Introduction: The Politics of Exile

In this book, we analyze the resilience and transformation of political exile from colonial times to the present in Latin America. The premise of this study is that exile has been a regulatory mechanism for political systems unable to create pluralistic and inclusive models of participation; and although exile developed as an elite phenomenon in the 19th century when political participation was restricted, it became a massive trend in the 20th century as mobilizations and more inclusive participation led to authoritarian rule.

Exile is a perennial subject that signals the logic of political exclusion and displacement from internal public spheres. Western democracies have increasingly developed pluralistic and tolerant public spheres that enabled them to contain countervailing, opposition forces without expelling them from their midst, as long as all sides abided by the democratic game. Former ruling elites, whose misdeeds during tenure have been exposed publicly, as well as dissident intellectuals and vocal opponents of incumbent administrations, have been able to act and express themselves in the public domains without being forced to abandon their home countries. After impeachment procedures were recommended, Richard Nixon resigned the presidency in 1974 but did not leave the United States. Charles De Gaulle abandoned office in 1946 for the solace of Colombey les Deux-Eglises, to return to power in 1958 and establish the Fifth Republic. When Giulio Andreotti, prime minister of Italy for many terms, was accused of corruption and complicity with organized crime, he still could stay in his home country and trust justice. Under established democracies and within the rule of law, both leading and rank-and-file politicians have been able to remain in their country and be involved in the public domain. This has not been the case in Latin America.

Institutional exclusion has been a major constitutive feature of Latin American politics. Clearly enough, the area has witnessed many rebellions, movements of protest, and pressures for widening political participation and access to political power and resources. Yet, in parallel, the political domain has often been controlled by narrow circles of elites, ostracizing others, while

1

the masses have been forced to work through mediating networks, clientelism, and favoritism. These trends have been present both in authoritarian, dictatorial environments and in situations in which those in power have professed to revolutionize their countries, and even in democratic situations. In other words and focusing on political actors, although exclusion of the opposition has been a natural correlate of authoritarianism, exclusion has not been absent from democratic openings. Under both authoritarianism and democracy, those fallen from power or directly in the opposition often have been forced to take the road of exile. Many opposition figures and rank-and-file citizens have moved abroad following Chávez's increasing control of the public sphere in Venezuela. In addition, former presidents such as Alberto Fujimori, Carlos Salinas de Gortari, Jamil Mahuad, and Alejandro Toledo have decided to leave their home countries instead of facing the difficulties of postpresidential life. Democracies have professed to respect the basic rights of every citizen, and yet, similar to the authoritarian polities that have used expulsion and exile as normative political tools, democracies too have been characterized by persecution, exclusion, and ostracism of citizens expressing voices dissenting with those in power. The recurrent use of exile reflects an ongoing challenge of the incomplete and exclusionary nature of the nation-states in the region.

Political exile has been a major political practice in all Latin American countries throughout most of the 19th and 20th centuries. It is our claim that exile has played a vital part in shaping the form and styles of Latin American politics.

Despite its ubiquity in these countries, political exile is still an underresearched topic. Although fascinating, until recently it has been conceived of as somewhat marginal for the development of these societies and has been studied in the framework of traditional concepts and concerns in history and the social sciences. It is not unusual to find numerous biographical monographs that mention exile as a formative political experience, from well-known cases such as those of Bolívar or Perón to less-renowned individuals, whose aggregate testimonies build up a collective story of communities of exiles and expatriates. Similarly, and not surprisingly, a testimonial literature accompanied the last wave of political exiles, first documenting the experiences of Brazilians who were forced to leave their country in the aftermath of the 1964 *coup d'état*,[1] and marking a trend that was to repeat itself continuously over the next three decades. A number of such biographies and testimonies has burgeoned in the past generation and include some outstanding and insightful works.[2]

---

[1] Pedro Celso Uchôa Cavalcanti and Jovelino Ramos, *Memórias do exilio: Brasil 1964/19??*. São Paulo: Editora Livraria Livramento, 1978; Abelardo Jurema, *Exilio*. Paraiba: Acauá, 1978.

