

UNIVERSITY OF MINNEAPOLIS
RECEIVED
JUN 10 1980

I&L

IDEOLOGIES & LITERATURE

Volume III

Number 13

June-August 1980

ESSAYS

Roberto Reis

O Fantástico Do Poder E O Poder Fantástico

John Beverley

The Production of Solitude: Góngora and the State

David Hildner

Aristocracy and Reason: Behavior Patterns
in Calderón's Secular Characters

Ellen McCracken

Vargas Llosa's *La Tia Julia y el Escribidor*: The New Novel
and the Mass Media

David Wise

Peruvian *Indigenista* Forum of the 1920s:
José Carlos Mariátegui's *Amauta*

CLUES AND SOURCES

Frederick Stirton Weaver

Thomas Carlyle on Dr. Francia:
The Functional Role of the Carlylean Hero

Hernán Vidal

Teoría de la Dependencia y Crítica Literaria

REPORTAGEM

Ronald W. Sousa

Ideologies and Literature, a bi-monthly journal, is published under the auspices of the Institute for the Study of Ideologies and Literature, a nonprofit organization incorporated in the state of Minnesota and devoted to the promotion of socio-historical approaches to Hispanic and Luso-Brazilian literatures.

EDITORIAL BOARD

René Jara, Managing Editor
Edward Baker
Russell G. Hamilton
Arturo Madrid
Antonio Ramos-Gascón
Heana Rodríguez

Ronald W. Sousa
Nicholas Spadaccini
Constance Sullivan
Hernán Vidal
Anthony N. Zahareas

Executive Secretary
Patricia Burg

CORRESPONSAL EN ESPAÑA Y DISTRIBUCION:

Editorial Castalia
Zurbano, 39
Madrid-10

Ideologies and Literature welcomes articles written in English, Spanish, Portuguese and, in some cases, French. Manuscripts submitted for the *Essays* section can be either of a theoretical or an applied nature, concerning problems and issues arising from a socio-historical study of Hispanic and Luso-Brazilian literatures and should normally not exceed 50 pages. Material for *Clues and Sources*, not to exceed 20 pages, should offer new perspectives on already established critical issues. *Review Articles* should address themselves to the discussion of general problematic issues within the objectives of the journal, as suggested by the book or ensemble of books under review, and should not exceed 20 pages. Manuscripts for the *Theory* section (see editorial) should not exceed 30 pages. Manuscripts submitted should adhere in format to the second edition of the *MLA Style Sheet*. Authors of unsolicited articles must include a self-addressed, stamped envelope. Opinions expressed by contributors to *Ideologies and Literature* are their own, and do not necessarily represent the views of the Board of Directors, the Advisory Board of the Institute for the Study of Ideologies and Literature, or those of the Editorial Board of the journal. Third class postage paid at Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Editorial and Business Address

Patricia Burg, Executive Secretary
Institute for the Study of Ideologies and Literature
4 Folwell Hall
9 Pleasant Street S. E.
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Copyright © 1980, Institute for the Study of Ideologies and Literature
ISSN: 0161-9225

Ideologies and Literature

Subscription Rates:

USA:
Student: \$9.00 per year
Library Institutional: \$15.00 per year
Regular: \$12.00 per year
Patron: \$25.00 per year (Patron's name and address
will be published in the Patron's list)
Price per Issue: \$3.00

ESPAÑA:
Número suelto: 125 ptas.
Suscripción anual: 550 ptas.

I&L

IDEOLOGIES & LITERATURE

Volume III

Number 13

June-August 1980

CONTENTS

ESSAYS

- Roberto Reis: "O Fantástico Do Poder
E O Poder Do Fantástico" 3
- John Beverley: "The Production of Solitude:
Góngora and the State" 23
- David Hildner: "Aristocracy and Reason: Behavior Patterns
in Calderón's Secular Characters" 42
- Ellen McCracken: "Vargas Llosa's *La Tia Julia y el Escribidor*:
The New Novel and the Mass Media" 54
- David Wise: "Peruvian *Indigenista* Forum of the 1920s:
José Carlos Mariátegui's *Amauta*" 70

CLUES AND SOURCES

- Frederick Stirton Weaver: "Thomas Carlyle on Dr. Francia:
The Functional Role of the Carlylean Hero" 105
- Hernán Vidal: "Teoría de la Dependencia
y Crítica Literaria" 116

REPORTAGEM

- Ronald W. Sousa 123

Ideologies and Literature is supported in part with grants from the following sources at the University of Minnesota:

College of Liberal Arts
Alumni Association of the
University of Minnesota
College of Liberal Arts
and University College
Graduate School
Research Development

Patrons:

Tom Conley
University of Minnesota

Alan and Cheryl Francis
Boston, Massachusetts

John Beverley
University of Pittsburgh

Lydia D. Hazera
George Mason Univeristy

Stephen Burmeister
Macalester College

Inman Fox
Knox College

Hector E. Torres-Ayala
Smith College

Claudia Schaefer
Paul Rodriguez-Hernandez
Rochester, New York

Susan Kirkpatrick
University of California, San Diego

Paul C. Smith
Univ. of California, Los Angeles

James Parr
Univ. of Southern California

Rosanne Potter
Iowa State University

Eduardo Forastieri
University of Puerto Rico

Alfredo A. Roggiano
University of Pittsburgh

Jean Franco
Stanford University

Michael P. Predmore
University of Washington

Elias Rivers
SUNY, Stony Brook

Robert Brody
University of Texas, Austin

Bertha and Samuel Baker
Rockville Centre, New York

Beth Miller
Univ. of Southern California

O Fantástico Do Poder E O Poder Do Fantástico

Roberto Reis

Universidade Gama Filho, Rio de Janeiro

I — Os Contornos Do Real —

Toda cultura escolhe dentre um espectro de possibilidades as formas que privilegia e institucionaliza. Da mesma maneira que o sistema fonológico de uma dada língua resulta de um corte operado na vasta gama de sons vocais produzidos pelo homem, selecionando aqueles que serão pertinentes para figurar como fonemas do sistema, uma cultura procede a recortes num sem número virtual de possíveis para constituir—se como um conjunto de regras, sobrepondo uma ordem onde imperava a descontinuidade.

Vista nessa perspectiva, torna—se claro que a cultura restringe, impõe limites, estabelece fronteiras, desenhando os espaços do permitido e do proibido. Não existe, por exemplo, apenas uma forma de casamento —a monogamia—, mas a civilização ocidental optou por ela, em detrimento de outras maneiras, encontráveis em outras sociedades (poligamia, bigamia, etc.), de tal forma que violar este costume consiste em infração à lei, sujeita à punição moral, religiosa, legal.

De igual modo, se pensamos no vestuário, distintos grupos sociais cobrem o corpo (quando o cobrem—e a noção de vergonha é criada por condicionamentos culturais) distintamente. Observe-se que tendemos a achar pitoresco e esdrúxulo um nativo, membro de uma sociedade diferente da nossa, por sua maneira de vestir, sem levarmos em conta que sua indumentária atende às suas necessidades, decorrentes do habitat em que ele se locomove (o homem do deserto, para citar apenas um caso, se envolve em panos para proteger-se do sol, ali implacável).

Isto se explica pelo detalhe de que encaramos a realidade a partir das simbolizações oferecidas por nossa cultura. O que foge a ela nos parece estranho. Podemos ir mais longe, e dizer que é através dos símbolos e da linguagem (isto é, um conjunto de símbolos, sejam eles verbais ou não) que apreendemos a realidade. É o

símbolo que faz o mundo existir para o sujeito.

Ora, se a realidade depende dos símbolos; se a um sistema simbólico denominamos linguagem; se a um conjunto de sistemas simbólicos/linguagens (religião, língua, arte, regras de parentesco, as relações econômicas, a ciência, etc.) denominamos cultura, deduzimos que a própria idéia do que seja realidade se acha delimitada pelo círculo que a cultura traça numa totalidade de formas virtuais. E que este risco define e institui os territórios do possível e do impossível.

No entanto, cumpre lembrar que a cultura é o lugar do humano. Vale dizer: o homem provavelmente não conseguiria exercer sua humanidade fora da cultura. É a cultura, basicamente, que o distingue da animalidade (a cultura implica em regras — cf. Lévi-Strauss—, na capacidade de simbolização — cf. Cassirer—, duas características mais desenvolvidas no homem do que no animal). A cultura se sobrepõe ao nada, organiza o caos, permitindo ao homem a vida em sociedade e em termos humanos. Além disso, toda cultura não é em si mesma boa ou má: ela procura atender às necessidades de seus membros e a elas se adaptar, mantendo o equilíbrio social e a coesão do grupo (esta adaptação, inclusive, é que acarreta a noção de progresso).

Esse raciocínio nos leva a afirmar que, sobre a cultura, abarcando um “sistema de idéias” — “que fornece uma visão de mundo através de leis e princípios conscientes” — e “um sistema de atitudes” — “que engloba o comportamento, os costumes e as maneiras de agir já tornadas inconscientes”, na especificação de Affonso Romano de Sant’Anna¹, abrangendo as crenças, valores e opiniões, se dispõe a ideologia. A ideologia vai prescrever outras normas de conduta social, vai propor outras leis.

Em todo grupo, a uma minoria, a uma classe, se atribui — ou ela mesma se encarrega de outorgar-se tal função— a responsabilidade de dirigir os interesses comunitários. Esta minoria — a classe dominante— ocupa então o Poder, e vai garantir seu mandato professando, e obrigando que se professe, uma dada ideologia.

Do que desenvolvemos interessa guardar que a noção do que seja realidade decorre de um condicionamento, cultural e ideológico. O que o senso comum entende por realidade foi estipulado pelas imposições culturais e ideológicas. A cultura — bem como, dentro dela, a ideologia— ergue uma barreira que separa o real do irreal. A cultura dispõe as simbolizações para que possamos pensar a realidade; a ideologia autoriza e exige que a realidade seja vista de acordo com os interesses e conveniências da classe dominante, que ocupa o Poder.

II — A Transgressão Do Fantástico —

Acreditamos que a Literatura é eminentemente subversiva e transgressora. No entanto, não nos ocuparemos aqui da exploração deste ponto de vista, dedicando-nos simplesmente ao estudo do fantástico — uma das formas assumidas pela Literatura para vasculhar os interditos.

Se admitirmos as proposições do tópico precedente, de que a cultura circunscreve a realidade (vindo a ideologia reforçar a noção), após um recorte efetuado, concluímos que algo terá ficado de fora, que não foi abarcada a totalidade anterior ao destaque das formas eleitas, na mesma medida em que um sistema fonológico não abrange todos os sons vocais existentes. Temos assim que a realidade deriva de um seccionamento executado no Real. O Real, por conseguinte, engloba a realidade mais os possíveis rejeitados, acrescido dos impossíveis que temos dificuldade sequer de imaginar ou supor.

Tzvetan Todorov, em sua obra *Introdução à literatura fantástica*, não considera que o fantástico tenha subsistido no séc. XX. Desde o momento em que, sobretudo com Kafka, “o fantástico torna-se a regra, não a exceção”² e que são abolidas, na literatura, as fronteiras entre o imaginário e o real (e era a categoria de real que proporcionava ao autor condições de formular sua definição fantástico³), deixa de fazer sentido, para o estudioso europeu, a postulação da existência de um discurso fantástico na literatura de nosso tempo.

Todorov salientava ainda que o fantástico “permite franquear certos limites inacessíveis quando a ele não se recorre”: “os desmandos sexuais serão melhor aceitos por qualquer espécie de censura se forem inscritos por conta do diabo”⁴, dando a entender que, ao apelar para o fantástico, o escritor tocava em problemas que a sociedade procurava ocultar e reprimir. Ele parece não perceber que terão mudado as coisas censuradas, mas que persistem as censuras. A transgressão do fantástico, apontada pelo crítico búlgaro, se revelaria extremamente fecunda se ele a trouxesse até o séc. XX.

A posição de Todorov merece portanto uma primeira retificação: não é que o fantástico não sobreviva na literatura contemporânea — acontece que sua transgressão parece mais radical, e que a sociedade se transformou. Pode não ser mais necessário se trazer o demônio à tona como artifício para se evitar abordar, mais abertamente, desejos recônditos e sexualidade, mas isso não significa que a sociedade tenha suspenso suas repressões, consentindo tudo, sem proibir. A sociedade sempre proíbe. O social implica em interdições.

Para nós o fantástico continua em vigência. O fantástico, justamente, anula a barra que separa o real do irreal, o possível do impossível, virando a realidade pelo avesso, arranhando o Real em sua complexidade e pujança. Se o fantástico é a regra e não a exceção, se o homem é absurdo, estas revelações, produzidas pela literatura fantástica do séc. XX, mostram que a realidade assumida e cotidiana é aparente, é frágil, escavando assim o Real que está por trás.

O discurso fantástico problematiza a realidade. Qualquer noção de realidade é precária, se decorrente de uma escolha, que rechaça outras possibilidades igualmente viáveis. A barra separadora aí está inscrita pela cultura e pela ideologia. A transgressão do fantástico nos parece mais extrema por apontar para a subversão das censuras (que pairam inculcadas em nosso inconsciente) e até mesmo para o instante em que se fratura o Real para, culturalmente, se constituir uma dada noção da realidade. O fantástico questiona a cultura, a ideologia, submete a exame as convenções comunitárias, mostrando que os modelos culturais institucionalizados não circunscrevem o Real (Bessière):

L'événement fantastique redessine la totalité que la culture oblitère, et par là se charge d'une fonction libératrice. Il ne correspond pas au passage de la frontière du réel, mais au surgissement de certains domaines du réel oblitérés⁵.

II.1 — O fantástico como discurso duplo —

Como assinalamos, Todorov se alicerça na categoria de real para conceituar o fantástico. Procedendo assim não conseguirá vislumbrar que o fantástico trespassa a realidade para descortinar o Real.

No entanto, para que se possa manejar o conceito de fantástico, operacionalmente impõe-se que o trabalhemos em contraste com o real. Se um evento merece o nome de fantástico é porque ele escapole ao enquadramento nas leis naturais que regem nosso mundo, transborda a realidade, pertencendo ao sobrenatural. Em suma, se a metamorfose de Gregor Samsa é fantástica é porque homens não se transformam em insetos.

Nesse sentido, o discurso fantástico é por definição um discurso duplo, em relação intertextual com o outro texto/discurso que é a realidade⁶.

Tomando-se o texto fantástico (A) e a realidade como texto (B), verifica-se que A só consegue ser lido em relação a B, ou seja: se os eventos narrados em A são fantásticos e sobrenaturais isto se deve à sua contraposição ao que existe em B. Considerando ainda a

novela de Kafka como referência: A se opõe a B (homem transformado em inseto/homem não se transforma em inseto), suspende e anula parcialmente o significado de B (homem transformado em inseto), que no entanto persiste (mas homem não se transforma em inseto). Cria-se então a ambigüidade: o fantástico pressupõe a existência de dois discursos perpetuamente em tensão —o do texto fantástico propriamente dito e o da realidade—, e esta tensão não se resolve, sob pena de se transformar em estranho ou maravilhoso⁷, e de desaparecer o fantástico, que repousa nessa impossibilidade. É ela que gera a hesitação, examinada por Todorov.

II.2 — A comunicação do fantástico —

Todorov atribuía à hesitação do leitor a primeira condição do fantástico⁸. No último capítulo de seu livro, ele registra a alteração sofrida pela hesitação na obra de Franz Kafka⁹. Será esta mudança, passando o sobrenatural a ser encarado com “naturalidade”, que faz com que não reconheça a presença do fantástico na literatura atual.

A nosso ver, pode ter havido aqui também uma modificação. É verdade: em geral, nos textos fantásticos contemporâneos não há um espanto face ao sobrenatural (um personagem de Cortázar aceita perfeitamente vomitar coelhos). Porém, o que importa postular é que, diante do sobrenatural, narrador, personagem e narratário (este leitor a que se refere Todorov é na verdade o narratário) “silenciam”, não captando o absurdo como tal. Eles lêem o fantástico de forma literal.

Mas o leitor concreto, exatamente por causa desse silêncio, ao confrontar os acontecimentos fantásticos com os parâmetros fornecidos pela realidade, constata sua incompatibilidade. O fantástico produz uma ruptura, ao por em cheque os precários contornos do real cultural e ideologicamente estabelecido.

II.3 — A ruptura do fantástico.

O exame da comunicação do fantástico com o leitor nos obriga a estudar a ruptura por ele levada a efeito¹⁰.

Tenhamos em conta que ler um texto implica em tentar um acordo entre este e nossos modelos culturais, visando naturalizá-lo a nosso repertório de conhecimentos, valores e vivências, recuperando suas propostas e adequando-as ao universo de nossa subjetividade.

Ora, se o texto fantástico coloca o leitor diante do sobrenatural, daquilo que extrapola seus critérios, ele provocará uma

desarticulação; ao problematizar a realidade o fantástico problematiza o leitor que se vale dessa mesma realidade.

Mas narrador, personagens e narratário não estranharam o absurdo do narrado. O leitor concreto, violentada sua noção de realidade pelo “inverossímil” textual, se indaga: então homem pode virar inseto? É possível alguém vomitar coelhos?

Se a leitura do fantástico pelos agentes fictícios era literal (pois o tomavam com naturalidade), seu silêncio deflagra uma fissura que termina ecoando no leitor, com a ruptura resultante, e este então passa a se perguntar o que podem significar esses eventos absurdos.

Todorov negava a possibilidade de uma leitura quer poética quer alegórica do texto fantástico. Em nosso modo de ver, uma vez que a literatura não é “gratuita” (pois encontra seu espaço na cultura, estando em relação com as outras linguagens que a compõem), o fantástico não se justifica por si mesmo. Ele é transgressor, está desestruturando alguma coisa, que, se é estraliterária, não se situa num lugar alheio à literatura — tudo ocupa o solo do simbólico, do social, do cultural, do humano.

Na perspectiva de sua comunicação, produzida a ruptura, quando intervém o leitor concreto, o fantástico se lê de forma alegórica (entendendo a alegoria como o texto do censurado) — daí seu caráter transgressor. Dito com outras palavras: o texto literário lê o simbólico, lê a cultura, lê a realidade, lê o social. E uma forma de apreensão de realidade, que a recria e a transforma. A Literatura é metáfora da realidade. E o discurso fantástico, inserido nesta visão do fenômeno literário, é lido alegoricamente — isto é: o que ele diz é uma maneira de dizer ainda uma outra coisa. Quando Gregor Samsa amanhece com asas enormes o que se está, de fato, dizendo, tem a ver com a sociedade, com o homem, com um tempo histórico.

