take place (Jones 134).

Finally, these novels each take up the university experience in Barcelona, a Catalonian city whose regional culture and language was severely repressed during the regime in the interest of forging a homogenous national identity. To be a woman writer from Catalan during the Francoist dictatorship, as were Laforet, Moix and Tuqsuets, therefore meant writing from a position of layered marginalization and multiple silences; as women subjected to conservative notions of passive feminine behavior, as intellectuals subjected to laws of censorship, and as Catalonians subjected to repression of regional identity and culture. Taking these works up for investigation is thus one way to negate that marginalization and write towards female inclusion in the still male defined Spanish literary cannon.

INTRODUCTION

Fascism is an intricate and contested label, and when treating the forty year Spanish dictatorship under Francisco Franco, scholars continue to debate whether the regime fits the bill. Scholars purporting the regime's fascist character cite its ultranationalist platform aimed at transforming Spain through a conservative counter-revolutionary response to socio-political crisis. In the eyes of Nationalist forces, the previous government of the Second Republic had squandered the national heritage, leading the way for new leadership whose aims to end class-struggle, regionalist aspirations, political party pluralism and foreign influences would create a unified Spain (Jackson 161, Richmond 3). In order to act on that vision, victorious nationalist forces organized Spanish society around a hierarchical state with authority hyper-centralized in a singular leader to which totally loyalty and obedience was owed. In turn, that singular leader helped articulate an idealized past upon which to construct a new vision of national community.

General Francisco Franco was that leader and as the new head of the Falange, "his authority transcended that of a military general to become one of *Caudillo*, the political and spiritual leader of Spaniards in their crusade against the Second Republic" (Richmond 3). However, scholars interpreting the regime as authoritarian, or parafascist at best, point to the fact that General Franco came to power in a *coup d'état* supported by military forces under his command, not as the head of a mass political party seen in contemporary Germany or Italy (Guibernau 43). To this, they add the fleeting rhetoric of imperial gain and productive military power following the defeat of the Axis powers in WW2, as examples of the regime's deviation from conceptual definitions of fascism

(Guibernau 45, Griffin 188-9). But in reponse to this, we must consider the strategies by which the new regime solidified a popular power base within Spain.

In regard to political parties, the fascist *Falange* founded by José Antonio Primo de Rivera in 1934, was absorbed into the rising regime's government families following Rivera's wartime execution. And while, as Kathleen Richmond explains in Women and Spanish Fascism, there were differences between the *Falange* and right-wing conservative opposition to the Republic, the 1937 Decree of Unification brought all parties of the Right under the umbrella of the *Falange* in an anti-republican front. Far from an ideological monolith, the front - dubbed *Falange Espanola Tradicionalista y de las Juntas de Ofensiva Nacional-Sindicalista* (FET y de las JONS) - included Falangists, monarchists, Carlists, the church, the army and the landed elite. Amongst mixed company, the social radicalism of the *Falange* was necessarily toned down, since for example, Rivera's plans for economic reform to nationalize banks and organize workers into a "giant syndicate of producers," stood in direct conflict with not only "established class divisions dear to the church, army and parties of the right", but more explicitly the conservative bloc's aim of restoring the economic power base of financial elites (Richmond 2). Yet while class objectives within in the front trumped populist economic plans, the merger of families positioned the *Falange* as the singular, official state party, making the *Falange* the administrative framework of the Nationalist state. Thus, while the regime's political message altered from that of the pre-front *Falange* in order to mobilze the masses in rebuilding a 'new state' without altering traditional structures of property, the role of the fascist party delivering that message to the masses did not.

Certainly the one of the most distinctive component of the regime was the fierce Catholicization of fascsism adopted by the Franco (Guibernau 43). Falangist doctrine under leadership of Rivera recognized the importance of religion in Spanish nationhood, but advocated for the separation of church and state. Nevertheless, the Catholic Church came to hold an unparalleled position of dominance and privilege under the new regime. Franco placed the religious component of the nationalist platform front and center, promulgating Catholicism as *the* defining trait of traditional *hispanidad* his regime intended to recapture: "Our state must be a catholic state, both from the social and from the cultural point of view, as the true Spain has always been, is and always will be deeply Catholic" (qtd. in Guibernau 42). Rechristianisation of Spanish society thus comprised a significant part of the 'progress' sought by the regime, and as Montserrat Guibernau claims, while stressing a Christian identity as the rallying point for a change in leadership allowed the fascist character of the regime's political tendencies to take second place, doing so did not displace those tendencies from operation.

In sum, Francoism wove Catholicism, extreme nationalism and European fascism together in an acutely authoritarian regime characterized by a totalitarian revisionist project that brought the patriarchal, mililatrized and catholicized state into all factions of people's lives (Richards 16). National-Catholicism served as the organizing ideological principle behind this revisionist project to stamp out the liberal secularization of the Second Republic through a recovery of tradtion that would restablish cultural hierarchies and catholic values as the cornerstones of national idenity.

In the wake of the Civil War, autarky served as the chosen strategy to

operationalize this ideology on the ground and solidify regime authority while reconstructing its economic and social organization. Franco withdrew Spanish participation in international capitalist markets to establish policies of national self-sufficiency. In the process, disengaging from global markets helped the regime secure the loyalty of the industrial bourgeoise through government polices that, in efforts to industrialize quickly, removed avenues for worker mobilization by replacing "Republican labor legislation [with] conservative legislation [giving] preference to obedience over efficiency as the most valuable quality of any worker" (Guibernau 39). The state's assistance in dissolving avenues of laborer mobilization coupled with the church's dissemination of work as the individual's necessary 'sacrifice' to *la patria,* helped usher in more cost-effective production models that laid the foundations of a modern industrialized state, and along with it, a "very significant deepening of capital accumulation in the hands of those who would dominate political and social circles in Spain throughout the Franco Era and beyond" (Richards 11). In addition to the economic ramifications of autarky, this isolationist foreign policy served a spiritual and political purpose by distancing Spain from liberal models under the precept of freeing the nation from an immoral modern world (Radcliff 3 Mar). As a result, Spain under the Francoist regime embarked on a process of authoritarian modernization in which the glorified pursuit of self-sufficiency and cultural purity behind these autarkic policies created a self-imposed, closed cultural system that negated the risk of any competing political discourse from abroad well into the 1950s.

Internally, securing popular support in the national endeavor required a massive programme of simultaneous repression of dissent and social education aimed at creating

thoroughly National-Catholicized cultural habits by which individuals would *freely* put their productive forces towards perpetuating the hegemony of National-Catholic discourse (Griffin 198). Pervasive and systematic violence played an important role in liquidating opposition in the post conflict years when upwards of 200,000 Spaniards were imprisoned, tortured or executed by the regime in the wake of the Civil War (Richards 11). But coercion can not be omnipresent, and because it is always in the element of language that individuals are interpelated as subjects, the dissemination of National-Catholic ideology - that is, the active circulation of National-Catholic rhetoric as *the* national language and basis for linguistic community - necessarily became the regime's primary objective in its efforts to revive traditional *hispanidad,* and with it, the conservative socio-political power dynamics uprooted by the Republic.

As part of this process, the state established a monopoly on mass media with a built-in "omnipresente Censura" used to closely monitor cultural productions (Sartorius 43). And while media control was essential to instantaneous circulation of pro-regime propaganda and suppression of dissent, it was ultimately the family and schools that served as the dominate institutions – or state technologies in Althusserian terms - in the mission to hegemonize National-Catholic discourse and reproduce state power. What made these institutions dominant above other ideological state apparatuses was their combined function in producing national identity and shaping the individual's understanding of their relationship to the National-Catholic agenda (Gómez 52). By concurrently penetrating these institutions, the state could implement a multi-faceted approach to guiding the formation of a thoroughly National-Catholicized subject. Beginning with more intimate relations tied to procreation and parenting, and moving

outwards to institutions of learning within the public sphere, the state and Catholic Church made themselves present at major junctures in a individual's development. In this way, the union of church and state was not only the foundation of the conservative nationalist platform, but the backbone of a power network facilitating the totalitarian nature of the state's revisionist project.

At the core of the state's presence within the home and school was enforcing a separate spheres ideology that legitimated appropriate spaces of action along gendered lines while governing individual behavior within those spaces. The family and school institutions fell in opposing spheres; the family within the private and schools, the public. Both will be taken up for discussion, but we will turn our attention to the family first. In a sense, National-Catholicism was able to nationalize the family - the foundation of catholic values - and along with it, patriarchal gender relations re-awakened by the Francoist recovery of tradition. The following excerpt taken from a 1965 *Sección Femenina* university course aptly titled *Formación Politica-Social* clearly illustrates the hierarchical organization of the family:

> La jerarquía familiar es el padre. No le proviene al padre la autoridad de su fuerza física, o de la superioridad social o económica. Le proviene directamente de Dios. De esta autoridad se dice que es "de institución divina". Así, el padre es, en la familia, el representante de la paterna autoridad de Dios. Y la madre recibe la autoridad por participación en la del esposo. (qtd. in Otero 115)

With authorial power concentrated in the father and the authority of others legitimized only in relation to him, the family represented a microcosm of the dictatorial state. And by using the familial institution as a mirror of state power, precepts of National-Catholicism were able to charge its internal relationships with a civic function.

As Etienne Balibar explains in a revealing treatment of the nation from, the civic function of familial relationships was made possible by constant state assistance (101). For example, having reversed all progressive civil reforms set up by the Second Republic, the Francoist state re-located legitimate action of Spanish women explicitly within the private sphere and promulgated laws, such as the Labor Charter of 1938, to mark her legal exit from the workforce and public sphere. Once the traditional domain of women was restored by legal means, the state went to work initiating propaganda campaigns to educate women of their appropriate role within that space. As the defenders of traditional family values, women - the church and *Seccion Femenina*[1] declared - were to "serve *la patria* with abnegation through dedication of the self" to motherhood (Gómez 52):

> Es la madre la mejor forjada de patrias e imperios. Es el mejor modo que la mujer tiene de servir a la Patria: darle sus hijos y hacer de ellos héroes y patriotas dispuestos a darle su vida si es necesario. Es la grande y magnífica misión de la madre española, su gran tarea, su mejor servicio. (qtd. in Otero 114)

By equating motherhood with a woman's civic duty, National-Catholicism was able to portray alternate forms of female action in a deviant or anarchistic tone of disallegiance that legitimated suppression for the good of *la patria*. Also by making motherhood paramount in the lives of women, National-Catholicism gave the state a specific stake in

[1] The Catholic Church and *Seccion Femenina* were the official arbitrators of female duties under the regime. The *Seccion Femenina*, or women's section of the Falange's *Movimiento* party apparatus, served as the transition belt for moral and political values of the regime to the population of Spanish women. Causes associated with the Nationalist victory, such as a return to patriarchal society and restoration of traditional gender roles constituted the fundamental doctrine behind *Seccion Femenina* campaigns (Richmond 4). Here we can see that the Francoist state entrusted implementation of its gendered policies to women themselves. Paradoxically, campaigns undertaken by the women's section facilitated the mobilization of women under the leadership of other women as a political unit for the purposes of disseminating conservative values among the Spanish population that, above all else, purported women's intellectual and political incapacity act autonomously of male guidance (101).

the bodies of Spanish women while Catholic ideals of female self-abnegation, “la actitud passiva y el espiritú de sacrificio” simultaneously reduced women to their bodies (i.e. the means reproduction itself) (Martin-Gaite 27). Furthermore, as this quote suggests, mothers were to be the primary educators of the next generation, "la que transmite la continuidad de las cosas, la que prepara el nuevo ser para el futuro” by instilling the child’s first lesson about their role in *la Patria* (qtd. in Otero 105). Hence, not only did state ‘assistance’ legitimatize a specific locale and type of female action, the inequality of gender roles in conjugal love and childrearing entrenched therein constituted the anchoring point for mediation of the family by the state (Balibar 102).

Mediating the family was imperative to the survival of the regime for, in their sanctioned role as mothers, Spanish women were providing a tangible power-producing service for the state. As “el puntal y el espejo de futura familias,” Spanish mothers functioned as living propaganda in the most fundamental way by physically reproducing bodies and ideologically reproducing subjects via indoctrination of the National-Catholic precepts governing identity formation (Martin-Gaite 27). Consequently, as the epicenters of corporal reproduction and the formation of political consciousness in future generations, women occupied a power*ful* social position; they were quite literally a nexus of the social body and control of the body politic. This civil duty charged to mothers illustrates the regime’s view of women as crucial assets in nation-building, but also exposed its vulnerability to, and necessary regulation of, women’s behavior. In order to facilitate a smooth reproductive process, promoting “aquel tipo de mujer antigua,” a woman who never served as the occasion of discord became the tireless and inexhaustible “propaganda de la época” (Martin-Gaite 27). Thus

female (re)productive power was kept in check by (1) omnipresent patriarchal gender relations legitimizing female power only in relation to that of a man's, (2) dissemination of propaganda celebrating the harmonizing nature of female company and most importantly, (3) the marginalization of the female power-producing-function to the private space. That is to say, female productive power was specifically distanced from the public realm of knowledge and political action.

That space was the university, and as a *public* space was gendered male. As a site of state power educating the political elite, the university became both a space for inculcating National-Catholic ideology, and later in the dictatorship, a place where it was contested. However, in the hands of victorious nationalist forces following the war, the institution was first subjected to a very tangible re-organization. The overarching goal was to re-Catholicize the university in reaction to the displacement of church curricular authority under the Second Republic's Institución Libre de Enseñanza (Sartorius and Alfaya 50). This task manifested a process of liquidating dissent essential to securing the omnipresence of National-Catholicism in university infrastructure. The most notable instances of this process involved the calculated persecution of republican intelligentsia and implementation of La *Ley de Ordenación Universitaria*. On one occasion, the former purged the Spanish university of one hundred and ninety-five intellectuals, many of whom if not internally marginalized were forced into exile or killed. And that was in 1939 alone! The trend continued into the forties to include republican sympathizers, those aligned with liberal-democratic, socialist or communist philosophies and any other university professional voicing opposition to the new regime (48).

In the summer of 1943 the process of purging dissent brought about the *Ley de Ordenación Universitaria* (L.O.U.), a law reforming the university mission that would govern higher education until 1970. The following excerpt taken from the law's preamble illustrates the prevalence of National-Catholic doctrine implemented within the institution:

> La ley, además de reconocer los derechos de la Iglesia en materia universitaria, quiere ante todo que la Universidad de Estado sea católica. Todos sus actividades habrán de tener como guía el dogma y al moral cristiana y lo establecido por los sagrados cánones de la enseñanza…En todas las aulas se establecerá…una auténtica educación: el ambiente de piedad que contribuya a fomentar la formación en todos los actos de la vida del estudiante...Por otro parte la ley…exige el fiel servicio de al universidad a los ideales de la Falange… (qtd. in Sartorius and Alfaya 46-7).

As illustrated in the passage, the systematic influence of nationalist Catholicism within the institution went beyond the political organization of the students to ideological control at the level of teaching (Maravall 156). In accordance with the law, university education now revolved around Christian morality and patriotism, and because foundations of knowledge and legitimate discourse within this space were organized by National-Catholic principles, university education primarily became a normalizing process. Most importantly, as Aurora Morcillo Gómez succinctly explains, "the law entrusted the university with the task of creating a political elite able to fulfill the Francoist spiritual revolution and, implicitly, to lead that revolution in the broader (male) public realm" (60).

By the transparent hyperideologizing and hyperpoliticizing of the university, the *Ley de Ordenación Universitaria* put the institution in direct service of the new regime as a technological apparatus upon which patriarchal state power was constructed and

perpetuated. The *Sindicato Español Universitario* (S.E.U.) – an obligatory student union included in L.O.U provisions – helped facilitate that task on the individual level by monitoring student activity and "encauzar las reivindicaciones estudiantiles por canales oficiales fácilmente controlables" (Valdelvira 19). The S.E.U registered each student for obligatory terms of civil service, and as within the family, university civil service was gendered; young men were to serve six months in the university militia while (the few) young women completed six months instruction in domestic duties mediated by the *Seccion Femenina* of the Falange (Gómez 62).

The most important distinction between these types of university service is the approach to the scholar/subject and in what spaces students were to put their education to use. A young man's university service echoed the scholar-soldier identity outlined in the L.O.U's mission to raise a "theological army" for the re-Catholicizing mission: "Being a good scholar and a good Catholic were one and the same; the soul of a scholar was also that of a solider…[who would] fight against heresy…in the spiritual revolution" (Gómez 60). As Gómez points out, the masculine pronouns and military images used in L.O.U articles defines 'scholar' as inherently male and shapes *his* active participation in the national endeavor around the defense of Spain's Catholic homogeneity. That defense entailed exporting those ideas to the public realm of socio-political action in order to "*to produce a knowledge* that takes over the world and educates men who…honor Spain and serve the church (qtd. in Gómez 60, my emphasis). Civil service for a female student on the other hand, expedited her return to the private sphere. Service for a young women at the university was broken into two parts: "*Formación*, which entailed political indoctrination [of National-Catholic

ideology subjugating her status within the home] and home economics; and Service (*Presentación)*, which normally involved working in a…nursery or shelter" (Gómez 62). We could say that obligatory service for university women was like a figurative U-turn upon their entrance into the public sphere of the university that highlighted the contradiction between the scholar identity and National-Catholic femininity; women were discouraged from attending the university, and when they did, the education they received reinforced a young woman's destiny as self-abnegating mother (63).

The essential difference between gendered university service is that male scholars were on the producing end of knowledge; they were the educat*or*s given a specifically active role by the L.O.U. to spread that knowledge in the public space of political conflict. Conversely, the opposition between female and scholar identities could only be reconciled by making the female student a passive one, always on the receiving end of (male) knowledge already formed and in service to maintaining operative hierarchal power structures. Take for example the words of Pilar Primo de Rivera: "Las mujeres nunca descubren nada: les falla, desde luego, el talento creador, reservado por Dios para inteligencias varoniles: no podemos hacer nada más que interpretar peor o mejor lo que los hombres nos han hecho" (qtd. in Sartorius and Alfaya 294). Spanish women that is to say, were never to produce knowledge themselves, but always be the receptacles of it. And when women were educated by women, as was the case with university courses taught by the *Seccion Femenina*, the group's doctrinal loyalty to the official state party exposed its educators as little more than mouthpieces of the same patriarchal knowledge. More importantly, upon a woman's destined return home, education stressing her legitimate role within that space

as a transmitter of those ideas to her children ensured a closed circuit reproduction of National-Catholicized subjects within the private sphere.

In the ways described, church sanctioned and state assisted education in the home and schools functioned as the principal means of reconstructing *hispanidad* as a National-Catholic linguistic community. This guided education ensured that Spain would be a nation that 'spoke' National-Catholicism in their daily lives, and by doing so enabled the automatic functioning of dictatorial state power. Yet, herein lays the slippery hold of language in forming communities, for while it ideally "assimilates anyone who speaks it,…the linguistic construction of identity is by definition open [*because*] it is always possible to appropriate…languages and to turn oneself into a different kind of bearer of discourse" (Balibar 98-9). This makes institutions organized around discourse valuable to control yet vulnerable to change.

I believe this provides crucial insight as to why women's presence at the university was specifically discouraged and why the scholar identity was considered antagonistic to ideal femininity under the National-Catholic regime. Firstly, universities are spaces characterized by the pursuit of knowledge, that is, a student goes to a university seeking to think and learn. And as has been discussed, the (male) scholar identity was an active one involving the production of knowledge. Foucault tells us that knowledge both produces discourse and locates power in the bodies of learned individuals. But, in her sanctioned role as mother the Catholic woman was to be self-abnegating; giving up her self - and necessarily knowledge of that self - to motherhood while forming an identity primarily in relation to the state. Thus on a basic level, a female scholar would constitute a selfish transgression of ideal catholic womanhood by

pursuing and producing knowledge at the expense of her scripted corporal reproductive duty (Gomez 59-62). The danger to automatic functioning of state power in doing so would be a breach in the church endorsed-state assisted purposeful separation of self from the female body resulting from the investment of power in that female body by a female scholar producing knowledge.

Secondly, we know that when Franco came to power the university had to be purged, re-organized and then heavily monitored in order for that institution to best serve as a building block of regime stability. As part of that process, intellectuals espousing heterodox political doctrines and those opposing the Francoist state were marginalized to various degrees of severity, but despite the state's totalitarian efforts that process did not eradicate those voices altogether. Nor did expelling individuals within the institution erase the university's history as a hotbed for discourse of political doctrines opposed by the new regime. Furthermore, by 1950's as Spain's economic and political isolation begins to wane, "núcleos de oposición al gobierno" resurfaced in the university, gaining increasing visibility in subsequent waves of student mobilizations until the end of the dictatorship (Sartorious and Alfaya 58).

The university then, was a public space marked by change and ideological conflict; an institution whose infrastructural discourse reflected and reproduced the dominant national language of the historical moment among the political elite, but one that also housed a past of ideological difference and marginalized dissent in the present. While learning the language of National-Catholicism was the regime's primary goal for students attending the Spanish university, the marginalized existence of alternate discourses produced a potentially linguistically plural space. And if we consider the

learning of ideology (or political language) as the simultaneous un-learning of another interpelating us as subjects, the Spanish university in its linguistic plurality operated as a site of both learning and un-learning National-Catholic discourse.

In sum, the scholar identity was placed in contradiction to femininity as constructed by National-Catholicism because that identity (1) deviated from self-negating reproductive duties of the suffering mother and by doing so threatened to invest power in the female body, and (2) facilitated potential interface with heterodox discourse incongruous with state needs to maintain a homogeneous language community. Such discourse in the hands of a woman representing a nexus of the social body and body politic, a woman whose contribution to the national endeavor was her labor power to form political consciousness of future generations, constituted a major threat to the automatic functioning of state power. Hence if we are always capable of learning new languages, we can understand the Francoist priority of keeping women, as producers of new bodies and subjects, out of the public sphere of learning where the homogeneity of discourse itself was threatened.

But knowing that National-Catholicism places the scholar identity at odds with ideal femininity, what happens when women in the university make the transgression of taking up the scholar identity as a producer of knowledge? And how does that process impact female subject formation within the historical moment of that action? This is exactly the matter taken up by the novels treated in this project! The protagonists in these novels are all learning, that is, they each under go a subversive (mis)education in the formation of female subjectivity. What makes this education and subject-forming process particularly subversive is 1) the sustained female presence in intersecting public

and private spheres and 2) the double female presence as the subject being educat*ed* and the subject doing the educat*ing*. Unlike the traditional familial structure under the Francoist state that employed mothers as the medium by which to transmit "la primera lección sobre la Patria", the protagonists of these novels are essentially motherless; Andrea comes to Barcelona an orphan while the self-absorbed mothers of Julia and Elia make themselves unavailable to their daughters at key moments of identity formation or personal crisis (Otero 115). In their civic responsibility to inculcate National-Catholic ideology in the next generation, mothers functioned as the state stand-in facilitating identity formation in relation to that state. However, the motherless status of these protagonists leaves that role vacant at critical moments, resulting in young female protagonists who bring their common concerns for authentic identity with them to the university.

Instead, their education is facilitated through relationships with female educators forged in the public sphere of knowledge and political action; you might say that the motherless status of each protagonist is her "in" to an education and subject formation conducted under alternative conditions. The university is that alternative environment, the public space functioning in the novels as both a center of enforcing/learning and resisting/unlearning hegemonic discourse of National-Catholicism. The difference is that once these protagonists enter the university and forge relationships with female educators in that space, they sustain the scholar's pursuit and production of knowledge and turn the process towards the private sphere. That is, they maintain the intersection of the public and private or the overlap of university and familial institutions. Most importantly, this process allows the

protagonists to address issues of women's social position and violence on female bodies in the private sphere via their interaction within a public framework. They are in a sense exercising a heterodox female scholar identity that takes the private public, and in the educative process of discovering female body centered knowledge, expose the inability of operative National-Catholic discourse to articulate authentic female identity.

This process of female (mis)education is repeated in each novel, but set during a distinct period in the Francoist regime. Nada recaptures the desperation of Barcelona during the height of repressive campaigns in the forties. Present action in Julia depicts the same Catalonian city during Spain's increased international political integration and economic transition of the sixties. And finally, El mismo mar reflects on both the fifties and early stages of the political democratic transition of the late 1970's. This project argues that through this historical sequence in which the (mis)education of the protagonists and their search for self is set against the changing representations of the same Barcelonan university, we not only see the scholar identity function as a site of resistance to the ideological hold of the state, but are able to map the parallel narrative of economic and political transformation under the regime, and a trajectory of increasing female body-centered knowledge calling out classist restricitions and patriarchal morality as consistent obstacles to female subject self-mastery and the need for non-phallogocentric discourse capable of articulating female experience and desire.