[2] Among them: Albertina de Oliveira Costa, et al., *Memórias das mulheres do exílio: obra coletiva.* Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1980; Albino Gómez, *Exilios (Por qué volvieron)*. Rosario: Homo Sapiens Ediciones, 1999; Flavio Tavares, *Memorias do esquecimento*. São Paulo: Globo, 1999; Carlos Ulanovsky, *Seamos felices mientras estamos aquí.* Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamericana, 2001; Diana Guelar, Vera Jarach, and Beatriz Ruiz, *Los chicos del exilio. Argentina (1975–1984)*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones el País de Nomeolvides, 2002; David Cox, *En honor a la verdad.*

These biographical accounts and testimonies of exiles and expatriates con-tribute important building blocks toward a reconstruction of the collective experiences of exile. They also point out the ubiquity and profound impact of the phenomenon, which resulted from political exclusion and persecution by the military dictatorship of the 1960s to 1980s. And yet, most of these testimonies do not provide a systematic analysis of the role of exile in Latin American politics and societies and also do little to explain the recurrence of exile or its transformations over time, from the early 19th century to the late 20th century. Only recently have collective works moved in the direction of constructing building blocks for a comprehensive approach to specific commu-nities of co-nationals exiled during the last wave of military dictatorships.[3]

In parallel, recent years have witnessed the proliferation of literary analy-sis and criticism focusing on the universal meaning of the experience of exile, from forced to self-imposed exile. This literature is mainly anchored in 20th-century writings, reflecting the pronounced impact of political repression and military dictatorships of the 1970s and 1980s on exile.[4] Often, these works provide in-depth theoretical hindsight of the existential experience of marginal-ization and the tensions it creates, especially for writers rooted in the language of communities that were silenced by repression and underwent processes of cultural transformation in which the exiles took only a tangential part while abroad. And yet, most works in this line are strongly permeated by postmodern emphases and have been less prone to contribute to the systematic social and political study of the impact and roles of exile in Latin American politics.

Memorias desde el exilio de Robert Cox. Buenos Aires: Colihue, 2002; Abril Trigo, *Memorias migrantes. Testimonios y ensayos sobre la diáspora Uruguaya*. Buenos Aires and Montevideo: Beatriz Viterbo Editora and Ediciones Trilce, 2003; Jorge Luis Bernetti and Mempo Giardinelli, *México: El exilio que hemos vivido*. Buenos Aires: Editorial de la Universidad Nacional de Quilmes, 2003; and Pilar Roca, *Ismael Viñas. Ideografía de un mestizo*. Buenos Aires: Dunken, 2005.

[3] José del Pozo Artigas, Ed., *Exiliados, emigrados y retornados chilenos en America y Europa, 1973–2004*. Santiago: RIL Editores, 2006; Silvia Dutrénit-Bielous, Ed., *El Uruguay del exilio. Gente, circunstancias, escenarios*. Montevideo: Trilce, 2006; Pablo Yankelevich and Silvina Jensen, Eds., *Exilios. Destinos y experiencias bajo la dictadura militar*. Buenos Aires: Libros del Zorzal, 2007.

[4] Gloria Da Cunha-Giabbai. *El exilio: Realidad y ficción*. Montevideo: Arca, 1992; Ana Vásquez, and Angela Xavier de Brito, "La situation de l'exilée: essai de gènèralisation fondé sur l'exemple de réfugiés Latino-américains." *Intercultures*, 21 (1993): 51–66; William Rowe and Teresa Whit-field, "Thresholds of Identity: Literature and Exile in Latin America." *Third World Quarterly*, 9, 1 (1997): 232–255; Maria José de Queiroz, *Os males da ausência ou a literatura do exílio*. Rio de Janeiro: Topbooks, 1998; María-Inés Lagos-Pope, "Testimonies from Exile: Works by Hernán Valdés, Eduardo Galeano and David Viñas," in idem., Ed., *Exile in Literature*. Lewis-burg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 1999; Hamid Naficy, Ed., *Home, Exile, Homeland*. New York and London: Routledge, 1999; Amy K. Kaminsky, *After Exile. Writing the Latin Amer-ican Diaspora*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999; Mike González, "Exile," in Daniel Balderston, Mike González, and Ana M. López, Eds., *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Latin American and Caribbean Cultures*. London and New York: Routledge, 2000, Vol. 2, pp. 539–540.