O texto alegórico é o texto do reprimido, ensina José Guilherme Merquior, busca explorar a área do censurado. Ao ser lido alegoricamente (tomando a alegoria num sentido outro, que não parece ser o que lhe emprestava Tzvetan Todorov), o fantástico realiza seu caráter transgressor.

E se encontra com a Literatura pensada como transgressão. A Literatura é um discurso que questiona as tensões da sociedade (Luiz Costa Lima), é uma exploração daquilo que a ideologia e a cultura reprimiram. Estará, aí, nesse desvão censurado, o Real em sua plenitude e força. Se a ideologia acomoda, a Literatura incomoda.

III — O Fantástico Do Poder —

Uma possibilidade de leitura de uma parte significativa da contística de Gabriel Márquez é deprendermos de seus textos uma estrutura de Poder, em que existem, numa relação de dominação, o dominador e o dominado.

Um conto que nos apresenta esta problemática com suficiente nitidez é “Blacaman, o bom vendedor de milagres”¹¹. Nele existem dois Blacamans, ambos embusteiros, o primeiro mau, o segundo (o narrador) bom, cuja capacidade verdadeira de adivinhar permitirá que ele exerça sobre o outro o poder que antes era sobre ele exercido. A relação dominador/dominado continue a mesma, mudando-se apenas os ocupantes desses lugares.

Partindo do modelo (da estrutura de Poder) extraído deste relato, nossa análise tentará encontrá-lo em outros textos, com o intuito de ler como, neles, se manifesta tal estrutura. Iremos nos concentrar nos contos “A incrível e triste história da Cândida Erêndira e sua avó desalmada”¹² e “Os funerais da Mamãe Grande”¹³, onde a estrutura de Poder (CE), ou o Poder mesmo (FMG) se acham colocados em questão.

Uma vez adotado este ponto de vista interpretativo, procuraremos destacar como estas narrativas questionam o Poder, e as críticas que são empreendidas. Estas ressaltam pelo confronto do texto com o repertório do leitor e com o outro texto que é a realidade latino-americana. De modo que nosso comentário parte do pressuposto de que existe uma interação entre estes dois textos, que dialogam, um criticando o outro, transgredindo, carnavaalizando o Poder.

III.1 — O sangue verde da avó desalmada —

Em CE temos a estrutura de Poder manifestando-se termos mais individuais, na dominação da avó (desalmada, o texto é irônico) sobre a neta. O conto está dividido em sete partes, as quais poderiam ser assim esquematicamente sintetizadas:

I — Antes do incêndio;

II — Início da desgraça de Erêndira;

III — Ulisses;

IV — Erêndira com os missionários e seu resgate;

V — Ulisses reencontra Erêndira — Fuga;

VI — O cronista —Chegada ao mar— Novo encontro com Ulisses;

VII — Morte da Avó.

Acompanhemos o relato, salientando os aspectos principais. Logo na primeira parte, a caracterização da casa e da avó dão bem

uma medida das posses desta, em contraste com a subserviência e a fragilidade da menina Erêndira (cujo quarto “estava abarrotado de bonecas de pano e animais de corda de sua infância recente” — p. 99):

A avó, nua e grande, parecia uma formosa baleia branca na banheira de mármore. A neta acabara de fazer catorze anos, era lânguida, de ossos delicados e muito paciente para sua idade. Com uma parcimônia que tinha algo de rigor sagrado, fazia abluções na avó com uma água na qual fervera polantas depurativas e folhas perfumadas, e estas se grudavam nas costas suculentas, nos cabelos metálicos e soltos, no ombro potente, tatuado sem piedade, com um menosprezo de marinheiros (p. 94).

Quando acabo de banhá-la, levou a avó ao quarto. Era tão gorda que só caminhava apoiada no ombro da neta, ou em báculo que parecia de bispo, mas em suas atividades mais difíceis notava-se o domínio de uma antiga grandeza. Na alcova, arrumada com um gosto exagerado e um pouco absurdo, como toda a casa, Erêndira precisou de duas horas mais para arranjar a avó. Desembaraçou-lhe o cabelo fio por fio, perfumou-o e o penteou, pôs-lhe um vestido de flores equatoriais, empoou-lhe o rosto com pó-de-arros, pintou-lhe os lábios com batom, as faces com ruge, as pálpebras com almíscar e as unhas com esmalte vermelho, e quando a teve emperquitada como uma boneca de tamanho maior que o humano, levou-a a um jardim artificial de flores quentes como as do vestido, sentou-a em uma poltrona que tinha a base e a estirpe de um trono, e a deixou escutando os discos velozes do gramofone de corneta (pp. 94-95).

Observe-se que o grotesco da descrição, tanto da figura da velha quanto do ambiente, articula a crítica, que vai sendo feita ao nível da linguagem mesma. Aí está, queremos crer, uma característica do estilo do autor: o texto não se coloca explicitamente, nem deixa para o leitor a responsabilidade de fazer suas deduções (como ocorre em Rulfo¹⁴, por exemplo); é o próprio discurso do narrador —valorativo e/ou modalizante— que vai tecendo a perspectiva crítica da narrativa, obviamente que jogando com o aludido repertório prévio que os leitores porventura possuam (a exploração de Erêndira pela avó através da prostituição, ainda mais sendo ela uma menina, vem de encontro a valores pré-existentes do leitor, para restringir-nos a apenas esta anotação). Este tratamento da linguagem já está presente no próprio título do relato, extremamente irônico.

Outro aspecto a destacar é que o Poder da avó é dado metonimicamente em sua pessoa gigantesca, de dimensões excessivas¹⁵. A grandeza do domínio se expressa pela gordura, de uma forma degradada. Seu palácio é de mau gosto, seu marido fora um contrabandista lendário e consta que ele a tirara de um prostíbulo das Antilhas, ocultando-a na “impunidade do deserto”

— com todas estas inversões, que contrariam o que se poderia esperar de alguém poderoso a nobre (a imagem que nos fica dos contos de fada, etc.), a figura que ocupa o Poder é totalmente desmistificada, apesar de seus “sonhos de grandeza”, que subsistiram “graças ao sacrifício de neta bastarda”.

A terceira parte introduz o personagem Ulisses, que parece “um anjo disfarçado”. O amor aproximará Ulisses de Erêndira¹⁶. Importa sublinhar, na economia do conto, os traços que são atribuídos ao rapaz: seu avô tinha asas (“mas ninguém acredita”), seus olhos são “ansiosos e diáfanos”, seu pai conheceu um homem que podia caminhar no mar, faz muito tempo (Cristo?), ele tem nome de navegador, parece todo de ouro mas cheira a flores, Erêndira aprecia “a seriedade com que inventa absurdos”, e, mais adiante, os objetos de vidro por ele tocados mudarão de cor. Ele evidentemente destoa dos demais freqüentadores do corpo de Erêndira.

Na quarta parte, o texto dirige sua mordacidade para os missionários, para quem a avó está violando as santas leis de Deus com o tráfico imundo. Erêndira será raptada pouco depois e recuperada pela avó no Domingo de Pentecostes. Toda esta parte apresenta uma impiedosa crítica ao Poder religioso (pp. 123-25). Erêndira padecerá também no convento (onde as noviças trabalham sem cessar), entre cujas atividades nada religiosas se incluem casamentos forçados. Mas, apesar de tudo, a menina Cândida se sente feliz, o que brutaliza ainda mais os maus-tratos a que era submetida pela avó.

A sexta parte nos põe diante do cronista, narrador do texto, cujo depoimento procura dar autenticidade à história da avó desalmada e de sua neta, reintroduzindo o ambiente de feira, dircense (que já aparecera às pp. 107-8), tão freqüente na contística do escritor colombiano e responsável direto pela carnavalização:

Eu as conheci por essa época, que foi a de maior esplendor, embora não tivesse de pesquisar os pormenores de sua vida senão muitos anos depois, quando Rafael Escalona revelou, em uma canção, o fim terrível do drama e achei bom para contá-lo. [...] Ali estava a barraca do amor errante, sob as faixas de letreiros suspensas: *Erêndira é melhor. Vá e volte, Erêndira o espera. Isto Não é vida sem Erêndira*. A fila interminável e ondulante, composta por homens de raças e condições diversas, parecia uma serpente de vértebras humanas, que dormitava através de terrenos e praças, por entre bazares coloridos e mercados barulhentos, e saía das ruas daquela ruidosa cidade de traficantes. Cada rua era uma baiúca de jogo, cada casa uma cantina, cada porta um refúgio de desertores. As numerosas músicas indecifráveis e os pregões gritados formavam um só estrondo de pânico no calor alucinante (p. 141).

Quando as duas abandonaram o deserto rumo ao mar, o texto reincide na magnitude do poderio da avó. Transcrevemos a passagem, visto que nos interessa enfatizar a problemática do Poder:

Nunca se viu tanta opulência junta por aqueles reinos de pobres. Era um desfile de carretas puxadas por bois, sobre os quais se amontoavam algumas réplicas de pacotilha da parafernália extinta com o incêndio da mansão, e não só os bustos imperiais e os relógios raros, mas também um piano de ocasião e uma vitrola de manivela com os discos da saudade. Uma récua de índios ocupava-se da carga, e uma banda de músicos anunciava aos povoados a sua chegada triunfal.

A avó viajava em um palanquim com grinaldas de papel, ruminando os cereais do bolso postiço, à sombra de um pálio de igreja. Seu tamanho monumental aumentara, porque usava debaixo da blusa um jaleco de lona de veleiro, no qual metia os lingotes de ouro, como se metem as balas, em um cinturão de cartucheiras. Erêndira estava junto dila, vestia vistosos tecidos, com tachas doiradas, mas ainda tinha a corrente no tornozelo (p. 144).

O domínio da avó sobre a neta só será quebrado pela interferência de um personagem privilegiado, que tenha conquistado o amor de moça: Ulisses. A tentativa de fuga, narrada na quinta prte, fracassara. Mas Erêndira, após uma frustrada maeação de matar a avó — “arrepênde-se no instante final” —, convoca Ulisses. A morte da velha, contada na última parte, não advém sem dificuldades.

O primeiro atentado é por meio de um bolo, recheado com uma libra de veneno para ratos, completando “a farsa com setenta e duas velinhas cor-de-rosa”, pois era aniversário da avó, do que se aproveita Ulisses para com ela se desincompatibilizar. A avó comeu o bolo praticamente sozinha — o rapaz e a neta rejeitaram seus pedaços, sendo que o de Ulisses a velha acabou comendo —, ingerindo arsênico para exterminar uma geração de ratos, mas não morre. Revivendo seu passado no delírio do sonho, ela permanece “mais viva que um elefante”, na excalamção de Ulisses. Erêndira lhe diz que ele “não serve nem para matar alguém”.

A segunda tentativa é por intermédio de um pavio de dinamite que sai da caixa do piano. A exploção, entretanto, tem por danos apenas a peruca chamuscada e a blusa da velha em farrapos, bolhas de queimaduras nos ombros e o peito em chagas, porém mais viva do que nunca. O insignificante desastre causado aumenta a dívida de Erêndira, conforme ela mesma anuncia a Ulisses.

Este então se decide a matar a avó com uma faca, e o consegue em seguida a uma luta ferrenha com a monumental velha. O sangue é “oleoso, brilhante e verde, igual ao mel da menta” (p. 157).

Portanto, somente no instante em que resolve afrontar o Poder, diretamente, é que Ulisses logra êxito. Erêndira adquire, “de

chofre, toda a maturidade da pessoa adulta que não lhe haviam dado seus vinte anos de infortúnio”, após certificar-se de que a avó estava morta, e sai levando consigo o jaleco de ouro. Só quando Erêndira parte com o jaleco é que Ulisses “tomou consciência de seu estado”: ele fora utilizado por ela, incapaz de libertar-se por si própria do jugo da velha. E é liberação o que se depreende do derradeiro parágrafo do conto (p. 158), que sugere que Erêndira ingressa num espaço mítico, correndo “para além dos entardeceres de nunca acabar”.

Verifica-se assim, em relação à problemática do Poder, que temos o seguinte percurso: 1) Erêndira é impotente, dominada; 2) Erêndira ama Ulisses (ser diferente), o que o capacita a liberá-la; 3) o Poder é poderoso — fracassam as primeiras tentativas; 4) Ulisses assume uma agressão frontal e acaba matando a avó; 5) Erêndira foge com o jaleco de ouro, liberada; 6) Ulisses constata a inutilidade de seu ato — foi usado por Erêndira.

A nosso ver, a fuga de Erêndira, de posse do jaleco —que, ao final, resumia as posses da velha—, a credencia para ocupar o lugar deixado vago pela morte da avó, embora a narrativa se encerre sem nenhuma indicação que nos pudesse assessorar nessa opinião.

Por outra prte, cumpre chamar a atenção para detalhe de que a derrubada do Poder se efetua, numa primeira instância, por um elemento estranho (Ulisses) à relação dominador/dominado, a esta desarticulação termina por se revelar gratuita, na medida em que Ulisses percebe que ficou só. Disséramos que em “Blacaman, o bom vendedor de milagres” não se desfazia a estrutura de dominação, apenas desocupavam-se as casas, que eram preenchidas por outros representantes. Erêndira enfeitiçada e dominada, enfeitiça a domina Ulisses (e aí este personagem é implicado na estrutura) para se liberar da avó, cujo assassinio não significa um ato efetivo de desestruturação do Poder, uma vez que foi praticado por um personagem não envolvido diretamente, ademais de gabaritar a neta a ocupar o mesmo posto que ficara vago com a morte da velha. Erêndira, fugindo com o jaleco, se torna poderosa, configurando a persistência, ainda que virtual, do Poder, e deixando para trás o desespero de Ulisses.

Finalmente, sublinhemos que a crítica se faz sobretudo pelas palavras do narrador e pelo confronto do texto com o repertório do leitor. O exagero, o excesso, as marcas, veiculam essa crítica. É o caso do sangue verde da avó, signo da deterioração do Poder, de sua degradação, a estigmatizar Ulisses, dominado por Erêndira, cuja fuga nos parece uma forma de domínio. A liberação de Erêndira não é canalizada ao nível do real —uma vida em comum com

Ulisses—, mas extrapola para o mítico.

E o papel do cronista (da Literatura) é documentar, depor, denunciar. Tal função ficará mais patente em “Os funerais da Mamãe Grande”.

III.2 — Amanhã, quarta-feira, virão os varredores —

Se em CE tínhamos a estrutura de Poder manifestando-se em termos mais individuais, na relação avó-neta, em FMG esta se ampliará, englobando o social, implicando no político. Os domínios da Mamãe Grande — como nos parece fácil discernir—, sua Macondo, metaforizam a América Latina, onde praticamente encontramos os mesmos problemas (tais como o Poder fundado na posse da terra, na exploração dos arrendatários, no latifúndio; a distância e alienação do Poder central com respeito aos povoados interioranos; a submissão deste Poder aos grandes proprietários; as eleições “ajeitadas”, as “manobras” políticas; as leis caducas, dos “alquimistas” do direito; o mesmo palavrório, retórico e vazio; etc.). Mas atenhamo-nos ao texto, para rastrear nele as diversas críticas.

Inicialmente, apesar de não dividido em termos gráficos, o relato se organiza em partes:

I — Apresentação

II — Mamãe Grande em Macondo — seu domínio, suas posses, sua história, sua morte;

III — Na capital;

IV — Vinda do Sumo Pontífice;

V — Os funerais;

VI — Conclusão

Ao longo delas são dirigidas várias críticas, as quais alinhremos nos seguintes itens: a) o Poder da Mamãe Grande; b) crítica ao Poder civil; c) crítica ao Poder religioso.

a) o Poder da Mamãe Grande —

A sociedade sustentada pela figura da Mamãe Grande se estrutura em bases tipicamente matriarcais, consolidando seu domínio na posse de terras, em termos feudais, como nos latifúndios. Este Poder está assegurado — uma hegemonia de dois séculos— por meio de casamentos consagüíneos na família (era ela quem, na noite de seu aniversário, “engrenava os casamentos do ano entrante”), o que não impediu a constituição de uma descendência bastarda (seus afilhados, dependentes favoritos e protegidos), a qual serve os membros legítimos na mesma festa natalícia da matrona.

A partir desse reduto, garantido pelos casamentos, Mamãe

Grande conserva sua fazenda imensurável, sendo

dona das águas correntes e paradas, chovidas e por chover, e dos caminhos vicinais, dos postes do telégrafo, dos anos bissextos e do calor e que tinha além disso um direito herdado sobre vida e fazendas (p. 150).

A enumeração de seus assuntos terrenos demandou três horas. A Mamãe Grande é uma autêntica latifundiária: em suas terras, “um território ocioso, sem limites definidos, que abarcava cinco municípios”, “viviam a título de arrendatárias 352 famílias”. E vem então descrita a cobrança dos impostos, como no feudalismo da Idade Média:

Todos os anos, em vésperas de seu aniversário, Mamãe Grande exercia o único ato de domínio que havia impedido o retorno das terras ao estado: a cobrança dos arrendamentos. Sentada no pátio interior da casa, ela recebia pessoalmente o pagamento pelo direito de habitar em suas terras, como durante mais de um século o receberam seus antepassados dos antepassados dos arrendatários. Passados os três dias da coleta, o pátio estava abarrotado de porcos, perus e galinhas e dos dízimos e primícias sobre os frutos da terra que se depositavam ali como presentes (pp. 156-57).