NADA

In 1944, at the age of twenty-three, Carmen Laforet was the first Spanish woman born in the twentieth century to win acclaim as a novelist. That year her first novel Nada won the Egenio Nadal Prize – the most prestigious literary award in Spain (Ennis 1). Set in Barcelona immediately following the civil war, Nada recaptures the war's destruction of urban life, its physiological effects on a society navigating changing social mores, and the general deprivation and despair that rocked Spain in the early repressive years of Franco's regime. Autarkic policies imposed at that time on a war-worn Spain relied heavy on state intervention in the economy and rapid industrial expansion, but proved largely unsustainable due to Spain's lack of "raw materials…or the income to purchase them" (A. Jones 74). Consequently, Spain was unable to produce or import enough food to feed the population, and coupled with the simultaneous withdrawal of civil liberties and calculated violent silencing of those opposing the new regime, "los años del hambre" as they were called, reflected less of the government's triumphant rhetoric than a reality in which "el deterioro de las condiciones socioeconómicos del país se daba la mano con la despiadada represión llevada a cabo por los vencedores sobre los vencidos" (Sartorius y Alfada 31).

This is the Spain that produced Nada, a first person narrative in which eighteen year old Andrea recounts experiences of her year long stay with relatives in Barcelona while attending the university. Andrea is both protagonist and narrator of the novel, and thus tells her own story, but from a more mature perspective sometime after the events she describes. What she describes is a quest for freedom and secure female identity framed within two distinct representations of the bourgeois family: the household of

Andrea's relatives on *Calle* Aribau and that of her university friend Ena on Vía Layetana. An optimistic Andrea arrives at the former with illusions of liberation, of launching a new life in Barcelona beyond the country village she left behind, but instead of the safe and stable harbor on a burgeoning street she remembers from childhood, her grandparent's apartment has fallen into a state of terminal decay. Arriving in the middle of the night, Andrea is taken aback by the crowded, dark and filthy environment: "me parecía todo un pesadilla" (Laforet 5). Destabilized by civil war, the household *Calle* Aribau is in crisis, both in terms of patriarchal masculinity and class status. In contrast to the derelict state of *calle* Aribau, the household on Vía Layetana - whose familial dynamics represent the entrepreneurial elite favored by the Francoist state - is stable, happy and increasingly prosperous (Jordan 10). It is between these oscillating poles of bourgeoise society, and the university space where they intrinsically mix, that Andrea navigates a subversive education shaping her developing subjectivity and subsequent emergence as female author.

A number of critical essays focusing on the family paradigm of the novel interpret Nada as a Cinderella story or a search for identity that ultimately reaffirms patriarchal-bourgeois values by marking Andrea's initiation into the dominant culture of post-war Spain (Johnson 249). But against these readings, I find that through protagoisnt's interface with the univeristy facilitating her parallel exploration of relationships in the private and public sphere, Nada more accurately tells the story of a protagonist uncovering the exploitative violence of the dominant culture and alternatives to the prevailing social script for women. That education begins with Andrea's introduction to and ensuing fascination with the *calle* Aribau household where

a rude awakening to “la realidad miserable” of her family in postwar Barcelona renews her desire for escape and independence with which she arrived (45). As stated, the Aribau household is in the midst of crisis, and as Elizabeth Ordónez explains, that internal instability stems largely from the deterioration of patriarchal authority among its ranks (“Double” 37). Andrea’s grandfather has died during the war, and with him has symbolically gone the economic and ideological base of Spain’s petite bourgeoise. Since his death the family’s wealth - as reflected in the partitioned apartment and overall corrosion of material belongings - has deteriorated, and the remaining male members of the family, brothers Juan and Román, both fail to fulfill their scripted patriarchal role of authoritarian provider (Laforet 34) .

Juan, a night watchman and unaccomplished painter unable to meet the material needs of his family, bases his masculine authority on physical violence directed most frequently at his wife Gloria (34). As Román assures Andrea during a dinner time squabble, this domestic violence has been completely normalized in the household by its continuity and the absence of intervention from others: “No te asustes, pequeña. Esto pasa aquí todos los días” (Laforet 18). In contrast, Roman’s smuggling activities may be more economically lucrative than Juan’s art, yet he bases masculine power on manipulation of women and psychologically tormenting his brother. Both Juan and Román prey on vulnerability and as the essential alternative to the “authoritarian strength and protectiveness” of ideal male behavior, their performance of masculinity within the household on *calle* Ariabu reveals the dark underbelly of degraded bourgeois patriarchy (Ordóñez “Initiation” 64-5).

While economic instability and the resultant degradation of patriarchal authority deliver the Aribau household into crisis, it is aunt Angustias' staunchly conservative notions of appropriate female behavior that most distinctly characterize the oppressive atmosphere from which Andrea seeks escape. As an orphan, Andrea comes to Barcelona motherless, and Angustias makes it clear that she intends to fill that void for the benefit of her niece's social education:

> Es muy difícil la tarea que se me ha venido a las manos. La tarea de cuidar de ti, de moldearte en la obediencia…eres mi sobrina; por lo tanto, una niña de buena familia, modosa, cristiana e inocente. Si yo no me ocupara de ti para todo, tú en Barcelona encontrarías multitudes de peligros. Por lo tanto, quiero decirte que no te dejaré dar un paso sin mi permiso. (Laforet 14)

In her role of surrogate mother, Angustias attempts to reproduce her own traditional Catholic education of obedience, class propriety, female self-abnegation and familial duty. She defends marriage and the convent as the only honorable occupations for women, a testament to the social contract of the historical moment positioning women's legitimate status in relation to male authority (in this case, of husband or god "our father") (72). As part of her moral instruction, Angustias polices Andrea closely, leading her on guided tours of Barcelona that stifle Andrea's initiative and sense of adventure. She is careful to point out the many places respectable women should not go and that a young woman is never to walk un-chaperoned in the streets. From this, Angustia's message is clear, ideal womanhood is shaped by uninterrupted mediation and withdrawal from public spaces.

As Andrea's surrogate mother, Angustias asserts herself as the model of femininity for Andrea to imitate, but it is one that Andrea associates with limitation and

resultantly rejects. Yet in spite of her growing frustration, Andrea can only conceive of passive resistance against the authoritative surveillance of her aunt (Laforet 25). Instead of directly confronting Angustias, Andrea gravitates towards relationships with other members of the family as an outlet for non-conformity. Andrea indulges her interest in Román's artistic talents, but more specifically, Andrea befriends her aunt Gloria even though, or perhaps because, Angustias has assured her that any amity with the overtly sensual and lower-class woman (who Angustias identifies as the source of the family's decline) would be a direct affront to Angustias and the moral consciousness she attempts to cultivate in Andrea (33). However, while Angustias recognizes a presence of *rebeldía* in her niece, Andrea's passivity endures and when her aunt eventually leaves to join a convent[2] her departure negates the need for Andrea to vocalize dissent (73).

Experiencing "el sordo horror de aquella casa sucia" on *calle* Aribau effectively renews Andrea's desire for freedom in Part I of the novel when her original optimism is disillusioned by an oppressive household where poverty, violence, and manipulation reign (70). However it is Angustias, and more specifically her authoritarian gaze, that Andrea identifies as the source of her oppression (70): "Era aquello lo que me había ahogado al llegar a Barcelona, lo que me había hecho caer en la abulia, lo que mataba mis iniciativas; aquella mirada de Angustias. Aquella mano que me apretaba los movimientos y la curiosidad de la vida nueva" (71). To the attentive reader on the other

[2] Here, Angustias' behavior exposes the hypocrisy and double standards of patriarchal morality by retreating to the safety of "convent life after having usurped the attentions of a married man whom twenty years earlier she had rejected as [economically] unworthy" (Ordóñez "Initiation" 72). Furthermore, not only has she fallen to the temptation of her body (a moral caution she delivers to Andrea), but she engages in the kind of same cross-class love affair with which she accuses Gloria of ruining the Aribau household.

hand, Angustias operates as an "enforcer of the most stringent and repressive aspects of patriarchal [bourgeoise] morality" (Ordóñez "Initiation" 71). In other words, Angustias is indicative of a value system, but Andrea does not recognize her aunt as a manifestation of operative power dynamics and instead associates limitations to her freedom with Angustias the individual. Once Andrea learns of Angustias plans to enter the convent, the protagonist immediately envisions the liberation her aunt's physical absence will deliver: "Traté de imaginarme lo que sería la vida sin tía Angustias, los horizontes que se me podrían abrir…" (58). What Andrea has in abundance here is a distaste for authorial impositions on her free actions, but what she lacks is a critical consciousness enabling her to recognize the social dynamics that solidify limitations to female autonomy.

In this sense, while Angustias' absence does not bring the long term liberation Andrea anticipates, her relinquished project as surrogate mother and departure for the convent does leave the role of educator vacant once more and provides Andrea with agency to explore spaces and relationships outside her home on *calle* Ariabu. This next stage in Andrea's education, a period of vagabond freedom in which the young student steps into the role of student, proves crucial to her development of a critical consciousness and sense of self. In the absence of her usual city chaperone, Andrea sets out on an unmediated exploration of Barcelona, a period of self-navigated learning during which Andrea purposely occupies *public* space[3] in an effort to escape her family and the squalor of their home. Through her self-navigated exploration of the city and

[3] During this period, Andrea spends much time walking the streets of Barcelona but also spends time in specific public spaces such as the university, industrial pier area, *el barrio chino*, etc.

relationships with peers from the university, Andrea comes to recognize in Part II that limitations to her freedom are necessarily tied to class antagonism, anxiety over female sensuality and her role as spectator. That is to say, it is during this period in which the young student lacks a clear pedagogue that she becomes aware of the classist restrictions on women within bourgeoise patriarchy (Ordónez "Initiation" 72).

Andrea's plans to attend the university are originally what bring her to Barcelona, and as classes begin the university emerges as a refuge in which the protagonist seeks support from her peers in reaction to the adult models she has encountered:

> La verdad es que me llevaba a ellos un afán indefinible que ahora puedo concretar como un instinto de defensa: solo aquellos seres de mi misma generación y de mis mismos gustos podían respaldarme y ampararme contra el mundo un poco fantasmal de las personas maduras. (42)

By Andrea's description, the university is a space where youth can develop dialogue, a sense of solidarity and resistance. To some extent this potential is realized when amongst her new friends, Andrea finds herself involved in "un cúmulo de discusiones sobre problemas generales en los que no había soñado antes siquiera" (42). Topics of these discussions are innovative and intriguing for Andrea, yet they do not produce any recognizable mobilization among the student body. Moreover, as a reflection of the historical moment, the aforementioned conversations do not take place inside the classroom, but in the university plaza and gardens, that is, in periphery or marginal spaces within the institution. There is no reference to dialogue *in* the classroom and the singular assignment mentioned is translating Greek and Latin texts, repetitive exercises requiring students to reproduce the language of an established power system – Latin of

the Catholic Church. By situating this treatment of the university with in the socio-political context of post-civil war Barcelona, we know that the temporal setting of Laforet's novel is coterminous with the close critique of cultural productions by censors, the *Ley de Ordenación Universitaria's* reorganization of the institution, and regime's normalizing campaigns to purge universities of heterodoxal cells and dissident intellectuals. Thus, the absence of organized student resistance and overtly anti-hegemonic language within the institution is a telling silence, but one stilling representing the university as a site of marginalized political dialogue among students.

Despite institutional limitations that operate in their silent representation of the university, Andrea hopes the friendships she forms there will usher in a "nuevo renacer" to complement the "magnífica independencia de que disfrutaba" in Angustias' absence (90). But unlike the privileged children of Barcelona's industrial elite, Andrea can only afford to attend the university because orphans receive fee remissions. It does not take long for Andrea to register the difference between her own class status and that of her wealthy peers, and thus her intended re-birth or new sense of self in the student world is quickly thwarted by persistent markers of class inferiority. Ironically, the space where Andrea goes to escape the destitution and violence of *calle* Aribau is that in which her economic inferiority is most pronounced, and where her relationships with peers expose the inherent connection between the spheres she attempts to isolate.

In an effort to maintain the university as the refuge she seeks, Andrea attempts to separate "aquellos dos mundos que se empezaban a destacar tan claramente en [su] vida: el de [sus] amistades de estudiante con su fácil cordialidad y el sucio y poco acogedor de [su] casa" (45). However, her desperate craving for human companionship

and a conflicting "deseo de hablar" about the bizarre decadence of *calle* Ariabu complicates Andrea's attempt to separate these worlds (44, 68). In terms of the latter, anxiety over exposing her difference from the university crowd leads Andrea to *choose* silence, and as a result, a self imposed censorship trumps the protagonist's desire to disclose the strange and violent behaviors of home to her peers. Importantly, as Andrea recounts her first days at the university, we see that institution operating as a complex learning space that in this moment exhibits the normalizing process under the Regime: Andrea otherwise finds political conversations among students invigorating, yet she conforms to the script of National-Catholic femininity by falling silent (and thus not becoming the occasion of discord). She in essence, is learning not to speak within the university space as a coping mechanism to maintain friendships with members of the elite class imposing that mode of femininity. Furthermore, by keeping silent as a means to separate her worlds in the interest of fanning membership with the elite bourgeoise, one that, by Andrea's logic, gives her power to escape the household of *calle* Aribau, she makes a point to keep the private sphere out of the space of (marginalized) political dialogue, thus inadvertently aiding in perpetuating the very power dynamics causing her desperation to escape and desire to tell of violence at home.

Andrea's desire for comradery on the other hand, leads to an important friendship with a spirited classmate named Ena that does employ the university as a public framework to address the violence of bourgeoise patriarchy in the private sphere. And in regard to the university as a space of dialogue and solidarity, Andrea's relationship with Ena is the most promising friendship the protagonist forms there: "nunca había una amiga con quien [se] compenetrara tanto" (Laforet 90). As Andrea's

closest university friend, Ena embodies all the things that Andrea is not; she is rich, happy, confident, assertive and a leader in conversation. Ena thus behaves in public places in ways Andrea can only imagine, and is in many ways Andrea's Other (defined here as a reflection of desired traits absent in her self). Their friendship in the novel therefore also defines the self/other dynamic in terms of female identity, manifestations of opposing high/petite bourgeoise, and in terms of the victors/defeated of the Civil War. Ena is the sole daughter of the household on Vía Layetana and as described, the progeny of a stable, affectionate, progressive, wealthy family. Consequently for these reasons, as Barry Jordan describes, Ena is the protagonist's "ego-ideal, the fulfillment of all her fantasies regarding female power and social superiority" (52). This helps explain Andrea's frustration when Ena asks to meet Roman, for while Andrea seeks refuge in the university from the sordid reality of *calle* Aribau, her favorite friend threatens to mix the worlds by demanding access to that private space (52).

Ena's friendship is largely responsible for Andrea's happiness in Part II of the novel, but it is somewhat sporadic and tensions between the friends over Ena's access to the *calle* Aribau causes lulls in their interaction. The time they spend apart in turn, projects Andrea back into her course of self-navigated exploration and relationships with university peers. For example, trips with Ena and her boyfriend Jaime to the coast are the protagonist's first encounter with heterosexual relationships based on love rather than manipulation or violence (Collins 301). These trips are a happy time for Andrea, but she is a spectator in these scenes and her heterosexual interface is largely by proxy of her female friend (Laforet 96-97). Ena consistently mediates the protagonist's interaction with the couple, but once her secretive liaisons with Román put her

relationships with Jaime and Andrea on hold, only then does Andrea make her own attempts at heterosexual relationships. Unfortunately Andrea's relationships with young men from the university are not as simple as Ena makes them look, and if friendship with Ena provides a first hand account of the female identity and home life Andrea desires, her relationships with Gerardo and Pons expose the limitations of patriarchal morality and classist restrictions on women impeding that desire.

Andrea's date with Gerardo is the first of these relationships with men. The protagonist contacts Gerardo in an attempt to distract herself from Ena's absence, but not long into their date, would much rather be distracted from his paternalistic advice and condescending tone. An observant reader recognizes Gerardo as the product of paternal authority celebrated by Franco's regime, but Andrea instead hear echoes of a more familiar oppressor: "en aquellos momentos, casi me pareció estar oyendo a tía Angustias" (Laforet 146). His condescending tone is off putting from the start, but the date goes downhill when Andrea's inexperience with men and general sexual naiveté spark a fearful and disgusted reaction to Gerardo's physical advances. Gerardo in turn, responds to the rejection by lecturing Andrea about walking "solita" thru the streets. Their short and unfulfilling relationship highlights both Andrea's anxiety with displays of normalized heterosexual behavior, and in a second likeness to Angustias, her continued interface with the contradictions of patriarchal morality in Gerardo's reaction of moral advice to his attempt to use Andrea to satisfy his own lust (Ordóñez "Initiation" 72).

The climax of Part II surrounds Pon's invitation for Andrea to attend a high-society party at his home, and although her relationship with Pons appears to be more

promising from the outset[4], it ends in similar disappointment. In the romantic pattern of vertical oscillation between adventures in upper and lower worlds, Andrea's ascent into "un mundo alegre inconsciente…que giraba sobre el sólido pedestal del dinero," is immediately preceded by Andrea's descent into *el barrio chino*[5], where her uncle Juan goes to reclaim his wife from her sister's tavern (Laforet 138). Andrea's grandmother begs the protagonist to mediate the anticipated conflict, but Andrea can only shadow her uncle's route thru the streets. She is unable to act and "una extraña inactividad" prevents her from doing anything to ameliorate the escalating situation (122). A telling reflection of the dire reality facing many women after the Civil War[6], we learn in *el barrio chino* that far from abandoning her ill baby or insinuated prostituion, Gloria has been secretly supporting the family by gambling in the back rooms of her sister's tavern. In this scene Andrea is unable to act, but in her night-time exposure to the streets

[4] Pons first introduces Andrea to the bohemian world of his artist friends, who turn out to be nothing more than privileged sons of industrialists parading as artist-*rebeldes* in their *barrio chino* flat. But considering the confusion of heterosexual behavior that Andrea exhibits during her date with Gerardo, it is important to note that Andrea fills comfortable in the bohemian atmosphere: "Yo estaba muy divertida y contenta…Me encontraba muy bien allí; la inconsciencia absoluta, la descuidada felicidad que aquel ambiente me acariciaban el espíritu" (107-108). We have seen Andrea's interest in artistic endeavors before (specifically Roman's music and paintings, Margarita's singing, etc.) and her comfort in the studio of "los bohemios" can definitely be attributed in part to a fascination with the creative process - albeit the young men in the studio produce only imitations of masterpieces – but, it would be an oversight not to connect Andrea's relaxed attitude when visiting the studio with the fact that Guixols, Pojul, and Iturdiaga treat her as friend, if not a little sister, and make no demands on her as a sexual being (Jordan 23).

[5]"Un infierno" of sin that Angustias has specifically forbidden Andrea to visit, *el barrio chino* in Barcelona at this time housed "low society" and indulgent behaviors: prostitutes, drugs, bars, gambling, etc. This was also a space of marginalized political culture such as those who lost the civil war and the artistic endeavors of *los behemios*. In connection to marginalized political culture, *el barrio chino,* and the tavern of Gloria's sister in particular, is the only place in the novel where Catalan is spoken (regional language banned from being spoken by regime efforts to form a homogenous language community).

[6] Facing economic desperation at a time when the new regime declared to have 'liberated' women from the workplace, numerous Spanish women later admitted to working without the knowledge of their husbands. The necessary secrecy of this work often limited opportunities to attending domestic chores in other homes or to 'work of the night' such as prostitution.

of *el barrio chino,* she learns of Gloria's role as the economic mainstay of the family, and thus the increasing desperation of the household on *calle* Aribau (123-4).

Andrea's inability to act endures at Pons' party. Although initially hesitant about the feeling Pons' affection produce in her – an anxiety about the obligation of a relationship with Pons should she accept the invitation - Andrea, having recently been reminded of her family's increasing state of crisis, is unable to resist the opportunity to free herself from her oppressive surroundings (131). She envisions Pons' invitation as an escape and in a dream entertains the Cinderella transformation fantasy with all its implications of female self worth stemming from her position as object of the desiring male gaze (136). The fairy tale script, of course does not play out in Andrea's reality and her first high-society party ends in disaster. In a distorted version of the fairy tale, her economic inferiority is exposed when Pon's mother sees Andrea's inappropriate shoes - these shoes have not been changed into glass slippers, her economic inferiority has not been masked (139). In this moment, Andrea is called out by the same figure of high bourgeoise economy that her fantasy of social upward mobility would have elevated her to; wealthy wife in a patriarchal marriage. Once her economic inferiority is "outted," Andrea becomes paralyzed by frustration and despair. In response, she withdrawals within the scene, making no attempt to interact with guests and becoming increasingly aggressive when Pons tries to engage her in conversation (139-45).

In contrast to her decent into *el barrio chino* where Andrea is immobilized by an "extraña inactividad," being outted as economically inferior produces Andrea's inertia at Pons' party. Andrea in turn abandons the party, and with it, the fantasy of upward social mobility (120). This is the significant conclusion to her short lived experience

with heterosexual relationships as a means of escape from *calle* Aribau. Her relationship with Gerardo ends over her simultaneous rejection of his sexual advances and paternal advice; her unwillingness to accept the contradictory terms of patriarchal morality that might otherwise sustain the relationship. On the other hand, Pons seems genuinely fond of Andrea and makes no observable demands on the protagonist as a sexual being. He is also oblivious to the class markers that differentiate Andrea from other girls to whom he prefers her company. Instead, Pons' mother, in her familial role as guardian of propriety and whose gaze confirms *her* consciousness of class distinction, that ends the relationship. Thus ensuring that if restrictions of patriarchal morality will not hinder Andrea's desire for female autonomy, restrictions of class divisions from which they are inseparable, will.

In Part II of Nada, Andrea develops relationships with characters outside the private sphere of *calle* Aribau only to learn through her exploration of public spaces that obstacles of gender and class impeding the freedom she seeks follow her wherever she goes. Barriers to her freedom now surface at the university where she originally sought refuge and solidarity among her peers. In and attempt to keep the world of *calle* Aribau and her university refuge separate, Andrea attempts to perform the affluence of her friends, but Ena, whose fascination with marginalized misfits leads her to befriend Andrea and breech this separation of worlds, calls out Andrea's performance and anxious desire: "Te crees que no sé lo que es ese mundo tuyo…yo sé que te quedas sin comer y que no te compras la ropa que necesitas por el placer de tener con tus amigos delicadezas de millonaria durante tres días…nunca has sabido lo que quieres y que siempre estás queriendo algo" (113). So while the protagonist forms friendships on

campus, she is also made to feel economically inferior in that space, thus tainting her sense of freedom there with sentiments of class antagonism.

As Ena points out, Andrea can only perform the charade of affluence in short bursts - or not at all in the case of Pon's party - and as observed in her increasingly emaciated body and perpetual hunger pains, Andrea's emotional and physical malnourishment heighten in the second part of the novel. She and her family are starving, and in terms of emotional sustenance, Andrea has distanced herself from her family and is now unable to sustain human contact with the friends at the university. Her attempts at relationships with Gerardo and Pons are a bust due to her ill-preparation or unwillingness to behave in line with patriarchal bourgeoise morality and its script of femininity. More notably the fulfillment she does get from her friendship with Ena subsides with the latter's undisclosed relationship with Roman. This combined lack of nourishment and inaction direct Andrea on a despairing decent into *nada*, a nothingness representing the lack of political space in which to constitute herself as a subject. Notably, her decent into *nada* coincides with the period of Andrea's education in which she lacks a clear female model to emulate. Angustias filled that role in Part I, but her attempt to shape Andrea's moral consciousness was interrupted by Andrea's (passive) resistance and her own departure for the convent. Now in Part II, the absence of a female model to emulate or reproduce in herself is itself the *condition* allowing Andrea to independently explore the public spaces of Barcelona and a *symptom* of the heterodox nature of unmediated female education that leaves Andrea's no space in which to constitute herself as a subject.