Another major corpus of work is that developed by psychologists, social psychologists, social workers, and psychiatrists on the difficulties that many exiles faced as they were displaced from their homeland. These works have elaborated, often in penetrating ways, the problems of adjustment, personal disarticulation, mental stress, distrust and isolation, cases of suicide, as well as high rates of family disruption and divorce. Outstanding is the pioneering work of Ana Vásquez and Ana María Araujo, *Exils Latino-americains. La malediction d'Ulysse*, which, on the basis of their professional experience with South American exiles in France, has elaborated a theoretical stage-by-stage analysis of exile. According to their analysis, also reminiscent of the Grinbergs' work, exiles live through an initial phase of pain and remorse, followed by a phase of transculturation, and a possible third phase of shattering illusions and deep questioning. Although we rely on the insights of this work and similar contributions, we refrain from reviewing in a systematic way their contribution to the understanding of the exilic condition.[5]

Our work follows a sociopolitical perspective, analyzing political exile, its background, patterns, and wider social and cultural impacts. Recent developments in political science and history, sociology, anthropology, and international relations have highlighted the centrality of diasporas and transnational studies, of transience and relocation, of cultural hybridity and multiple modernities. Following these analytical developments, we suggest that the study of Latin American exile can become a topic of central concern, closely related to basic theoretical problems and controversies in these disciplines. In parallel, we suggest that the systematic study of exile also promises to lead to new readings of Latin American development, away from the traditional readings of national histories and toward other more regional, transnational, or even continental dimensions.

On the theoretical level, the study of exile highlights an ongoing tension between the principle of national membership and the principle of citizenship. Once a person is pushed into exile, she or he may lose the entitlements attached to citizenship but, at the same time, he or she may become even more attached than before to what is perceived as the 'national soul.' There is a latent but distinct dimension of collective identity submerged in citizenship, necessarily recognized while in exile. Accordingly, it has been abroad that many of the displaced nationals discovered, rediscovered, or rather invented the 'collective soul' of their countries in primordial or spiritual terms. Whereas some migrants and sojourners became transnational and deterritorialized, many others sought to reconstruct their bonds of solidarity in terms of the home collective identity, thus opening a fascinating area of political and cultural debate as these societies returned to democracy and opened their public spheres.

---

[5] See, for instance, Jorge Barudy et al., *Así buscamos rehacernos. Represión, exilio y trabajo psico-social*. Santiago: COLAT-CELADEC, 1980; León and Rebeca Grinberg, *Psicoanálisis de la migración y del exilio*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1984; Ana Vásquez and Ana María Araujo, *Exils Latino-americains. La malediction d'Ulysse*. Paris: CIEMI and L'Harmattan, 1988.

After periods of crisis, which produce a significant number of exiles, fascinating debates have been generated between those who stayed in the home country and those who moved abroad over the definition of the components of national collective identity. Concurrently, new bonds have been forged with exiles from 'sister-nations,' reinforcing a dynamic of mutual recognition and identification of shared problems and transnational interests in the inter-American system. Exiles, hoping to return someday to their home country, often attempt to define in novel ways the terms of collective identity. In many instances, exile seems to have played an important role in Latin America, in defining or redefining both the national and the pan-Latin American identity.

At the same time, though the exiles often claim they are the true representatives of 'the people' while abroad, they interact in new environments, are exposed to fellow exiles from other countries, and confront new models of organization that transform them, willingly or not. This poses a major dilemma for every exile at the personal, psychological, familial, and collective levels: how to relate to the host society and whether to become part of it, beyond the instrumental level of everyday life, and even develop hybrid identities and commitments. Moreover, if they settle in what they perceive as a more developed, organized, or cultured environment, they face this dilemma more poignantly. The longer the exile, the more likely this leads to fragmented identities, to visions of heterogeneity, migrancy, and heteroglossia, which some may celebrate and others mourn.