Além disso, e dos três potes cheios de ouro, “enterrados em algum lugar da casa durante a guerra da Independência”, são arrolados os bens morais, que constituem seu patrimônio invisível — que Mamãe Grande se esforça por ditar ao notário, erguendo-se sobre suas nádegas monumentais. O trecho, por se tratar de uma súpula absurda e exagerada das posses da velha, merece ser citado:

A riqueza do subsolo, as águas territoriais, as cores da bandeira, a soberania nacional, os partidos tradicionais, os direitos do homem, as liberdades do cidadão, o primeiro magistrado, a segunda instância, a terceira discussão, as cartas de recomendação, as contingências históricas, as eleições livres, as rainhas de beleza, os discursos transcendentais, as grandiosas manifestações, as distintas senhoritas, os corretos cavalheiros, os pundonorosos militares, sua senhoria ilustríssima, a corte suprema de justiça, os artigos de importação pública, as damas liberais, o problema da carne, a pureza de linguagem, os exemplos para o mundo, a ordem jurídica, a imprensa livre mas responsável, a Atenas sul-americana, a opinião pública, as lições democráticas, a moral cristã, a escassez de divisas, o direito de asilo, o perigo comunista, a nave do estado, a carestia da vida, as tradições republicanas, as classes desfavorecidas, as mensagens de adesão (p. 159).

Será desnecessário recomendar que o leitor atente para o extremo sarcasmo da passagem, composta de chavões e da retórica dos discursos de políticos: não poderia ser maior a carnavalização do Poder, que se mostra fantástico, absurdo, absoluto.

Mas a crítica se estende: Mamãe Grande sucumbe, “afogando-se

no *mare magnum* de fórmulas abstratas que durante dois séculos constituíram a justificação moral do poderio da família”, expira, depois de emitir um solene arrote.

Sua figura —que, como a da avó de Erêndira, é descrita como monumental, de gigantescas proporções, numa metonímia de seu Poder¹⁷— é totalmente desmistificada: seu “trono” era uma cadeira de balanço de cipó¹⁸; apesar de ter mais de 100 anos e de julgarem-na imortal, ela more em meio à enumeração de seus bens invisíveis, com um arrote em vez de um último suspiro. A Mamã Grande, autoridade em seu distrito de calor a malária, que,

em tempos pacíficos, [. . .] concedia e retirava prelações, prebendas e sinecuras, e velava pelo bem-estar dos associados mesmo que para conseguir tivesse que recorrer à trapaça ou à fraude eleitoral;

e que,

em tempos tormentosos, [. . .] contribuiu em segredo para armar seus partidários e prestou de público socorro às vítimas (p. 162),

não poderia ter seu falecimento, com todo “esse zelo patriótico” que “a credenciava às mais altas honras”, passando despercebido na capital.

b) crítica ao Poder civil —

Seu retrato —um de quando ela tinha vinte anos— aparece na primeira página das edições extras mas a desinformação (e alienação) é tamanha que pensam se tratar de uma nova rainha de beleza, sendo seu nome ignorado pelo resto do país. No entanto, “a ordem social fora abalada pela morte”, comovendo o próprio Presidente da República. Este é a imagem da alienação: “os sentimentos urbanos chegavam [até ele] como que através de um filtro de prurificação” (p. 160).

Comovido o primeiro mandatário, comoveram-se os ministros. E urge tomar uma providência, porque

durante muitos anos Mamã Grande garantira a paz social e a concórdia política de seu império, em virtude dos três baús de cédulas eleitorais falsas que formavam parte de seu patrimônio secreto. Os varões da criadagem, seus protegidos e arrendatários, maiores e menores de idade, exerciam não só seu próprio direito de sufrágio, como também o dos eleitores mortos em um século (p. 161).

O presidente adquire plena consciência de seu destino histórico, decreta luto nacional e “homenagens póstumas à Mamã Grande na categoria de heroína morta pela pátria no campo de batalha”, além de discursar aos compatriotas através de uma cadeia de rádio e televisão.

Porém, o palavrório toma conta do Congresso — “rarefeito por um século de legislação abstrata, entre retratos a óleo de próceres nacionais e bustos de pensadores gregos” —, enquanto o cadáver da Mamãe Grande aguarda a 40 graus à sombra, pois se conciliavam pareceres e se faziam emendas constitucionais, visando o comparecimento do presidente ao enterro.

Finalmente, a decisão chega: uma vez conturbada a ordem pública, o presidente da República lança mão das faculdades extraordinárias, rataplã, rataplã, rataplã, plã, plã (p. 167). Havia expedientes de exceção também Macondo.

c) a crítica ao Poder religioso —

Já em Macondo, quer na figura decrépita e quase centenária do padre Antonio Isabel, quer nas regalias da Mamãe Grande, na missa,

abanada por algum membro do poder civil, desfrutando o privilégio de não se ajoelhar nem mesmo na hora da elevação para não estragar sua saia de volantes holandeses e suas anáguas engomadas de cambraia (p. 154),

ficara bem delineada a relação da velha matriarca com os representantes do clero, que lhe faziam concessões. No entanto, o Poder da Mamãe Grande se alastra, e sua morte repercute até no Castel Gandolfo, residência papal de verão, causando “uma hora de confusões, afobações e correrias no império sem limites da cristandade”, pela “terceira vez em vinte séculos”. O Sumo Pontífice contemplava de sua janela a busca dos mergulhadores, no lago, da cabeça da donzela decapitada — e essa sua preocupação se constitui igualmente numa imagem da alienação —, quando os jornais estampam “o manchado daguerreótipo” da Mamãe Grande.

E lá se vai o Papa “rumo aos fantásticos e remotos funerais da Mamãe Grande”, e em uma canoa pontifícia atravessa os canais e lamaçais “que delimitavam o Império Romano e as fazendas da Mamãe Grande”, padecendo “o tormento dos pernilongos”. Lá, nos domínios da Grande Velha, o Sumo Pontífice sofrerá uma insônia sudorífera, e durante o dia distribuirá às crianças caramelos italianos.

Quando de sua partida, ao crepúsculo, entremeava-se “o profundo dobrar dos sinos da Basílica de São Pedro” com “o repicar rechado dos bronzes de Macondo”.

Outras críticas são formuladas no decorrer da narrativa, como a ganância e ambição dos descendentes e protegidos mais diretos da Mamãe Grande, ávidos pelo Poder, que “fecharam as portas tão logo foi retirado o cadáver, e desmontaram as portas, despregaram as tábuas e desenterraram os alicerces para dividir a casa” (p. 170).

Outra é dirigida ao médico, “contrário por convicção filosófica aos progressos da ciência”, com seus “emplastos acadêmicos, julepes magníficos e supositórios magistrais”, em proveito de quem a velha proíbe o estabelecimento de outros doutores em Macondo. Como os parentes próximos da velha, ele também teve “o privilégio de ser pai de numerosos filhos alheios”, até que o artrismo obrigou-o a “atender os seus pacientes sem visitá-los, por meio de suposições, mexericos e recados” (p. 151).

Será necessário, porém, ressaltar a crítica feita à história oficial, logo na Apresentação do conto. Depois de enumerar a partida daqueles que haviam comparecido às cerimônias fúnebres (o conto principia *in ultimas res*), escreve o narrador:

agora é a hora de encostar um tamborete à porta da rua e começar a contar desde o princípio os pormenores desta comoção nacional, antes que os historiadores tenham tempo de chegar (p. 143).

Como sucedera em CE, aqui se tem o cronista, postulando como função da literatura uma documentação verídica — e à margem da versão “oficial” — dos fatos. Ainda como em CE, a crítica se encontra diluída na narrativa, como neste trecho, em que é veiculada *en passant*:

No Capitólio Nacional, onde os mendigos envoltos em papéis dormiam ao amparo de colunas dóricas e taciturnas estátuas de presidentes mortos, as luzes continuavam acesas (p. 161).

E, analogamente ao sangue verde da avó de Cândida Erêndira, a degradação do Poder da Mamãe Grande é dada metaforicamente pelo vôo dos urubus, ao final:

Ninguém viu a vigilante sombra de urubus que seguiu o cortejo pelas ardentes ruazinhas de Macondo, nem reparou que ao passar dos ilustres elas se iam cobrindo por um pestilento rastro de excrementos (pp. 169-70).

Como ainda ocorria em CE, em FMG o Poder também não é desarticulado conseqüentemente, mas se desfaz, com a morte da todo-poderosa velha. Nesse sentido, considerando estes dois contos, constata-se que Márquez não vê uma solução “revolucionária” — a desestruturação do Poder, sua transformação, desfazendo a relação de dominação e beneficiando os dominados —, posto que os poderosos são eliminados gratuitamente, como em CE (onde o texto acaba liberando Erêndira, para o mítico, mas sem acrescentar nada quanto a uma efetiva mudança de situação), ou, como em FMG, desaparecem por morte natural, cercados de todas as homenagens. De qualquer maneira, pode-se afirmar que em ambos os casos desenha-se uma

libertação, bem mais nítida em FMG, com a alusão aos varredores e ao novo tempo que se prenuncia.

Importa valorizar ainda, em CE e FMG, além da discussão do Poder, a forma fantástica que assume esse Poder, sua total carnavalização, evidente nas críticas que procuramos destacar. E aí é que está sua mais contundente demolição, empreendida pelos textos aqui examinados. A carnavalização se materializa no texto, particularmente por meio do ambiente de feira, de igual forma presente em FMG: não só os aniversários da Grande Velha são comemorados “com as feiras mais prolongadas e tumultuosas de que se tem memória” (pp. 152-53), como seus funerais assim se apresentam:

Era chegado o Grande dia. Nas ruas congestionadas de roletas, fogareiros de frituras e mesas de jogos, e de homens com cobras enroladas no pescoço que apregoavam o bálsamo definitivo para curar erisipela e assegurar a vida eterna: na pracinha colorida onde a multidão tinha pendurado seus toldos e desenrolado suas esteiras, galhardos arcabuzeiros abriam caminho para a autoridade. Lá estavam, á espera do momento supremo, as lavadeiras de São Jorge, os pescadores de pérolas do Cabo de Vela, os tarrafeiros de Ciénega, os camaroneiros de Tasajera, os feiticeiros de Monjana, os salineiros de Manaura, os acordeonistas de Valledupar, os camelôs de Ayapel, os plantadores de mamão de San Pelayo, os galistas de La Cueva, os repentistas das Sabanas de Bolívar, os aldrabões de Rebolo, os canoieiros do Magdalena, os rábulos de Mompox, além dos que foram enumerados no começo desta drônica, e muitos outros (p. 167).

(Note-se, na lista dos presentes, a titulação das autoridades. Há, mais adiante, uma lista das “rainhas nacionais de todas as coisas existentes e por existir”, que omitimos — pp. 168-9).

FMG prolonga a degradação (pela putrefação) do Poder com a interferência dos varredores, após a alusão aos urubus, que fecha o relato. Exterminado o Poder, tudo voltará a seus lugares e vislumbra-se uma transformação, com a liberddde, como comentamos:

A única coisa que não passou inadvertida a ninguém no fragor daquele enterro foi o estrondoso suspiro de descanso que exalou a multidão quando se completaram os quatorze dias de preces, exaltações e ditirambos, a tumba foi selada com uma placa de chumbo. Alguns dos presentes dispuseram de clarividência suficiente para compreender que estavam assistindo ao nascimento de uma nova época (p. 170).

E reafirma-se o papel do cronista —que aparecera na Apresentação do conto—, de depor, trazendo a verdade, porque extinto o Poder, deteriorado, virão os varredores e varrerão o lixo dos funerais, “por todos os séculos dos séculos”.

IV — O Poder Do Fantástico —

A Literatura, entendida como uma manifestação cultural, tendo seu espaço no terreno do simbólico, no qual transitam as demais linguagens que constituem a cultura, não deve ser vista isoladamente, em si mesma. Seria negar a permanente relação que ela mantém com outros textos, no contexto (conjunto de textos) em que se acha, seria negligenciar a dinâmica intertextual que está implicada em toda obra literária.

Dentro desse enfoque, ver o fantástico literalmente nos parece significar a adoção de uma postura cega aos múltiplos diálogos que o texto literário enceta com os demais textos. Como afirmávamos, o fantástico é, antes de tudo, um discurso duplo, em constante tensão com o discurso que é a realidade, de que a Literatura é uma metáfora.

É a partir dessa leitura do real, que o texto fantástico efetua, que nele a realidade se vê negada e desestruturada. O fantástico transgredir o real. Do ponto de vista de sua comunicação, a ruptura operada na narrativa termina por ecoar no leitor, desorganizando os esquemas com os quais costumeiramente ele encara o mundo.

No caso dos textos de García Márquez estudados, a interação se dá entre a narrativa e a realidade latino-americana, constando esta no repertório prévio que o leitor carrega para o seu diálogo com o conto no ato de leitura. É esse diálogo que faz o texto significar. Daí o fantástico não poder ser tomado em si mesmo— como nenhum discurso, afinal—, visto que ele não pode prescindir desse diálogo para se semantizar. Isolado, o texto carece de sentido.

Pois, em CE e FMG, onde se discute e carnavaliza o Poder, o que se revela fantástico não é o texto, exatamente — trata-se de ficção—, mas o próprio Poder nele representado. O que se questiona, em última análise, são seus mecanismos, a ideologia que o sustenta — em suma, o conto deflagra aquele conhecimento anterior que o leitor possui, degrada e desmistifica o Poder. As estruturas de dominação persistem, os textos as denunciam.

O papel conferido ao cronista, nas obras estudadas, nos autoriza agora a estabelecermos essas postulações, porque ali, visivelmente, tínhamos que ao cronista-escritor se atribuía a responsabilidade de depor, trazendo à tona a veracidade acerca dos eventos narrados.

O poder do fantástico reside por conseguinte em sua capacidade transgressora, carnavalizante, em revelar aqui o Poder como fantástico. As histórias da avó de Erêndira e da Mamãe Grande põem entre parênteses o Poder, o fantástico tensiona seus limites. A questão derradeira que se coloca não é de que forma deve existir o Poder; o que está em cheque é a própria existência do Poder.

Ficamos esperando pelos varredores.

NOTAS

1. *Análise estrutural de romances brasileiros*. Petrópolis, Ed. Vozes, 1973, p. 27. Não nos interessa aqui aprofundar o conceito de ideologia. É suficiente, para nossos propósitos, que ele seja entendido, de maneira simplificada, como visão de mundo da classe dominante, que, se impondo, sem questionamentos, conforma o senso comum. Esta visão, não custa anotar, mascara a realidade social.
2. Tzvetan Todorov, *Introdução à literatura fantástica*. São Paulo, Ed. Perspectiva, 1975, p. 181.
3. Todorov, p. 175.
4. *Ibid.* p. 167.
5. Irène Basière, *Le Récit Fantastique: la poétique de l'incertain*. Paris, Lib. Larousse, 1974, pp. 248-49.
6. V. Anazildo Vasconcelos da Silva, "A lógica da ambigüidade fantástica", *Revista de Letras TA*, 1 (1974) e Roberto Reis, "Para uma definição do fantástico", *Chasqui*, 6,3 (1977). Neste artigo, baseados nas formulações do Prof. A. V. da Silva, estudávamos o conto "A casa de Asterion", de Borges, no qual a relação intertextual de duplicidade se manifesta entre o texto do conto e a lenda grega do Minotauro. Pode ocorrer, portanto, que nem sempre o outro texto envolvido no discurso fantástico seja a realidade. No caso de Borges, sabe-se, a realidade se compara a uma biblioteca, não nos surpreendendo que, em "Asterion", a relação intertextual implique num texto extraído de um saber livresco.
7. Para uma distinção entre o estranho e o maravilhoso, v. Todorov, *op. cit.*
8. Todorov, *op. cit.*, p. 37.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 179 e 181.
10. V. Roberto Reis, "A ruptura do fantástico", *Minas Gerais, Suplemento Literário*, 29 abril 1978. Note-se que o fantástico, no âmbito da narrativa mesma, opera uma ruptura, quebrando o equilíbrio com o surgimento do sobrenatural. V. Todorov, pp. 172-74 e Reis, *cit.*
11. Este conto figura na coletânea citada a seguir.
12. Gabriel García Márquez, *A incrível e triste história da Cândida Erêndira e sua avó desalmada*. Rio de Janeiro, Ed. Record, 1972. A tradução é de Remy Gorga, filho. Citaremos por esta edição, mencionando as páginas entre parênteses no corpo do ensaio. Doravante nos referiremos ao conto pelas iniciais CF.
13. *Idem.*, *Os funerais da Mãe Grande*. Rio de Janeiro, Ed. Sabiá, 1970. A tradução é de Édson Braga. Adotaremos o mesmo procedimento aludido na nota precedente e nos reportaremos a este texto pelas iniciais FMG.
14. V. Roberto Reis, "O planalto que chama", *Revista de Cultura Vozes*, 7 (1978).
15. V., a título de exemplo: "formosa baleia branca" (p. 94); "tamborete muito pequeno para suas nádegas siderais" (p. 120); "seu tamanho monumental aumentara" (p. 144); "depois de apagar as velas com um sopro arrasador" (p. 151); "revolveu-se na cama com um movimento de acomodação sísmica" (p. 153).
16. "[...] Erêndira o amara tanto, e com tanta verdade, que voltou a amá-lo pela metade de seu preço enquanto a avó delirava, e continuou amando-o sem dinheiro até o amanhecer" (p. 117); "Ulisses permaneceu a contemplá-la um longo momento sem a despertar, mas a contemplou com tal intensidade que Erêndira acordou. Então se beijaram na escuridão, acariciaram-se sem pressa, despiram-se

vagarosamente, com uma ternura calada e uma felicidade recôndita que se assemelharam mais que nunca ao amor” (p. 148).

17. Outro aspecto vinculado ao Poder da Mamãe Grande é o cadeado, que marca os quartos traseiros dos animais de sua propriedade.

18. A crítica surge aqui, então, na degradação do sublime, procedimento freqüente em García Márquez, cujo exemplo mais notável é o anjo de “Um senhor muito velho com umas asas enormes”, incluído em *A incrível e triste história da Cândida Erêndira e sua avó desalmada*. A mesma desmistificação é feita com a avó, conforme vimos, em CE.

The Production of Solitude: Góngora and the State

John Beverley

University of Pittsburgh

What was involved in the seventeenth century debates on Gongorism and in its reception by the literary elite of the Spanish imperial state and ideological apparatus was not simply a matter of style. The much argued question of Góngora's formalism meant not the absence of political and social concerns—as the contemporary usage of the term suggests—but rather the relation of a certain way of doing poetry to the dominant ideology and to the society which represented and reproduced itself in and through that ideology. Poetry was still regarded as a *legislative* discourse; aesthetics questions were thus inseparable from ethical ones, and these in turn from the concrete institutions and operations of the civil society at large. In these terms, it is appropriate to consider Gongorism in its specificity as what Althusser has called an *ideological practice*.