What may reconcile Andrea's decent into *nada* is the knowledge she produces concerning her social condition in the process. She concludes that her role in life is predetermined and that barriers to change are multiple and complex. Andrea also comes to this conclusion via an exploration of Barcelona that is, though independent and self-navigated, largely from the standpoint of an observer. At key moments during this phase she is unable to act and in terms of her search for a secure female identity, the frustration and failure she experiences leads the protagonist to a vital moment of self-knowledge in which she articulates a feeling of entrapment in her role as spectator (Collins 303):

> Me parecía que de nada vale correr si siempre ha de irse por el mismo camino, cerrado, de nuestra personalidad. Unos seres nacen para vivir, otros para trabajar, otros para mirar la vida. Yo tenía un pequeño y ruin papel de espectadora. Imposible salirme de él. Imposible liberarme. (Laforet 144)

In contrast to Part I in which Andrea considered the household *calle* Aribau and Angustias as the terms of her oppression, Andrea now identifies her passive behavior as a more urgent obstacle to the freedom she seeks.

This moment of self-knowledge is key in terms of Andrea's education for just as the protagonist laments the limitations of her spectator role, she runs into Ena's mother, Margarita. The third and final part of the novel opens with a conversation in the university plaza between the two women in which Andrea learns of an alternative to the limiting role of spectator. During their conversation Margarita confesses to a past love affair with Román and her experiences as a mother. Margarita recounts an intimate moment in which the act of breastfeeding subjugates the new mother to her child, enabling her let go of youthful self-interest to embrace sacrificial love, acceptance of

suffering, humility and self-denial (197). Elizabeth Ordóñez interprets this memory as a manifestation of operative National-Catholic ideologie describing Margarita's initiation into the most respected role for women within the dominate discursive contract of Nada's historical moment ("Double" 41). And in deed, it appears that Margarita embodies the ideal image of destined motherhood celebrated by the church and promulgated by the *Seccion Femenina*. But an over-determined reading of this conversation, such as appears in Ordónez's "Initiation into Bourgeoise Patriarchy," limits Margarita's message to a defense of motherhood and inevitable re-imposition of the operative female model that "serves to round out the protagonist's developmental trajectory and expose her to the preferred and seemingly definitive myth of womanhood" (74). On the contrary, what makes this conversation most interesting in regard to the definitive myth of womanhood is the deviation from that myth, for while Margarita's praise of motherhood and the subjugated position of women adhere to state sanctioned female behavior, her motivation behind the conversation does not.

Thru the course of their conversation, Margarita highlights the extraordinary love she feels for Ena and her sense of responsibility as a mother. She also shares the history of her relationship with Román whose seductive manipulation years earlier left Margarita humiliated, physically dismembered[7] and quickly married off as a remedy to the affair. Margarita is aware of Ena's present meetings with Román and has come to Andrea for help. She fears that Ena will fall prey to his manipulative power and asks Andrea to intervene, telling Andrea that she must act to save her friend from Roman's

[7] At Román's request and as a sign of devotion to him, Margarita cuts off her long blond braid - her sole mark of beauty and most defining feature.

control. This is the moment where Margarita becomes an ambiguously subversive reproducer/pedegogue: Her obedience to motherhood and dedication to family make her the embodiment of ideal Catholic womanhood under Francoist discourse, and thus a female model the regime wanted to see reproduced, but she simultaneously delivers a heterodox message of female action. Margarita fears that the violence she endured will now be revisited on her daughter, and the mode of resistance she presents is female alliance against predatory male sexuality.

What makes Margarita's message ambiguous are the contradictory implications for the female body; her defense of motherhood as the essence of womanhood echoes the regime's diminution of women to the reproductive capacity of their bodies, but her simultaneous concern for sexual violence on the female body, and more specifically, her demand for female action in the interest *of* female bodies contradicts the passive acceptance of suffering celebrated in the ideal woman under National-Catholicism. In other words, Margarita is celebrating motherhood (i.e. the reproduction of bodies), but the education she imparts, as a mother and symbolic pedagogue within the marginal space of the university, is an alternative political consciousness undermining the hegemony of state sanctioned ideology. Laforet makes this paradox possible by co-opting the very figure used by the regime as a tool for indoctrination, and by doing so wraps an alternative mode of femininity in the apparent legitimacy of its messanger. As the figure of Margarita functions in the novel, embedding a heterodox message within a mechanism of state control facilitates a quite rupture in the hegemony of National-Catholic discourse without an overtly anti-hegemonic challenge to the state, a critical tactic for the violently repressive time in which the novel was published.

By observing the change in Andrea's behavior following their conversation in the university plaza, we can conclude that Margarita's ambiguously subversive message proves crucial in terms of Andrea's education and process of subject formation. The protagonist easily relates to terminology of creation associated with women and finds herself in agreement with what Ena's mother has to say: "Cuando la madre de Ena terminó de hablar, mis pensamientos armonizaban enteramente con los suyos" (155). But after concluding their conversation, there is no evidence that Andrea ever conforms to the ostensibly endorsed script of motherhood or for that matter, heterosexual relationships that usually precede it. Instead, we observe that Andrea exercises a new responsibility to others after Margarita solicits her aid, and notably that responsibility is to female figures Ena and Gloria who break with scripted female behavior. The message she clearly takes from Margarita is a subversive one stressing the importance of female alliance in that her actions exhibit intentions specifically antagonistic to the script of passive female behavior and thus the automatic functioning of National-Catholic ideology and the bourgeoise power structures it perpetuates. Significantly, it is Margarita's message from their conversation in the university plaza that Andrea puts to use within the private sphere of *calle* Ariabu.

Andrea first acts on this message during Ena's next visit with Roman. After eavesdropping on their conversation and believing her uncle is threatening her friend, Andrea is finally able to act in accordance with her feelings; imagining that Román has a gun, she hurls herself at him and yells for Ena to run (166). In this moment Andrea is transformed from a spectator into an actor while also reversing the roles in her friendship with Ena; for the first time the protagonist assumes the assertive role while

Ena momentarily gathers courage from her (Collins 304). The friends flee to the university garden where their subsequent conversation reveals clear communication and solidarity. From the beginning Ena has differed from scripted feminine behavior in terms of her aggressive, independent personality and her preference for those who think along the margins of operative discourse; “Me gustan las gentes que ven la vida con ojos distintos que los demás, que consideran las cosas de otro modo que la mayoría (Laforet 112). Through their dialogue in the university garden, we learn her fascination with “calamidades indeseables” that originally sparked her interest in Andrea has lead Ena to a new appreciation of her friend: “La verdad, Andrea, es que en el fondo he apreciado siempre tu estimación como algo extraordinario, pero nunca he querido darme cuenta. La amistad verdadera [me] parecía un mito hasta que te conocí” (170).

Yet apart from Ena’s original desire to explore Andrea’s world, it seems Ena’s interest in *calle* Aribau had other motives through which Laforet “takes revenge on male oppression, violence and a predatory sexuality” (Jordan 53). Ena we learn, instigated the relationship with Román as a means to revenge the pain he caused her mother, and the young seductress proves the only woman in the novel able to match, if not top Roman’s manipulative behavior; “a nadie he logrado desesperar así, humillar asi…” (Laforet 171). What she had not calculated was an exit strategy, and this is where her devoted friend met her greatest need; “Andrea ¡Si viniste del cielo! ¿no te diste cuenta de que me salvabas? (170). Ena goes on to describe the internal struggle of duel forces that drove her dangerous yet cathartic game of seduction with Román and how Andrea has helped her realize the nature of her true self: a nice girl in love with Jaime. Through their dialogue, Andrea “[empieza] a mirar a [su] amiga…por primera vez tal

como realmente era" (174). The young women return to a friendship based on mutual respect and admiration, and the resulting "confortadora sensación de compañía" is just what Andrea's desperate soul had been searching for at the university (169).

Gloria is the second female figure for whom Andrea exercises a new responsibility and does so in such a way that employs both aspects of Margarita's subversive message. As with her friend Ena, Andrea protects[8] and aligns herself with a woman who exhibits an alternative mode of femininity. In a spin on Margarita's message of creation as the essence of womanhood and her call for female alliance, what Andrea creates in this case is her voice as a writer that in the narrative treatment of her year in Barcelona, she employs to illustrate Gloria's longing for another text and the need for an alternative discourse to articulate female experience.

Andrea is intrigued by her aunt Gloria from the beginning for they share several traits influencing their social positioning. Most notably, Andrea and Gloria are both orphans. That is, they lack a mother who otherwise would have taught them 'proper' feminine behavior, an attribute often highlighted by other members of the Ariabu household to explain their actions. For example, when Gloria describes her habit of eavesdropping on conversations between Juan and Roman, *abuela* responds: "Nina, no se debe esuchar por las cerraduras de las puertas. Mi madre no me lo hubiera permitido, pero tú eres huérfana…es por eso…" (35). In addition to their orphan status, both

[8]Following Róman's suicide, Gloria falls ill and the household ignores her except for Antonia, the maid who having been overtly in love with Róman and now blames Gloria for his death. Andrea, on the other hand, cares for Gloria while she is ill, and as protection from Antonia's hateful gaze, she decides "quedar[le] junto a ella el mayor tiempo posibe" (183).

women desire to escape the oppressive atmosphere of *calle* Aribau[9] and are considered economically inferior by the rest of the household. To Angustias, Andrea is a poor girl living off the charity of her family while Gloria is the "mujer nada conveniente," or woman of proletariat stock, for whom Juan settled in marriage (27). When Gloria comes to Barcelona during the war, Angustias and don Jeronimo openly express their fear of class contamination by often claiming that Gloria and Juan's marriage is illegitimate[10], thus insinuating that Gloria is also a loose woman (36). This view in turn, is reinforced by Gloria's delight in her own body, open boasting of her physical beauty and frequent trips to her sisters tavern; all sensual behaviors unbecoming of well-brought-up women of class.

Against these accusations, Gloria's continuous insistence that she is 'good' and that she must "contar [su] historia" illustrate both her desire to correct the distorted image others have of her and her intense anxiety with male authored texts (33). Gloria's anxiety of others determining her movements surfaces early, taking root sometime before narrative action in a secret conversation she overhears between brothers Juan and Román during the war: "Juan y Román se encerraban para hablar. Creía que hablaban de mí. Estaba segura de que hablaban de mí" (48). While it is plausible that the *gloria* they discussed was in reference to the war itself, Juan's new wife is convinced that it is her future they are discussing, and the fact that she is shut out from the private conversation only heightens her sense that "words of male discourse [have] entrapped her" (Ordónez "Double" 47).

---

[9] This desire manifests physically in Andrea's vagabond behavior about the city and Gloria's frequent trips to her sister's tavern.

[10] Most likely a reference to the civil marriage ceremonies conducted during the Second Republic.

Gloria treats Andrea as a confidant, often seeking out her company after she is beaten by Juan. Tellingly, Andrea's empathy for Gloria's longing for an alternative discourse emerges the day she observes Gloria posing nude for one of Juan's paintings:

> Juan pintaba trabajosamente y sin talento, intentando reproducir pincelada a pincelada aquel fino y elástico cuerpo. A mí me parecía una tarea inútil. En el lienzo iba apareciendo un acartonado muñeco…Gloria, enfrente de nosotros, sin su desastre vestido aparecía increíblemente bella y blanca entre la fealdad de toda las cosas, como un milagro del Señor. (24)

Here Andrea witness the reduction of Gloria's body, described as beautiful and pure by her words, to a crude form on Juan's canvas. He fails to represent the female subject before him in her complexity, and for the emerging writer, "Juan's esthetic blindness is not without significance: the metonymy of one unseeing male eye and one unyielding brush suggest the need for difference if the 'body' of woman's creation is to avoid confinement to the Other's rules of representation" (Ordónez "Double" 49).

Many scenes following the episode described above depict Gloria in a different light than that painted by Angustias, Román and Juan. Through the medium of Andrea's narration, these scenes uncover the truth and motivations behind Gloria's actions. For instance, the episode in *el barrio chino* reveals her role as the economic mainstay of the family, a role that by carrying out secretly "para que el señorón se crea que es un pinto famoso," makes Gloria the dutiful servant of the patriarchal family (Laforet 124, Jordan 42). And in contrast to insinuated prostitution, we learn that Gloria is engaged in unusual but honest labor: "Es la única manera de tener un poco de dinero honradamente" (Laforet 159). In another scene Andrea overhears a conversation on the balcony in which Róman tries to seduce Gloria. Displacing the view that Gloria is unfaithful, she flatly rejects his advances and threatens to betray his smuggling

activities to the police (134). Thus, in her narrative treatment of Gloria's actions, Andrea represents Gloria as a character of considerable strength and resolve (Jordan 43).

In each of these scenes Andrea can only observe, however after Andrea's conversation with Margarita, she begins inquiring after Gloria's woes and asking her aunt to explain herself. Gloria is the first to recongize this change in Andrea; "Tú antes no le preguntabas nada a nadie, Andrea…Ahora te has vuelto más buena" (Laforet 179). Whereas in the past, Andrea had simply entertained Gloria as a listener, this is the first time that Andrea engages her young aunt as an active interlocutor. It is no coincidence that this change coincides with Margarita's message of female creation and alliance, for where before Andrea had been a passive listener to Gloria's longing for an alternative text, Andrea now likens Gloria to a muse – the inspiration for a creative project (160). Through Andrea's role as narrator we see that Gloria's image as an unfaithful, whorish, sensual woman reflects more the views of a class system that regards her as inferior and a reactionary patriarchal morality threatened by the alternate mode of femininity she exudes (Jordan 43-4). Hence, the emerging writer's ultimate responsibility to Gloria in terms of female alliance against male violence on the female body is making Gloria's story visible by means of a female authorial voice that opens up the discursive space in which a female character exhibiting an alternative mode of femininity and who desires to author her own text emerges totally redeemed. Pointing outside the text, the narrative treatment of Gloria's anxiety with male authored texts and desire to write her own story makes a broader comment on the limitations of exsiting social discourse to articulate the

reality and experiences of those shut out from political space and the self-authorial process.

In this regard, it is pertenant to revisit Laforet's representation of the university in 1940's Barcelona. While Laforet does not make any explict references to student mobilization on campus, later accounts of the period like that of historian Walter Bernecker describe the nascent stages dissent amoung university students:

> The first post-Civil War generation, which was constituted mainly by children of the victors, moved to an extent over to the losers' side partly out of religious conviction and partly because they became aware of the social injustice within Spain…[T]his youth became reconciled with the children of the defeated in the univeisty and where shocked by the working and living conditions in the labour camps, the outlying city areas, and in the shanty towns…This led them to commit themselves politically to the working class and to acquire a subversive conscience…and to collaborate with the labour movement. (76)

What Bernecker describes manifests in Laforet's description of Andrea's relationship with women during the protagonist's year at the university. For example, the friendship between Ena and Andrea forms across class lines and the winner/defeated divisions of the Civil War. Once they meet, the marginal spaces of the univeirsty serve as the sole site of conversations in which the young women talk-out problems arising in their friendship, such as Andrea's discomfort when Ena discovers the derelict state of the household on *calle* Aribau. The university is also where Ena declares her upmost respect for Andrea following Andrea's interruption of the conversation between Román and her friend, a conversation marking the sensation of comrodery Andrea hoped to find at the university. So, in some ways this relationship subtlely reflects the kind of student disobedience emerging at Spanish universities during the 1940's.

Yet, the more interesting occasion is Andrea's repetition of this dynamic within the private sphere where her relationship with Gloria exhibits a clearer political commitment to the working class woman. As described, after the conversations between Margarita and the protagonist where Andrea learns a new discourse of female alliance andn where she describes a sense of comradery with her university peer Ena, Andrea begins engaging Gloria as an interloctur. Later, when Andrea writes visible Gloria's reality as the secret economic mainstay of the family and the most frequent recipient of violence within the Aribau household, she more explicitly reveals that "the crisis-ridden bourgeoisie of Aribau, in a clearly parasitic fashion, [is] surviving largely on the labours of the lower orders" (Jordan 42). If Laforet was delicately referencing the earliest stirrings of student protests of the post Civil War Barcelona then Andrea's interface with the university and the resultant subversive education postioning her as a producer of knowledge and capable of action[11], is what facilitates her orientaion of this critical view towards the injustices she observes of the female social postion in the private sphere. In a sense, Andrea is taking this early form of student protests from the university home with her to expose the exploitative power relations of the dominant patriarchal, bourgeois political-economy.

Nada comes full circle shortly after the conversation between Andrea and Margarita, ending as it began with a journey and the promise of liberation. Andrea is leaving Barcelona to live with Ena's family while continuing her university studies in

[11] By producer of knowledge, I refer to the explorations of public space and university relationships that enable the protagonist to recognize her social condition and the limitations of her role as spectator. By 'capable of action' I refer to the outcome of Margarita's message of female solidarity in which we see Andrea act to aid her friend Ena.

Madrid, a move that she feels "[le] había abierto, y esta vez de una manera real, los horizontes de la salvación" (191). The move excites Andrea "como una liberación," but she is adamant about leaving behind "las ilusiones" with which she arrived in Barcelona (192). The question then, as Andrea departs, necessarily becomes what she will be taking with her. Has she developed into an active, independent subject, or has she been trumped by *nada*?

The answers to these questions are left somewhat ambiguous. Barry Jordan argues that Andrea remains a largely passive protagonist throughout the novel whose 'liberation' from *calle* Aribau comes by no independent efforts of her own (63). But while it is true that Andrea acts on Margarita's request to intervene in Róman and Ena's relationship, she does independently initiate a new responsibility to Gloria as an interlocutor. Thus, some change in terms of her ability to act independently is evident. Also, while Ena ultimately delivers Andrea from the absolute poverty of *calle* Aribau by inviting her friend to live in Madrid, we are told during their conversation in the university garden that Ena had aspirations of leaving everything having to do with Róman and *calle* Aribau behind up until the moment Andrea bursts into the room to save her. So in a sense, Andrea's new ability to act at all helps secure her future in Madrid.

Andrea is the consistent focus of the novel, and because narrative action has less to do with the incidents the she encounters and more to do with their effect on the developing subjectivity of the protagonist, it is necessary to consider these questions in relation to the process of her education (Firmat 28). Once Angustias abandons the task of reproducing her conservative moral code in Andrea, it is the unmediated nature of

Andrea's self-guided exploration of public spaces and relationships with university peers that shape her knowledge of the patriarchal-bourgeois power structures governing her experience. This period coincides with both Andrea's decent into *nada,* due to the lack the political space in which to constitute herself as a subject and what Andrea recognizes as the consequences of a class morality assigning her to the role of spectator. So while Andrea's exploration of the public sphere is an independent endeavor, the knowledge her time as a student produces is of the existing limitations to the independence she desires. Yet, the letter from Ena offering work in her father's office is one intending to provide the means for Andrea "vivir independiente," hence the horizon holds hope for the female autonomy Andrea craves (191). Most importantly, we also observe a change in Andrea's ability to act following the conversation in which Margarita steps into the role of subversive female pedagogue to give Andrea an alternate discourse through which to constitute herself as a subject. The alternative discourse she presents offers female comradery as a positive alternative to the sanctioned script of marriage or the convent, which again, at least provides the opportunity of independence from the dominant social contract for women as the protagonist leaves for Madrid. So, while Andrea is not trumped by *nada* when narrative action ends and has exhibited an increased capacity for action, if she achieves self-mastery, it happens sometime outside narrated experience in the time between Andrea's departure for Madrid and her narrative return to Barcelona.

Through the course of Andrea's year in Barcelona, the identity she forms is the product of a constant process of exploration and experimentation. Her time as a student and the initial absence of a mother/pedagogue facilitating that process of unmediated

exploration was the precursor to using her friendships at the university as an avenue to investigate the power dynamics governing women's social position. Historically, we know that the university under Franco's regime served as an institution in which to forge a unified National-Catholic community. However, the university, as presented in Nada, becomes the framework by which the protagonist explores parallel relationships with women Ena and Gloria who exhibits alternate modes of femininity in the public and private spheres. Andrea, in her search for female identity, is the overlap between these spheres and it is her education on the periphery of the university under a subversive pedagogue delivering an alternative discourse that leads to the subtle rupture in the hegemony of National-Catholic ideology by presenting the possibility of alternative modes of female political consciousness, action and writing. In the process, the university functions as both a stage for class conflict and as the conversations in periphery spaces between Ena and Andrea depict, a space where female comrodery can potentially be forged across class lines through dialogue in the institutional space. As the protagonist reorients this dynamic towards the private sphere, the political conciousness of female comradery she forms at university provides the means by which the emerging author exposes the exploitation of the Gloria's labor within *calle* Aribau and the need for new social discourse correcting that maginalization from the processes of self-authoriship. This political conciousness of female comradery is Andrea's newest experiment in female subjectivity with which she leaves for Madrid, one through which Andrea may eventually become creator and protagonist of an alternative social text (Ordóñez "Double" 51).

JULIA

By the 1950's the growth model adopted by the regime at the end of the Civil War had been exhausted, and the failure of excessive autarkic policies were bringing Spain to the verge of economic collapse (Aceña and Ruiz 34). Ever adaptable for the purpose of functionality, and with limited options to ease the disequilibria of the domestic market, Francoist authorities shifted economic policies from "an inward looking to an outward looking strategy" (35). By necessity, Spain modified its foreign policy as well, and given the concurrent polarization of the world's major political powers in the Cold War, the regime shifted from total isolation to an anti-communist alliance with Western powers (A. Jones 76). As Sartorius and Alfaya describe, during this process of Spain's reintegration into the international context the regime dropped all fascist rhetoric in an attempt to construct a new image, "la de un gobernante autoritario pero no totalitario, que se permitía hablar sin sonrojo del 'mundo libre'" (33). Spain, Franco declared, was an organic democracy, and while this change in rhetoric was perceptibly superficial in terms of civil freedoms, his cooperation in the defense of 'the West' in the fight against communism helped normalize diplomatic ties and facilitate Spain's incorporation into a range of international organizations such as the United Nations (1955), the International Mometray Fund, and the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (both 1958) (Buchanan 86).

These shifts in foreign policy definitively ended Spain's political isolation, but more importantly for its struggling economy, put Spain within reach of "international markets at a time of great stability and strong growth in terms of world economy" (Aceña and Ruiz 45). The concurrent strengthening of relations with Western powers

and access to their financial markets facilitated important changes for Spain. The regimes support in the anti-communist front warranted considerable fiscal support under President Truman's Marshall Plan, the importance of which is often overlooked in historical treatments of Spain's modernization of the 1960's. The agreement signed between the US and Spain in 1953 not only gave the regime the seal of approval from the leading political and economic power in the world, but provided the crucial infusion of capital needed to jumpstart Spain's liberal capitalist development (Share 49). The resulting exchange of U.S. military bases in Spain for an influx of foreign capital, in conjunction with the market liberalization programme under the Stabilization Plan of 1953, and consecutive Development Plans put forward by Opus Dei technocrats and new financial ministers initiated a boom of economic growth that would secure Spain a place on the global stage as a rising industrial power (Palomares 118). *El milagro económico* as the phenomenon has been coined, reoriented Spanish society towards a modernizing consumerist culture, and due to the unintended consequences it produced is often considered to have helped produce the social origins of the Transition.

Cultural exchange resulting from emigration, tourism and the growing service industry increased Spaniards' exposure to new ideas, the demand for foreign and contraband media, and eventually the decrease of censorship. In addition to outside influences, increased industrialization sparked new waves of rural emigration to cities. During this time, a quickly urbanizing Spanish society experienced expanding horizontal structures such as grass-roots neighborhood associations and worker's commissions that allotted for the reemergence of civil society at the local level (Radcliff "Associations" 143). Dissenting voices gained visibility in public institutions as

students mobilized in interest of reorganizing the university, an absolutely intolerable act during the early years of the regime but one whose frequency would only increase. Spain continued to evolve throughout the fifties and sixties in ways the regime had not anticipated, but often in ways that did not directly interfere with the vertical organization of the state. The regime also lacked existing channels to meet the demands of emerging social organizations, and because Western eyes and visiting tourists meant that openly violent repression could no longer be as extensive or indiscriminant as in years prior, a kind of *social* pluralism developed on the ground (Radcliff 13 Mar). Nevertheless, while Spanish society experienced a relative *apertura* resulting from liberalizing economic systems and the social transformation that ensued, "the economic boom was not accompanied by a parallel programme of political reforms" that might have otherwise conflicted with processes of authoritarian-conservative modernization (Townson 120, Brenecker 78). Indeed, the regime never abandoned its totalitarian roots and National-Catholicism endured as the official state doctrine until the end of the dictatorship. This safeguarded existing forms of power as change took place, but as one can imagine produced an environment riddled with contradiction (Richards 14).