The experience in exile challenges the displaced persons to reconsider the ideals they came with and their notions of both the host country and the homeland that they left behind. A profound process of redefinition of cultural, social, and political assumptions thus takes place, which is crucial to trace as one analyzes later transformations in these countries.

This approach leads us to suggest that political exile is important in multiple ways. It is both the result of political processes and a constitutive factor of political systems. In causal terms, because it results from political persecution but stops short of annihilation of the opposition, exile speaks – in Gramscian terms – of an authoritarian hegemony in politics, whatever the formal definition of the political system may be. Such patterns of politics are built on exclusion and a situation set between a winner-takes-all competition for power and the perils of a zero-sum game broadened into civil wars.

Although resulting from such forms of political competition, the recurrent use of exile has ensconced it in the political culture of these countries, reinforcing the exclusionary rules of the political game in Latin America. In early stages of political development, the widespread practice of exile has limited democratic institutionalization, even if it projected pressures on a wider domain of political action. It affected democracy by limiting representation and contestation within the polity, hindering the scope of free debate and the possibility of contesting established power by the open channels of democratic action.

The study of exile requires a nuanced reading of context and history because it evolved and changed its character throughout the 19th and 20th centuries.

Political exile is dynamic, hinging on political action and evolving in a parallel fashion to processes of political institutionalization and deinstitutionalization and to the reformulation of political ground rules. In parallel, the dynamics of recurrent exile have been main components of limited or exclusionary democracies in Latin America.

It should be stated that the experience of exile is multiple, and yet there are trends and patterns in exile, which can be studied from various disciplinary vantage points. We follow a sociopolitical and macrohistorical approach that combines institutional and network perspectives. Our thesis is that political exile has been instrumental in defining key aspects of Latin American states, with consequences for the ways in which politics has been played and public life structured in these countries since independence. Although recognizing the early use of translocation in colonial times, we have identified in postindependence times the transformation of exile into a major mechanism for regulating authoritarian polities, with central consequences for the public spheres of these countries.

We also claim that exile has changed its structure with the passing of time. In the context of elitist politics, exile developed a three-tiered structure, shaped around the interplay among the expelling state, the exiles, and the host countries. By the late 19th century, and moreover in the 20th century, this tiered structure started developing a fourth tier in the form of an international public sphere with increasing impact in modulating the ways in which the other tiers interact.

In the early pattern, the combination of political factionalism and the lack of effective mechanisms of political turnover and representation created waves of individuals expelled into neighboring territories. Oppositions often found themselves ostracized from their home political scenarios. As the frontiers of the new states were still in the process of being defined, exile became a major mechanism of regional politics. In situations of defeat, exiles moved to neighboring areas to prepare themselves to regain control of the home political scene. Motivated by their own agenda, the host rulers exercised their regional influence by giving shelter to those fleeing detrimental constellations of power, turning them into sympathetic political allies. Therefore, it is not surprising that when a faction that a ruler sided with was defeated in a neighboring country, the ruler often welcomed the vanquished into his territory, hosting them, and even supporting their plans of return to the polity of origin. When the defeated faction was inimical to the host's political design, he could still host the expelled individuals and control their freedom of action, thereby curtailing the possibilities of plotting against an ally, the ruling government in the neighboring expelling country. In all cases, the translocated individuals and the communities of exiles played an important role in this three-tiered structure, within both the plans of regional hegemony of the host countries and their home country's strategies and pressures on the states hosting the translocated.

This dynamic was maintained throughout the first two centuries of independent political life. Still, major changes were effected in its workings as the result

of social, economic, and political transformations, particularly the degree of institutionalization or deinstitutionalization of the different polities. Political factionalism reflected the format of elitist and mass politics. Political openings and mobilizations – both through civil wars and enlarged franchise – generated increasing complexity. This was reflected both in the diversification of the social and economic background of the exiles and in the extent to which the route of exile was followed by increasing numbers of individuals of varied background. In a certain way, exile mirrored the pace of modernization, evinced in pressures for political inclusion by incorporation of new social strata into politics and, at the same time, exclusion through banning, persecution, and translocation. Accordingly, exile progressively reflected the limited character of the political arena facing the mass activities of individuals in political associations, parties, professional associations, trade unions, and student organizations.