Gongorism has in the seventeenth century a Janus-like nature. On the one hand, it is violently attacked by the humanists of the Counter Reformation as a form of radical heresy. For Cascales, Góngora is "Mahoma de la poesía española"; Quevedo boasts "yo te untaré mis versos con tocino / porque no me los muerdas, gongorilla"; the Inquisition prohibits the sale of the first published edition of Góngora's poems, for several years (Lope de Vicuña's *Obras en verso del Homero español* of 1627). On the other, after the poet's death Gongorism rapidly becomes an accepted, even "official," poetic manner in the Spanish Court and the Colonies. In the *Justas poéticas* of the Vice-royalties, no one aspiring to patronage and protection via a well wrought sonnet or ode can afford to remain innocent of Gongorist *culteranismo*. It serves Calderón in his effort to fashion a didactic state theater and Gracián's neo-scholastic aesthetics and politics. The Conde Duque de Olivares has Góngora's works transcribed on parchment for his private library.

"Homer" or "Mohammed" of Spanish poetry? Sublime or heretical? Does Góngora "speak" the dominant ideology or is his art the practice of an outsider and rebel? The answer is both. Why this is the case is what I want to outline here.

What specifies Góngora's poetry is his deliberate, some would say perverse, cultivation of difficulty. As Panofsky demonstrated, the Italian Mannerists had advanced in the sixteenth century the idea of difficulty *per se*—*dificoltà*—as an aesthetic property. They held that a special pleasure was to be gained through the ability of mind—*acutezza*, whence Gracián's *agudeza*—to experience the art work as an intricate space of signification. The point was related to an argument in favor of artistic freedom. For a theorist like Zuccari, aesthetic intuition and exploration constituted a legitimate mode of understanding which might produce a knowledge and a behaviour in ways independent of (and in the case of a poet of "doctas dificultades," as Carrillo y Sotomayor called Lucretius, contradictory to) established dogma or the precept that art must be morally useful in the Christian sense. What mattered, the Mannerists argued, was the subtle logic of the *dispositio* not the *materia*.¹ On the other hand, the leitmotif of the attackers of Gongorism—all claiming to represent an orthodox Aristotelian discipline of the rules—was that the cultivation of difficulty for its own sake betrayed a contradiction of the scholastic entailment of *res* and *verba*, of language and that which language signifies. Hence they saw the catachresis—the figure of speech in which the terms of comparison are implausible (calling the sea a "Libia de ondas," for example)—as the paradigm of the new aesthetics. By seeming to posit conceptual wit (*ingenio*) as the primary basis of aesthetic pleasure, they felt, Góngora produced a language which was nugatory and functionally atheistic.²

The appearance of the *Soledad primera* in the literary tertulias of the Madrid Court in 1614 was answered by a manifesto known as the "Carta de un amigo," probably by Lope de Vega and/or his cohorts. It charged Góngora with being 'inventor de dificultar la construcción del romance,' suggesting that the result was a "disparate" in which "le alcanzó algun ramalazo de la desdicha de Babel." Góngora replied as follows (in a document that has come to be known as the "Carta en respuesta"):³

... en dos maneras considero me ha sido honrosa esta poesía; si entendida por los doctos, causarme ha autoridad, siendo lance forzoso venerar que nuestra lengua a costa de mi trabajo haya llegado a la perfección y alteza de la latina, a quien no he quitado los artículos, como le parece a Vm. y a esos señores, sino excusándolos donde no necesarios: y así gustaré me dijese en dónde faltan, o qué razón de ella no está corriente en lenguaje heróico (que

ha de ser diferente de la prosa y digno de personas capaces de entendelle) . . .
 Demás que honra me ha causado hacerme oscuro a los ignorantes, que esa es
 la distinción de los hombres doctos, hablar de manera que a ellos les parezca
 griego; pues no se han de dar las piedras preciosas a animales de cerda.

There are several things to notice here. One is the idea of the poetry "causing" (creating/signifying) honor; two the idea of poetry as a labor, a *trabajo* to use Góngora's word or what later Gongorists like Éspinosa Medrano would call a *fabricación*, a making; three the point about the nobility and perfection of Latin; four, the claim that his departures from normal usage and syntax are justified by the requirements of a heroic language, worthy of those capable of understanding it (i.e. those who possess honor). Ordinary Spanish—what Góngora calls "el romance" in the letter—is seen as a language which must be instrumentalized because it has fallen from "la perfección y alteza de la latina." Góngora's "trabajo" is to have sublimated it, extended and refined its expressive and ordering capacity, by incorporating into it the complex periods of Latin syntax and a new range of words and concepts. "El romance" thus attains in the artifact the status of a heroic or epic language because it becomes, thanks to the poet, an instrument for knowing and representing the contingencies of Spain's national destiny (because epic is the discourse of the state), contingencies which are to be met by the "personas capaces," the aristocracy and its retinue in the state and ecclesiastical apparatus. The poet's achievement "causarme ha autoridad" because it is like the Latin political essay or ode a formal sign of the measured subtlety and innovation—what Gracián later called *arte de ingenio*—required for rule.

The equation which is implicit in this argument is of the mastery of language, a task the division of labor accords to the specialized techniques of the poet, and of the mastery of government and economy. Góngora seems to assume that the division between mental and manual labor still corresponds to the distinction between the noble and the non-noble. But what about the problem of non-noble persons of letters, of which there were obviously many in seventeenth century Spain? The *exclusionary* character of Góngora's defense of difficulty is crucial here ("hablar de manera que a ellos les parezca griego"), since the manner of his poetry prohibits those who may be functionally literate but lack *sutileza*, are not "doctos," from appropriating the text. Nevertheless, there is an ambiguity we will have to return to: it is not clear that one possesses *sutileza* simply by virtue of blood nobility, since to be a "docto" requires a specific "trabajo." Indeed the passage seems to suggest that the *hidalgos* of the "Carta de un

amigo" (who raised the question of honor in the first place) may be fairly counted among the "ignorantes."

This is not a defense, as Dámaso Alonso and the modernist canon on Góngora has tended to assume, of a "puro placer de formas." Rather it indicates the existence of a situation where questions of poetics have become involved with a social reality—state power and the estamental definition of class and caste—poetry as a social practice corresponds to, both as a means of representation and/or legitimization of authority and as a means of educating the consciousness of the ruling class, of translating through the reception and assimilation of the text an aesthetics into an ethics and tactics.

Who, then, does Góngora concretely address in his poetry? We can begin our answer with Pierre Vilar's definition of Hapsburg absolutism as "imperialism, the highest stage of feudalism":

La conquista española funda una sociedad nueva, porque instituye el *mercado mundial* y porque permite—al derramar sobre Europa un dinero barato—la *acumulación primitiva del capital*. Esta sociedad, sin embargo, no puede desarrollarse mas que contando con unas fuerzas productivas acrecidas y con unas relaciones sociales nuevas. Es lo que ocurrirá en el Norte de Europa. En España, en cambio, o mejor: *en Castilla*, las clases dirigentes han realizado la conquista del Nuevo Mundo como hicieron la Reconquista hispana: *a la manera feudal*. . . Así el imperialismo español ha sido en realidad la "etapa suprema" de la sociedad que el mismo ha contribuido a destruir.⁴

This definition implies a number of things which are important for our discussion. First, that the Baroque state in Spain is a class dictatorship, a dictatorship of the feudal aristocracy, but in particular of the most powerful, chauvinist and imperialist fraction of the aristocracy, that group—the *grandes*—which has through the newly consolidated state apparatus been able to connect its power and fortune to the colonial and domestic primitive accumulation and which, therefore, is properly a *mercantilist* and *monopolistic* aristocracy. Moreover, the absolutist feudal state is not the same thing as the pre-Hapsburg feudal state(s), nor is its economic basis the same. Seventeenth century Spain is a society flooded with bullion from the colonies, subject to a continuous process of inflation, and dominated by a generalized commodities market. There is a huge state and ecclesiastical bureaucracy, whose nominal nobility or "honor" becomes increasingly ambiguous in the push and shove of inter-bureaucratic competition. Rent in kind or labor services has been generally replaced by money rent, resulting in either the dispossession from the land of masses of peasants who emigrate to

the urban centers in search of work or welfare or their proletarianization as day-laborers, *jornaleros*. (According to Bennassar's demographic studies, 15 to 20 per cent of the population is chronically unemployed.)⁵

Second, Hapsburg absolutism and imperialism implies the marginalization of large sections of the traditional aristocracy (as in the case of the petty aristocracy of the Comunidades rebellions). Because a primitive accumulation has taken place, because social life is thus increasingly mediated by money and the marketplace rather than the production for use of the "natural" economy of pure feudalism, class and caste status is subject to a double, and for many *hidalgos* a contradictory, determination. On the other hand, because feudal caste restrictions continue in force (as in the proof of purity of blood used to exclude not only the non-old Christian but more extensively the non-noble from office), this determination is still estamental; political and economic power continues to depend on title and privilege and cannot be attained in a purely entrepreneurial fashion. On the other hand, as Don Quijote or Lazarillo's impoverished *escudero* illustrate, a title by itself means little in a society where money has become the generalized form of exchange and where one's hereditary estate is subject to mortgages and leins.⁶ The idea of quality as a natural corollary of nobility of blood tends now to be overdetermined by the requirement that some form of entrepreneurship and/or specialization is necessary, that the *hidalgo* as much as the *picaro* is bound to *el medro*—the quest for office—, and must seek to "arrimarse a los buenos." Góngora, coming from a titled but economically obscure provincial Andalusian family, is one of these marginalized aristocrats. He must insert himself in the circles of power *from the outside*.⁷

The marginalization of the petty aristocracy and the personnel needs of the imperial state and ecclesiastical bureaucracy explain in part the tremendous growth of Spanish universities in the sixteenth century and the function of that curious figure somewhere between the Renaissance courtier and the Jacobin known as the *letrado*, the person of letters. Between 1459 and 1620 18 new universities are created in Spain and 5 in the colonies, making a total of 28 in Góngora's day. In Castile proper they enrolled, as Richard Kagan has shown in his studies of the phenomenon, around 20 to 25,000 students at their height: that is, about 2 to 2.5 per cent of the total male population between the ages of 15 and 24 (to which would have to be added several thousands more studying in the increasingly popular Jesuit colleges). Moreover, Kagan observes, "since students stemmed largely from the nobility, particularly the numerous *hidalgo* class

which may have constituted up to one tenth of Castile's total population, perhaps as many as one quarter to one third of Castile's young noblemen may have received some form of university or university-level education," making Castile along with England Europe's most highly educated nations at the time.⁸

The standard major by the end of the sixteenth century was *Leyes*—canon law—because a degree in *Leyes* was an all but automatic ticket into the state and ecclesiastical apparatus. Góngora chose *Artes*—humanities—which was tending as today to become marginal in terms of effective demand. Nevertheless, the central role of intellectual labor in Spanish feudal-imperial society still put a premium on literary skill: not in the sense that like Cervantes (who eventually had to depend on his writing for a living) Góngora could or wanted to market his poetry. Quite the contrary, it is part and parcel of his aesthetics that his works circulate privately and in manuscript, that they evade the status of a commodity, that they be "no para los muchos." Who are the implied "pocos," however? The other *letrados*, because without a university education no one was going to make much headway with Góngora's poetry. And not only the *letrados* in general, but the most refined and/or powerful among them, because, as we have seen, "no se han de dar las piedras preciosas a animales de cerda." In these terms, the difficulty or *sutileza* of an aesthetic artifact signifies an aristocratic sublimation on the part of both receiver and emitter, an "autoridad." What is transmitted, however, is not only a sign of class ascendancy but also a technique of class power. The poem is an exercise which refines and empowers the intelligence of the ruler(s), as Góngora explains elsewhere in his letter of defense:

. . . y si la obscuridad y estilo intricado de Ovidio . . . da causa a que, vacilando el entendimiento en fuerza del discurso, trabajándole (pues crece con cualquier acto de valor), alcance lo que asi en la lectura superficial de sus versos no pudo entender; luego hase de confesar que tiene utilidad avivar el ingenio, y eso nació de la obscuridad del poeta.

The poem appeals to the clientelism of the patrons—the *grandes*—in the centers of power: the Court, the imperial urban network, the Viceroyalities. It claims to provide a means for the ritualization and pseudo-universalization of these centers of power, a heroic language or discourse of state; it creates between poet and prince and against "los muchos" what Hernan Vidal has called a "comunidad lingüística diferenciadora"⁹ in which each concedes to the other an equality of status and a mutual dependency (hopefully for the poet in terms of money or position).

But there are obvious problems with this calculus of aristocratic reciprocity and sublimation. Though poet speaks to prince in terms of equality, using the familiar "tú," their relationship is patently asymmetrical, just as Don Quijote's with the Duke and the Duchess in Part II. Moreover, as we have seen, the sublimation requires a "trabajo" on the part of both poet and reader. The difficulty of the language forces the reader to "trabajar el discurso"—work the language. Yet this insistence is dissonant with the estamental principle that the nature of the aristocrat is properly to *appropriate* the work of others, that his social function is military (i.e. governmental in the broader sense), that his paradigmatic form of recreation is therefore hunting. (In the dedicatory to both the *Polifemo* and *Soledades* Góngora insists on the pastoral convention of a suspension of the hunt, as if to suggest by metonymic displacement that the reading of the poem represents an *alternative form of practice*.) Aristocratic behavior demands a logic of consumption rather than of production: hence the contempt for manual labor characteristic of the Spanish nobility which trickles down into other strata of the population during the Golden Age (the *pícaro's* aversion for productive employment, for example). But there is clearly a sense in which Góngora is conscious of his activity as an artesanal activity in which the work expended on form is seen as productive or value-creating labor, rather than simply recreation or expression of a pre-existing "natural" quality. By the same token, he enjoys depicting in sharp detail the techniques and forms of labor of the *serranos*, *labradores* and *pescadores* who populate his country landscapes: There is no urgency here, as in the more purely aristocratic pastoral of Garcilaso, that the pastoral require a suspension of labor or its attenuation. (Herding sheep in the convention of Renaissance pastoral is more a form of leisured appropriation—the economics of the Age of Gold—than a specific technique and practice. That is what allows the fiction that the shepherds are transposed aristocrats, a fiction which would clearly collapse, as it does in *Don Quijote*, if the shepherd were rendered as an actual *jornalero*, living by the sweat of his brow.)

We return here to the ambiguity of who is "docto" and who isn't in Góngora's audience. The poem selects its audience: the select. An aristocracy of letters, an aristocracy of blood, or both? "Ya muy entrado el siglo XVII el letrado seguía siendo un ser indefinible, es decir, huérfano de una clara definición social," comments Jaime Concha. He continues:

Ser noble, ser sacerdote, ser ganapán, eran cosas muy nítidas, aristotélica y escolásticamente nítidas en la conciencia colectiva del período. No así el

letrado, cuya práctica social no encajaba plenamente dentro de la mentalidad excluyentemente nobiliaria de los estamentos dominantes. ¿Se puede ser letrado sin ser noble? ¿Constituye la actividad de las letras, sobre todo da las letras profanas relacionadas directamente con el derecho y la jurisprudencia, una sabiduría autónoma que se justifique a sí misma? En el tiempo, las reacciones a estas preguntas oscilan en un abanico de posibilidades que va desde la básica postulación del letrado-noble hasta un débil conato ideológico de reconocer la especificidad técnica de tal praxis intelectual.¹⁰

We have seen that Góngora regards his poetry as a means of self-insertion into the dominant centers of wealth and power in his time. His defense is a Baroque version of the older topic of the poet as *vates*—prophetic bard but also legislator of civic consciousness. But is there also a sense in which his activity, by its very specificity (the cultivation of difficulty), leads him to question the logic of this dominance? (I am thinking as I write this of an observation in a recent essay by Herbert Marcuse: “The inner logic of a work of art terminates in the emergence of another reason, another sensibility, which defy the rationality and sensibility incorporated in the dominant social institutions.”)¹¹

Let me bring forward another problem in the argument of Góngora’s letter. Góngora claims to be fashioning a heroic language; but he uses it dissonantly to describe not epic subjects or the urban centers of imperial power but rather the everyday life of the countryside. The anomaly was not lost on his critics. Neo-aristotelean literary preceptism permitted epic or quasi-epic discourse a hyper-complication of image, syntax and usage so that the style of imitation might express the complexity, elevation and universality of the subject, as Góngora properly notes. But his poetry is to all appearances strictly bucolic, in the words of one Baroque critic, “concurso de pastores, bodas, epithalamios, fuegos.”¹² So Góngora’s *sutileza* was held to fail not only because it was seen as nugatory or formalistic but because at best it worked towards an idealization of “cosas humildes”—ordinary things. This sense of what we termed a *desgarrón afectivo*—a cleavage between signifier and signified—was to become the major premise of the anti-gongorist current in Spanish criticism.

In a number of senses, however, the anomaly indicates precisely why Góngora’s manner did come into general acceptance, became “officialized,” after his death. The epic stage of Spanish imperialism—the Conquest—had been completed by the end of the sixteenth century. In fact, under the pressure of the English and the Dutch and internal discontent the empire was entering the phase of contraction which would reach its culmination in 1898.

The problem of Lerma and Olivares and the Baroque apparatus was how to maintain the unity of his massive empire with its contradictory diversity of peoples, classes and forms of social and economic life *on a feudal basis*. To put this another way, the problem facing the state was to create/maintain an imperial civil society in which the function of *letras*—jurisprudence, pedagogy, culture, political discourse, religiosity, etc.—overlies and attenuates the need for rule by naked force—*armas*. And here was where Góngora's heterodoxy in epicalizing (in the manner of imitation) "cosas humildes" came readily to hand, because Góngora was preserving the *scope of epic* (its ordering and monumentalizing function) in a situation where epic action *per se* was no longer seen as possible or desirable. In place of an anachronistic military epic, Gongorism offered a new genre in which ordinary activities of social production and reproduction (agriculture, artesanry, courtship, marriage, leisure, etc.) could be duly recorded and universalized.