Author Ana Maria Moix, herself a product of the sixties, is considered a member of the *novísimos*, "the group of Spanish intellectuals weaned on the mass media…the 'coca-colazation' of Spain…and the activism of the sixties (Levine "Censored" 293-4). Her female protagonist Julia, from Moix's first novel by the same name, vastly reflects this changing socio-political reality. A recurrent memory from Julia's childhood is particularly symbolic of the conflict between the existing conservative political forces and the social change produced by *el milagro económico*: "Julia, sentada en el portal de

una casa…la mirada baja, fija en los dos pierdas que machacaba una contra otra" (Moix 219-20). Spain too was at a threshold, navigating tensions between modernizing and traditionalist forces that would determine its future course. More specifically, throughout the 1960's women were at the epicenter of tensions between the competing demands of their official role in the home ascribed by National-Catholic ideology and the regime's growing need for an enlarged source of labor that encouraged women's incorporation into the workforce (A Jones. 77). Again, we return to the image of Julia on the threshold, teetering between male public space and female private space as the regime's own contradictory needs of her labor-power collide in her hands.

Julia, the novel, reflects a Spain navigating the problematic process of modernization under a regime whose ideology centered on turning back the clock. Julia, the protagonist, reflects a young woman in crisis navigating an alienated existence within this changing environment. Unlike Nada, the protagonist of Julia does not tell her own story. Instead, Julia's experiences are communicated via an internal monologue narrated exclusively in the third person. Scholar Geraldine Nichols finds this third-person narration problematic: "El lector atento se pregunta el porqué del empleo de un narrador que no sabe más que la protagonista. ¿Porqué no narra Julia su propia historia?" (115-16). Rather than a structural shortcoming, it is imperative we understand the third person monologue used to narrate Julia's experience is a purposeful one, a testament to Julia's inability to tell her own story. Julia is above all a novel about silence, something Moix comes to show as the defining lot of women in Francoist Spain (Bush 137). And if Nada serves to highlight female anxiety for male authored texts, Julia intends to show how women are silenced within those texts and the dangers of

remaining so (Pérez-Sánchez 91). This chapter aims to uncover the terms of Julia's silence and its relation to her experience with the scholar identity under subversive pedagogues and the university space.

Over the course of one sleepless night, Julia recounts the personal history of a protagonist in psychological crisis unable to communicate profound alienation from self, body and society (Levine "Moix" 341). Set in 1960's Barcelona, Julia lies alone in bed, terrified by continuous nightmares evoking traumatic events of her childhood that feed her present anxieties. Throughout this bout of insomnia, the novel oscillates between Julia in the present at age twenty and Julita around age six as the temporal loci structuring narrated experience. These temporal loci are central to the novel for they also frame the Self/Other relationship as a split in the protagonist's subjectivity; a split in consciousness between Julia in her present state of crisis, and Julita as a frozen memory of herself around age six. Julia, we learn, has repressed the memory of Julita, "l[a] había borrado, escondido fuera si misma," and when those abandoned memories 'speak' to her from the dark corners of her psyche, she attributes them to an entirely different person (Moix 54). Julita is thus rendered the Other, the alienated self buried within an alienated body. Consequently Julia finds herself puzzled by her body, "como si ella no estuviera en ninguna parte" and frightened by the world around her (54). More importantly for the protagonist, during these episodes of insomnia Julia battles an "extraña sensación de vacío, de inexistencia" that during the day plagues her search for a cohesive self with silence and sense of inertia (55, 215).

Curiously, within the same moments that Julia declares a feeling of non-existence, she also recognizes memory as the "singular vehículo que…se encontraría a

sí misma por la primera vez" (55). Julita, the protagonist concludes, is the necessary means and object of her search for a cohesive self that she can uncover "sólo con…intentar tomar consciencia de su cuerpo" (55). We learn only at the end of the novel that the conclusions Julia reaches in the first pages are closest in time to the night of their recollection. The novel, in effect, begins with its own ending. Several critical essays treating Moix's first novel, such as Sandra Kingerly's "Memories of Love" and Geraldine Nichols's "Julia: This is the Way the World Ends," recognize alienation as a defining trait of the protagonist and the prevelance of past memories plaging her present. Yet their analysis does not answer the question of how Julia arrives to this current point of crisis or, more importantly, the realization that memory is central to her search for cohesive self. A close reading of the novel reveals that Julia's present state of crisis, and the silence that both characterizes and produces her split subjectivity, are directly related to her attempt to navigate an aversion to heterosexist control and a desire for women within a Spanish society whose dominant ideology of National-Catholicism could only conceive of women's social position and female desire in relation to men. These experiences furthermore are complicated in the novel by Julia's relationships with two key pedagogues that at times both nurture Julia's subversive consciousness and reinforce her silence, but who ultimately help her reach a conscious understanding that the key to her present torment lies in the past.

Julia's aversion to men is a central quality marking her anxiety with control and first materializes in an "entraño sentimiento" towards her father after she is raped by a family friend. The same morning, Julita witnesses her father's violent reaction to his wife's eluded infidelity, a moment in her life that only serves to intensify the strange

feeling to “un odio violento hacía Papá” as Julia imagines various ways of killing her father at the prospect of her parent’s looming separation requiring Julita to live with alone with him (112). Later, Julia harbors a murderous rage towards her aunt’s suitor as she witnesses his errant behavior transform tía Elena into a melancholy and silent fiancée (123). Her aversion to men becomes more tactile throughout the novel, when for example Julia flees in disgust form the advances of her university friend Carlos (208-9). But perhaps the most blatant display of Julia’s aversion to men are the phallic symbols that plague her sleepless nights, constantly evoking images of her rape and distorting the images upon which she focuses for repose. Conversely, Julia remembers time spent with her beloved grandfather and brother Rafáel as rare periods of tranquility. But an important qualification for this sense of calm is that Julia never observes these characters in relationships where sexual demands are made on women. The fact that Julia’s aversion to men is most pronounced where heterosexual interactions locate woman on the receiving end of displays of patriarchal masculinity tells us that Julia has more an aversion to oppressive sexist intrusion than to men themselves.

Julia’s aversion to heterosexual relations with men, in turn, bears consequences for her sexual development and is closely coupled with a desire for women that for Julia, takes root in a sexualized mother-daughter relationship during childhood. Julita’s self-absorbed mother is often absent from home and when she is present, exhibits an obvious preference for her sons. Her interest in Julia is much more erratic, and in fact as Julita understands it, “así se había sentido ella querida por Mamá: a ráfagas” (17). Mamá’s absence and inconsistency in affection towards her daughter, produces “una especie de locura” in Julita’s love / desire for her mother (37). That love is introduced in

abnormally passionate terms, blurring mother and lover into one: “lo deseaba…la soñaba a todas horas” (13). We read of Julita vomiting on her school clothes just to stay home and linger outside Mamá’s bedroom door, her desperation to share her mother’s bed, and moments of caressing and kissing on the rare occasion she is invited to play there.

While living with her paternal grandfather don Julio, the shear anxiety of being separated from her mother, and her need to calm the nightmares that keep sleep at bay, leads Julia to repeat this fervent behavior in bed with tía Elena: “Cuando pensaba en [ella] se desesperaba y se echaba encima de tía Elena, la abrazaba, le llenaba la frente de besos, las mejillas, el cuello; hundía las manos en sus cabellos negros y los acariciaba. Tía Elena, sin despertarse del todo, la abrazaba y devolvía los besos y la llamaba cariño mío” (98). Tía Elena provides the maternal affection that Julita’s mother denies her and is willing to share her bed with Julita. After returning to Barcelona, Julita often fixates on this memory of Elena as a means to calm her anxiety during episodes of insomnia. As Andrew Bush points out, when Julia’s reminiscences of Julita return to this moment, her narrative, for the first time, makes no clear reference to the present moment of insomnia, so that “even as recollection, it is a shared bed with an older woman that represents the only effective remedy for Julia’s anxious sleeplessness” (Bush 145).

Over time Julita loses her passionate love for Mamá, with that loss demarcated in clear stages. One of the earliest is her mother’s selfish reaction to Julia’s physical distress after being raped by Victór: When Julia, bleeding and half unconscious, is brought back from the beach to her mother’s side, “Mamá [empezó] a darle de bofetadas, descargando de ese modo la impaciencia sufrida” (62). Other stages in which

Julia references loosing her mother include Mamá's preference for the company of her male lover that keeps her away from home, don Julio's open criticism of Mamá's bourgeoisie values, and following Rafael's death, Mamá's hyper-attentive critique of Julia's refusal to participate in culturally dictated feminine behavior (53, 132, 161)**.** More accurately, when Julia references losing Mamá, what she describes is losing her mother to heterosexuality and the ebb of her affection for a woman whose willing participation in the sexual norm of the dominant moral code effectively converts the original object of Julia's desire into Julia's harshest critic.

Julia's passionate love for her mother is first replaced by hate and later indifference, but once displaced from Mamá, Julia's desire for women surfaces in relationships with other female characters, who importantly are not in relationships with men; namely tía Elena, Señorita Mabel and ultimately her literature professor Eva (13). Julia often laments that her desire to be coddled by these women does not coincide with her age, but she never totally comes to terms with her homosexual desire. Julia recognizes that she is 'different', but does not recognize that the terms of her difference is desire *for* women (Levine "Censored" 306). She cannot name her feelings, nor conceive of them as love: "Julia nunca se había preocupado por aquello. El amor era algo que sucedía a los demás, a los personajes de las películas, de las novelas, y a las gentes que vivían a su alrededor" (Pérez-Sánchez 105, Moix 142). In fact, Julia's desire for women is never explicitly named lesbianism, but as Gema Pérez-Sánchez argues and will be later taken up for discussion, is instead treated by means of strategic silence that effectively points outside the novel to the absence of that language within sociopolitical discourse of 1960s Spain.

Within the text, Julia's split in consciousness and the experiences from which it raises shape her complex relationship with silence. Julia's initiation into a world of silence comes hand in hand with a traumatic childhood experience: At age six, she is raped on a deserted beach by a family friend named Victor, and when Julia threatens to tell her mother, her assailant demands "no dirás nada, idiota" (Moix 61). This violent censoring of the female body solidifies several of Julia's defining behaviors, such as the instinctive fetal position she assumes after Víctor flees and in which we find the twenty year old protagonist in the initial pages of the novel (Nichols 121). In addition, Julita's attempt to hold her breath to avoid the sickening smell of her attacker at the moment of violation inaugurates the trope of stifled breathing or asphyxia triggered in later moments of anxiety when Julia seeks to escape something fearful or oppressive (Bush 142-3).

Most importantly, in terms of female voice, this aggressive silencing or act of forcing silence onto the protagonist[12] crystallizes Julia's linguistic inertia throughout the novel as we are repeatedly told that Julia held it in, fell silent, did not respond, could not respond, would not respond.[13] The experience of being silenced not only leaves Julia unable to tell of male sexual violence inflicted on her body but also of her heterodox desire for women. These aspects in turn become the repressed aspect of Julia's narrative that thereafter resurface in the central image of the novel - the reoccurring memory of Julita waiting for Mamá, blocking the doorway, silenced and lonely, and trapped in

[12] In contrast the Andrew Bushes interpretation that Víctor obstructs Julia's access to language, scholar Gema Perez-Sánchez believes he more inflicts silence onto the protagonist; making his relationship with Julia "a metaphor for the larger silencing of women in sexist Spain" (97).

[13] The combination of these behaviors taking root during the violent act of rape loudly echo Helené Cixous's notion that if you "censor the body, you censor breath and speech at the same time" ("Laugh of Medusa" 880).

perpetual childhood: “Julia, sentada en el portal de una casa, pequeña, delegada, los pies descalzados, las trenzas despeinadas, el pantalón corto y el jersey azul marino con una ancla dibujada en el pecho, la mirada baja, fija en dos piedras que machacaba una contra otra” (219-20).

This violent silencing also marks Julia’s expression of rebellion as notably passive in the face of suffocating societal norms:

> Quizá fuera necesario saltar,…arañar y protestar para liberarse del agobio que incluso a veces le impedía respirar; pero ignoraba si algún día tendría agallas para hacerlo. En su interior, sí. Gritaba de indignación y vergüenza, pero su boca no pronunciaba palabra, no sabía qué decir ni cómo actuar, la ira se le iba acumulando, royéndola por dentro a ella, no a los demás. Las manifestaciones exteriores se limitan a no responder a ciertas preguntas de Mamá, ni ir a misa ni pasar el rosario con abuela Lucía, no cuidar de su aspecto personal…Sólo pequeñas muestras de rebeldía; no se atrevía a más…se quedaba muda. (192)

As described in this passage, it is not a subversive consciousness or Julia’s desire to communicate angst that is lacking, but the voice and knowledge of how to do so. The result compounds Julia’s sense of inertia that she in turn combats by choosing silence when interrogated by figures representing the oppressive, dominant social system around her: “La irritaba el control de Mamá. No soportaba las preguntas, que se metieran en sus cosas. Enmudecía para enfurecer a Mamá” (38). Julia’s attempt to balance silence as a forced voicelessness and as a resistive tactic is most notable during her freshman year at the university where “las manifestaciones exteriores” Julia refers to take place. Julia thus comes to the university with a subversive consciousness that she expresses within that space by choosing silence. Her tutelage under two key pedagogues flanking her university experience plays a central role in the development

of this subversive consciousness and her (changing) behavior as a student within that institution.

Don Julio is the first of these pedagogues, and arguably the most important in terms of Julia's socialization and subject formation, for as the surrogate parent replacing Julia's mother, don Julio is the first to educate Julita and give her a language though which to develop a political consciousness. However, the education he provides is a problematic introduction to the scholar identity that ultimately positions Julia as a political battleground within her family and alienates the protagonist from her peers. Julia comes to live with her paternal grandfather at the onset of two familial crises: for a year when her brother Rafael falls ill with a mysterious condition, and again for five years when her parents decide to separate. In contrast to the family that Julia leaves behind in Barcelona, and specifically its matriarch abuela Lucía, don Julio represents the political other of new Spain under the regime. A far cry from the catholic-bourgeois values governing the Barcelonan apartment, don Julio is a anarchic atheist who fought on the Republican side of the civil war. Having fought on the losing side, he has chosen a self-imposed exile in the mountains of Cataluña in order to live out ideals of liberty found unattainable in the dominate society of the war's victors (Nichols 122-3). Don Julio is thus a resolutely independent, but marginalized man whose Republican principles have been rendered residual by the nationalist victory and the shifting focus of the regime towards the Cold War and integration with international economies (Richmond 4).

In addition to his positioning on the margins of society, his behavior earns don Julio the reputation among Julia's family in Barcelona of being "mal educado" (Moix

99). And although we may assume that abuela Lucía, the self-proclaimed arch-enemy of don Julio, refers to his quick temper and lax manners, this label more accurately describes his resistance to the precepts of National-Catholicism. That is to say, don Julio has been poorly educated in, or interpelated thru, state sanctioned ideology of the regime that would otherwise lead him to live out that ideology and render his productive forces to its perpetuation. Don Julio "no…sab[ía] perder" the war, did not conform and his behavior is instead indicative of a subject antagonistic to the regime's conservative moral code of submission to the church-state apparatus (85). In fact, to Julia's atheist, anarchic grandfather "all forms of authority are anathema" (Bush 146).

The exception to this rule is of course the authority don Julio exercises in his own home. In this sense he lives out an incongruous ethic: He rejects the dictatorial regime for encroaching on individual liberty, but in his own home (comprised exclusively of his daughter Elena and female maid Martina) don Julio perpetuates traditional gender roles and acts out the role of authoritarian patriarch that defines the state he abhors. He consequently represents a different kind of patriarchy, but again, one that has been completely marginalized in post-war Spain. His relationship with young Julia further illustrates don Julio's paradoxical patriarchal behavior within the historical moment because he, a father figure within the private sphere no less, teaches Julia to deviate from the dominate culture. Where as abuela Lucía repeatedly denounces educated women as an abomination of ideal femininity[14], don Julio sets out explicitly to

[14]Take for example, the way abuela Lucía responds to Julia's habit of borrowing her brother Ernesto's books: "Aparecer delante de la abuela con cualquiera de esos libros era la única venganza a que Julia podía aspirar. A menudo se los arrancaba de las manos…Una mujer no necesita saber tanto como un hombre, así es desde que el mundo es mundo" (164).

endow Julia with an education: “Haré de mi nieta una persona inteligente aunque sea una mujer” (102). This claim is itself indicative of the seemingly contradictory nature of his character for it assumes that being a woman and an intelligent person are mutually exclusive, while the goal of don Julio’s pedagogical project is to challenge the very dominant political forces purposefully disseminating this idea. To this end, don Julio declares: “una de las cosas que voy a enseñar a mi nieta es demostrarle que puede vivir sin que nadie gobierne sus actos” (94). Accepting freedom as the only unquestionable truth, don Julio’s first lesson to Julia is that “eres libre, nada más. Únicamente somos libres. En nombre de esa libertad uno tiene el derecho, incluso la obligación, de matar si es preciso” (97). But however free Julia may inherently be according to his ideals, don Julio governs the (mis)education of his name-sake closely and sets out to reproduce his own political consciousness in Julia.

Don Julio’s pedagogical method of reproducing knowledge again echoes the state he intends to undermine for he positions his female pupil as the receptacle of an ideology. The success of his efforts are evident when Julia responds angrily to a taunting letter from her brothers:

> No, exclamó Julita dando un puñetazo encima de la mesa. Quiero matar a esos dos estúpidos…Don Julio sonrió. Julita se había expresado como él, con idénticas palabras y gestos. Yo en tu lugar contestaría con una carta…Son estúpidos y charlatanes, exclamó de nuevo Julita. Dame un papel y un lápiz. Estaba tan nerviosa que las palabras escritas aparecían casi ilegibles sobre la cuartilla que don Julio la había entregado lleno de satisfacción. Muy bien, dijo el abuelo al leerlas: sois tan estúpidos y charlatanes como los curas. Muy bien, repitió el abuelo, a tu abuela Lucía le encantará ver que ya sabes escribir. (102)

To her grandfather’s delight, Julia not only mimics his aggressive behavior but parrots his political convictions. Tellingly, when Julita visits her family between stays at don

Julio's mountain home, Mamá (a female voicing the dominant culture) immediately recognizes the influence of her grandfather: "Decía Mamá que don Julio la había malcriado y contagiado su carácter y mala educación: tú eres una imitamonas. Cada vez que Julita se enfadada y daba un golpe sobre la mesa o insultaba a Ernesto, Mamá le daba una bofetada y la llamaba doña Julia" (111).

Yet, Julita's letter to her brothers and Mamá's reaction to her learned behavior encapsulate the problematic education don Julio imparts: Separate of his *method*, what makes don Julio's pedagogical role in Julia's socialization particularly subversive is the *content* of Julia's education under his tutelage. He teaches her to be critical of control, and in contrast to the passive script assigned women in dominant culture, to be independent and self-sufficient like himself. Here we can see that the subversive content of the political conciousness and education don Julio passes on is the distinciton between the patriarchy that don Julio exhibits and that of Franco governing Spain. Franco's regime promoted patriarchal figures as the center of familial authority in the private sphere with the explicit intention to establish that hierarchal model as the basis of political organization in the public sphere. Don Julio on the otherhand, weilds patriarchal authority within the privacy of his home - being the only space where this marginalized man weilds any effective power in contemporary Spain, but his home is also where he simultaneously passes on Republican-anarchic ideals to his granddaughter, the intent of which is for Julia to challenge dominant culture and live out those ideals of freedom in the public, political sphere. So, don Julio's patriarchal behavior appears more of a reaction to marginalization he experiences rather than the gender or political model he he hopes to nuture in Julia.

Additionally, as part of his lessons in Republican-anarchic ideals undermining the regime, don Julio teaches Julia to reject the authority of the Catholic church, which under the concordant of 1953 between the regime and the Vatican held a monopoly over Spanish education (Maravall 156). When don Julio praises Julia for exhibiting her ability to write, what he certainly enjoys more is that Julia's comment about "los curas" will antagonize the stoutly religious abuela Lucía and her conservative values. The problem is that by antagonizing abuela Lucía and the dominate culture in this way - that is, by means of shaping the behavior and politicized language of the young girl under his care - he positions her as a cultural battlefield within a politically divided family and society at large. It is Julia who upon returning to Barcelona bears the brunt of Mamá and abuela Lucía's reactionary responses to her learned behavior because that behavior is inconsistent with the mode of femininity they espouse and the patriarchal-bourgeois morality shaping their values. Likewise, it is Julia who is left to navigate the ostracized existence this conflict produces when she leaves the secluded safety of don Julio's home.

As evident in Mamá's reaction to her daughter's new habits, the gendered behavior of the protagonist becomes a central conflict within the family between don Julio and women voicing the dominant culture. For Julia's mother, proper femininity hinges on seductive narcissism: "Una chica debe ser coqueta y presumida, de lo contrario parece un hombre" (145). For abuela Lucía, representing oppressive catholic morality, "la feminidad se demuestra en otras cosas…por ejemplo en la piedad hacia Dios. Una mujer que no va a misa y no reza, no es una mujer decente, y eso naturalmente, se nota en la apariencia" (161). In contrast, under her subversive male

pedagogue Julia not only learns aggressive behaviors, but through the ideology shaping her subjectivity that he prescribes, to reject the moral authority of the central institution shaping ideal National-Catholic womanhood. Thus, by intending to reproduce himself in Julia and pass down his masculine traits, don Julio in effect mis-educates her into being "an inappropriately masculine little girl" (Pérez-Sánchez 102).

A prominent element to consider in this regard is don Julio's attention to Latin in Julita's formal studies. To don Julio, "El Latín es un buen ejercicio para desarrollar la inteligencia y poder leer a los clásicos" (Moix 104). Julita, at her grandfather's insistence, approaches the language like a game and her exceptional mastery of the language becomes her most defining trait upon returning to Barcelona, prompting admiration from her teacher and brothers who struggle with the subject in school. According to Andrew Bush, don Julio's choice of subject matter is the key to Julita gaining access to language:

> Latin is a synecdochic figure for language in general – and the mastery of Latin for mastery in general. The infancy that was prolonged by the mother's unwillingness to reciprocate Julia's love and the thereafter rendered permanent by the fixating effect of her rape, leaves Julita limited to silence…before coming to don Julio. Latin, therefore, is in some sense the first language that [Julia] truly acquires (146).

Consequentially, the language that don Julio passes down is that of the church and male reason; the oppressor's tool of knowledge and power. Coinciding with don Julio's pedagogical goal of reproducing a subversive consciousness in his granddaughter, don Julio "hands down to Julia one of the ultimate patriarchal privileges," that in her hands becomes a tool for decoding and reading power: "Se enfrentaba con palabras misteriosas cuyo significado buscaba en un diccionario, y luego debía encontrar el

orden preciso de las mismas para larles un sentido" (Pérez-Sánchez 103, Moix 104). Surprisingly, a detail these critics do not address is the fact that Latin is a dead language, and while Julia's command of it is impressive for her age, it therefore carries limited value as a tool to give Julia a voice or to read power in her reality. Instead of bringing Julia out of silence, this male knowledge identifies her with don Julio and further masculinizes her behavior and intelligence.

Lastly, in terms of teaching Julia to deviate from dominant political culture and its gender scripts, many earlier critics of Moix's work fail to recognize don Julio's pedagogical role in solidifying Julia's aversion to heterosexual romantic relationships. As part of his lessons espousing independence, don Julio applies his ideology of freedom to the relationship between tía Elena and her errant fiancée Felix: "Él hace el amor un arma de posesión, ya que la pobreza de su espíritu no le permite saciar sus ansias de domino, y ella justifica en él su debilidad y cobardía. Están hechos el uno para el otro; débiles y estúpidos se buscan, y acaban siempre por encontrase. Así va el mundo. Tú ve aprendiendo" (123). From his lesson in *amor libre*, don Julio cautions the protagonist against gendered hierarchy in conjugal love, the bedrock of relations in relations in Francosit political-economy. Julia heeds his warning, and from his lesson derives a new awareness of the dangers to women posed by heterosexuality: "La angustiaba pensar que algún día ella pudiera sentirse dominada" (Pérez-Sánchez 104, Moix 123). Thus, by using tía Elena and Felix's relationship as an example of what not to do, a mistake not to repeat if Julia wishes to be free, don Julio's political lesson of freedom impresses an aversion to heterosexual relationships at a critical period in the development of Julia's subjectivity.