Exiles were not necessarily champions of political democracy. Many of the 'revolutionaries' going into exile were no less authoritarian and violent than the rulers who sent them into exile or from which they were fleeing. By tracing the characteristics of the exiles, research may reveal the changing tug-of-war between authoritarian politics and the pressures to democratize Latin American politics. The violence generated by this political process has been a major ingredient pushing people to flee their home country, even when their connection to politics was tangential. By the 20th century, massive migration resulting from political conflict, civil war, and violence was manifest throughout the continent. The refugee problem became evident both in civil war situations and in protracted and low-intensity conflicts.

The triangular structure of exile underwent a core transformation once a fourth and increasingly important element entered the exile equation: a global arena preoccupied with humanitarian international law and human rights. In Latin America, the ground for this fourth tier was laid in the 19th century. The proliferation of exiles, and later on of refugees, triggered Latin American efforts to internationally regulate the issue and move toward the creation of an inter-American set of international regimes of asylum. As early as the 1860s and 1870s, delegates of these countries discussed the right of asylum and progressively elaborated a corpus of norms of international private law and international penal law. The issue of exiles and refugees has increasingly resonated in the global arena, creating a more complex political environment in which the actions taken by expelling governments were increasingly questioned and placed under criticism. Exiles were incorporated into widening transnational and global networks with a voice not to be silenced by distance, time, or internal censorship. Networks of solidarity, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), international governmental organizations (IGOs), and global media created a new and more complex organizational environment to be taken into account. Toward the late 20th century, exile had already clearly evinced this four-tiered structure.

This study traces the origins of political exile in colonial translocation. We reconstruct the emergence of exile out of colonial forms of translocation, when

it was used for juridical, administrative, and social purposes, into the modern form of political exile, and its subsequent transformations in the 19th and 20th centuries. After independence, colonial precedents were ingrained in the formation of exile as the mechanism to serve the hold of small elites over the masses by avoiding a zero-sum game and mutually destructive situation inherent in factionalism. One of the unintended consequences was that exiles became a factor in defining the boundaries and borders of nations and states in a region.

The emerging situation of being translocated helped shape the ways in which borders, identity, and alterity were defined in Latin America. Thus, it gave substance to the formal definitions that were taking place among both the mass and the elites in the process of defining new states in the Americas. In such a manner, exile was unwittingly instrumental for these states, based on formal administrative divisions inherited from colonial times, as their elites struggled to shape singular identities and construct their own ethos and nations. As the ostracized political actors took the road of exile within the American continent, they ascertained their status as 'nationals' of a 'polity' left behind as soon as they were out of the reach of the rulers of their place of origin but realized they were not accepted as full members in their place of destination. This phenomenon in itself has shaped in novel ways what turned out to be fragmented spheres of power emerging from former colonial boundaries. Hence, political exile helped in defining the new polities and forms of sovereignty characteristic of the emergence of modern nation-states out of disintegrating empires. We thus attribute to political exile not only a derivative function of former traditions but also a formative role in the transformation of politics and states in the Americas.

The Janus-face nature of political exile was evident as it continued to reinforce the authoritarian characteristics of the political game in these states. In the political culture of the various Latin Americas, to follow the expression coined by Renato Ortiz, exile turned into a major regulatory mechanism of political action. Exile and return allowed the new polities to stabilize by projecting political pressures outward and by ruling momentarily without being challenged by internally well-organized and effective oppositions. These phenomena also enabled their organization, on the basis of the formal political models of the time, to be coupled with the lack of political debate within their countries.

The very exclusion of exiles from the domestic public arena shaped, however, a transnational public sphere and multistate politics in the Americas and beyond, in which some of the exiles learned how to play their national politics from afar and the states were drawn into play politics on an international and, later, global scope.