It is important to bear in mind, that when Góngora or the literary Baroque in general launch into their customary celebration of nature and the life of the countryside they are to some extent evoking an absence. The rise of the great cities as corporate monopolies, market centers and collective legal *seigneurs* fostered by absolutist centralism and mercantilism involved, as John Merrington reminds us, "not only a massive shift of human and material resources in favor of urban concentrations, but also a *conquest* over the countryside, which becomes 'ruralized', since it by no means represented in the past an exclusively agricultural milieu. From being a center of all kinds of production, an autonomous primary sector that incorporates the whole of social production, the country becomes 'agriculture', i.e. a separate industry for food and raw materials."¹³ If solitude is for Góngora the image of a human and natural space which has not yet been colonized, not yet subjected to the tyranny of "metales homicidas," the pastoral has also lost its status as a self-sufficient landscape outside of and immune to the contingencies of history. To fashion a heroic language to depict pastoral themes is to historicize the pastoral. This implies that however much the city is apprehended as an alienating, usurping modernity from the perspective of a nostalgic feudalism, the countryside is no longer a complete human context, since it has been demographically, culturally and economically impoverished. It must be, so to speak, "worked up," given the lineaments of a utopia. Robert Jammes notes "qu'en présentant (le) idéal de vie rustique Góngora ne prétend pas évoquer la masse des paysans dans son ensemble, mais

seulment les plus riches d'entre eux";¹⁴ Bruce Wardropper that in Gongorism "the natural life consists, paradoxically, of subjecting Nature to the discipline of Art. Cultivation is not, as the myth of the Golden age would have it, an abuse of Nature's prodigality. . . . The relation between Art and Nature is not one of being but of becoming."¹⁵

Moreover, the Baroque *alabanza de aldea, menosprecio de corte* entails only a nominal contradiction between city and countryside in which the real contradiction (exploitation of the countryside by the city, of agricultural production by aristocratic consumption) is mystified. As Noël Salomon has shown, the representation of the achievement of political legitimacy in the Baroque *comedia* necessarily involves the immersion in the bucolic which will serve to indoctrinate the ruler in the principles of economic prudence and moral virtue.¹⁶ To govern well, he must know his people's capacity for freedom, the nature and extent of their suffering, the "other" possibilities of life and community which still persist in the countryside. But as an aristocrat he has become urbanised, a *cortesano*. The geometric and social labyrinth of the city hides these experiences from him; he must leave it, leave his class identity, become for awhile ("dejate *un rato* hallar del pie acertado" Góngora asks of the Duke of Béjar in the dedication of the *Soledades*) "one of them." The pastoral thus no longer lies outside of history. It is secularized; it becomes a tableau to be read on the panels of the Court. The hero returns from exile in a confused solitude—*soledad confusa*—to govern. Walter Benjamin explained in his analysis of the teleology of Baroque tragedy:

What is peculiar about the baroque enthusiasm for landscape is particularly evident in the pastoral. For the decisive factor in the escapism of the baroque is not the antithesis of history and nature but the comprehensive secularization of the historical in the state of creation . . . The Spanish theater delights in including the whole of nature as subservient to the Crown, creating thereby a veritable dialectic of setting. For on the other hand the social order, and its representation, the Court is, in Calderón, a natural phenomenon of the highest order, whose first law is the honour of the ruler.¹⁷

This may help us answer part of our original question: How does Gongorism, heterodox in its inception, come to be the model aesthetic discourse of the state and ideological apparatus, especially in the Colonies where the problem of legitimization of power is most crucially decisive and difficult? Answer: it is a form of colonization by *letras* not *armas*. It is a *technique*, a simulacrum of new forms of political practice (Gramsci: "Machiavelli is called the artist of politics") which correspond to the need to elaborate

hegemony in and through civil society in a period of imperial stabilization and contraction. The condition is that which Benjamin called the "dialectic of setting" involve the return of consciousness to the center of political power, the city, the reconciliation of opposites (city/countryside, universal/indigenous, poet prince, authority/society) in a new and more all-embracing unity. As we shall see, however, this reconciliation between discourse and state typical of Colonial Gongorism is not possible in the case of Góngora himself.

This kind of Gongorist metaphor will be familiar to everyone: the spray of water from the prow of a boat is the pearl necklace of an Inca queen, the nets of some fishermen are Dedaluses' labyrinth, honey is Minerva's liquid gold, cottage cheese is "los blancos lilios de la Aurora," etc. We might call such metaphors "mercantilist" to the extent that they seem to imply a transmutation of ordinary objects of use of perception into appropiately sublime or luxurious expressions of exchange value. What is characteristic in the aesthetic discourse of the Colonies is how Gongorist metaphor and syntax is appropriated and used to conceal through its verbal alchemy the real sources of wealth and goods in the labor of the indigenous masses (e.g. in Balbuena's *Grandeza mejicana*). This is part of its service as an ideological practice to the ruling class: it is a technique for fetishizing wealth and authority, which appear as if automatic reflexes of some providence built into reality rather than as determinate products of human elaboration carried out under very particular and exploitative relations of production. Metaphorical decor becomes in Colonial Gongorism a veritable theory of magic accumulation which masks the real "primitive accumulation" and makes it appear to be harmonious with the religious and aristocratic assumptions of Spain's imperialist ideology.¹⁸

The problem is that, as we have seen, Góngora himself was hyperconscious of the status of his discourse as itself a piece of labor. Moreover, he was someone who identified both in person and in practice with the anti-mercantilist current in Spanish economic thought, what Vilar calls the *cuantitativistas* as opposed to the *bullionistas*.¹⁹ Góngora entrusted the critique of the *Soledades*, for example, to another *letrado* called Pedro de Valencia, among other things the author of a treatise on economics in which we may read the following:

Piénsase que el dinero mantiene las repúblicas y no es así: cada uno ha de labrar su parte. Ahora los que se sustentan con dinero, dado a renta, inútiles y ociosos son, que quedan para comer lo que otros siembran y trabajan.²⁰

Arbibristas like Valencia or González de Cellorigo in his *Memorial* (1600) were foreshadowing the later doctrine of the Physiocrats that value sprang from nature and from agricultural production exclusively, that manufacturers, merchants and the rentier aristocracy, not to speak of the parasitic bureaucracy of Church and state, merely manipulated or consumed this value in a sterile way. Against the mercantilists, they held that gold and money were merely tokens of value therefore, rather than value itself and attacked the idea that the accumulation of precious metals should be the over-riding goal of absolutist economic policy. From this point of view, there is some sense in which Góngora is not simply assimilating in his metaphors and poetic decor the "cosas humildes" of rural life to the mercantilist assumptions of an urbanized aristocracy. When he calls honey "Minerva's liquid gold," he seems rather to be indicating that the honey is the value, the gold its expression. "The point seems clear," noted R. O. Jones. "This is the wealth of Nature, better than all the illusory riches of the Indies."²¹ But since mercantilist assumptions are hegemonic and the basic mechanism of imperial absolutism takes the form of an accumulation of wealth in the urban centers at the expense of the countryside, the colonies, and/or the direct producers, Góngora's poetry retains an element of dissidence, suggests not so much the glorification of the *status quo* as the proposition of a rudimentary alternative political economy without concrete political bases. Its task is thus not only to flatter the intellect of the ruler, but to *seduce* it, to make it more like the poet and the poem. The text is a mirror of princes not in the sense that the aristocrat sees what he is but rather what he should be.

What this rudimentary political economy implicit in Góngora's aesthetics consists of I think we can answer summarily. It is a variant of what Marx and Engels called (in a different historical context) "feudal socialism" ("half lamentation, half lampoon; half echo of the past, half menace of the future").²² Góngora, as we have seen, is conscious of his activity as in some sense *productive*, but not productive of exchange value. To be "raro" something must be "no comprado": "la comida proliza de pescados, / raros muchos, y todos no comprados"—*Soledad segunda*. Over and over Góngora's tropes will counterpose use value to exchange value. One might speak in the case of his own poetics of the aristocratic fetish of a highly-wrought form seen as noble or sublime because it eludes the comprehension of the vulgar and is situated outside the arena of the market and of money as a means of possession and a determinant of status and power. This consciousness leads him to

an identification with an "otherness" outside of his estamental definition: with nature and with the direct producers of agricultural wealth who are the protagonists of his major pastoral poems. As in the case of nineteenth century feudal socialism, his poetry proposes implicitly in choice of subjects and its manner of imitation the possibility of an alliance between a section of the aristocracy which shares an anti-mercantilist critique and these masses of direct producers, an alliance to be sure led by "los pocos" acting feudally, that is paternalistically, for their dependents (perhaps in particular by the young Conde de Niebla who appears in the dedication of the *Polifemo* and at the end of the *Soledad segunda*, described as "en modestia civil real grandeza"). It is worth noting that such a movement actually does come about, and that in 1640 a section of the Andalusian aristocracy led by Góngora's patrons the Medina Sidonia, following the example of Portugal and Catalonia, undertakes an uprising to break the region away from the Castilian-Hapsburg center as an independent republic. But the uprising fails—a testimony in part to the limitations of a "feudal socialism."²³

This brings us to a final point I want to touch on: Góngora's relationship to the problem of Baroque historicism. Góngora's critics were fond of noting his apparent inability to complete several of his major projects, due they speculated either to neurasthenia or to the vanity of attempting a discourse so clearly dissonant with literary convention. But it would be more correct to speak in so fastidious a poet of a deliberate incompleteness, a *constructed* incompleteness. "In Baroque allegory it is the *facies hipocratica* of history that lies like a frozen landscape before the eyes of the beholder," argued Walter Benjamin.²⁴ The meditation on the period of a day, the cycle of the agricultural year and its symbolic coincidence with the topic of the four ages of man, the cycle of the rise and fall of empire depicted in the Classical myth of the Ages of Metal, the taste for assembling together the extremely distant and the near, the archaic and the modern, the mythic and the real, the natural and the courtly, the moment of origin and of apotheosis: all these are staples of the Gongorist conceit and mark it as an essentially historicist form of representation. This is part of what Góngora means in his claim to have elaborated a "lenguaje heróico." His poetry aspires to be the discourse of history—*historia conficta*—in a way which rivals and displaces the function of traditional epic. History, in turn, is the process which produces the apotheosis of the mercantilist-absolutist city, civilization as monument, as centralized accumulation and political power. History is what leads to the present, to the ideologized Absolute of Church and state and the established patterns of life and work.

But the meditation on history also has a problematic dimension in the discourse of the Spanish Baroque, since it addresses a situation in which there is a growing collective sense that Spain has entered its Iron Age, a period of irreversible crisis and decay. "If all the great empires, including the greatest of them all, had risen only to fall, could Spain alone escape?" asks J. H. Elliott, trying to define the mood of the early seventeenth century. "The idea of an infinite cyclical process by which all living organisms were subject to growth, maturity and decay was deeply embedded in European thinking," he continues. "The organic conception of the state in the sixteenth century reinforced the analogy, and history confirmed it." How to deal with a situation in which history is seen as a necessary and sublimating process and at the same time as a sort of entropy tending to reduce the architectonic consolidation of state power to the status of a ruin?²⁵

Quevedo's ultramontane stoicism is one solution. Like Nietzsche or the Tory Radicals of the nineteenth century, he sees history as the dimension of the vulgar and thus the impermanent. History is money and money has corrupted everything, is literally and figuratively shit. Góngora's mannerism in particular is an exemplar of this corruption; it is an "inflationary" phenomenon. The true aristocrat has to practice an ascetic withdrawal through the aesthetic strategy of the *concepto* which provokes a sensation of *desengaño*, an understanding of the difference between appearance and reality. The withdrawal into self, however, is also a means of establishing (more accurately: revealing, since they are eternally present) the principles of the good and the true—the *política de Dios*—which may then be brought forward to inspire and instruct the state to correct the situation of decay. The means of correction is to return Spain to the reactionary utopia of a feudal *status quo ante* in which nobleman fought, priest prayed and peasant labored without the benefit of money wealth, luxury consumption, *letrados*, merchants, gongorism and what one historian has called the "inflation of honor," the retailing of titles of nobility by purchase or bribe. What this implies is an annulment of history *per se* which becomes mere appearance, concealing the foundations of a feudal estamental ordering of society, an ordering impervious to time because it mirrors the *civitas dei*. The passion of Christ—the moment when history is fulfilled, when the awaited messiah comes, when the divine and the human are joined—is seen anachronistically as coincident with the establishment of feudalism in its pure form. Therefore, for the person who sees truly there is literally nothing new under the sun. History *has happened* (Mallarmé: "La Nature a lieu").

Spain's decadence is merely a dream which has to be woken up from. "Y los sueños sueños son," Calderón would console; "And dreams are simply dreams."

The Puritan poets might seem to offer a contemporary alternative which points forward rather than backwards. They address a class which is beginning in the seventeenth century to exercise its ideas and practices with increasing authority. Their poetry expresses and in turn helps to form this authority, its images of history and community, its political economy, its personal ethics and style, its sense of revolutionary legitimacy. Beyond their parallel withdrawals to the "solitude" of nature or of the scholar's study they are able to intuit the transfiguration of the absolutist city into a "new Jerusalem," and they bend their art and their lives to serve its birth.

But Góngora has neither Quevedo's reactionary faith nor the Puritan's confidence that history is on the side of their revolutionary vision. The crisis of Hapsburg absolutism is a sterile and genocidal one: "en su propio solar, en Castilla y hacia 1600, *el feudalismo entra en agonía sin que exista nada a punto para reemplazarle.*"²⁶ Góngora's characteristic *persona* is the pilgrim who represents a form of aristocratic homelessness and marginalization: "náufrago, y desdeñado sobre ausente" (*Soledad primera*). He is the seeing eye of a mobile pastoral as he travels in search of some point of reconciliation with his destiny. This must involve inevitably the recognition of those he considers his legitimate peers: the return to the city and the company of the Court. His story, the movement of the Gongorist trope, implies a movement from region to nation, from periphery to center, from wilderness to civilization. But the restoration to the city demands a transposition of its initial status as an alienated and alienating dimension of experience for the poetic subject. This is felt to be impossible or implying a debasement, a loss of honor (since it is the arena of money and the market), however, and the transposition can never be completed in a satisfactory manner. What is needed is a new image of political legitimacy discovered in the exercise of bucolic exile (i.e. in the process of reading the text—"trabajando el discurso"). But such an image is not available in a coherent or historically viable form. To be genuinely *national* feudal socialism would have to concretely ally peasant and aristocrat against the absolutist center. Such an alliance is not finally possible because it would entail the need for the aristocracy to attenuate or abandon the feudal relation of production in which their income and status depends on the exploitation of peasant labor (as Engels pointed out in his famous critique of Lassalle's

Franz von Sickingen).²⁷ Góngora's cultivation of difficulty is rather a substitute for a direct political practice which is no longer possible. At the same time that it expresses a new sense of value and civil society, it limits his audience to a diminishing elite of connoisseurs. This is what E. L. Rivers calls a "pastoral paradox": "Góngora gives us a new vision of the world of nature by creating enigmatic verbal artifacts which can be deciphered only by the humanistically educated, constantly alert intellectual . . . (a vision) which the blissfully ignorant peasant is not even aware of perceiving."²⁸ Góngora's readers are finally like himself, isolated and contradictory figures like the anti-bourgeois bourgeois intellectuals of post-1848 Europe (Baudelaire's metropolitan *flaneur*, Flaubert).

Góngora's self-conscious "trabajo" of elaborating a new poetic manner exists side by side with a process of historical change and crisis which is constantly eroding its premises. This explains why on the level of form all that he is capable of producing is a text in which the equation of necessity and probability required by an ending remains indeterminate and in which the ideological closure of discourse and ideology, poet and state cannot be made. This explains also why ruins are for Góngora and the Baroque in general what Starobinski calls "a minor form of idyll: a new union of man and nature, through the intermediary of man's resignation to death."²⁹

But such a discourse, despite moments of erotic or utopian plenitude, is also a tragic form of idyll with a peculiar deadness at its heart: a reverie before the encroachment of oblivion, the epitaph for a nation and a decadent class, an acknowledgement like Don Quijote's final disillusion that the attainment of wholeness, the transfer between art and life, is not possible in the present, that it requires other human actors, other forms, other beginnings. The dialectics of Gongorism are a paralyzed dialectics. In the guise of transcendence, Góngora's cultivation of difficulty ultimately betrays its own ostentatious and mechanical hollowness and reveals itself as a form of mourning. The style is a mask: "Mourning is the state of mind in which feeling revives a world grown empty in the form of a mask, and derives an enigmatic satisfaction in contemplating it."³⁰

This is perhaps both the appropriate symbol and measure of the narcissistic grandeur and sadness of the task which Góngora undertakes: the production of solitude.

NOTES

1. See Erwin Panofsky, *Idea: A Concept in Art Theory* (Columbia: Univ. of Missouri, 1968). A. A. Parker comments: "Góngora's *culteranismo* was not a bolt-from-the-blue in 1613 but the cultivation of a steadily developing aesthetic . . . stressing the 'divine madness' of the poetic imagination against the Aristotelean discipline of rules"—*Polyphemus and Galatea: A Study in the Interpretation of a Baroque Poem* (Austin: Univ. of Texas, 1977), p. 10. As such, Gongorism is related to the development in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century of what Noam Chomsky calls Cartesian Linguistics, especially Huarte's *Examen de ingenios* (1575).
2. E.g. Francisco de Cascales: "Ella (Góngora's language) no es buena para poema heroico, ni lírico, ni trágico, ni cómico: luego es inútil"—*Cartas filológicas*, (Madrid: Clásicos Castellanos, 1959), vol. II, p. 186.
3. I cite both the "Carta de un amigo" and the "Carta en respuesta" from the versions given in Ana Martínez Aracón, *La batalla en torno a Góngora (selección de textos)* (Barcelona: Bosch, 1978), which I think are better than those in the Millé y Giménez, Góngora, *Obras completas* (Madrid: Aguilar, first edition 1941).
4. Pierre Vilar, "El tiempo del *Quijote*," in *Crecimiento y desarrollo: reflexiones sobre el caso español* (Barcelona: Ariel, 1964), pp. 440-41.
5. Bartolomé Bennasar, *Valladolid au siècle d'or* (Paris and The Hague: Mouton, 1967); also Noël Salomon's *La campagne de Nouvelle Castille a la fin du XVIIe siècle* (Paris: SEVPEN, 1964).
6. On these points see J. A. Maravall's recent "La función del honor en la sociedad tradicional," *Ideologies and Literature* II, #7 (1978), 9-27.
7. On Góngora's relation to the petty aristocracy see, in general, Robert Jammes, *Etudes sur l'oeuvre poétique de Don Luis de Góngora* (Bordeaux: Feret, 1967), but especially his "Idéal de Don Luis" on pp. 26-35.
8. Richard Kagan, "Universities in Castille 1500-1700," *Past and Present*, #49 (1971), p. 49.
9. Hernán Vidal, unpublished lecture on the Colonial Baroque, University of Minnesota, 1978.
10. Jaime Concha, "Introducción al teatro de Ruiz de Alarcón," *Ideologies and Literature* II, #9. Quoted from author's ms.
11. Herbert Marcuse, *The Aesthetic Dimension* (Boston, Beacon, 1978), p. 7.
12. Juan de Jáuregui, *Antídoto contra la pestilente poesía de las Soledades* (1614). Text in E. J. Gates, *Documentos gongorinos* (Mexico City: Colegio de México, 1960), p. 86.
13. John Merrington, "Town and Country in the Transition to Capitalism," in Rodney Hilton (ed.), *The Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism* (London: Verso-New Left Books, 1976), p. 171. Marx noted laconically in the *Grundrisse*: "The modern age is the urbanization of the countryside, not ruralization of the city as in antiquity."
14. Jammes, *Etudes*, p. 617, n. 87.