Don Julio, notably, serves as the most significicant pedagogue shaping Julia's subjectivity for he gives Julia a political consciousness and a tool for understanding. But the languages he presents (both the political language of republican ideology and Latin) become themselves agents of her compounding alienation. As a subversive pedagogue bent on making Julia into a free and intelligent young woman, don Julio's introduction to the scholar identity has been a messy one: He nurtures a subversive conciouness, yet his method of delivering that content has in effect reproduced male knowledge and phallic power in a female body. Julia is certainly well educated in unorthodox topics for a female student. The glitch is that as the receptacle of this male knowledge and not the creator of knowledge, she lacks a means to invest power in her body or to resist it when exercised over her. Furthermore, because Latin is a dead language and Republican politics have been pushed pushed out of the public space of political engagement, the education he reproduces in Julia does not give her a voice, but instead reproduces in her don Julio's own social position at the margins of society. Thus, while don Julio's pedagogical role is central in the development of Julia's subjectivity and subversive consciousness, his lessons of freedom and the masculine language tool he imparts prove unsustainable outside his mountain utopia, ultimately leaving Julia more inept to navigate dominant society *because* those lessons and language have a marginalizing effect on her female body.

Nowhere is this more apparent than during Julia's return to institutionalized education after five years of intense private tutoring. While her teachers are impressed by the results of her placement exam, don Julio's uneven attention to academic subjects places Julia in four grades at once, "y no pertenecía...a ninguna" (129). Julia feels

different from her peers and in, perhaps, an unintended but learned response of her grandfather exiles herself within the classroom, "[sintiéndose] aislada de las demás" (129). In addition, Julia's superior command of the Latin language, a knowledge don Julio nurtures as a tool for reading power, now becomes what renders Julia power*less* to remedy isolation from her female peers. Julia's knowledge of Latin sets her apart and ultimately impedes Julia's communication with girls in her class: "No hablaba con nadie…no sabía qué decir ni de qué hablar con sus compañeras…Intentaba establecer contacto con ellas, pero no lo conseguían…hablaban entre sí por medio de frases hechas que la desconcertaban. Era como si hablaran en clave en su presencia" (129-30). Julia's confusion over the language of her peers is two fold: her time in the mountains did not expose her to the language or experiences concerning their conversations of normalized female adolescence (boyfriends, parties, gossip), nor does she understand their interest because these topics are incongruent with her own desire and don Julio's lessons of independence. Unable to communicate with her peers, Julia earns the nickname "la que no habla," and excluded from student circles because of her abnormal behavior, falls back into a silent world initiated by male violence and unspeakable desire (129).

While Julia copes by marginalizing herself within the classroom, at night she turns her thoughts to tía Elena in unnamed manifestations of homosexual desire: "echaba de menos el cuerpo tendido junto al suyo y sus caricias…imaginaba que tía Elena estaba...a su lado" (130). That desire soon transfers to Señorita Mabel, the headmistress of *el colegio* Julia attends, and who recognizing Julia's anxiety, initiates a relationship with Julia outside the classroom. Unable to relate to her classmates, Julia "se sentía diferente a los demás, y todos, incluso los profesores, cultivaban la

diferencia" (111-2). Señorita Mabel in contrast, purposefully does *not* distinguish Julia from her classmates and openly asks Julia questions about the lesson, ignores her nervousness to speak in class, and goes so far as to include Julia in collective punishments imposed on disruptively talkative classes (153). In an attempt to understand Julia's observed desperation, Señorita Mabel privately asks Julia to explain herself:

> Julia, creo que no te sientes a gusto en este colegio, me gustaría saber por qué. Julia no supo que decir... [Julia] empezó a llorar, sin perder contenerse…Vamos Julia, no llores, ya sé que Rafael…No, no es eso, murmuró. La directora no debió oírla, porque continuó: pasará pronto…No es eso, repitió. Bueno, lo demás pasará también, con el tiempo. Julia negó con un movimiento de cabeza. Clara, Julia, pasará, ahora no quieres contármelo, ¿verdad? Pero otro día, cuando tú quieras, ven aquí y me lo cuentas. La señorita Mabel cogió su cabeza entre las manos y le besó…Una entraña sensación de dulzura la invadió y se arrojó a los brazos de la señorita Mabel, estrechándose contra su pecho. (155)

Here when Julia repeatedly denies Rafáel's death as the cause of her distress without successfully expressing what is, the inquiry into Julia's alienation goes no further. Instead Señorita Mabel kisses Julia, affection fueling the desire at the root of alienation Julia cannot articulate.

Thereafter Julia develops a habit of spending her free time in Mabel's office under the pretext of grading student Latin exercises and helping the headmistress with other office tasks. The position of authority Mabel give Julia over her peers by asking that she grade their assignments of course heightens recognition of her unfeminine intelligence and breeds hostility towards Julia among her classmates. However, it is something Julia finds herself able to endure as long as she maintains her relationship with Mabel (156). Her time with senorita Mabel and the safe space her office

represents is Julia's sole source of pleasure, "la única recompensa con que agradecía a sí misma el hecho de asistir a aquel aborrecido colegio," and the repose her company offers is highlighted by Julia's longing for Mabel's presence when she cannot sleep (176). During school Julia loiters outside Mabel's office, waiting to be called in (much like she did in childhood outside her mother's bedroom), and often wishes the headmistress "fuera más cariñosa con ella" but if not, finds comfort in "la seguridad de compartir algo con ella" (157).

Nevertheless the jealous hazing by a manipulative new classmate Lidia, who singles Julia out as "la preferida de la solterona" and recognizes the nature of Julia's desire even if the protagonist does not, effectively closes that avenue of alliance with Mabel as a means for Julia to combat alienation in the classroom (173, Pérez-Sánchez 105). Rather than give her classmates the chance to continue their cruel antics or accuse the principal of "especial deferencia" towards Julia, Mabel suggests that Julia not only change her behavior but transfer schools (Moix 176). Here we see that while Señorita Mabel originally steps in to help remedy Julia's desperation, by indulging both Julia's expertise in a male knowledge and her desire for women, the headmistress actually heightens Julia's difference - similarly to the teachers of *el colegio* to whom she is originally contrasted - then severs their relationship to prevent having the heterodox terms of their relationship from being named.

Julia, feeling powerless "para luchar contra [la] injusticia" of having her time with Señorita Mabel taken away, reflects on the futility of her time under don Julio's tutelage (Moix 176). Like don Julio had predicted, Lidia and her cronies sapped her strength; they had counter attacked the power producing pleasure Julia found in señorita

Mabel's company. Consequentially, Julia's time at *el colegio* serves as the transitory stage on which the injurious effects of don Julio's education play out: his instruction leads Julia further into ostracism and when Mabel takes Julia under her wing, Julia's confusion with her peers' repressive response to the relationship between the two women, their intent to "quitarle algo que ni siquiera había llegado a poseer, algo tan sólo había deseado," exposes the limitation of the (male) language don Julio passes down (172-3). Don Julio has given Julia a tool to read power, but not a language that enables the protagonist to exercise a voice or name the subversive desire characterizing the difference she feels. As the result Julia gives up all hope of communicating with others and, per Mabel's example, resigns to the path of least resistance: "No sentía dolor, ni pena, ni ganas de llorar, sólo rancor contra sí misma por haberse dejado derrotar y por soledad que prometía ser eternal" (177-8).

After leaving *el colegio*, Julia attempts to co-opt this seemingly inevitable silence as a tactic to resist control of her actions. Her attempt to balance silence as a forced voicelessness and as a resistive tactic is most notable during her freshman year at the university where she becomes the love interest of two ideologically opposed male students: Andrés, a Spanish language teaching assistant and Carlos, a student activist. As illustrated by the latter and open references to student protests throughout the novel, the university has evolved into a much more visibly dynamic space of political dissidence from that presented in Nada. Nonetheless, that is not to say that the normalizing processes of university education under the regime had faded. On the contrary, institutional elements used to indoctrinate students continued, most clearly represented in Julia by the character Andrés who jokingly resorts to coercion in efforts

to help his students learn the language he teaches: "hay que machacarles, pero si uno es buen professor, los alumnus aprenden la asignatura" (Moix 42).

An educator representing the infrastructural discourse of the university, his specific task is to reproduce a learned language in the next generation of students, to ensure that they communicate using the specific language he provides. However, Julia makes the instructor's task a difficult one because she refuses to answer his repetitive inquiries about her thoughts: "Andrés siempre preguntaba: ¿En qué piensas? Y ella tenía que responder: En nada. No pensaba en algo que pudiera explicarle a Andrés" (28). Andrés may not be able to engage Julia in conversation, but a significant consequence of Julia's chosen silence is that rather than recognizing the resistive intent behind Julia's choice not to speak, Andrés reads her silence as the gendered conditions of their heterosexual friendship and takes it upon himself to structure their interaction around what he perceives as Julia's compliance with a subservient feminine position.

Instead of transmitting the language his role as teacher prescribes, his pedagogical authority manifests by keeping Julia within his gaze[15] and limiting her movements on campus. Julia finds his company exhausting, but succumbs to the normalcy of his omnipresence: "De hecho a Julía le parecía normal y corriente…Incluso cuando Andrés no se encontraba junto a ella, sentía su presencia en cualquier parte" (Moix 29). Apart from his unshakeable company, Julia is particularly irritated that he knows how to get what he wants: "[Julia] sentía cierta ternura por Andrés aunque seguía odiándole…por meterse en sus cosas…porque ella, Julia, sabía

[15] "Estuvo con Andrés por la mañana. Ahora, con los ojos cerrados, se veía a sí misma, en clase, observada por Andrés. Se veía en el patio de la facultad, paseando o charlando con algún compañero, bajo la mirada de Andrés…siempre Andrés" (27-8).

que en cierto modo Andrés la adivinaba y era consciente de que prodigándole su cariño y protección, sin agobio, sin palabras…sin pedirle nada, ella nunca rechazaría su presencia" (31). The protagonist believes Andrés would leave her alone if she asked him to, but they both know she never will. Inertia prevents her from articulating her frustration, leading her into the monotonous repetition of the days he designs. Here, the young language assistant - while not "machacando" a specific language into her speech – positions himself at the center of Julia's university experience by subtly seducing Julia into gender conformity, obliging her into a role of passivity by indulging the very silence she intends as a resistive measure to the heterosexist society around her (Pérez-Sánchez 95). Consequently while Andrés clearly cares for Julia, his behavior is more a palpable illustration of the continual systematic indoctrination of women within the university as a place to learn/reinforce the tenets of National-Catholic femininity.

Julía's friend Carlos, alternatively represents a different vain within the student body seeking to loosen the regime's grip on universities. By the sixties "ya existía en la universidad una mayoría de estudiantes de tendencies democráticas y socialistas," thanks to the work of generations of student minorities that contributed to the development of political dissidence within the institution (Valdelvira 15). This student agitation of the previous decade was met with harsh state repression but showed a movement capable of confronting the regime and the SEU (13). After 1962 this movement resurged with increasing continuity and effectiveness, due in part to successful unionist strategies adopted through its connections with the labor movement, Ministers of Education such as Joaquín Ruíz Gimenez whose tenure fostered a more liberal campus atmosphere, and the growing number of students on campuses (Share

39, Maravall 160). In regard to the later, the boom of *el milagro económico* put university education within reach of the expanding middle classes and generations of students with a new mentality. As historian Gregorio Valdelvira explains, the level and structure of economic development in Spain at the time provided "oportunidades de movilidad social [que] se daba a la educación como medio de promoción social," and as a result, the university student body grew upwards of by sixty percent within a ten year period.

Along with its swelling size, this generation of students - who had not lived through the civil war nor the early years of the regime - brought "actitudes y aspiraciones muy distintas a las de las generaciones anteriories y con mayor conocimiento de las corrientes intelectuales del anterior" (16). According to Michael Richards, "the regime rested above all on the constant threat of coercion and the memories of its violent birth," but this generation was experiencing a higher economic standard of living that evermore highlighted the absence of basic political freedoms on campus and within the society at large. In response, organizations like the student run Comité de de Coordinación Universitaria de Barcelona rejected the influence that the civil war held over previous generations and called for a fundamental reorganization of the university institution:

> Los estudiantes no conocemos a Guerra Civil más que su resultado, el franquismo, y no lo aceptamos, porque no podemos aceptar la represión, la arbitrariedad y la censura sean formas de gobierno. De la Guerra Civil no solamente queremos desterrar sus resultados, sino también los odios y las violencias que la hicieron posible. Por ello hemos reivindicado siempre para la universidad y para el país la democracia plena, el diálogo abierto a todos, la crítica exigente y constructiva, el respeto a todas las ideologías, la colaboración y la unidad entre todas las fuerzas políticas…que desean que el país pueda desarrollar y progresar. (qtd. in Valdelvira 16-7)

Mirroring the ideas and demographics of the newer student body, Julia's friend Carlos is delight by the increasing activity on campus and the call for a student strike: "Carlos se veía alegre y animado. Estupendo, hay que reestructurar la universidad" (Moix 195).

Surprisingly, apart from his attempt at a kiss that sends Julia running, Carlos is virtually ignored in critical essays of the novel. As the voice of the student movement, one hopes Carlos might finally present an opportunity by which Julia can establish solidarity with peers focused on rejecting control of the state. Unfortunately, Julia's slips into willful silence thwart the possibility of communication with someone specifically interested in using dialogue for the purpose of challenging the status quo. She is irritated by the confidence and masculine agency with which he exercises his own voice and 'destroys' power with language: "Carlos calificaba su poesía como de protesta y aseguraba que se 'lo cargaba' todo…y a veces cuando se mostraba tan seguro de sí mismo, de su inteligencia, de su brillante porvenir, y de lo claras que tenía las ideas sobre lo que convenía al mundo para que todo marchara bien, conseguía sacarla de quicio" (Moix 189-90). Julia has the suspicion that Carlos wants to control her, for much like Andres he plans how they spend their time together, but is prevented from rejecting his company by inertia and the convenience that because he talks so much, Julia is never required to contribute to the conversation.

In fact, there is no space for Julia in Carlo's conversations. For all his loquacious prattle about the travesties of capitalism and the importance of dialogue in the university, he never solicits Julia's opinion on the matter. And as the voice of the student movement of the historical moment, his behavior reflects the persistent absence

of gender inequality as a grievance in the movement's platform. At this point in Spain, the student and labor movement had established a tie that would endure till the end of the regime, but recognition of women as contributing members of either faction (whether as participants in the effort or as beneficiaries of its potential successes) was not on the agenda.[16] Moreover, when students mobilize on campus Carlos explicitly tells Julia not to participate in the protest: "Tú vete a casa, es mejor, las chicas no sabeis correr" (193-4). So while Carlos advocates "la reforma de las estructuras burguesas" as a path to "la libertad," his actions towards Julia show his participation in the concurrent gender scripts of those power structures removing women from the sphere of political action (193). Thus Carlos' idea of bringing about change is a mixture of new and dominant mentalities recognizing collective action as a necessary avenue, yet marginalizing Julia's role in the endeavor (Bernecker 72). In conjunction with Julia's struggle to co-opt a forced voicelessness as a resistive measure within this environment of change, Carlos's behavior highlights the regime's ideological hold as a continued ability to fragment opposition on university campuses (Share 38).

Both Julia's suitors derive power within the university from language; Andrés as the giver of legitimate language perpetuating the hegemony of political powers controlling the institution, and Carlos by using language to mobilize students into subversive action. But theirs is a power of which Julia cannot partake because the

[16] Indeed, the prevalence of the student and labor movements of the sixties as forces in opposition to the regime was paired with a comparative absence of an activist feminist movement in Spain at a time when, from the later 1960's onwards, 'second wave' feminism was already gaining potency in Western Europe and the United States (Buchanan 94). In Spain, unlike other struggles of the sixties, feminism lacked legitimacy as a body of political thought (Threlfall et al. 16). For an in depth look at the emergent feminist movement in Spain that came later during the political democratic transition of seventies, see Una Imensa Minoría by M.ª Ángeles Larumbe and Lo Personal es Politico, by Pilar Escarío, Inés Alberdi and Ana Inés López-Accotto.

young men interact with Julia, as does Julia resist, in ways that position her squarely within the gender script of the passive, silent woman. When a student protest finally materializes and police arrive to disband the assembly, the same silence induced inertia preventing Julia from rejecting the company of Andrés and Carlos leads her to equate "el dejarse apalear por la policía en la universidad" as "una pequeña protesta contra [su familia burgués]" (Moix 192). Hoping her apparent[17] participation in campus demonstrations will scandalize her family; Julia attempts to project the violence of the state on her body *as* her involvement in a subversive disturbance when it was the ideology of said state that inaugurated the silenced induced inertia leading to the beating. In other words, Julia is the recipient of a double violence: spinning violence on her body by police at the university as rebellion against a social system whose silencing of women displaces her telling against violence in the first place. Understandably, Julia's re-appropriation of silence and projection of police violence on her body as a "pequeña muestra de rebeldía" does not bring the relief Julia seeks. On the contrary, "la ira se la iba acumulando, royéndola por dentro a ella," thus negating antagonistic silence as a viable political strategy because it entrenches the protagonist in a deadly state of inertia (Moix 192, Pérez-Sánchez 91).

Lucky for Julia, in conjunction with the increasingly visible student movement of the sixties, the professoriate also witnessed ruptures in the monopoly of National-Catholic ideology among university intelligentsia. After the purges following the civil war, the majority of professors throughout the forties and fifties "era de tendencia

[17] I use the word *apparent* because paralyzing fear, rather than a choice to participate in the demonstration, prevents Julia from avoiding the stampede of protesters and perusing police.

franquista," but by late 1962 professors advocating democratic, socialist, and communist ideologies were showing up in the classroom (Valdelvira 17). These professors reintroduced topics of study that had been excluded for decades and participated in or otherwise lent their support to the organized activities of students in opposition to the regime. Many members of this anti-hegemonic professoriate lost or quit their jobs. Others spent time in jail or left the country, but regardless of the consequences their support was crucial to the vitality of the student movement (18). Julia's literature professor Eva is one such example of this reemerging intellectual heterogeneity and is arguably the most successful pedagogue (albeit momentarily) in helping Julia deal with alienation from self, silence and resulting inertia.

Having met Eva during her visists to don Julio's home and now her student, Julia takes refuge in Eva's classroom in the aftermath of the student protest. Here, Eva tends Julia's wounds incurred from police thereafter hires Julia as a research assistant in her home office. In an important transfer of the contemporary platform of the student to the private sphere, it appears as their work commences that Julia is the focus of the reorganizing project she has in mind. The professor engages her female student in dialogue and solicits Julia's opinion about various cultural productions (books, movies, etc). Teaching Julia that she must "esforsarse," Eva challenges Julia's superficial responses, "oblig[ándola] a pensar, a razonar, sobre algo exterior a ella…la obligaba a comprender el *porqué*" behind her opinions (205). Afternoons of Eva's purposeful questioning are the happiest time of Julia's life, who outside those moments thought "vivir significaba permanecer aislada de los demás, al margen, en otro mundo [donde] elaborar pensamientos, opiniones, resultaba absurdo" (205). It is through Eva's

exercises in inquiry that Julia establishes a dialogue with the internalized thoughts she directs at herself and whose truth value she took for granted in the absence of critical inquiry. Eva teaches Julia that she must be critical of the reality she experiences and her reactions to it. Tellingly, during these conversations the boredom, asphyxia, fear and inertia that inhibit Julia's overall action and communication with others is displaced by an alert protagonist focused on the work and conversation at hand, and who most significantly, "se sentir existir" (205).

Linda Levine rightly describes Eva as "more than an intellectual model for Julia; she represents the mother, friend, and lover that Julia actively seeks" ("Censored" 304). Still, I believe the emphasis of what Eva represents for Julia in this remark should be reversed. Eva is the woman Julia most desires, the most consistent image in which Julia fixates during the night of insomnia that frames the novel, and I think it is the intellectual model this pedagogue provides that makes her so. Although Eva's sever tone and rigid demeanor in the classroom fades to friendliness in her interactions with Julia, the literature professor remains the least affectionate women for whom Julia expresses desire (187). In the case of tía Elena and Señorita Mabel, Julia longs for their presence in bed only after they show her physical affection. Eva, in contrast, never shows Julia physical affection, yet the protagonist continually turns to her for repose: "se acogía a la imagen de Eva, a la extraña pasión que sentía por Eva" (Moix 27). The inaccessibility of this desired body may contribute to the strange passion Julia feels, but so does the agency and sensation of existence Eva's inquisitive company produces for Julia (27). Julia has long recognized something "anormal" about herself, "algo que la diferenciaba," but does little to independently uncover the root of that sentiment (180).

Eva, on the other hand, seeks an explanation from Julia *about* Julia, that is, she specifically prompts Julia to articulate herself, to know something about her *self*. In short, the literature professor gives Julia a tool by which to generate a conscious understanding, a tool to close read that leaves Julia aware of her own existence. In the absence of physical affection that sparks Julia's obsession with previous objects of desire, I think Julia's association of this power-producing tool with Eva is what leads the protagonist to desire her presence as a means to combat nightmares of rejected memories that caused Julia's initial confusion with her body.

The same model of intellectual inquiry that heightens Julia's desire for the Eva is also what makes the relationship between this female pedagogue and female student subversive for it urges the protagonist to immunize herself from internalizing thoughts without judging them and to understand why she thinks the things she does. In this way, rather than reproducing a passive subject through fixed/uncontested ideology, Julia becomes a participant in the ideas forming her sense of self. In this sense, the power-reading tool that Eva passes down is more applicable than that of don Julio as a tactic to resist control excercised over her female body. Facilitating Julia's command of a dead language does not enable the protagonist to read power in her present reality as intended, but instead adds to gender disconformity that Julia does not recognize as a source of her alienation. Eva, on the otherhand, by showing Julia how to engage her thoughts as an intellectual tool to become self assured, and more importantly aware of her exsistance and body, shows Julia how to close read thoughts produced by her reality and the injustice therein.

This is the key distinction between the central pedagogues influencing Julia's interface with the scholar identity. Both don Julio and Eva nurture a subversive consciousness in Julia, but the difference lies in their pedagogical methodologies: In an effort to reproduce himself in Julia, don Julio positions his student as the receptacle of (male) knowledge, while Eva conversely positions Julia as a producer of knowledge. Even though the content of don Julio's education is itself heterodox for a female pupil, the scholar identity he fosters in Julia is in the traditional passive sense reserved for female students, which later leaves her unable to combat the marginalization that her command of male knowledge brings about. Alternatively, the scholar identity Eva fosters in Julia is of the active vein that in producing knowledge invests agency in the learned body. For Julia, in addition to deconstructing the 'demonstrated certainty' of thoughts she directs at herself and internalizes (that she is weak, that she is powerless, that she is a coward), the knowledge Julia ultimately produces from Eva's lesson that she must "esforsarse" is a conscious understanding of her current state of crisis (205).

After learning this powerful lesson, Julia is shocked by Eva's reaction to her first independent exercise in 'making an effort'. Because Mamá and abuela Lucía blame Eva for Julia's participation in the university protest, the women in Julia's family cannot stand the woman. For that reason Julia is both more eager to spend time with her professor and required to do so secretly. When Mamá uncovers Julia's deception, she immediately recognizes her meetings with Eva as a reiteration of the mis-education don Julio began and forbids Julia from visiting her professor (Pérez-Sánchez 105). Deciding that Eva must be warned "de aquella injusticia, de la atmósfera de crueldad e incomprensión" that threatens to take away her sole source of pleasure, Julia takes the

initiative to call Eva (212). In this critical moment, Julia not only acts, but does so with her first external intent of articulating the injustice she experiences. Eva however, responds coldly and ends the conversation before it starts, effectively stonewalling Julia's first real attempt to make herself heard: "La voz de Eva…fue seca, cortante. Hola, Julia. Ahora no puedo atenderte…Llámame mañana. Y colgó. [Julia] marcó de nuevo el número…Debía explicarle a Eva lo sucedido, pero Julia escuchó otra vez la voz fría, casi antipática: Te he dicho que tengo trabajo, ¿sucede algo grave? No seas pesada…Buenas Noches (212). Denied an interlocutor at a critical moment, her voice silenced by the same professor who encouraged its use, Julia acts again, this time attempting suicide in an effort to stifle the body that "gritaba el nombre de Eva" as retribution for a controlling family and society that does not understand her pain (212-3).

Acting on the first lesson of her revolutionary grandfather - that she has the right to kill in the name of freedom - Julia seeks death; power's limit in its hold over the body, the ultimate silence and escape from her divided self (Foucault History 138). To her chagrin, Julia is discovered by her family and resuscitated in the hospital. As daybreak brings her long night of recollections to an end, "the traditional metaphor of illumination as an emergence from ignorance" sustains, for in the last pages of the novel, Julia finally comes to realize that "era Julita quien, desde sus cinco años, la obligaba…a rehuir la presencia de Andrés, de Carlos, de Papá, de Víctor,…a protegerse contra los demás compañeros, a desear la presencia de Eva, de tía Elena, o de la señorita Mabel" (Bush 142, Moix 216-7). *Julita*, the constant evocation of her rape and who "nunca le perdonó haberla abandonado allí en un universo inmóvil," is the she source of

her alienation and has come to take revenge: “se había convertido en un dios martirizador…que reclamaba continuos sacrificios para calmar su antiguo dolor” (63, 220). Sadly, where Nada leaves the possibility of female self-mastery optimistically ambiguous, Julia’s most lucid moment about her state of crisis is also one in which she admits utter defeat: “Se sentía agotada, vencida…La habían desterrado un lugar sin nombre, desconocido, fuera del tiempo y del espacio de los demás” (217). Julia tried to kill Julita, but Julita and a class morality intolerant of heretical female rebellion had won.