Another important implication of this is the emergence of political cultures characterized by a lack of congruence between the boundaries of statehood and the definitions of national identity. Many nationals, including members of the elite, found themselves fleeing abroad. Whereas only by the late 19th century are there true diasporas, translocated individuals moved across territories as they

debated and redefined their identity and their country's identity and boundaries. This also implies that there was a spillover of politics beyond the formal borders of any single Ibero-American state and that the very definition of a country's identity and borders turns into a function of exiles' personal and collective experience in the 19th century, as it will become a vector of political and cultural renovation in the 20th century.

That is, by excluding members of the political and cultural elites, the problems deemed internal to a polity are projected to an arena that only then becomes identified as 'abroad.' Accordingly, the interplay of exiles in the evolving realms helped in shaping the transnational and the national domains in ways that both linked the new states to the older administrative boundaries and projected them into new visions and definitions, while perhaps reducing the internal pressures for change.

The structure of this book follows the preceding claims and suggestions along an analytical line. Chapter 1 analyzes the exilic condition and focuses on the key issues, meaning, and scope of exile as an exclusionary social and political phenomenon. The chapter examines prevailing approaches on translocation and displacement and suggests analytical dimensions for the study of political exile.

In Chapter 2, the Latin American tradition of displacement and the historical antecedents of exile are analyzed. The chapter reviews Portuguese and Spanish practices of banishment; the early construction of differentiated Latin American collective identities in exile; and the formative role of exiles in the process of constitution of the new nation-states and their collective identities.

Chapter 3 is about the three-tiered format of early exile and the emergence of communities of exiles, addressing their role in the transnational dynamics of Latin American politics. Special attention is devoted to collective imaginaries and the formation of the new state identities through a politics of exit.

Chapter 4 elaborates on the role played by major sites of exile by reviewing the cases of Chile in the 19th century, Paris as the cultural Mecca attracting exiles and émigrés since independence, and Mexico in the 20th century. It examines receptivity of host countries and the limits set by them on the political activity of the exiles.

Chapter 5 treats the relationships between widening political and social participation and the massification of exile as the counterface of political inclusion. It elaborates on issues of international agreements of asylum and the transformation of the format of exile into a four-tiered structure, in which transnational networks played an increasingly important role.

In Chapter 6, the varied dynamics of communities of exiles in the late 20th century, their relationship to the diasporas of co-nationals, and the political role they played as part of the globalizing fourth tier of exile are examined through the cases of exiles from Brazil, Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay. Special attention is given to the way in which proactive communities of exiles have an impact on their home-country politics through the international arena. For reasons of space and research design, the focus is on the communities of exiles

escaping repression in the Southern Cone, leaving aside other important exile communities such as those of Cuba, Haiti, and Central America.

Chapter 7 combines quantitative and qualitative data on the extent of Latin American presidential exile since independence and into the present, singling out the displacement of heads of states because of their centrality in the political process, both practically and symbolically. An original database of nearly 1,500 presidential terms in Latin America is analyzed in terms of the extent and forms of exile.

Finally, Chapter 8 explores the question of whether return and democracy mean the end of exile. It also touches on some of the transformations experienced during exile and those involved in the process of returning to the home countries. Living abroad and interacting with organizations and networks in the host countries and in the transnational arena, exiles experienced significant personal and ideological changes in how they understood political activism, gender, race, and national unity. On return of many of them, these new perspectives had an impact on the political and social processes in their home countries. The chapter concludes by indicating the broader implications of this study and future lines of research.

The combination of themes around political exile and its Latin American variants constitutes an attempt to see the theoretical implications of this phenomenon on the basis of its development in a region that has used and abused political exile as a regulatory mechanism of exclusion. The multifocal approach we follow escapes simple historical–developmental analysis. By encompassing different aspects and angles of political exile, we hope to raise awareness of the main problems of research ahead, as we suggest lines of analysis that are both theoretical and empirical, based on hundreds of past and contemporary cases of displacement in the Americas.