15. Bruce Wardropper, "The Complexity of the Simple in Góngora's *Soledad primera*," *The Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, #71(1977), pp. 48-49. Elias Rivers notes similarly: "Art and Nature are first restricted to their most concrete physical aspects and are then pushed to their antithetical extremes, extremes which meet and merge in Góngora's hyperaesthetic materialistic poetry itself"—Introduction, G. C. Cunningham (trs.), *The Solitudes of Luis de Góngora* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Univ., 1968), p. xix.

16. See Salomon's *Recherches sur le thème paysan dans la 'comedia' au temps de Lope de Vega* (Bordeaux: Feret, 1967), especially pp. 250-357.

17. Walter Benjamin, *The Origin of German Tragic Drama*, trs. John Osborne (London: New Left Books, 1977), pp. 92-93.

18. "El barroco fue un estilo importado por la monarquía española como parte de una cultura estrechamente ligada a su ideología imperialista. Su importación tuvo, desde el principio, fines de dominio en el terreno ideológico y cultural. Esto no implica una valoración estética negativa. Pero sí estimamos necesaria una toma de conciencia respecto a la verdadera significación del barroco, que es un fenómeno estrictamente europeo, y al imperativo de elaborar nuestras propias formas artísticas en la etapa de liberación económica, política y cultural de la América Latina, formas que en una serie de aspectos serán todo lo contrario del barroco." Leonardo Acosta, "El 'barroco americano' y la ideología colonialista," *Unión* (Havana, Cuba), XI, #s 2-3 (1972), p. 59.

19. In another of the essays included in *Crecimiento y desarrollo*.

20. Cited by P. Vilar in *Crecimiento y desarrollo*, p. 204.

21. R. O. Jones, Introduction to his *Poems of Góngora* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ., 1966), p. 26. About Góngora's depiction of the Conquest in the miniature epic interpolated in the *Soledad primera*, he adds: "The perversion of nature—*mal nacido pino*—brings only disaster: not merely shipwreck but . . . discord and war. Seafaring impelled by greed is not only debased but finally profitless: a moral order is broken together with the physical one and only disaster can follow."

22. *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, part III, 1(a). Marx and Engels refer to the nineteenth century critique on the part of some sections of the English and European aristocracy of the evils of industrial capitalism. They add, however, that feudal socialism is an unstable and contradictory phenomenon, because "in pointing out that their mode of exploitation was different from that of the bourgeoisie, the feudalists forget that they exploited under circumstances and conditions that were quite different and that now are antiquated. In showing that, under their rule, the modern proletariat never existed, they forget that the modern bourgeoisie is the necessary offspring of their own form of society."

23. On the rebellions of 1640 in general, see J. H. Elliott's *The Revolt of the Catalans* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ., 1963), or chapter nine, "Revival and Disaster," of his *Imperial Spain: 1469-1716* (New York: Mentor, 1966). On Góngora's relations with dissident sections of the Andalusian aristocracy, see Jammes, *Etudes*, pp. 280 ff., 330-34 and 586-92.

24. Benjamin, *Origin*, p. 166.

25. J. H. Elliott, "Self-Perception and Decline in Early Seventeenth Century Spain," *Past and Present*, #74 (1977), p. 48. On the theme of entropy in Baroque historicism, Benjamin commented: "This is the heart of the allegorical way of seeing, of the baroque, secular explanation of history as the Passion of the world; its

importance lies solely in the stations of its decline. The greater the significance, the greater the subjection to death, because death digs most deeply the jagged line of demarcation between physical nature and significance. But if nature has always been subject to the power of death, it is also true that it has always been allegorical. Significance and death both come to fruition in historical development, just as they are closely linked as seeds in the creature's graceless state of sin"—*Origin*, p. 166.

26. Vilar, *Crecimiento y desarrollo*, p. 441.

27. Frederick Engels, letter to Ferdinand Lassalle (May 18, 1859), in Marx-Engels, *Selected Correspondence* (Moscow: Progress, 1975), pp. 110-13. Marx in his own critique of Lassalle's play added: "In so far as Sickingen . . . struggles against the Dukes (his demarche against the emperor can be explained only by the fact the emperor transforms himself from the emperor of knights into the emperor of dukes), he is simply a Don Quijote, although historically justified. The fact that he begins the revolt under the guise of a feud among the knights only means that he begins it *as a knight*. If he were to begin it otherwise, he would have to appeal directly and at once to the cities and the peasants, that is, to those very classes whose development amounts to the negation of knighthood"—letter to Lassalle (April 19, 1859), in Lee Baxandall and Stefan Morawski (eds.), *Marx and Engels on Literature and Art* (New York: International General, 1974), p. 107.

28. Rivers, Introduction to Cunningham's *Solitudes of Góngora*, p. xix. Also his "The Pastoral Paradox of Natural Arts," *Modern Language Notes*, #77 (1962), 144-50.

29. Jean Starobinski, *The Invention of Freedom* (Geneva: Skira, 1964), p. 180. "In the ruin history has physically merged with the setting"—Benjamin, *Origin*, pp. 177-78.

30. Benjamin, *Origin*, p. 139.



Aristocracy and Reason Behavior Patterns of Calderón's Secular Characters

David Hildner

University of Wisconsin

When dealing with a Golden Age author about whose works a convincing social history has yet to be written, the critic faces a double uncertainty. In studying the literary text, in this case Calderón's *Comedias*, the difficulty is to pick out the key words, scenes, characters, etc., which will provide anchorage points for a historical interpretation.¹ On the other hand, the critic must sift through the available historical material to single out the facts and tendencies that will illuminate the literary texts. Although he may begin his task with the firm belief (or even an unmistakable intuition) that there *is* a connection to be found between the given works of literature and the social life of their time, the discovery and full description of these links is a difficult and tricky process, particularly so in the case of Calderón. This difficulty is due partly to the sketchiness of our biographical knowledge about him and partly to the prevalent types of Calderonian criticism.

When critics of Calderón in the first fifty or sixty years of the 20th century have attempted to link his *comedias* to the society for which they were written, at least two grave errors have been committed. At times the critic's view of "Golden Age society" has been derived solely from the works of literature and ideas of the period, and thus the Spanish 17th century, however sombre it may have been politically and economically, is seen as an age of high spiritual values. Karl Vossler, for example, in *Literatura española: Siglo de oro*, refers to the reigning conception of the epoch as "la idea estoico-cristiana". This view makes the connection between literature and society relatively easy to find, but it falsifies history in the process.

In other cases, the decadence of late Hapsburg Spain is squarely faced: the weakness of the monarchy and the tyranny of aristocracy are recognized, but Calderón as an "enlightened" individual, is seen as the upholder of true Christian values which implicitly or

explicitly criticize the predominant behavior of Baroque society. The latter position has been taken by many 20th century ethico-religious critics of Calderón's *comedias*. In this case, there is a specific avoidance of connecting the *comedias* with real socio-political facts of their epoch.

Neither of these methods does full justice to the facts we know about Calderón and his society. They will not help us to find Calderón's function in Spanish social history, unless we can clarify exactly what ideologies are present in the *comedias* and in what manner they are present. The texts must be read on a different level, as the critic keeps in mind certain essential facts about late Hapsburg Spain, of which I shall mention several in the course of this study. They all refer to the preoccupations of Spain's ruling class as the Empire entered into its crisis and decline. Thus while witnessing the words and actions of Calderón's fictional aristocrats, we should look for parallels with the aristocratic character that historians have gleaned from the documents of the period: an increased aggressiveness as the threats from external enemies became greater, occasional frankness about pragmatic means to self-preservation, a resigned religious sentiment combined with Neo-Stoicism that sometimes perceives the decline of the whole Spanish power structure and opts for "inward" values like honor. Many more traits could be added to this list.

The present study does not attempt to perform a complete socio-historical analysis of the Calderonian *comedia*, but rather to suggest a new perspective on the ideological content itself. It is hoped that the clues given here could aid in the construction of a fully historical portrait of Calderón as secular dramatist.

The ethical criticism on Calderón's *comedias*, which has become so prolific in the years since the first epoch-making articles of A. A. Parker, contains two methodological principles which need to be corrected.² First, it sees Calderón as a remodeler of earlier plays and of historical and mythological sources with the intention of using them to exemplify a moral or theological insight.³ Secondly, it elevates Calderón's *autos sacramentales* into the position of a canon of interpretation for the *comedias*. With respect to the first difficulty, many critics have tried to state unequivocally what Calderón's "message" was in individual *comedias* or in his handling of the genre as a whole. They have then organized the dramatic material created by Calderón in accordance with the abstract theme. It is usually found that Calderón was a master craftsman in making all the elements of a play contribute to the illustration of precepts. As an orthodox Counter Reformation dramatist, critics have usually limited his

repertory of themes to Christian doctrine or to classical Aristotelian or Stoic ethics, in short, to the officially accepted dogmas of his time.

In the second place, it is assumed that Calderón's thought is most "pure" in his doctrinal *autos* and that the best way of unlocking the secrets of the *comedias* is to find equivalent phraseology, characters, and dramatic situations in the *autos*.⁴ Thus Calderón's whole dramatic output, both secular and religious, is seen as the expression of one consistent world-view, which turns out to be more or less congruent with orthodox Thomism.⁵

The doctrines of Thomism, as can be gleaned from certain portions of the *Summa Theologiae*, posit intellect as man's highest faculty in his dealings with worldly beings, including his fellow human beings. Since intellect converts material things into non-material concepts and non-materiality automatically brings any creature closer to God, it is nobler, according to Thomism, for a human being to comprehend his fellow creatures intellectually than to love or to hate them. In his relations with angels and God, the reverse is true: it is nobler for a human being to love God than to know about him. The conclusion to be drawn from these doctrines is that human conduct should be guided by "right reason" and that all desires and aversions should be filtered through the human being's free, rational will (called *appetitus intellectivus* in Scholastic Terminology.)

There is no question that this view is verbally expressed in countless passages from Calderón's *comedias*. These very passages, however, are set in dramatic contexts that give them a different orientation. It is one thing to hear the above doctrines proclaimed in a sermon or to read them in a theological treatise and quite another to hear them expressed by a dramatic character who has vital interests at stake. From the minute the curtain rises on Act I, Calderón's characters are involved in a worldly situation which conditions their behavior. This aspect of the *comedias* is lost if we take certain characters as mouthpieces for the ideas that Calderón was trying to put across. The same happens if we regard certain other characters merely as examples of behavior that Calderón condemns. A. A. Parker has rightly observed that there is a mixture of prudence and imprudence in most Calderonian protagonists, but he uses this fact to support the Christian doctrine that even the best human actions are tainted by man's general sinfulness.⁶ He never relinquishes the idea that his version of the Christian moral code is the right measuring-stick by which to pass ethical judgments on the characters.

Yet if we take a closer look at the characters that Calderón employs, it becomes clear that he is not portraying the behavior of human beings in general, but rather of a group of aristocrats of various epochs and places, a group whose concerns tend to run in certain well-defined directions. The characters are involved in these conflicts willy-nilly because they are born into the aristocratic group by virtue of their *sangre ilustre*; this trait was considered in Spanish baroque ideology to be one of the *causas ministras* that God's providence used for its inscrutable ends.⁷ It is true that these heroes strive after *virtud*, but their virtue cannot be adequately defined in terms of Biblical or even Thomistic Christianity. It is tied to the needs of a social estate to maintain itself in its prestige and power. In personal and matrimonial life, this implies maintaining one's honor; in political life, it means exercising successfully the art of statecraft; and in religion, it implies saving one's soul. In one sense it could be said that the subject-matter of the *comedias* consists of conflicts between the contradictory patters of virtue which the nobleman is called upon to fulfill.

Most of Calderón's *comedias* are court dramas, which posit in dramatic form and with heightened conflictiveness the personal and social factors which enter into the art of survival in the highest strata of an absolute monarchy. The ideology of 17th century Spain (fervent Catholicism, inherited honor, nationalism, and courtly love) and the practical realities (competition for honors and posts, imperial wars, economic collapse) find their way into Calderón's *comedias* in the form of absolute demands on the characters' ingenuity and loyalty. The plot of the drama shows how they navigate their way through these obstacles.

Given the exigencies of the anguished conflicts into which Calderón throws his characters, it often happens that the traditional domination of reason over passion is reversed: characters who are in the grip of passion will use reason to justify an action already performed or about to be performed. At certain moments of insight, they become aware of what they are doing with reason's help. In *La estatua de Prometeo*, for instance, the populace of the Caucasus has split into two factions led by the twin brothers Epimeteo and Prometeo. The two groups argue verbally until their discussion breaks down and it becomes necessary to resort to arms. Epimeteo declares: "Ya no es tiempo, / si han de razonar las armas, / que lidien los argumentos." This sentence summarizes the attitude toward reason that I have just described; thoughts are weapons in a battle whose cause was not originally determined by reason. Yet the orthodoxy of 17th century

Spain required that this instrumentality of reason be hidden and that the characters verbally insist that their actions are based on Reason as transmitted by the authority of the classics and the church.⁸ Thus classical precepts and religious dogmas are submitted to a sophisticated distortion so that they can be used to prove the points which the speaker needs to prove in order to rationalize his desires and obligations.

We may illustrate these tendencies by examining the four principal characters of one of Calderón's political dramas, *La gran Cenobia*.

The first character to appear on stage is Aureliano, who begins the play dressed in the animal skins that are often used by Calderón to symbolize the natural man who is ruled by sense appetite. He comes across a crown and scepter which have been left on the rocks in the forest. It turns out that the former Emperor had passed that way after defeat in battle and had left the crown and scepter there. Aureliano takes the royal accoutrements, drawn by an instinctive desire for the power they represent. All through the play, Aureliano is characterized by the same irreflexive passion, which makes him take things at their face value and react emotionally on a superficial understanding.

When the leader of his army, Decio, returns from the war against Cenobia and admits defeat, Aureliano immediately strips him of his position and proudly boasts that he is going to conquer Cenobia himself. His rashness is due to two factors: a lack of forethought and a lack of experience. Decio has an advantage over the new emperor in that he has already tried to vanquish the Oriental queen and knows how powerful she is in military strength and personal attractiveness. In other words, Decio has gone through a process of *desengaño*, not so much in the Christian sense of learning that worldly things are transitory, but rather in the secular sense of learning just how things stand in this world. The most important fact these characters have to learn is that, as Aureliano says, *esto es mundo*. Aristocratic valor must be tempered by pragmatic knowledge of facts, often referred to by Calderón in the term *tocar la ocasión*. Aureliano is not blameworthy because he has strong desires. Quite the contrary; such *brío* is one among several signs of noble blood. It is his inability to subject the passions of the blood to the active power of practical reason that makes him ineffective in maintaining his position.

This pragmatic faculty is, in its turn, a product of experience and not of abstract speculation. Such a lesson was taught time and time again to the aristocratic class of Spain as it discovered that

naming an armada Invincible did not necessarily make it so; that the "wisdom" employed in expelling the *moriscos* did not make this policy any less disastrous for Spain's welfare; and that theologically-based notions of the king as a "god on earth" did not prevent court favorites like Lerma and Olivares from practically taking the reins of government into their own hands. These experiences and others underlie the typically Calderonian image of Aureliano boasting about his superiority over Cenobia in one scene and in the next scene fleeing from her army in the heat of battle.

Aureliano's rashness puts him in grave difficulties when, in flight from the pursuing enemy, he promises his crown to a masked soldier who offers to safeguard his escape; the stranger is none other than Decio. When the latter appears before the Emperor in the middle of the triumphal procession, unmasked, and demands his reward, Aureliano shields himself with an ingenious syllogism: 1) A man without honor is not capable of receiving any honors, "... porque un hombre sin honor / no es capaz, con tanta afrenta, / de honra alguna." 2) Decio was stripped of his rank, therefore he has no honor. 3) Therefore, Aureliano cannot and is not obligated to share his crown with Decio. The reasoning is sophistic, but Decio cannot question it because Aureliano wields the imperial power at the moment.

The antagonism which Aureliano has created throughout the play, however, catches up with him and he dies at Decio's hands, having lost the support of the people and the army. He has practiced a politics of self-aggrandizement like that of Gracián's *Héroe*, but has not learned the *razón de estado de sí mismo*, the art of governing oneself, which the Jesuit philosopher considers absolutely necessary to become a hero in the circumstances of monarchical and imperial states. For instance, when Aureliano has heard Libio's plan to capture Cenobia, he wants to proceed to action immediately and exhorts: "Pues no hagan las razones / estorbo con sus vanas ilusiones." There is a scorn for deliberation and judgment in his words.