A failed subject unable to reconcile the alienation of her divided selves, Julia is de-masked as the perpetual child that abandoning Julita has forced her to be (217). For fifteen years she has been living under the domination of an image encapsulating the violent act of patriarchal censorship that forever left her silent and inert. Alienated from her body, voice, and desire, Julia has navigated an existence at the margins, isolated and lonely. And while subversive pedagogues pass on tools to read the power of a social system that casts Julia to the margins, they ultimately aid in her demise. Just as Julia’s co-opting of silence at the university leads her to an impasse in her efforts to combat control exercised over her, don Julio while nurturing a subversive consciousness, ultimately leaves her unable to counteract the marginalizing effects his male education has on her female body. Similarly, when a subversive female pedagogue at the univserity reorients the student movment platform of establishing dialogue in the institution towards her recognizably alienated student as a method for Julia to know herself and become self-assured (by establishing a dialogue between her divided selves and body), Eva inexplicably abandons the project at the critical moment when Julia first

exhibits the quality she sought to cultivate. While Julia's relationship with Eva ultimately brings her to a moment of self-knowledge - that the crux of her crisis lays in the past and that "se econtraría a sí misma por la primera vez sólo con…intentar tomar conciencia de su cuerpo"- the consequence of attempting suicide, of exercising that agency over her body as a means to remove herself from the oppressive social text - comes at the expense of her thoughts and desire (55). An unwilling survivor, Julia is cast into a non-life; voiceless and condemned to a monotonous "inexistencia…ciega y tullida, sin pensamientos, sin recuerdos, sin deseos," where only Julita, her personal symbol of violent silence, remains (215-6).

As the night of Julia's recollections comes to an end, we see that the entire novel maps the process by which Julia reaches the crisis of inexsistence identified in the opening pages and her conscious understanding that memory lays at the heart of her search for a self. So it is surprising that critics touch on alienation in their characterization of the protagonist without addressing the more interesting process of subject formation bringing about those distinctive qaulitites in the protagonist. As has been argued here, Julia's present state of alienation and her arrival to the conscious understanding that memory and her body lay at the center of her search for self are the product of subject formation split by male violence and her attempt to navigate a an aversion to heterosexist control within the dominant social system of 1960's Spain. And as we have seen, influences of subversive pedagogues undoubtedly help nuture Julia's subversive conciousness, but the success of their efforts are at times problematic in aiding Julia to combat the silence that defines her (in)exsistance.

Silence then, as a central theme of the novel, proves Julia's biggest obstacle to a cohesive self. Within the text, silence is something both forced onto the protagonist and taken up by the protagonist as (an unsuccessful) resistive tactic. As a condition forced onto the protagonist, silence leaves Julia unable to articulate or recognize her desire for women. The inability to recognize or name that desire, in turn, becomes a crucial element in Julia's profound alienation from voice, body and society. In addition, Gema Pérez-Sánchez argues that Moix is able to code silence in the novel as a means to present the theme of lesbianism by strategically deploying things 'said' and 'unsaid' so that what is said points *at* the unsaid, thus giving Moix a chance to say what she is not supposed to say within the dominate social system (94). The 'unsaid' in Julia is her lesbian desire, which like the protagonist herself is defined as an absence. Significantly, by defining lesbianism as an absence within the text, the novel points to the absence of that language within the sociopolitical discourse of 1960s Spain with the result of breaking the silence of lesbianism through the act of writing about that silence (93).

The most explicit thing 'said' along side Julia's 'unsaid' lesbianism, Pérez-Sánchez argues, are the homosexual tendencies of Julia's older brother Ernesto: "Ernesto's homosexuality is an open secret. Everyone [in the family] 'understands' his tendencies and explicitly avoids naming them" (98). For example, his homophobic father often reacts violently to Ernesto's effeminacy, while the family maid discusses the topic privately with Julia: "Chica, he visto de que pie cojea tu hermanito, te digo a ti porque hay confianza. Tiene miedo a las mujeres, bueno, suponiendo que no sea otra cosa peor que me callo porque Dios me libre (y se santiguaba) de añadir leña al fuego y en esos casos lo mejor es ver, oír y callar" (Moix 42). This 'saying' of male

homosexuality while never mentioning a word about lesbianism in the novel is what Pérez-Sánchez believes opens the space for Moix to point at the absence of lesbianism in dominant discourse (98). But while Pérez-Sánchez provides a penetrating analysis of the silent presentation of lesbian desire in the novel, we are left wondering *why* male homosexuality is more transparent in Spanish society to begin with. What is the underlying social qualification for this metonymical gesture to work? Characters in the novel may not name Ernesto's desire, but they recognize what they see. Julia's alienation on the other hand, hinges on a difference that she can not understand and that her family interprets simply as *rara.* Why then, is lesbianism the silence operating along side National-Catholic discourse of 1960's Spain when a concept of male homosexuality already existed in the public imaginary? And furthermore, why did this silence of female homosexual desire prevail during a period of *apertura* that was producing change in other parts of civil society?

An interview with feminist and author Carmen Alcalde explains that lesbianism remained an alien concept within dominant culture because it was not considered a serious option:

> El lesbianismo no lo consideran, creen que no es nada, que son juegos, no se lo toman en serio. Si cogen a dos mujeres en lesbianismo, te aseguro que no les pasará nada porque lo primero que se les ocurre es decir que les faltaba un señor. No tienen identidad de lesbianismo aquí. Verdaderamente tú puedes ir abrazada por la *calle* con una mujer y, máximo, algún mal pensado te insultará, pero si te denuncian a la policía, la policía no sabrá que hacer. No entienden que una mujer guste a otra mujer. No cabe dentro de su yo, de su narcisismo. (Levine and Waldman 36)

As the passage indicates, female desire could only be conceived of in relation to a man, a notion constantly reiterated by a regime constructing *la patria* as a male-defined

entity. More specifically, by considering these questions in relation to the class objectives of the francoist state and the period of capitalist expansion in which the novel was written, a women's sense of self and her desire under the regime were to be formed exclusively in relation to the act of reproduction. This meant that a woman's desire and sense of self was to be separated from her body and conceptualized around a process, to which propaganda celebrating motherhood as woman's civil duty and the Catholic ideal of female self-abnegation can attest. Locating female desire within the act of reproduction was fundamental to getting Spanish women to freely put their labor power towards producing the tangible part of a National-Catholic community that otherwise remained largely imaginary in the discourse of institutions. To this end, "nothing that was not ordered in term of generation…could expect sanction or protection," and the regime continually tried to deny, reduce, repress or illegitimaize any kind of female pleasure not associated with reproduction itself (Foucault History 4). As a testament to the obsessive effort, Dr. Jorge López Ebor, a practicing OBGYN and official voice of sexual politics under the regime, set out to uncover scientific evidence that the female orgasm did not exist (Martin-Cabrera 27 May).

Lesbianism, or female desire for the female body, was thus *counter*productive to the automatic functioning of state power in significant ways: Sex between women did not produce new bodies, nor for that matter, reproduce a political consciousness in those bodies forming subjectivity in gendered relation to patriarchal authority of the state. Furthermore, while unproductive for the capitalist regime, lesbian desire when translated into female self-desire was potentially an empowering force leading to heterodox action in ones self interst. In other words, lesbian desire did not comply with

regime needs of maintaining its own power base because, by reconciling the alienation of female desire from her body, lesbian desire negated male-managerial access to the means of reproduction (female bodies). This threat of heterodox female desire was doubly the case during the process of modernization in Spain for the state now had increased dependence on the labor power of women to perpetuate popular support for the regime and to facilitate growth of the capitalist economy by entering the work force. During the earlier period of autarky, it was easier to isolate women, their desire and their labor contribution within the home because the existing market (including that of ideas) was small, but when the capitalist market was forced to expand in order to sustain the national economy, the Spanish state then needed reproductive services from women in both the private and public spheres. Hence, state demand for female labor power intensified at the same historical moment that women were gaining increasing access to the public sphere, where as has been discussed, social heterogeneity and organized opposition to the regime was increasing, and with it, the potential interface with heterodox ideology facilitating the formation of subjectivity antagonistic to maintaining the status quo.

This enables us to understand the general anarchistic and sacrilegious tone that sexually 'deviant' behavior easily took on in Franco's Spain, but also helps elucidate the silence of lesbianism in Julia. Because ideology used to construct the myth of sovereignty and perpetuate the power of any hegemonic bloc is the product of selection, we can say that the existence of language articulating female homosexual desire was a direct threat to maintaining the homogenous National-Catholic linguistic community needed to perpetuate the hegemonic status of state ideology. Therefore, that language

needed to be explicitly excluded from the social conversation. The absence of lesbianism within the social-political discourse was thus an integral part of the over-all discursive strategy to control female desire, because without that language there was no political space in which to interpelate oneself as a subject through that language (Foucault History 27). Hence the enduring absence of lesbianism within in socio-political discourse of 1960's Spain, the silence that Moix's employs recognition of male homosexuality to point at, was a purposeful silence operating along side the things said to negate heterodox lesbian desire while leaving labor capacities intact.

This makes the rape scene doubly effective for the power structures benefiting from control of Spanish women as a labour source. In the act of violently censoring her female body through rape, Víctor eliminates Julia's motion by setting limits to her actions; Julia can not speak (Arendt 466). This crystallizes the inertia characterizing her inability to respond to sexist intrusion, whether that be verbally to her family's attacks on her lack of feminine behavior, or physically to reject the company of Andrés and Carlos. But the censorship of language dramatized by the rape, and the resultant alienation rising from Julia's inability to name or understand the terms of her desire, is what brings about the *isolation* and loneliness that in the end she attempts to remedy by an act of self destruction leaving her void of desire all together.

In sum, lesbianism was necessarily less transparent in comparison to male homosexuality during the historical moment of Julia's publication because survival of the political-economy of Spain was dependant on continued female self abnegation and the absence of female body centered desire. And while it can be said that the economic development of the 1960's brought about the *apertura* of Spanish society in other

respects, the totalitarian project of the fancoist state - as far as it related to tyranny over female bodies and desire as a means to alienate the labor source from the means of production - was alive and well. Julia's lesbianism is thus a crucial component of the alienation she experiences, but her lesbianism, constructed in the novel as a mark of abjection, remains just one of the obstacles keeping her from becoming a speaking/active subject: Julia's alientaion from voice, the marginalizing effect of don Julio's politically subversive yet problematic education, and a patriarchal-bourgeois morality governing her family's reactionary response to her attempt to commit suicide are factors as well. However, understanding *why* lesbianism was explicitly excluded from the social conversation as a means to funnel female productive labor into acceptable channels helps us locate it within a larger network of power relationships designed to maintain the heirarchal, repressive, and exploitative social structure of the Francoist political-economy through marginalization and fragmentation of the opposition and subject.

Ultimately unable to reconcile the alienation of her divided selves, Julia meets a depressing end, but perhaps a reconciliation is the function behind it. By calling out the silence of lesbianism within dominant social discourse, Julia - the novel - fractures the very control mechanism of the dominant culture constructing that purposeful silence, and by doing so potentially opens the space for a new mentality inclusive of female body centered knowledge and desire to emerge (Bernecker 68). And importantly, by looking comparatively at Julia's education under subversive pedgogoes in the novel, and specifically at their distinctive methods of shaping Julia's interface with the scholar

identity, we can idenitify Eva's model of knowledge production as the path to generating a consciousness of the body from which woman has been alienated.

El MISMO MAR DE TODOS LOS VERANOS

Set in late 1970's Barcelona amidst the political transition to democracy, this first-person confessional narrative tells the story of a protagonist experiencing existential crisis. Approaching fifty years old, with a grown daughter and a husband made absent by frequent adulterous escapades, Elia[18] finds herself alone in the post-productive years of the compulsory motherhood enshrined by Francouist cultural discourse, and thus, at a cross roads in terms of refocusing her future life to break with gender scripted behavior. Like the protagonist of Julia, Elia battles a feeling of non-existence, but while Julia's conclusion that her past lays at the heart of her alienation comes in the final moments of narrative action, El mismo mar begins narrative action with Elia's memory of an authentic self that existed once, "anterior a la falsificación y al fraude de todos los papeles asignados y asumidos" (72). To recover that authentic self Elia returns to the summer home of her childhood to undergo an exercise in self-analysis by means of re-occupying old dark spaces (house and psyche) and (re)reading the literary and social texts that have shaped her present subjectivity. Most significantly, this search for self coincides with Elia's return to the university where, through a lesbian love affair with a student named Clara in her literature class, professor and student undergo a mutual subversive learning process in their attempts to (re)write myths for women and destabilize paradigms of phallogocentric discursive authority.

[18] Although the protagonist remains unnamed throughout the novel, the reader is told that her two syllable name begins with E. Based on character continuity in the works of Tusquets' trilogy; critics retrospectively refer to woman "E" in El mismo mar as Elia.

Elia's search for self is also a critique of the upper Catalan bourgeoisie to which the protagonist belongs. She describes her membership to this group as a problematic one; she is definitely one of *them* but is missing "los rasgos distintivos de la tribu" (Tusquets 78). Finding herself at the margin, the protagonist criticizes this hegemonic block as spiritually dwarfed, and for the failed leadership of its intelligentsia in shaping a national agenda in Spain's post-Franco period (Servodido "Narrative Web" 160). The internal class marginalization is most pronounced in Elia's estrangement from her mother and daughter Guiomar, both of whom conform to patriarchal-bourgeois scripts of female behavior. To her mother, Elia is coterminous with mis-behavior; first as a sad and solitary child, and now as an adult scandalizing the family with her lack of propriety in dealing with Julio's habitual infidelity (72). Elia's unpredictable or script-deviant behavior is *the* problem for her mother and daughter, whose distress drives them to conference secretly about "*el problema"* but ignore Elia's outreach for support. Thus, while the problem Elia causes takes precedent in their conversations, the protagonist herself is largely nonexistent to them.

Their anxiety about the Elia's deviant behavior proves quite palpable upon their return to the Catalonian coast for the grandmother's funeral: "aqui me tienen las dos, una a cada lado, igual se les ocurre que voy a escapar o a lanzarme en el momento más impensando a la peor extravagancia…mi madre y mi hija teman todavía, ambas al unísono, lo que yo pueda hacer" (185). Described as two bailiffs, their concern here is not for female fraternity that might ease a sense of losing the family matriarch, but for Elia's anticipated deviance from the dominant cultural script of abnegating women. Apart from illustrating terms of Elia's marginalization within her family and class along

lines of gendered (mis)behavior, this episode also highlights the omnipresence of patriarchal morality in the novel by pairing physically absent patriarchs with policing *of* women *by* women.

Notably, the protagonist's relationship with her daughter and mother is one marked by difference: "las damas anglosajonas" are blond, beautiful, and always know how to handle themselves properly (76). Elia on the other hande, stands apart as the dark haired odd-ball of the matrilineal line. Apart from physical attributes and concern for adherence to proper female behavior, the protagonist also distinguishes her difference from the women of her family in terms of writing. Finding herself in a local *papelería,* Elia contrasts her traveling mother's empty postcard messages and her scientist daughter's scribbled mathematical formulas to her own lusting after blank stationary and colored inks. Thus the reader learns that these women are not interested in the kind of self (re)writing project Elia has in mind (75-6). Several of the many scholars treating Tusquets' work have commented on the protagonist's search for self and the methods, such as intertextuality and erotic imagery, that Tusquests employs to communicate Elia's (re)writing project to the reader. However, current criticism on the novel does not consider the prevelance of the univeirsty space, and pedagogue-student relationship Elia forms there, as the impetus for the specific route her project in self-analysis takes.

From her view at the margins of haute bourgeois society, Elia distances herself from class intellectuals and refuses a dinner invitation from fellow university alumni who have lost their nerve and vision for change to the decadence of power and languor of ill-timed success:

> La cena…será…un banquete de…los espectros de la más brillante promoción de la posguerra, derrotados los más inexorablemente por el fracaso en bruto, definitivo y sin engaños…vencidos…por la parodia grotesca…de haber quizás triunfado, un éxito risible que nos acarrea…el odio rencoroso de los más…porque [el éxito] nunca es verdad [y] siempre fuera de tiempo (83-83)

Elia only reconsiders the invitation on the condition that it be to a somber wake for dead dreams. Disillusioned by the self-aggrandizing game these intellectuals play, she rejects their company but is correct to include herself in the invitation to the wake, for she too has acquiesced into intellectual inactivity: Literature has become an elegant distraction for the university professor, and she recognizes that she had not taken her work seriously (185). Yet, although Elia turns down the invitation to dinner, this same conversation in which her friend Maite describes a beautiful foreign student enrolled in Elia's upcoming literature class, arouses what becomes Elia's avenue to correct her intellectual inactivity upon returning to the university space.

The University of Barcelona is treated in the novel at two specific junctures in time; Elia's years as a student witnessing the pivotal student protests of the fifties and Eia's return to the university as a literature professor thirty years later. As M.J. Marr points out, Elia's reflections as she returns to the classroom are principally concerned with a "disjunction she perceives between the University of Barcelona's recent progress in sociopolitical terms and its anachronistic physical environment" (224). Indeed, the years between Elia's time as a student and her return saw an ever increasingly visible student movement, the disbanding of the SEU in 1965, efforts to join the labor and student movements and in later years the increasing radicalism of issues amidst the rise of diversifying student groups (Maravall 160). Yet as Elia assumes her new role "al otro

lado de la mesa," the professor is struck by the sort of stasis that plagues the interior space of her classroom:

> ¡volví a la universidad después de casi treinta anos y todo era, claro, muy distinto!-: lo sorprendente, lo extrañísimo, es que aquí no había cambiado – como en el pozo de sombra de la biblioteca – casi nada. Una despierta al cabo de los siglos y ya tiene en la punta de la lengua las palabras consabidas-¿dónde estoy? ¿qué significa todo esto?...[S]ólo que en este cuento lo que…produce [la atónita extrañeza] es que est'as en el mismo lugar entre los mismos objetos…(97)

Mimicking the state of herself as a subject, and foreshadowing her (re)writing project, it is the classroom - the interior space of the institution and its stagnant contents that now need change and reorganization.

The connection between the temporal junctures of university experience is Clara; the dark haired foreign student who rouses anticipation of metamorphose in Elia, and who upon meeting her professor instantly ignites flashbacks of a student demonstration in which a female student breaks into the campus tower to ring the 'bell of freedom' as police forces repress mobilized students and faculty. The student protests of the fifties to which this memory refers were crucial to the longevity of the student movement: Demanding political freedoms, the right to independent organization and democratic self representation within the institution, the massive student demonstrations of 1956 and 57 "demostraban que en la Universidad existía un movimiento capaz de enfrentarse al Régimen y de erosionar al SEU" (Valdelvira 13). These first protests, while subjected to repression, were the building blocks for the student movement of subsequent generations. Significantly, the memory of these specific student protests provoked by Clara's entrance to narrative action is conspicuously symbolic of Elia's search for self and the course of their heterodox affair as a means to author more

democratic social texts for women: Elia and Clara's retreat to spaces of childhood reading/learning mirrors that of student protesters taking shelter in lecture halls with dissenting faculty. The strange new language produced by the lesbian love affair echos Elia's memory of the female student participating in a seemingly unproductive act that generating a beautiful unaccustomed sound. Finally, the transformation in observed in Clara as Elia's husband returns to reclaim his wife reflects the female student's descent from the bell tower into hands of waiting policemen and the birth of something fragile but heady thereafter (104-106).

Standing alone, it would be impossible to determine if the following quote described student and faculty meetings following the bell tower stunt or the lover's secluded days spent in the home of Elia's grandmother: "aquel encerrarnos sin consignas ni propósitos y ver surgir por primera vez un tipo especialísimo de íntima solidaridad era terrible, hermoso y esperanzador" (106). Furthering the allegorical connection between Elia's past interface with student protests and what we observe as her resistive project in the present, Elia instinctively takes Clara to the same cafeteria where students once gathered for clandestine meetings. But after recalling the closure of the institution following the protests and subsequent purging of said conversational spaces, professor and student take their lessons to more private spaces. That is Elia and Clara relocate their own student disobedience to the private sphere of home and self!

This relationship between student and educator is central to Elia's search for an authentic self and also what defines the self/other relationship in the work. Like Julia, the self/other relationship in El mismo mar is structured by a kind of generational separation between self and alter ego, but unlike Julia the subjects on either side of this

divide mutually and passionate engage in an exchange. Clara in this sense is positioned as the other, the woman Elia failed to be or as Elia's authentic self that existed before "papels asignados" delivered her to an empty life in the Catalonian upper crust. Recognizing a younger version of herself in Clara, Elai's relationship with the student therefore "no solo le permite reviver y recontar su pasado, sino también adentrarse por los laberintos de su propia identidad" (Cornejo-Parriego 47). In addition, what distinguishes this student-pedagogue relationship from those treated in Nada and Julia is the double subversive education taking place: In the sense that Clara serves as an interlocutor for Elia's (re)reading of literary and social texts from her past, the texts this literature professor (mis)reads with Clara serve as the subversive educational content through which Clara produces a political consciousness recognizing those texts as instruments of a patriarchal-bourgeois order to impose its morality and rules on female subjectivity (Mazquiarán de Rodríguez 130). Simultaneously, as Elia goes about her exercises in self-analysis by (re)reading the texts through which she interpelated a subjectivity ultimately delivering her to the present crisis, she is *un*learning their content as her relationship with Clara both destabilizes the "truth" those texts were intended to portray and produces female body centered knowledge.

Hence, Elia sets out on a concurrent mission of self analysis and (mis)education of her student that builds on the metamorphic imagery of their initial meeting in the classroom. Together, the women engage a multiplicity of texts during their twenty-five day affair. One such text is the socio-cultural texts of 1970's Catalan upper society wherein Elia escorts Clara on a pilgrimage of bourgeois cultural temples to expose the

costumes, narcissism and performed fraternity of her class. Take for example, the night Elia and Clara visit the opera at el Gran Teatro del Liceo de Barcelona:

> …es el templo más auténtico de mi raza…y aquí acudimos, más o menos en serio para sentirnos nosotros, para sabernos clan, para inventarnos quizá – ayudados por la hostilidad que reina en al *calle* contra nosotros…una hostilidad incómoda desde que se ha tornado agresiva, pero que refuerza no obstante la vigencia de oxidados mitos, de cultos en los que hace ya mucho dejaron de creer los propios dioses-, inventarnos quizá durante una horas que somos mejores…esto también…es un rito de una clase hecha de gentes chatas y mezquinas…(171-2)

Clara adopts the role of mocking observer in these class-theaters and is marked as an outsider in these spaces by her lack of "deseos de participar" and her inappropriate choice of dress (her anti-costume), such as wearing a turtleneck sweater to the "apoteosis de los senos"[19] (142). As Elia leads her student through a reading of the social text, she describes the activities at each of the stops on the pilgramige as initiation rites for members of the bourgeoisie, but for Clara these stops are tests of her reaction to the grotesque decadence she observes and the purity or authenticity Elia believes her to possess – testing her likeness to a subterranean plant capable of descending into and growing in dark places to discover new worlds (139).

Stemming from the protagonist's deep-seated obsession with childhood reading of fairy tales and Greek myths, Elia and Clara also engage a myriad of literary texts as part of their mutual subversive education and search for authentic self. These childhood readings have had such a profound impact on Elia's adult life that the protagonist views herself as a "strange amalgam of countless textual layers" (Levine "Reading" 204). In childhood, literature served as an escape for Elia that lead her to choose words over

[19] A topless pool party.

reality. But this preference for literary worlds was complicated by Elia's childhood confusion in distinguishing heroes from villains and her distress at supposedly happy endings that positioned female heroines as abandoned like Ariadne, mute like the Little Mermaid, and imprisoned like Rapunzel or Guinevere (Tusquets 226). Adding to her distress of reading these (un)happy endings, Elia identifies the canonical female role invariable; "una historia tan necia y eternamente repetida sin posibles variantes – escrita de una vez por todas con su final no feliz…una historia que [termina] siempre mal, una única, una misma aventura con un único previsto final" (178). Understandably, Elia's childhood (mis)reading of these invariable myths and stories scripting female behavior have in turn encoded alienation and deviance in her adult life; "nada de lo que yo sentía, nada de lo que yo pensaba encajaba en aquel mundo isleño y claustrofóbico y cerrado en el que había nacido y que era el único mundo que yo en aquel entonces que conocía (226).

However, recognizing the connection between her present sense of alienation and childhood (mis)reading illustrates her understanding of male-authored canonical roles as hostile towards female individuality and the interpelating effect of literary consumption (Levine "Reading" 204). So it seems fitting that she would revisit childhood reading as part of her exercise in self-analysis and (mis)education of her student. The puzzling thing is that while Tusquets intention is to expose canonized fairy tales as indoctrinating instruments of patriarchal morality, Elia describes her childhood (mis)readings to Clara but then reads herself into *male* roles of the texts when revisiting them within the context of the women's affair. As a child, Elia recognized trends of

voicelessness and passivity as monolith attributes of female heroines[20] yet continued to identify - albeit problematically - with those roles as an adult. So, why read herself into male roles now?

Clara's poinent inquiry "¿Cuál de las dos es la Bella? ¿Y en que rincón nos espera la Bestia?" itself highlights the dichotomous categorical limitations of phallogocentric authorship. So, perhaps Elia reads herseld into the male roles by default. Because the initial dynamics of the professor and student relationship is one of authority, Elia occupies the position of the self-assured and dominant figure with Clara as the quite and passive figure of the pair. Elia's monologue consistently reads Clara into the heroine literary roles, which following the classic dichotomy of passive/aggressive incarnated in the figures of Beauty and the Beast, positions Elia as the aggressor. Yet Elia is occupying that role having already experienced the position of its counterpart. Nina Molinaro suggests that in the absence of a male force "the women can redefine their roles in the traditional stories…substituting different interpretations and substituting themselves into the interpretations differently" (39). As Clara's question suggests, to this we can add that the subversive education female pedagogue and female student undergo together provides not only an avenue for revisiting (mis)read texts, but a means for role play within the interpelating texts shaping their subjectivity that undermine paradigms offered by operative patriarchal literary and social patterns.

[20] "los tontos cuentos para niños con princesas infelices y muchachas abandonadas, las historias de patitos feos, de panteras que mueren en el nieve, de sirenas convertidas en espuma" (133)

This, in turn, is evident in the act of code-juggling their exercises with socio-cultural and literary texts brings about. The affair between Elia and Clara positions the women in multiplex and often simultaneous social roles of friend / daughter / mother / student / teacher / seducer / lover. For example, following a boat outing with "la mujer-pajaro" and again at the opera house, Clara is the first to initiate sexual contact with Elia, but she does so with a feverish aggression and emotionally breaks down in the process. Elia reacts by rocking Clara, soothing her with lullabies as a mother might comfort a child (158 / 182). After the death of Elia's grandmother, the roles are reversed between the women; Elia seeks Clara's company, with the later reciprocating maternal behavior by preparing meals and bringing Elia her childhood ritual glass of orange juice. The conscious code switching culminates when the women make love, collapsing these social roles, literary dichotomies, Clara, Elia's childhood and the family's apartment into a singular entity. The result positions Elia as the object of her own desire as "Clara and the narrator assume in their being the dual essence of 'la bella y la bestia'" and leads to a process of mutual transformation in which neither partner presumes to subjugate the other (Bellver 20-1).

Elia and Clara make love twice in the novel, an act that produces two nascent phenomena in the socio-political climate of 1978 Spain: female body-centered pleasure and non-phallogocentric discourse. Both are the product of a new kind of love previously inexperienced by Elia in orthodox relationships and may best be understood by describing what it is not. In the words of the narrator, the love she and Clara experience is not like

> amores hechos de regateo y vanidad, del empeño obstinado por encontrarnos magnificados en el otro a nosotros mismos, del empeño obstinado de ejercer el poder y de afirmarnos, de anular nuestras frustraciones y todos nuestros miedos, juego cruelísimo y no obstante banal de sexo y de poder, o de poder a través del sexo perverso juego narcisista, implacable juego de múltiples espejos, en busca siempre de la propia imagen…siempre poniendo a prueba al otro. (205-6)

That is to say, this new love and lovemaking is dissimilar to what Elia has experienced in the heterosexual relationships of her life or the literature she consumes. Theirs is a protracted love without suspicion, games, goals, or imposed hierarchies, but is instead characterized by sure and hysteria-free pleasure (199). Lovemaking between the women is described as slow, fluid and gentle in contrast to the heterosexual sex act between Elia and her husband that is described as violent, pain and fire (Kingery 58). The violence associated with heterosexual sex is explicitly replaced by mutual consent and passion between the two women.

Most importantly, while the pleasure that Elia and Clara find together is not defined by power exercised over another, their experience does *produce* power by producing discourse. The pleasure and power produced in these instances of lesbian lovemaking can be explained by simultaneous meaning-making, for in both scenes Elia discovers a strange new language:

> entre beso y beso…la arrullo con palabras increíbles, tan extrañas, palabras que no he dicho nunca a ningún hombre…ni siquiera a Guiomar…palabras que ignoraba yo misma que *estuvieran en mí, en algún oscuro rincón de mi conciencia*, agazapadas, quietas y a la espera de ser un día pronunciadas…*una voz que tampoco reconozco* aunque debe ser forzosamente la mía, tantos anos ocultos esta voz y estas palabras en un centro oscuridad grana, en este cubil con aroma a mar y a cachorro. (182 my emphasis)

The second description of lesbian lovemaking and subsequent discourse tellingly coincides with the grandmother's burial – the symbolic displacement of a family matriarch whose happiness slowly suffocated under the weight of an ox-husband that possessed her in bed without understanding her desire, and who consequently never experience the deep pleasure Elia and Clara uncover together:

> empiezo a musitar también yo palabras muy extrañas, palabras que tampoco tienen sentido y que pertenecen a un idioma *no aprendido*, y recuerdo que ya me pasó otra vez con Clara algo semejante, pero esta vez yo no quiero detenerme, porque las palabras surgen en una embriaguez sin fin, y sé que han caído todas las barreras y se han bajado todas las defensas. (201 my emphasis)

Importantly, this new discourse Elia describes is not learned - is *no aprendido* - from male language, but has emerged from within the body during her search for an authentic self: "este lenguaje no nace en el pensamiento…nace hecho ya voz de las entrañas" (202). The pleasure that Elia and Clara experience during lovemaking is echoed by a feminine language of the body that is both from deep parts of self yet recognized as a voice of the other, or perhaps more acuratly as a voice that has been *othered* by hegemonic discourse privileging male-centered experience. As Stephen Hart succinctly states, this "voice…transcends the boundaries between self and other [to go] beyond the binary categories of the phallocentric code" (95). The strangeness Elia describes results from this language's innate corporal familiarity paired with a marked absence in operative, orthodox discourse and experience. In other words, this discourse is strange to the mind but had been present in the body, and has been brought out from the depths by a pleasure discovered through a (un)learning of the dominant social texts that 'other' woman from her body and voice. This language has risen from sexual desire of the

female body, from female self-desire, and while this 'strange' female discourse is not disclosed *per se*, even in its possibility dislodges phallus centered discourse as the sole criterion of knowledge!

Nevertheless, the hysteria free pleasure and ensuing discourse that Elia and Clara unearth provoke disparate reactions from the two lovers. Elia, having shared her intimate stories and histories with an attentive listener, finds herself at peace with her past yet anxiously anticipating the inevitable scripted betrayal of the love struck Ariadne (Tusquets 224). She verbalizes this anxiety when she tells Clara the painful story of Jorge's abandonment; An activist from her college years, who was the first to love her, the first to show her that another, a different, better world was possible, and then betrayed her by committing suicide without leaving any explanation (237-40). Clara, on the other hand, the product of a subversive education in dismantling operative paradigms of discursive authority, has transformed from a tense, quiet and passive young woman to a relaxed and active subject. She takes a more ardent approach to sustaining their love by constructing a cocoon in which Elia can conclude her metamorphosis and by making plans to convert their love into an ecumenical force for "todos los oprimidos [por] el viejo sueno de ver unidos arte, amor, revolucion" (228-9). Not only does Clara now act, but when Julio - Elia's philandering husband - finally calls to reclaim his wife, she more importantly demands that *Elia* act, that she take Julio's call and responsibility for the spinning the last thread to complete her transformation.

Despite the future Clara has in mind, Elia is ultimately unable to break away from mythic image of the island of Naxos or the socially conditioned (un)happy ending contended in childhood literature. The challenge of translating desire born knowledge

into action that would allow the protagonist to break patterns of social conditioning proves too great for Elia and the protagonist effectively reinserts herself within the patriarchal text (Servodidio "Narrative Web" 173). Over the course of dinner with Julio, the protagonist's monologue concludes it was Jorge's betrayal that delivered her to this meaningless marriage and that she now continues as a cowardly revenge - her own slow suicide - against Jorge and the idealized escape from limitations imposed by her family and social class that he offered. Drunk, emotionally numb and unable to assert her own will, Elia passively allows Julio to lead her to their matrimonial bed and do as he please with his wife's body; "el hombre…me manipula, me maneja, me dispone en posturas distintas como una muñeca bien articulada" (257). Elia lies silent and motionless under the weight of her husband, again voiceless in a world of heterosexual power. In this same moment, all language of her metamorphosis and possible transformation ends in a powerful image of Elia - displayed as a crucified butterfly – nailed by her collector-husband's phallus into his "caja para mariposas muertas"(256-7).

Thus in this act of acquiescence, the protagonist has severed the possibility of sustaining her break with gender-scripted behavior, betraying Clara and ultimately herself (Ichiishi 60). However the difference in this act of betrayal is two fold and what allows the novel to end on a quasi-hopeful note in spite of Elia's relapse into a "no vida" (270). Elia becomes Clara's Thesus by abandoning her lover, but Elia gives Clara a choice, an opportunity to protest that abandonment that Elia makes possible for Clara *because* she had experienced the injustice of its absence; "yo - aun traicionándola – le he dado la posibilidad que a mí me negó Jorge, la posibilidad de dar la réplica, de actuar en un sentido o en otro, de fijar posiciones y de tomar venganzas" (269). And from this

unscripted space of choice comes the second element that differentiates this betrayal from others in the novel: Clara removes herself from the text and returns to Colombia, not in defeat, but rather "escapa[r] sencillamente de [Elia], intacta o casi intacta su capacidad de anadar sobre las aguas…de explorar nuevos mundos subterráneos, de aprender volar…" (Tusquets 268). This action is significant because throughout the cycle of betrayal in which love or trust is repaid with desertion, Clara is the only character who consciously removes herself from the relationship in which love or trust has been betrayed.[21] Thus Clara-Ariadne assumes the dual role of follower and leader, never becoming the exploited and subsequently discarded lover of Greek myth (Bellver 21).

From the transformation observed in Clara, we can interpret this unscripted action as a direct consequence of her (mis)education under a subversive pedegogue. By accompanying Elia through a (re)reading of literary and patriarchal-bourgeoise social texts that have shaped the protaginsts present alienated existence, Clara learns that Elia's alienation is a product of forming her sense of self through those texts scripting women to a passive, mute role. And in their mutual process of subversive (un)learning the dominant social discourse, the destabilization of operative hierarchy paradigms made possible by the double female presence as educator and student reading those texts is what leads to the heterodox female pleasure facilitating Clara's intrepelation as a subject through an alternative discourse of the female body. Now able to act in ways

[21] According to Margaret Jones, betrayal forms part of an archetypal paradigm in the novel based on desertion: "[Elia's] husband Julio's infidelities and desertions (the marital betrayal), the uncompromising expectations of her mother and daughter (betrayals of the narrator's desperate need for understanding and support), her father's betrayal of Sofia's love (and simultaneous betrayal of the social 'pact' by publicly humiliating his wife), Jorge's suicide, and the narrator's betrayal of Clara" (188).

Elia has proven unable to do, Clara becomes an agent in her own maturation and exhibits an "awareness of the dangers and pleasures inherent in embodying fantasies modeled on [the] textual sources" from which Elia cannot remove herself (Molinaro 30). Tuqsuets thus suggests writing (as new social texts for women), not necessarily as a lesbian activity like Levine claims, but as process and product of subversive learning prompting new scripts for female behavior.

To revisit Elia's original memory of student protests, if the heterdox female student-pedagogue affair and ensuing discourse from the female body mirrors the senseless[22] act of the dissenting student, and Elia's return to Julio constitutes the female student's descent from the belltower into the hands of waiting men, then Clara, "esta posibilidad tan loca y tan maravillosa que se ha llamado Clara," represents the fragile but heady thing born from that radical act (Tusquets 271). Although Elia has resigned herself to a numb existence, she remains optimistic that Clara will continue "hacienda…la guerrilla y el amor y la literatura con otros en sus selvas colombianas o donde quiera y pudiera" (270). Clara, then, the active product of a subversive learning is the hopeful ending. The only problem is that when Clara leaves for Columbia, she takes the potential of that revolution happening in Spain with her. After Clara's departure, Elia is forced by her family to awake to a nightmarish existence: "Elia's punishment for deserting her class, her morality, and a whole network of oppressive social relationships, will be a slow death of disgust, desperation and resignation to re-established patriarchal[-bourgeois] authority" (Bellver 14). So while El mismo mar is

[22] Again, this discourse rising from pleasure / desire of the female body is not associated with the mind and so is described as strange, albeit incredible, to the mind.

concerned with subversion and disruption of dominant power structures, they are not necessarily dismantled. Using the university space and memory of student protest there as the framework to launch a subversive learning process within the private sphere of home and self, Tusquets does however destabilize the dominant discourse thru a double female pedagogue-student relationship that explores new social texts for women by highlighting female body centered desire as a power-producing force and source for alternative discourse of the female body. For the university student, the process of subject formation through that alternate discourse empowers Clara to remove herself from the patriarchal text of female self abnegation and gender scripted self betrayal. For Elia on the other hand, the twenty five day affair serves as a mere parenthetical break from society's "basic language of gender and sexuality that is phallically defined" (Servodidio "Esther" 489).

Why then, does Tuqsuets present a method of (mis)education that is successful for the Columbian university student but not the Spanish professor? Or, in other words, why - after participating in a heterodox relationship that collapses sexual hierarchies and produces a discourse and voice from the female body - does Elia's search for authentic self end, not in self affirmation or self-mastery, but with the protagonist "once again…mute and voiceless in a world of male heterosexual power" (Levine "Reading" 208)? While perhaps also a comment on the difficulty of translating that nacent discourse into a language of action necessary for breaking with socially conditioned behavior, or a comment on the subject as a contradictory force, I read Julio's return to reclaim his wife in an act of quasi-rape to be Tusquets dramatization of the last betrayal

of the novel, a betrayal within the democratic transition of the historical moment marked by reimposition of elite patriarchal authority and dismissal of regime violence.

By the long awaited death of Francisco Franco's in 1975, "much of Spanish society had adopted a critical attitude towards the regime" (Bernecker 79): Cultural exchange resulting from liberalizing economic policies during *el desarrollo* provided exposure to new ideas, effects of the 1966 Press Law had since slowly widened the margins of informative freedom and cultural productions, social forces were mobilizing into a visible democratic citizens movement that pushed for poltical change from below, shifting episcopal attitudes within the Catholic Church were calling for a speration of church and state, and even within the government itself pockets of elite *apuristas* recognized change was inevitable (Chulía 178, Radcliff 13 Mar). Consequently, by many accounts it seemed that traditionalism would be an unlikely option for Spain's future. Yet, traditionalism prevailed when Franco's death elevated King Juan Carlos de Borbón to the throne, thus trading one symbolic patriarchal head of state for another in the continuing paradigm of male authorial power. And while the young monarch indicated his support for political transformation of the political system, the transition from authoritarianism to constitutional monarchy left several stains on the change democracy delivered; namely the substitution of elite control for popular participation and the trade of of stability for social justice.

In regard to the former, Adolfo Suárez - King Juan Carlos's second Prime Ministert of the monarchal goverement appointed in 1976 according to procedures laid down by Franco - was given the arduous task of implementing political reform within the Francoist system that would open the constituent process for democratization.

Without recounting the complicated process at length or devaluing Suarez's impressive manipulation of the system, we can comfortably summarize that "the transition to democracy in Spain was controlled at all times by members of the authoritarian regime" (Share 123). In the long run, the transition produced a stable, functioning democracy, but similar to policies of the regime it replaced, concerns for stability put political decsion making for the future of Spain in the hands of few. On this note, consider that while the Spanish polity voted under universal sufferage in their first democratic election in forty-one years to form the parliament in 1977, the delicate balance of navigating a majority concensus among various political forces made constitution writing a product of strictly elite-level negotiation (143). The unposken goal was "to search for a historic reconciliation", but the outcome permanently embedded discrimination into the political system (Threlfall 34).

For instance, many feminist groups who organized public demonstrations to advocate for democratic reform later lobbied their contacts among the deputies of the Constitutional Committee, yet while their demands saw gains such as the reintroduction of a gender non-discrimination provision, the larger message of the finished document endorsed conventional images of the family. Monica Threlfall's article "Gendering the transition to democracy," highlights numerous disapointments for the feminist movement on the ground. One such frustration was the Primogeniture article in which "politicians agreed that the monarch's son will have precedence over their daughter…even if she is the eldest" (35). A second saw the ambiguous language of the abortion issue as a failure to include birth control as a woman's right to control over her body (35). In both cases, concensus geared elite negotiation of the democratic

constitution allowed for dismissal of voices criticizing omissions or contradictions in the text while sustaining heterosexist power relations in the authorial process and content of future laws.

A similar pattern of elite negotiation shaped the outcome of the concurrent fiscal reform package known as the Moncloa Pacts. Although Suárez had extended unions the right to strike earlier in the year, processes undertaken in 1977 to address an economic crisis threatening to derail the viability of democratic reform explicitly "excluded representatives of labor unions or entrepreneurial groups" from the negotiation table. The resulting traditional austerity measures proved successful in areas of decreasing inflation and promoting export growth to sustain the market, but these measures did not deliver the benefits or economic structural reform promised to the left in exchange for them (Share 142-3). As with the constitution, elite negotiation in the Moncloa Pacts fostered a compromise that helped stabilized the actual process of reform without completely translating tenets of that language into political-economic structural change for those excluded from, or marginalized by, the processes.

Historian Gregorio Móran considers these strategies of reform 'from above' to be call signs of "una derrota de todo aquello que era para muchos antifranquistas objetivos ineludibles del futuro: la libertad sin oligarquías que la limiten, la transformación social y la política como actividad abierta de la ciudadanía" (31). Yet, a more haunting defeat within the democratic transition was the "pact of oblivion" that was entered into as a way of dealing with the legacy of the authoritarian past (Richards 9). Or perhaps, as a way of *not* dealing with the legacy of the past would be more accurate. The transition provided elites with much experience in compromise, and in

efforts to keep negotiation smooth between government factions and the opposition by preventing any kind of violent backlash that might delay the transition, “a kind of tactic agreement to forget” became an important condition of the peacefull transition to democracy (9). This pact of oblivion made legal in a blanket amnesty granted in 1977 released hundreds of political prisoners held by the government, but moreover excused the regime from culpability for violence committed during the Civil War and thrity-six years of dictatoriship. Hence, the silence of state violence prevailed in the name of securing liberty for the Spanish populace. These legacies of elite control and dismissal of culpability for state violence – what might be considered an act of violence in and of itself - were woven into the political birth of democracy in Spain, leading many critics of the transition to view the ‘negotiated break’ with the authoritarian regime as just that, a transition allowing for continutites of the old government in the new.

It is tempting to say that critical views of the transition come more readily with the distance time offers, yet even on the eve of the constitutional referendum, those directly involved in the democractic transition subtley articulated the absence of a definite *ruptura* with the political-economy of the regime: As Suarez appeared on television to ask for popular support, the president predicted that with the approval of the constitution “everything will be different, but not everything will have changed” (qtd. in Share 150). I see something similar happening in El mismo mar, evidence that criticism of the transition to democracy existed in cultural productions as the process

was taking place. Published in 1978, the same year[24] the constitution was sent to public referendum, El mismo mar reflects an author with democracy on her mind: The specific memory of the first significant student protests calling for democratization marks the beginning of the female student-teacher subversive education that works to deconstruct authority paradigms and bring about a new social discourse for women. Yet a qualification for exploring these themes as possibilities through literature is their relative absence in referential reality, telling us that the work done in the novel is what Tusquets likely saw as an unrealized project still necessary in Spain.

The exercise Tusquets presents in imagining a more democratic social contract for women through (mis)readings of literary and class cultural texts that facilitate an unlearning of past discourses to discover a female body centered pleasure and knowledge seems to set both women up for success in actualizing their new found freedom in a relationship together. But we have seen that was not to be, and if we imagine the exercise as a metaphor for of the historical moment, when Julio, described by Tusquets as an "institución a nivel nacional," comes to reclaim his wife through violent sex, she dramatizes the reimposition of prevailing cultural authority paradims in the name of reform as negation of critical work done on the ground (251). That is, while the Spanish populace undoubtedly gained civil liberties previously withheld under the regime, the exchange of social justice and popular participation for stability in the reform process left concentration of cultural capital and patriarchal-bourgeois morality of the previous political-economy untouched in the transition to democracy. Thus,

[24] In this year also, censorship was abolished and homosexuality decriminalized. Notably, unlike Moix's treatment of the topic, Tusquets makes no attempt to present Elia's lesbianism as the result of a traumatic childhood or explain it away as pathos (Mina 411).

despite the work of unlearning the prevailing social contract of her past during the parenthesis of possibility, Elia remains a failed subject hoping that “esta posibilidad tan loca y tan maravillosa que se ha llamado Clara” will bring change elsewhere (Tusquets 271). In sum, Tusquets presents a a method of (mis)education that is successful in writing a new script of female behavior for the student leaving Spain in order to illustrate what unchanged structures in Spain deliver Elia to defeat. So while El mismo mar destabilizes operative discourse as the only criterion for women’s social positioning by highlighting female body centered pleasure and knowledge as a source of new discourse for women, if Tusquets articulates an explicit program for larger sociopolitical change, it is calling out 1977 - the year of the betryal - as one that has failed to deliver the sought effects.

CONCLUSION

After the Spanish Civil War, processes undertaken by the Francoist regime to secure a stable power base followed a fascist model of authoritarian modernization that vertically reorganized society in reflection of the hierarchal state while forging a national identity shaped by conservative-class interests. For almost forty years thereafter, the state managed a prolonged project of indoctrination of National-Catholic ideology that socialized women into subordination while channeling female labor power in the national endeavor through gender scripts prompting their political withdrawal from public spaces to form a subjectivity in relation to the act of reproducing state power in the private sphere. Close readings of the novels treated in this project have shown Nada, Julia, and El Mimso Mar to be exercises in reading these exploitative power relations - "from below" as Foucault puts it – by examining the mechanisms shaping female action, desire, and conceptions of normalcy and deviance as a means to imagine new social discourses for women.

A strategic setting for these exercises in reading power, the university experience frames both present action in the novels and the search for identity taken up by the protagonist while occupying that public space. We have considered theoretically how control of educative institutions is crucial to constructing the hegemony of a dominant discourse, but historically we know that Spanish universities served as an ideological battlegrounds throughout the dictatorship where resistance to the regime's totalitarian revisionist project came into direct contact with forces designed to perpetuate National-Catholic ideology. Falling short of the perfect normalizing system, the circular continuity of student mobilization and state repression highlights

universities as sites of (marginalized) ideological difference and resistive action. So, if to be a scholar one must be actively involved in the process of learning or producing knowledge, and if the production of knowledge leads to awareness and investment of power in the body of the scholar, then the scholar identity within the university space becomes a possible site of resistance because it is identity in motion. That is, the scholar identity by vocation is not static. In this sense, when learning or producing knowledge happens where alternative ideologies exist, the scholar identity is constantly at risk of slipping out of ideological hold of the state interpelating machine that relies on fixed identities to sustain a power base. Thus looking at the scholar identity as a site of resistance to the ideological hold of the state helps show why the university became one of the most consistent spaces of organized resistance to the regime, and significantly, why Laforet, Moix and Tusquets spatially situated the identity crisis of their protagonists within the frame of university experience as part of an exercise in imagining new social discourses for women.