The emperor's antagonist is Cenobia, queen of the Orient, who really has no more legitimate claim to her throne than Aureliano has to his, since according to the custom of her kingdom, a woman should not succeed to her husband's throne when there is a male heir, in this case a nephew, Libio. She gains favor with the nation by winning several important battles, so that when her husband Abdenato dies, she is acclaimed by the people and the army. Unlike Aureliano she becomes a *razón de estado* unto herself and her prudence allows her to navigate the turbulent waters of

politics with greater security. She runs into difficulty because she falls in love with the Roman general Decio, and at an important juncture at which the latter is the only soldier guarding the passage to Aureliano's tent, she does not push her troops forward ruthlessly, but respects Decio's life and his moral position of loyalty. Thus spared, Aureliano has a chance to kidnap her. At the beginning of Act III, when Cenobia is dragged through the streets of Rome in a triumphal procession, it seems as if she has been led to political downfall by two motives that form part of every normal human being: family ties and erotic love. Yet Cenobia's prudence receives its reward at the end of the play; Decio assassinates Aureliano and offers to marry Cenobia and rule jointly with her. Cenobia's desire for power and her love are both satisfied in some measure. Her fortunate condition at the close of the play can be said to be a result of her intelligent balancing of two passions: ambition and love. If she had been like Aureliano, she would have steeled herself against Decio's manly charms. If she had succumbed completely to love from the beginning, she would have surrendered her kingdom's sovereignty without a fight.

To equate the practical-intellectual prudence of Cenobia with a sort of single-minded following of abstract moral principles would make Calderón's drama infinitely less interesting than it is. Even the most innately moral of his characters are not unwilling to use all the means at their disposal to achieve a prudent goal. In Cenobia's case, she is obliged to use her natural beauty to try to melt Aureliano's heart by pretending to be in love with him. She reasons that, since women are generally weak, beauty is their natural weapon. She therefore is now fulfilling her natural role by trying to conquer Aureliano in this way: "ahora sí que soy mujer, / ahora sí lo he parecido; pues con mis armas ofendo, / cuando a un bárbaro pretendo / vencer con amor fingido!" Since Aureliano has mastered her by cunning, she must do the same to gain her freedom.

Each of the two protagonists has a male subaltern who plays a role almost as important as that of the ruler. Decio, the general of the Roman army, both before and during Aureliano's reign, represents from the very beginning the rational or prudent man which Segismundo becomes at the end of his play and which Aureliano never becomes. Upon his return in Act I from a war against Cenobia, he confesses his defeats, both military and amorous, to Aureliano, who has nothing but scorn for his "cowardice". Decio is offended, but remembers that "la continua mudança / del tiempo me da esperanza; / que no hay en leyes de amor, / ni tirano sin temor, / ni ofendido sin venganza."

Note at this point that Decio is not renouncing his desire to gain Cenobia's love, but is merely postponing it. There is an important psychological difference between the humble-minded character who refuses worldly things because continual change will eventually take away all possessions, and the patient but determined man of action who depends on time's changeability to bring around an opportune moment for him to take vengeance or fulfill his desires. In the 17th century Spanish concept of morality, J. A. Maravall points out the following essential feature:

[S]i en algunos casos se escucha el eco arcaizante del tema medieval y ascético del 'de contemptu mundi' como preparación a una disciplina religiosa, en el siglo barroco se observa comunmente en la materia un considerable grado de secularización que hace que de la práctica de la desconfianza ante el mundo y el hombre, todos procuren sacar las convenientes artes para vencerlos en provecho propio.⁹

Decio is certainly the character who holds the most abstract concept of duty; in this sense he fits best into the traditional Scholastic idea of a wise or prudent man. He subordinates both his love for Cenobia and his hatred for Aureliano to the requirements of his patriotic duty as general of the Roman army. Even when personally confronted by Cenobia on the bridge leading to Aureliano's tent, he stands firm and refuses to let her pass, combating her persuasion with the word of honor he gave to defend the emperor's person. At the beginning of Act III, although he does not repent of having been loyal, he nevertheless admits to himself that his loyalty has resulted indirectly in the capture of the woman he loves: "[P]ues la ventaja que muestra / en este triunfo Aureliano, / es que en sus fortunas tengan / él un leal que le guarde, / y ella un traidor que la venda." Once again we see the typically Calderonian contrast between the viewpoint of a particular moment at which loyalty seems a mistake and that of the play as a whole, from which it appears that Decio's loyalty is ultimately instrumental in making him emperor. The people trust him because of his refusal to surrender to Cenobia in previous battles. In other words, in spite of his final act of regicide, Decio is loyal to Rome in the abstract, and ends up satisfying his love interest as well.

Decio is finally determined to commit regicide by the sight of Cenobia imploring Aureliano and apparently in love with him. Since this love is feigned, the final emotional jolt that stirs Decio to action is accidental since he reacts to a situation he does not understand and since his arrival on stage at that moment is contingent and unmotivated. No matter that shortly thereafter Cenobia

explains the real situation to him and their lovers' quarrel is resolved; Calderón has seen fit to use a dramatic *peripeccia*, which is typical of the Lopesque style of *comedia*, to detonate the growing thoughts and emotions of indignation against Aureliano. Again the Scholastic doctrine of reason and passions is superceded by a more modern psychological representation. Just like the Calderonian "husbands of honor", Decio requires a "last straw" to serve as a catalyst for an action that in this case appears reasonable and laudable to the other characters. It is peculiar that the more personal motive of jealousy is a stronger force than military or political revenge; Decio makes his resolution in these terms: "[M]uera un fiero emperador; / no porque ofendió mi honor, / no porque triunfó de ti; / porque me dio celos sí, / que ya es agravio mayor." There are other passages in the play which suggest that love toward the opposite sex is an almost invincible passion that must be given its due for a person to be fully human. Aureliano, the real *hombre-fiera* of the play, is surprisingly the one who resists Cenobia's charms, although he is forced to admit at one point: "[S]in duda no advirtió / tal belleza el que pensó / que era libre el albedrío."

Decio's opposite is Libio, the traitor, who instead of being activated by a wide range of human motives, has only one facet to his character, the ambition to rule. Cenobia is superior to him however, in popularity and military prowess, so Libio resorts to treachery in order to obtain the throne. His strategy is to offer his services to Aureliano as kidnapper of Cenobia. When this plan backfires, Libio's second attempt at power is to try to murder Aureliano, which occurs coincidentally at the very moment Decio attempts the same act. In the final scene, both the loyal Roman and the treacherous Oriental attempt at different moments to kill Aureliano in his sleep, but each is forced to hide because the other arrives. Two patterns of behavior, as morally different as night and day, end with the same act, thus relativizing the sharp distinctions that moral theologians liked to make between the consequences of virtue and vice.

In fact, both Libio and Decio, when they try to stab the emperor, hurl the same four epithets at him: *bárbaro*, *tirano*, *soberbio*, *cruel*. This symmetry is either due to a love of exact parallelisms on Calderón's part or it shows that such value judgments tend to lose their sharp contours in the arena of royal politics, a fact which becomes clear in the final scene. Decio orders Libio put to death, presumably for having kidnapped Cenobia, Decio's wife-to-be. For this act, he deserves the designation of *traidor*. Libio, on the other hand, calls Aureliano *cruel* because he deprived the former of

the reward he had promised in return for the kidnapping. Although Decio claims to be executing Libio and Irene for their crimes, we know that another fundamental motivation is to assure his life and Cenobia's against further assassination attempts.

The entirety of *La gran Cenobia*, then, presents a veritable labyrinth of political and personal means and ends. This, of course, can be said of most of Calderón's dramas of royalty, but what stands out here is the character of Decio as the most well-rounded and at the same time contradictory. We may venture to suggest that he turns out to be the most "positive" character precisely because of his sensitivity to several opposing demands on his emotions, his judgments and his actions.¹⁰ His prudence consists in his being a middle term between the passion-bound Aureliano and the cold calculator Libio. He contains the one grain of madness, in the form of jealousy, that puts a rational prudence into motion, a prudence which by intellectual considerations alone might have remained forever deliberating and never have acted. Without a doubt, Calderón has repeated in *La gran Cenobia* his characteristic parallelism of virtuous characters and treacherous characters with the final triumph of the former. Yet the virtuous man's triumph here is not a merely providential act, as in certain other plays. It depends also on a strong will which is determined to obtain whatever it wills, whether the object be proper or improper according to classical ethics.¹¹ This can be done because the very Scholastic method of argument from authority has been developed to such a subtle degree that any measures taken can be justified by the ingenious application of a traditional precept.

All of the above tendencies in Calderón's secular dramaturgy make the plays into a reflection in some sort of the epoch lived by the Spanish aristocracy under the final century of Hapsburg rule. The increasing divorce between the ideological foundations of the Spanish empire (mainly Scholastic theology) and the actual course its rulers followed is reflected in the profound ironies of Calderón's discourse and in the contradictions between speech and action which characterize his dramatic style.

For one matter, in spite of the fantastic atmosphere and the "irrealism" of Calderón's style, his *comedias* do share with the social milieu in which they were performed the sense that, in Calderón's own phraseology, *las armas razonan*. The most intense intellectual debating between characters can be interrupted by the offstage cry, ¡Guerra, guerra! Likewise, sweet music and idyllic love scenes are cut off by the outbreak of battles and contention. Many characters recognize, either with admiration or with horror,

that might can override abstract right and, in an absolute monarchy, must do so to maintain a situation of power. Compulsion is recognized as a force that manipulates its victims without their consent. Eraclio of *En la vida todo es verdad y toda mentira*, when forced to flatter a tyrant he despises, mutters an aside: *Tiranía, ¿qué no arrastras?* This phrase could have been uttered by innumerable Spanish courtiers who, under late Hapsburg rule, were forced to fawn and flatter their superiors in order to maintain their ecclesiastical and bureaucratic posts. Arms, as well as economic necessity, social convention, the will of tyrants, and fate, have a hard logic of their own which, time after time, comes into conflict with intellectual reasoning or the desires of the heart.

The other half of the expression (*los argumentos lidian*) expresses the notion that reason is not only capable of being crushed by force, but also becomes a type of weapon in its own right. In intellectual matters, the prime requisite is *invención*, the art of finding (*invenire*) arguments and rhetorical devices to win practical battles, to justify victories or to excuse failures. In this connection it is interesting to study how the doctrines of the divine right of kings had to be modified when it became evident that a *valido* like Olivares could be a better ruler than the king himself. The same tendency is found in the religious controversies of the 17th century, in which the Company of Jesus, for example, saw its theological debating against heretics as a quasi-military operation. The intellect is not the discoverer of new truth, but a rearranger of old truths for new purposes.¹²

Thus, the fate of Calderón's secular characters, their successes and failures, the passions they undergo, and the plans they carry out, instead of merely reinforcing a divine teleological view of life, such as that which so many ethico-religious critics uphold, actually undermines this view in an unconscious way and shows how inadequate it is to explain occurrences and advise patterns of behavior in the circumstances in which Calderón's aristocrats find themselves: a secularized state, powerful enemy nations with new religious, political, and economic forms, all of which posed great theoretical and practical problems for a regime of aristocratic privilege.

NOTES

1. I am borrowing a term here from Edmond Cros, "Foundations of a Socio-Criticism", *Ideologies and Literature* 1:4 (Sept.-Oct., 1977), pp. 63-80.
2. Perhaps the essence of this type of criticism can be found in A. A. Parker, "Towards a Definition of Calderonian Tragedy", *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 39 (1962), pp. 222-37.
3. See A. E. Sloman, *The Dramatic Craftsmanship of Calderón: His Use of Earlier Plays* (Oxford: Dolphin Book Co., 1958).
4. Witness W. J. Entwistle's preference: "It was much better for Calderón when, in the *autos* of his last period, he was able to present his thoughts as a play of symbols only. It is hardly possible to avoid incongruence when making the abstract local and concrete." ("Justina's Temptation: An Approach to the Understanding of Calderón", *Modern Language Review* 40 [July, 1945], p. 189.)
5. "L'Espagne du XVII^e siècle adopte avec une extrême rigueur le rationalisme thomiste. Sa littérature ne peut se permettre le moindre écart par rapport à l'orthodoxie catholique." (C. V. Aubrun, "Le déterminisme naturel et la causalité sur-naturelle chez Calderón", in Jean Jacquot, ed., *Le Théâtre Tragique*, 2nd ed. [Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1965], p. 199.)
6. See A. A. Parker, *op. cit.*
7. J. A. Maravall, "La función del honor en la sociedad tradicional", *Ideologies and Literature* 2:7 (May-June 1978), pp. 13-14.
8. "La foi est implorée por apaiser la tempête, la raison est mobilisée pour servir la croyance, mais toute idéologie n'est qu'un effort de conjurer des forces irrationnelles par des suggestions irrationnelles." (Anton Constandse, *Le Baroque espagnol et Calderón de la Barca* [Amsterdam: Jacob van Campen, 1951], p. 131.)
9. J. A. Maravall, *La cultura del barroco* (Esplugues de Llobregat: Ariel, 1975), p. 326.
10. He performs a work of self-realization: "El hombre realiza sobre sí mismo y sobre los demás un trabajo de alfarero. Esto es lo que representa una obra como la de Gracián y en ella su más radical significación: el paso de una moral a una moralística, o digamos simplemente a una reflexión sobre la práctica de la conducta que . . . podemos llamar un 'arte de la conducta'—dando a la palabra *arte* su valor de una *técnica*." (J. A. Maravall, *op. cit.*, p. 346.)
11. "Calderón constructs his plays to emphasize the will, which, no matter how powerful the obstacles to its functioning, always functions and always succeeds." (J. E. Maraniss, *On Calderón* [Columbia, MO.: Univ. of Missouri Press, 1978], p. 14.)
12. "A la primera ojeada, el raciocinio de Calderón parece poseer el aspecto de una busca sin fin de la verdad nueva; pero un escrutinio más detallado muestra que es siempre una verdad, que, en efecto, en su filosofía se considera como fija y completa por toda la eternidad. El método dialéctico no es nada investigatorio; es un invento de Aristóteles, que en el teatro de Calderón extrae las consecuencias de las verdades conocidas por la enseñanza de la Iglesia, más bien que buscar verdades nuevas." (Everett W. Hesse, "La dialéctica y el casuismo en Calderón", in Durán y Echevarría, *Calderón y la crítica* [Madrid: Gredos, 1976], pp. 580-1.)

Vargas Llosa's *La tía Julia y el escribidor*: The New Novel and the Mass Media

Ellen McCracken

University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Many of us rely upon compartmentalized conceptions of culture to distinguish such areas as mass culture and high culture.¹ With the rapid development of the mass media in this century, several important writers have forced readers to re-examine these cultural separations. Proceeding beyond the general changes which Walter Benjamin attributed to mass reproduced art, many important twentieth century novelists have overtly joined mass culture to high culture in their writing. Within the Anglo-American tradition, for example the works of writers such as Joyce, Dos Passos, and Mailer question these traditional cultural divisions. In Latin America, novels by Leñero, Cortázar, and Puig² proceed even further, requiring that those of us who traditionally study high culture begin to examine the nature of mass culture as well.

Mario Vargas Llosa's recent novel *La tía Julia y el escribidor*³ reminds us continually of the difficulty of maintaining such clear-cut divisions. Ostensibly an autobiography of the novelist's life in the early 1950s when he worked at a radio station in Lima, the novel is structured contrapuntally. The autobiographical chapters are alternated with literary parodies of the radio dramas written by the hackwriter Pedro Camacho and broadcast on the station in those years. Readers who heretofore might have claimed disinterest in or even disdain for mass culture must now come to grips with it throughout an entire novel. In encountering the coexistence of elements from high and mass culture within a single text, one is confronted not only with Vargas Llosa's well-wrought critique of radio, Peru's principal electronic medium of the 1950s, but with the writer's ambivalent attitude toward the mass media as well.

Media Criticism: Infrastructure and Ideology

The novel makes an important contribution to media criticism

by exposing several aspects of the industry's infrastructure (i.e., the material conditions of the media's organization such as ownership and technology) as well as its superstructural role in the formation of ideology. Initially, the chapters of autobiography reveal the day to day relations of production at Radio Panamericana in Lima where Vargas Llosa worked as news director in the 1950s. At the base of these relations, as the writer shows, was the common ownership of Panamericana and its sister station Radio Central by the Genaro father and son team. The concentration of media ownership which Vargas Llosa portrays through the Genaro family points to the pattern characterizing media development not only in Peru but throughout Latin America.⁴ Thus, the novel's portrayal of this infrastructural component of Peruvian radio in the 1950s is an important expose of the contemporary social organization of the media in Latin America and not merely an isolated instance of misuse of a mass medium.

Continuing this critique of the media's infrastructure, the novelist shows that the father and son owners exaggerated what was an only slightly distinguishable difference between the cultural quality of the two stations. Radio Central was supposedly less "cultural" with fewer news items, much Indian and tropical music, telephone requests and radio dramas. Panamericana, on the other hand, played jazz, rock, classical music and the latest hits from New York and Europe. The owners emphasized these questionable distinctions in quality not only to promote feelings of superiority on the part of one sector of the listening public over another, but to encourage similar sentiments among the workers at the stations. For example, as Genaro-hijo was excitedly announcing that the ratings of Radio Central had gone up twenty percent in two weeks because of the new radio dramas, Vargas Llosa's assistant, who worked for the sister station Panamericana, asked for a comparable twenty percent salary increase. The owner answered by promoting the spurious cultural distinction between the two stations: "Ustedes no trabajan en Radio Central sino en Panamericana . . . Nosotros somos una estación de buen gusto y no pasamos radioteatros." (114). We see clearly that this false cultural hierarchy was used to mask reality: more than likely Genaro-hijo hoped that his employees would forget that these two ostensibly different stations had the same owners who would both benefit from the rise in ratings no matter on which station the radio dramas appeared.

Vargas Llosa as novelist continues to discredit this false cultural hierarchy by an amplified comparison between the content of Panamericana's news broadcasts and that of Central's radio

dramas. In the early 1950s the young writer's job as news director at Panamericana had consisted of clipping interesting articles from newspapers and editing them to be read on the air. As if this copy of an already inferior model were not bad enough, his assistant Pascual was "enamoured of catastrophes" and in every unsupervised moment broadcast the entire news bulletin around scandal items. The affinity between these broadcasts of scandal items and hackwriter Pedro Camacho's radio dramas at Radio Central is quite apparent to the reader, as we will see. Panamericana may not have broadcast radio dramas as the owner had boasted, but it did its share to lower the intellectual capacities of the public through these news broadcasts of radio-drama quality.