By analyzing the experiences of protagonists who occupy the female scholar identity under a subversive pedagogue supplying an alternative discourse, I have found that by breaking state mediation of the discourse forming female subjectivity, the political action the protagonists and subversive pedagogues perform is the act of (mis)education itself that creates a political consciousness critical of the operative social system when directing the act of knowledge production towards the private sphere. The resistive nature of this act is highlighted in the novels by parallel references to student movements of the historical moment. Furthermore, we see that for these female protagonists, the scholar identity as a performative role of knowledge producer operates

as a site of resistance to the ideological hold of the state specifically because it ruptures the reproductive cycle of National-Catholic ideology positioning women as the passive receptacles of phallogocentric male knowledge. Instead of reproducing National-Catholic ideology, we see that the female scholar, as representative of the sustained female presence in intersecting public and private spheres, *produces* self knowledge of patriarchal-bourgeois power relations governing women's social condition: Andrea, for example, uncovers exploitation of the working class woman as the cornerstone of survival for the crisis-ridden household of *calle* Aribau, while Julia reaches a conscious understanding that her present crisis stems in part from repressed memories of male sexual violence on the female body.

Additionally, treating the female scholar identity as a site of resistance in which the overlap of public and private spheres facilitates using the university as a public framework to address power relations governing the private sphere, raises the future question of whether a real distinction exists between the public and private spheres. While further research is needed to uncover the larger implications of this question, the historical moment in which these novels were written suggests that the distinction between private and public spheres disseminated under Franco's regime is more of a bourgeois social construct used to give women a clear national purpose within very limited peramiters of movement. Because the reproductive power of women – in both the physical and ideological sense – was crucial to reproducing National-Catholisized subjects, the state and the patriarchal-bourgeois social order it upheld was understandably the primary beneficiary of a separate spheres ideology. From what we can conclude, Laforet, Moix and Tusquets spacially locate an alternative subjectivity

formation process for their protagonists under subversive pedagogues within the public sphere *because* occupying the scholar identity of knowledge procuder was antagonistic to state sanctioned scripts of gendered behavior. The fact that doing so facilitates female resistive action in recognizing repressive power realitons within the private sphere further hightlights why the National-Catholic state would create or impose separation between specific groups and arenas of political action.

Performing the female scholar identity under a subversive pedegoge thus involves for the protagonists a simultaneous process of unlearning herself as the means of reproduction in service to the state. By fracturing the traditional culture and control mechanisms that are inherent to it (separate spheres ideology, state mediated discourse forming one's subjectivity, silence of violence on the female body, etc.), this subversive learning process in turn destabilizes phallogocentric discourse as the singular source of behavioral scripts for women and opens the space to suggest new discourses of female action and desire; such as that of female comradery presented in Nada, that of engaging thoughts directed at onself to rouse a consciousness of the body as seen in Julia, or that of female body-centered desire and discourse of the body as seen in El mismo mar. Significanly, by studying the scholar identity as a performative role subject to slipping out of ideological hold while allowing for processes of subject formation through alternative ideologies, we are better able to understand that hegemony is never compelete and that identities are not only impermenant, but radically open, confused, unfinished, and for that reason, capable of change.

In this reguard we have seen that while each protagonist undergoes change in political concicousness, the present subjectivites of the female scholars are marked with

mix results as the each novel comes to a close. Nada and Andrea's search for female independence ends on a positive note, for the alternative discourse of female comrodery characterizes the subjectivity with which she departs for Madrid. However this postitive ending is largely due to the the novel's ambiguously hopeful conclusion; we know Andrea returns to *calle* Aribau as an female authorial voice narrating past experiences there, but the success of self-mastery itself, if it happens, happens off the page. Clara from El mimso mar perhaps provides the most successful example of a subject interpelated through the explored text of female-centered pleasure to become an active, speaking subject, but then leaves Spain. Julia and Elia's experiences with the scholar identity on the other hand, end in failed subjectivities. Both participate in a subversive education producing body-centered knowledge, nevertheless by the conclusion of the novels, the only protagonists to definitively comment on the status of female self-mastery in Spain are cast back into a kind of 'non-life'. The remaining task is how to read this void.

The most readily available explanation is that while momentarily empowered, Julia and Elia are met with political backlash by those representing dominant culture; two such examples being the reacctioanry response of Julia's family to her attempt at suicide and the return of Elia's husband to reclaim his wife after her lesbian love affair. Hence this void presents evidence that individuals experienced tangible retribution for breaking with the normalizing process of state assisted education. A second conclusion leaning on the understanding of indentity construction as a process subject to expereimentation with other possible selves, interprets this void as evidence that the cohesive self is in fact a bourgeois myth (Jordan 110). Still, and perhaps most relevant

to future praxis, while the subversive education these protagonists undergo produces a critical conciousness of and limited resistive action towards heterosexist control, we can conclude that women cannot be liberated from a subjugated social status without also addressing class! As the regime rolled out its ultranationalist project of reconstructing traditional *hispanidad* through a model of authoritarian modernization, the task assigned Spanish women in the endeavor (script of motherhood and locus of dominant values) positioned them securely at the intrinsically linked and intersecting oppressions of capitalism and patriarchy within the Francoist political-economy. Church sanctioned and state assisted alienation of voice, self and desire from the female body is the cornerstone of capitalist societies governed by patriarchal-bourgeois morality, and necessarily, producing self-knowledge of women's social condition as a product of male exploited labour power (that is, a *gendered* alientation of the worker from the ownership of the means of production) may prove the key to articulating a new socio-political discourse for women inclusive of female body centered desire and pleasure.

Thus without addressing patriarchal authority paradigms *and* class antagonism, the project of uncovering female body centered desire as a source for new discourses for women remains an open but unfinished one across the historical trajectory in which these novels were produced. In Nada, Andrea calls out Gloria's anxiety with male authored texts depicting the sensual woman as whorish while shutting her out of the authorial process. Twenty three years later, Moix draws attention to lesbianism within the text of Julia by means of coded silence in order to call out unnamed homosexual desire as a barrier to Julia's self-mastery. However, because that treatment is indicative of an absence in the socio-political discourse of Spain, the novel breaks the silence of

lesbianism by writing about that silence, but does not convert female desire into female discourse (Levine "Moix" 343). Next El mismo mar, seemingly picking up where Julia left off, clearly identifies female body-centered pleasure as a source of new discourse of the female body, yet alludes to the 'strange words' without actually articulating them before falling back into a meaningless marriage. Hence, while this trajectory concludes with affirmation identifying female body centered desire as a source of new discourse of the body needed to imagine new social texts for women, it ends with work to be done.

One last consideration of the failed subjectivities exhibited by protagonists in the novels is how this void of female self-mastery can be read as evidence showing continuities in power relations of authoritarian regimes and capitalist democracies. In this regard, we see that the protagonist-scholars share common concerns of alienation and a search for self across the thirty-three year historical trajectory in which the novels were written. We have also seen that from the onset of the regime's Nationalist totalitarian revisionist project operationalized through a fascist model of authoritarian modernization, to a period of capitalist market expansion, and finally to a capitalist parliamentary democracy, patriarchal-bourgeois morality presents consistent obstacles in the search for new social texts for women across this historical trajectory. At the temporal junctures of change under the regime at which time these novels were written, each novel presents the possibility of breaking with the status quo. Yet at the end of Julia and El mismo mar eventhough a process of subversive education produces an alternative political conciousness in the protagonists, conservative bourgeois-patriarchal

morality as a reflection of the political-economy governing female social postion under the regime is securely re-instated.

So while parts of society where indeed undergoing changes in mentalities (reflected in part by the increasing student agitation at the university refrenced in the novels) and civil liberties were extended during the democratic transiton, by looking at the outcome of the experiences female scholars have with processes of subversive education, it appears that fundamental political-economic power structures – such as concentration of economic and political capital in the hands of elites and the failure to incorporate those apon whoes exploited labor the structures rest into the political system - survived well beyond the Francoist regime. This perhaps suggests that the power dynamics of the changing political models as shown in Spain are, if not similar, at least not mutually exclusive. Does this expose crisis/failures in Spanish democracy or capitalist democracy as a political system? Consider the comments of political sociologist Carlos Waisman:

> The Spanish transition was one of the first in the current wave of democratization, and it has been considered a model for similar processes in many parts of the world. In many ways it became the standard by which the success of the other cases was measured. For countries that initiated a similar itinerary later, Spain had to be the obvious reference point and trendsetter. (Waisman and Rein vii)

The fact that Spain is celebrated as an example of democracy's triumph over a repressive government, favors the idea that inequalities within and exclusion from the political system are systemic to the poltical model of capitalist democracy, not necessarily limited to the case of Spain in particular. If gender and classist restrictions on women remained the intertwined and consistent obstacles to female subject mastery

not defined by subjugation across a historical trajectory spanning days of a totalitarian revisionist project through authoritarian modernization to a capitalist democracy in Spain, and Spain serves as a model transition between the two *eventhough* continutites exist in political-economic power structures on both sides of the transition, then this project contributes to deconstructing the myth that authoritarian regimes and capitalist democracies are inherently different.

While every academic study leaves questions to be answered, what I hope this project contributes definitively to the larger conversation on Spanish history and literature is evidence that that despite constraints on women's advocacy, the years of Francoist dictatorship did not represent a complete void of political activity for women. The works of Carmen Laforet, Ana Maria Moix and Esther Tusquets are three such examples. Their literary contributions to revealing the realities of life under the regime and meditations on the scholar identity as a site of resistance to the ideological hold of the state, not only speak to the need and possibility of change, but as literature by women, is the "space that can serve as a springboard for subversive thought [and] the precursory movement of a transformation of the social and cultural structures" (Cixous "Laugh" 879-80). Most importantly, by including literature in studies of resistance, reading these works critically allows us the opportunity to recognize the value of the resistance they purpose while uncovering problems posed therein as cues for where the struggle for social change needs to go in the future!

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alcalde, Carmen. Mujeres en el Franquismo: Exiliadas, nacionalistas y opositoras. Barcelona: Flor del Viento Ediciones, 1996.

Asociación Mujeres en la Transición Democrática. Españolas en la transición: de excluidas a protagonistas (1973-1982). Madrid: Editorial Biblioteca Nueva, 1999.

Arendt, Hannah. "Ideology of Terror: A Novel Form of Government." The Origins of Totalitarianism. New York: Harcourt, 1973. 460-79.

Balibar, Etienne. "The Nation Form: History and Ideology." Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities. Trans. Chris Turner. Eds. Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein. London: Verso, 1991. 86-106.

Bell, David S., ed. Democratic Politics in Spain: Spanish Politics after Franco. London: Frances Pinter, 1983.

Bellver, Catherine. "The Language of Eroticism in the Novels of Esther Tusquets." Anales de la Literatura Espanola Contemporanea 9 (1984): 13-27.

Bernecker, Walter. "The Change in Mentalities During the Late Franco Regime." Trans. Jacqueline Cook. Townson 67-84.

Boyer, Agustín. "Lectura del pasado como constructo narrativo: Textualización del "yo" femenino en dos novelas de Carmen Martín Gaite y Esther Tusquets." Cincinnati Romance Review. 12(1993): 92-101.

Brown, Joan, ed. Women Writers of Contemporary Spain: Exiles in the Homeland. Newark: U of Delaware Press, 1991.

Buchanan, Tom. "How 'Different' Was Spain? The Later Franco Regime in International Context." Townson 85-96.

Bush, Andrew. "Ana María Moix's Silent Calling." Brown 136-58.

Casado, Stacey Dolgin. Squaring the Circle: Esther Tusquets' Novelistic Tetraology (A Jungian Analysis). Newark: Juan de la Cuesta Hispanic Monographs, 2002.

---. "From the Modern to the Post Modern Novel: The Case of Esther Tusquets." Hispanófila 133 (2001): 43-52.

---. "The Psychodynamics of Autobiography and Fiction in Esther Tusquets' Novels." Letras Peninsulares 13, no.2-3 (2000): 751-65.

Chuliá, Elisa. "Cultural Diversity and the Development of a Pre-democratic Civil Society in Spain." Townson 163-181.

Ciplijauskaité. Biruté. La construcción del yo femenino en la literatura. Cádiz: Publicaciones de la Universidad de Cádiz, 2004.

Cixous, Hélène. "Sorties." Modern Criticism and Theory. Ed. David Lodge. London: Longman, 1988. 286-93.

---. "The Laugh of Medusa." Trans. Keith Cohen and Paula Cohen. Signs 1.4 (1976) 875-93.

Conboy, Katie, Nadia Medina and Sarah Standbury, eds. Writing on the Body: Female Embodiment and Feminist Theory. Clumbia: Columbia UP, 1997.

Cornejo-Parriego, Rosalía V. "Mitología, representación e identidad en El mismo mar de todos los veranos de Esther Tusquets." Anales de la Literatura Espanola Contemporanea 20 (1995): 47-63.

Cristóbal, Gloria Nielfa, ed. Mujeres y hombres en la España franquista: Sociedad, economía, política, cultura. Madrid: Editorial Complutense Madrid, 2003.

Dolgin, Stacy L. "Conversación con Esther Tusquets: Para salir de tanta miseria." Anales de la Literatura Espanola Contemporanea 13, no. 3 (1988): 398.

Enders, Victoria Lorée and Pamela Beth Radcliff, eds. Constructing Spanish Womanhood: Female Identity in Modern Spain. Albany: State U of New York Press, 1999.

---. "Problematic Portraits: The Ambiguous Historical Role of the *Sección Femenina* of the Falange." Eds. Enders and Radcliff 375-99.

Ennis, Glafyra. Introduction. Nada. By Carmen Laforet. New York: Peter Lang, 1993. 1-3.

Escario, Pilar, Inés Alberdi and Ana Inés López-Accotto. Lo personal es político. Spain: Instituto de la Mujer, 1996.

Firmat, Gustavo Pérez. "Carmen Laforet: The Dilemma of Artistic Vocation". Ed. Brown 26-41.

Gascón-Vera, Elena. "El naufragio del deseo: Esther Tusquets y Sylvia Molloy." Plaza: Revista de la Literatura 11(1986): 20-4.

Gómez, Aurora Morcillo. “Shaping True Catholic Womanhood: Fancoist Educational Discourse on Women.” Eds. Enders and Radcliff 51-70.

Griffin, Roger. “Revolution from the Right: Fascism.” Revolutions and the Revolutionary Tradition in the West. Ed. David Parker. London: Routledge, 2000. 185-201.

Guibernau, Montserrat. Catalan Nationalism: Francoism, transition and democracy. London: Routledge, 2004.

Hart, Stephen. “Esther Tusquets: Sex, Excess and the Dangerous Supplement of Language.” Antipodas III. 3 (1991): 85-98.

Ichiishi, Barbara F. The Apple of Earthly Love: Female Development in Esther Tusquets’ Fiction. Nuestra Voz 1. Ed. Amy Williamsen. New York: Peter Lang, 1994.

Jackson, Gabriel. A Concise History of the Spnaish Civil War. New York: John Day Co., 1974.

Jones, Anny Brooksbank. Women in Contemporary Spain. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1997.

Jones, Margaret E. “Del compromiso al egoísmo: La metamorfosis de la protagonista en la novelística femenina de post-guerra.” Novelistas Femeninas de Post-guerra Española. Perez 125-34.

---. Afterward. The Same Sea as Every Summer. By Esther Tusquets. Trans. Margaret Jones. Nebraska: U of Nebraska Press, 1990.

Jonson, Roberta. “Carmen Laforet.” Eds. Levine, Marson and Walkman 242-252.

Jordan, Barry. Laforet: Nada. Valencia: Artes Gráficas Soler, 1993.

Kingery, Sandra. “Memories of Love: Ana Maria Moix and Esther Tusquets Remember.” Mester 30 (2001): 52-62.

Laforet, Carmen. Nada. New York: Oxford UP, 1958.

---. Nada. Trans. Glafyra Ennis. New York: Peter Lang, 1993.

Leante César. “Hacia un abordaje: Esther Tusquets y Rosa Montero ante la escritura femenina.” Un Mito Nuevo: La mujer como sujeto/objeto literario. Ed. Elena Gascón Vera. Madrid: Editorial Pliegos, 1992. 61-90.

Levine, Linda Gould, Ellen Engelson Marson and Gloria Feiman Waldman, eds. Spanish Women Writers: A Bio-Bibliographic Source Book. London: Greenwood Press, 1993.

---. "Ana Maria Moix." Eds. Levine, Marson and Waldman 337-349.

---."Reading, Rereading, Misreading and Rewriting the Canon: The Narrative Web of Esther Tusquets' Trilogy," Anales de la Literatura Espanola Contemporanea 12 (1987) 203-17.

---. "The Censored Sex; Women as Author and Character in Franco's Spain." Women in Hispanic Literature: Icon and Fallen Idols. Ed. Beth Miller. Berkeley: U of California Press, 1983. 289 – 315.

--- and Gloria Feiman Waldman. Feminismo ante el Franquismo. Miami: Ediciones Universal, 1980.

Lirot, Julie. "La identidad femenina como subversión amorosa en la narrativa de Esther Tusquets." Letras Peninsulares 16.3 (2003): 657-72.

Lopez, Aurora and M.ª Ángeles Pastor, eds. Crítica y ficción literaria: mujeres españolas contemporáneas. Granada: Universidad de Granada, 1989.

Lopez-Cabrales, María del Mar. "Esther Tusquets: Secretos de la Borgesia." Palabras de mujeres: Escritoras españolas contemporáneas. Madrid: Narcea, S.A. de Ediciones, 2002. 151-66.

Lurumbe, M.ª Ángeles. Una Inmensa Minoría: Influencia y feminismo en la Transición. Zaragoza: Prensas Universitarias de Zaragoza, 2002.

Macy, David. Dictionary of Critical Theory. London: Penguin, 2001.

Maravall, J. M. "Student and Politics in Contemporary Spain." Government and Opposition. 11.2(2007) 157-79. Wiley InterScience. UCSD library, San Diego. 3 Oct 2008. <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/120064648/abstract>

Marr, M.J. "Mapping the Space of Self: Cartography and the Narrative Act in Esther Tusquest's El mismo mar De Todos Los Veranos." Anales de la Literatura Espanola Contemporanea 29.1 (2004): 217-33.

Martin-Cabrera, Luis. Conversation. UCSD, California. 27 May 2008.

Mazquiarán de Rodríguez, Mercedes. "Entrevista con Esther Tusquets." Letras Peninsulares 13, no. 2-3 (2000): 609-19.

---. “Narrative Strategies in the Novels of Esther Tusquets.” Monographic Review 7 (1991) 124-34.

Mina, Alberto. “Esther Tusquets”. Who’s Who in Contemporary Gay and Lesbian Hisotry. Eds. Robert Aldrich and Garry Wotherspoon: From World Ward II to Present Day. London: Routledge, 2001. 410-11.

Moix, Ana Maria. Julia. Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1970.

---. “Frente, Contra o En Pos del Amor: Esther Tusquets.” Quimera: Revista de Literatura 123 (1994): 58-9.

---. Julia. Trans. Sandra Kingery. Lincoln: U of Nebraska Press, 2004.

Molinaro, Nina L. Foucault, Feminism and Power: Reading Esther Tusquets. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 1991.

Morán, Gregorio. El Precio de la transición: Una interpretación diferente y radical del proceso que condujo a Espana de la dictadura a la democracia. Editorial Planeta, Espana: 1991

Nichols, Geraldine Cleary. “*Julia*: This is the Way the World Ends.” Novelistas femeninas de la posguerra española. Ed. Janet Pérez. Madrid: Ediciones José Poffúa Turanzas, 1983. 113-23.

---. “Minding her P’s and Q’s: The Fiction of Esther Tusquets.” Indiana Journal of Hispanic Literatures 2.1(1993):159-79.

Nigel, Townson, ed. Spain Transformed: The late Franco Dictatorship, 1957-75. New York: Palgrave MacMillian, 2007.

Odartey-Wellington, Dorothy. “De las madres perversas y las hadas buenas: una nueva visión sobre la imagen esencial de al mujer en las novelas de Carmen Martín Gaite y Esther Tusquets.” Anales de la Literatura Espanola Contemporanea 25.2 (2000): 529-55.

Ordóñez, Elizabeth J. “The Double Voices of Youth: Writing Within and Beyond the Lines of Demarcation in Lafoet’s *Nada*.” Voices of Their Own: Contemporary Spanish Narrative by Women. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 1991. 33-52.

---. “*Nada*: Initiation into Bourgeoise Patriarchy.” The Analysis of Hispanic texts: Current trends in methodology: Second York College Colloquium. Eds. Lisa E. Davis and Isabel C. Tarán. Jamaica, N.Y.: Bilingual Press/Editorial Bilingüe, 1976. 61-78.

---. “A Quest for Matrilineal Roots and Mythopoesis: Esther Tusquets’ El mismo mar de Todos los Veranos.” Critica Hispanica 6.1 (1984): 37-46.

Palomares, Cristina. “New Political Mentalities in the *Tardofranquismo.*” Townson 119-139.

Pérez, Janet. Contemporary Women Writers of Spain. Boston: Twayne, 1988.

---, ed. Novelistas Femeninas de la Postguerra Espanola. Madrid: Porrúa, 1983.

Pérez-Sánchez, Gema. "Reading, Writing, and the Love that Dares Not Speak its Name: Eloquent Silences in Ana María Moix's Julia." Tortilleras: Hispanic and U. S. Latina Lesbian Expression. Ed. Lourdes Torres and Inmaculada Pertusa. Philadelphia, PA: Temple UP, 2003. 91-117.

Radcliff, Pamela. Lecture. UCSD, California. 3 March 2008.

---. Lecture. UCSD, California. 11 March 2008.

---. Lecture. UCSD, California. 13 March 2008.

---. “Associations and the Social Origins of the Transition during the Late Fanco Regime.” Townson 141-162.

Richards, Michael. A Time of Silence. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.

Richmond, Kathleen. Women and Spanish Fascism: The Women’s Section of the Falange 1934-1959. London: Routledge, 2003.

Ross, Catherine Bourland. “Ser mujer hoy en día; Esther Tusquets y su escritura.” Confluencia: Revista Hispánica de Cultura y Literatura 20.2 (2005): 212-8.

Sartorius, Nicolás and Javier Alfaya. “Bajo la Sombra del Pecado.” La Memoria Insumisa: Sobre la dictadura de Franco. Espana: Espasa Calpe 1999, 331-72.

Schumm, Sandra J. “Subjective Devices to Reveal the Feminine Psyche in Carmen Laforet’s Nada” Reflections in Sequence: Novels by Spanish Women, 1944 to 1988. Lewishburg: Bucknell UP, 1999. 25-44.

Servodido, Mirella d’Ambrosio. “Esther Tusquet’s Fiction: The Spinning of a Narrative Web”. Brown. 159-78.

---. “Esther Tusquets.” Eds. Levine, Marson and Waldman 495-506.

Share, Donald. The Making of Spanish Democracy. New York: Praeger, 1986.

Smith-Sherwood, Dawn M. “Situating Selves: Female Subjectivities in the Post-Franco Narrative of Esther Tusquets, Clara Janés and Monterrat Riog.” Diss. U of New York at Buffalo. Ann Arbor: UMI, 2001. 3021949

Soliño Maria, Elena. “When Wendy Grew Up: The Importance of Peter Pan in Ana Maria Matute’s *Primera Memoria* and Esther Tusquets’ *El mismo mar De Todos Los Veranos*.” Post/Imperial Encoutners: Anglo-Hispanic Cultural Relations. Ed. Juan E. Tazón Salces (ed. and introd.) and Carrera Suárez, Isabel (ed and introd.) Amsterdam, Netherlands: Rodopi, 2005 117-188.

Steen, Maria Sergia Guiral. “Triunfo del canon cultural en El mismo mar de Todos los Veranos.” Confluencia: Revista Hispánica de Cultura y Literatura. 20.1 (2004): 55-62.

Sullivan, Constance. “On Spanish Literary History and the Politics of Gender.” Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association 23.2 (1990): 26-41.

Threlfall, Monica. “Gendering the transition to democracy: Reassessing the impact of women’s activism.” Threlfall, Cousins and Valiente 11- 54.

Tusquets, Esther. El mismo mar de todos los veranos. Madrid, Spain: Editorial Castalia, 1978.

Valdelvira, Gregorio. La Oposición Estudiantil al Franquismo. Madrid: Editorial Síntesis, 2006.

Waisman, Carlos and Raanan Rein, eds. Spanish and Latin American Transitions to Democracy. Portland, Oregon: Sussex Academic Press, 2005.

Zatlin, Phyllis, “Women Novelists in Democratic Spain: Freedom to Express Female Perspective,” Anales de la Literatura Espanola Contemporanea 12.1-2 (1987): 29 - 44.