Another infrastructural component of Peruvian radio in the 1950s which the novel exposes was the market relations of the radio dramas themselves. We learn that the programs were purchased from station CMQ in Cuba owned by the radio-television czar, Goar Mestre. Mestre's high prices as well as linguistic difficulties—Cubanisms which had to be translated into Peruvian expressions—and the loss of or damage to entire chapters in the mail made this market system for mass culture increasingly less desirable for the Peruvian radio station owners. The novel recounts that consequently, in a type of mass cultural import substitution, the owners hired the famous Pedro Camacho to write and produce radio dramas directly at the station. Throughout the novel we see the effects of this substitution on Camacho—his reification in the mass cultural commodities he produced to replace the Cuban radio dramas. In effect, the hackwriter and his work were turned into commodities to substitute for those previously imported from Mestre. In the owner's words, Camacho "No es un hombre sino una industria." (17). Though he had begun with four radio dramas per day, due to their success he soon was producing ten daily. This included writing, directing, and sometimes acting in the plays. We are told that Camacho spent at least ten hours per day writing and seven in the studio rehearsing and recording; in effect, he had become a machine for producing radio dramas.

Though the picture of the media's infrastructure which the novel gives is much more extensive, one further example should be noted. The novelist recounts the important role of the advertising agencies in Latin America as early as the 1950s. The U.S.-owned McCann Erickson, now the largest ad agency in the world is referred to by name. Its Bolivian branch had assured the owners of Panamericana and Radio Central that Pedro Camacho's radio

dramas had the largest audiences in Bolivia, where the hackwriter had previously worked. Camacho and his mass cultural products were thus a low-risk commodity for which this transnational advertising agency could guarantee good sponsorship in Peru. It is to Vargas Llosa's credit that he points out these economic relations which lie at the base of Peruvian mass culture.

Several of the ideological effects which resulted from this organization of the Peruvian radio in the 1950s are also delineated in the novel. We have seen, for example, how the pattern of concentration of ownership common not only in Peruvian radio but throughout the Latin American media was ideologically disguised by the pseudo-distinctions the owners made between the cultural quality of the two stations. The fragility of this ideological ploy becomes evident as the novel exposes one of the effects of the media on human consciousness. In this case, Vargas Llosa himself, a character in the autobiographical chapters of the novel, is a victim of the media's confusing lack of real distinction between its programs. Overhearing his assistants recounting a fire, Vargas Llosa assumes it to be a news item. Instead, he is told that it is actually an episode from Camacho's 11:00 radio drama. There is so little difference between the content of the news bulletins and Camacho's radio programs that they are easily confused. As Adorno and Horkheimer had pointed out in the early 1940s, the content of mass media programs only appears to change, giving the façade of variety and innovation from program to program.⁵ The novel shows that one result of this absence of real variety is the inadvertent confusion of fiction and reality.

It was not only the news which exhibited structural and thematic similarities to the radio drama. Vargas Llosa's romance with his aunt, Julia Urquidí in the early 1950s began to take on the characteristics of Camacho's soap operas. Most likely, the reader will relate to the continuing episodes of autobiography which chronicle this "impossible love" with the same responses he or she has learned from the mass media: eager to discover the outcome of the romance, some readers will be annoyed by the technique of serialization which interrupts the flow of the autobiography with parodies of Camacho's radio dramas, and perhaps will be tempted to skip ahead to the later episodes. As we will see, however, one purpose of the novel's contrapuntal structure is precisely to check this impatience.

Julia herself is portrayed as a victim of the mass media's ideology. She analyzes her relationship with Vargas Llosa as if it were a radio drama: "En el mejor de los casos, lo nuestro duraría tres, tal vez unos cuatro años, es decir hasta que encuentres a la

mocosita que será la mamá de tus hijos. Entonces me botarás y tendré que seducir a otro caballero. Y aparece la palabra fin.”(206). Vargas Llosa reminds her that the media’s structures and thought patterns which have appeared in Julia’s view of the situation show the harmful effects of listening to radio dramas. Julia’s reply is that Camacho’s soap operas deal with totally different themes and thus are not influencing her in this case. We see in Julia, then both the media’s formation of consciousness and the victim’s inability to recognize it as such. Human understanding of an event is shaped not only by the content of mass culture but by its form: Julia is convinced that Vargas Llosa will quickly leave her when he meets a younger woman and her vision of this future moment assumes the form of a movie with the words “THE END” appearing on the screen.

The Media as Narrative Model

Though the novelist has developed an important critique of the mass media in these sections of autobiography, his ideological ambivalence is also visible in these chapters, as he examines the interconnections between mass culture and art. The relation was a conflictive one for Vargas Llosa early in his career. In the 1950s and early 1960s, while trying to establish himself as a writer, he had worked at several jobs in the mass media, at one point at as many as seven simultaneously in addition to his law studies. Understandably, a conflict developed between literature and the mass media as each vied for a share in the twenty-four hour day.⁶ He finally succeeded in establishing a more workable relationship between art and the mass media by the mid-1960s when he lived during the winters in England and traveled to Peru as a journalist every summer, utilizing these expense-paid trips to do research for his novels.

At the time most of the events in this latest novel took place, Vargas Llosa was still experiencing the conflictive relation between art and mass culture. Writing in the late 1970s, however, he could not view this conflict as entirely negative: significantly, it had been precisely this arena of conflict between the two cultural modes which had engendered much of his early artistic production. Not without ambivalence, then, this latest novel incorporates the conflict as its subject, critically evaluating the nature of the clash.

Together, the mass media and art had offered the writer a series of narrative possibilities in this early period. The narrative models which filled Vargas Llosa’s days at the time might be categorized as follows: 1) the cinematic—the numerous movies he and Julia

saw; 2) the journalistic—Pascual's scandal-oriented news bulletins; 3) the radio-dramatic—Pedro Camacho's radio stories; and 4) the literary—Vargas Llosa's own artistic production, the early short stories. For example, though Vargas Llosa was paid to spend time editing his assistant Pascual's news bulletins, he was forced to hide his own artistic production by sneaking moments here and there to work on his stories. Symbolically, Pedro Camacho also exacerbated this conflict for Vargas Llosa: first, he was a full time writer who was paid to create narratives, and secondly, he insisted that these radio dramas were art.

Though Vargas Llosa was caught in a conflict between the news, the radio dramas, and his own short stories, he derived material for his literary production from this very clash. For instance, Pascual recounted what he insisted was an eyewitness version of young children playing at the airport and being lifted off the ground by the force of airplanes taking off. Relating this "news item" to a film he had recently seen (Buñuel's *Los olvidados*), Vargas Llosa wrote what he classified a realistic short story. One of his friends, however, insisted that the story was more within the fantastic genre. Even brief reflection upon the difficult-to-believe content of the news item on which Vargas Llosa's early story was based, reveals a similarity to Pedro Camacho's exaggerated radio dramas. Vargas Llosa's early artistic production had taken on the characteristics of three mass cultural representations: the news, the radio drama, and the movies. This influence on Vargas Llosa's artistic production perhaps helps to explain the novelist's ambivalent attitude to the mass media: though certain mass cultural forms presented a conflict for his own artistic production, they sometimes served as the basis of that very art.

Perhaps exacerbating Vargas Llosa's ambivalence toward the mass media even further was a non-conflictive relation he was able to see between three of the four narrative structures. In this case, rather than extrapolating literary material from the mass media, Vargas Llosa imposed the optic of mass culture upon real life events and then began to see the subject for a short story in them. He recounted the process as if it were quite natural, with no overtones of threat or conflict between the mass media and literature.

In one such example, Vargas Llosa refers to his Tía Julia, recently widowed, who had been dating a senator who suffered from sexual impotence. As Julia recounts the history of the senator's problem to Vargas Llosa in the novel, one might have mistaken her story for a soap opera or radio drama: while visiting a

prostitute in the U.S. in his youth, the senator had been interrupted by a deformed robber who took his watch and money at knifepoint. Since this traumatic experience the senator has been unable to have normal sexual relations in spite of numerous medical consultations. Vargas Llosa's first thought upon hearing this soap-opera-like event from real life is that his news assistant Pascual would enthusiastically dedicate an entire news bulletin to the grotesque story. After mentally connecting the narrative and thematic structures of these two media versions of the events, the radio dramatic and the journalistic, Vargas Llosa begins to think again about a short story account of the senator's tale. Perhaps he is consciously recounting this episode in *La tía Julia y el escribidor* in order to compare his early literary endeavors to the worst products of the mass media. Whether or not this is the case, certainly, at least, we see the mass media's role in the process of artistic conceptualization of the young writer: a real event with radio dramatic overtones sets off a train of thought connecting the event to Pascual's scandal-oriented news bulletins and finally to the short story Vargas Llosa wants to write. We begin to understand why Vargas Llosa's attitude toward the media is ambivalent: though he can criticize the media's infrastructural organization and negative ideological effects, his early artistic production is indebted to the media on several counts.

The figure of Pedro Camacho is an additional emblem of Vargas Llosa's ambivalence toward the media. In one sense, the novel as a whole might be seen as Vargas Llosa's vindication of Camacho's superior attitude toward the radio plays he produced, or at least the novelist's attempt to come to grips with his own conflicting feelings toward the hackwriter and his mass culture. Camacho, almost a radio-drama machine, insists that his mass cultural production was art. On the day of his arrival, while taking a typewriter from the News Service Office, he tells Vargas Llosa: "El arte es mas importante que tu Servicio de Informaciones, trasgo." (24). While we may be reluctant to classify Camacho's soap operas as art, we can certainly agree that, sadly enough, the news as it was broadcast at Panamericana in the 1950s was certainly not more important than Camacho's dramas.

Camacho's routine of production, in itself, offered Vargas Llosa the chance to assert the hegemony of high culture: in *La tía Julia y el escribidor* the novelist would readapt into high culture what Camacho had originally taken from high culture. The hackwriter used what he termed "un viejo compañero de aventuras," a huge volume, "Deiz Mil Citas Literarias de los Cien Mejores Escritores del Mundo," subtitled, "Lo que dijeron Cervantes, Shakespeare,

Molière, etc. sobre Dios, la Vida, la Muerte, el Amor, el Sufrimiento, etc. . .'(67). This *Readers Digest* type of literary adaptation was the primary source of Camacho's mass cultural production. While he contended that he was creating art, we might see his radio dramas as adaptations of adaptations. One role of Vargas Llosa's novel, then, is a third adaptation of this material, this time in the direction of the original high cultural source. The novelist parodies Camacho's radio dramas in the short stories appearing as inserts between the episodes of the autobiography. The technique of self-conscious adaptation through parody and exaggeration enables Vargas Llosa to criticize mass culture humorously while introducing it into the mainstream of high cultural production in the tradition of Leñero, Cortázar, and Puig. We will see, however, that though he ultimately asserts the superiority of high culture, Vargas Llosa wavers between high and mass culture throughout the novel.

Mass Cultural Adaptation of High Culture

The media's function as a narrative model for Vargas Llosa mediates his clearly critical attitude toward the infrastructure and ideology of the communications industry. The resultant ambivalence of the writer toward the media is visible in the novel's contrapuntal structure in which chapters of autobiography are alternated with parodies of radio serials. The novel is framed by the beginning and ending episodes of this partial autobiography of his life in the early 1950s, followed by a concluding chapter or epilogue briefly summing up the decade following his marriage to his aunt, Julia Urguidi. One effect of this use of the autobiographical frame and epilogue is that the reader responds to the novel primarily as autobiography. Consequently, the alternating chapters of radio drama parody are experienced as interruptions in the main story line. In effect, Vargas Llosa's partial autobiography has been segmented and serialized within the novel. The reader must patiently wait for the next installment, in the mean time reading the exaggerated parodies of Pedro Camacho's radio dramas.

The technique of serialization of an accepted literary genre, the autobiography, in effect allows Vargas Llosa to use the mass media against itself. This critique of mass culture by means of mass cultural techniques occurs in two stages in the novel. At first the serialization functions on its own, instilling the reader with impatience to know the outcome of Vargas Llosa's romance with his Aunt, only then to assuage this impatience as the reader becomes aware of the interaction of all of the novel's parts.

Serialization has been used to check or at least slow down readers who are outcome-oriented.

In referring to the use of the media against itself, I am of course speaking of the literary adaptation of mass media techniques. Used within literature, a media device can have a different effect than it normally does. Unlike the serialization which usually occurs in the mass media (the *folletín*, the daily comic strip, the television soap opera, or weekly series), a novel with internal serialization affords the reader the opportunity to study the entire collection of segments together. At the same time, however, such a collection could also permit the reader to skip over the intervening parodies, giving free reign to the desire to discover the outcome.

Here the distinction between the mere use of the book form and a well-functioning novel is important. If Vargas Llosa had written a book which merely collected segments of a serial, his critique of the mass media would be only minimally effective. (Compare, for example, the paperback novelization of a movie or the fotonovel versions of movies which have recently appeared in the U. S.) At the moment the reader becomes conscious of the essential interplay between the autobiographical sections and the intervening radio-drama parodies, s/he has begun to experience the text as literature, not mass culture. Ideally, the reader's response now ceases to be guided by the impatience to know the outcome. Though the book form does enable one to skip the interruptions, the experience of the work as a novel prohibits this.

The autobiographical sections are further connected to mass culture through their affinity to the interview. The publishing industry, certain sectors of the mass media, and many literary academicians have elevated selected contemporary writers such as Vargas Llosa to the level of stars. More so today than at other historical moments, the successful writer is like a movie star, a public figure with a hidden private life. Periodically, elements of this private life are released (indeed, often sold) to the public in installments. Both the autobiography and the interview serve this function of revealing parts of the star's or writer's private life.

Several of Sara Castro-Klarén's observations on the function of the interview also apply to the role of the autobiography in contemporary society.⁷ Characterized by Castro-Klarén as an important mainstay of the media, the interview's aim is to make the interviewee reveal personal secrets, capitalizing on the public's assumption that the hidden self equals the real artist. In fact, the interview is often considered more successful, the greater the number of surprises or contradictions it reveals between the public and private self of the celebrity. Here Castro-Klarén has touched

upon an important link between the interview and the media. Her argument can be expanded: under the contemporary organization of much of the world's mass media, the interview can only function as a mainstay of the media as long as it shocks or at least surprises the public. Claiming to be constantly innovative, the media define newness in shallow terms, all of which stem from the market system of mass cultural creation and distribution. The media often claim thematic novelty through scandal, the unusual, or the shocking; the illusion of technical innovation and change is usually promoted through rapid camera shifts, changed formats, or new personalities, for example. An interview, too, cannot be successful without contributing to this artificial sense of novelty which the media requires: in most case it must surprise or shock the audience.

In this light, we can begin to understand what might be termed mass cultural aspects of the autobiography. It, too, releases hidden aspects of a figure's private life for private consumption. Its worth is often determined by the number and degree of shocks or surprises it reveals by uncovering these personal details. Indeed, its selling power is frequently this very ability to reveal previously unknown facts about a figure's life.

Underlying this market mechanism, as Castro-Klarén points out with respect to the interview, is the assumption that the interviewee's public acts, such as writing, are insufficient or incomplete versions of the figure's real self. Thus, the interview will uncover the "behind-the-scene" story of a novel or other public expression. Vargas Llosa's partial autobiography does this: the novel begins to recuperate a mass media function by revealing parts of the public figure's private life, the story behind the famous literature the author has produced. Once again caught in an ideological ambivalence, Vargas Llosa is both affirming and denying the assumption that public literary expression is an incomplete picture of the writer: by telling the story of his life during the mid 1950s, he validates the split between the public and private spheres and the notion that published literature is incomplete, admitting that the story needs to be told. At the same time, the novel attempts to deny this split by joining the previously separate spheres together within one text.

Perhaps this wavering is a symptom of an even more extensive ideological ambivalence, also visible in the autobiography's recuperation of the mass media's functions. For although Vargas Llosa successfully criticizes the mass media in this novel, the affinities with the interview are essentially non-critical. In the context of speculation that the Boom is over, * the novelist is

perhaps adapting the autobiography toward mass culture more in an attempt to widen his readership than to novelistically expose a media technique. The industry of mass culture has proven repeatedly the marketability of an autobiography or interview of a public figure. By coupling this popular genre with a happily ending love story, Vargas Llosa perhaps exploits media techniques for his own economic purposes, rather than denouncing their manipulative character.

High Cultural Adaptation of Mass Culture

If the serializations of the autobiographical sections and their thematic critique of the media point to Vargas Llosa's concern with the contemporary mushrooming of the mass media and its effects on high culture, this concern is no less evident in the intervening parodies of radio dramas. By reversing the procedure of the autobiographical sections, this time adapting mass culture into high culture, these parodies function as inversions of the same problematic—the current, often conflictive interrelation between art and mass culture. Again in the parodic sections, and not without contradiction, we see Vargas Llosa's self-assertion as a novelist in the face of the media's growing predominance.

Ostensibly, then, the traditional two voices of parody in these sections are those of the short story and the radio drama. It initially appears that Vargas Llosa is asserting the dominance of a specific literary form, the *cuento*, over mass culture. Several pieces of textual evidence substantiate this reading of the parodies, a reading which is valid and useful at an initial stage of understanding the novel. To begin with, the parodies are written in the form of short stories rather than as radio drama scripts. Secondly, though the character of Pedro Camacho, the hackwriter of mass culture, is the implied author of these sections, ultimately the mocking voice of Vargas Llosa is implicit in each parody. The writer of high culture is retelling these mass cultural episodes in his own terms. Significantly, the novelist has chosen a particularly weak moment for the media: the hackwriter has broken down like an overworked machine.

Here one can amplify Jean Franco's contention that many of the parodic elements of the Latin American Boom are attempts to rebel against the authority of externally imposed cultural models.⁹ The two voices of parody, in Franco's words, the voice of "the other," of authority, and the voice of mockery, of destruction, in Vargas Llosa's case become respectively that of the rapidly growing mass culture and that of a high cultural form intent on reasserting itself despite the media's dominance. In his attempt to

discredit this pseudo-cultural force, Vargas Llosa parodies the media at one of its low moments, when mechanisms such as Pedro Camacho have gone awry. Underlying the humor and often grotesque exaggeration of these sections is an implied tone of superiority: the *cuentista* and his high cultural aesthetic product poke fun at mass culture from a position of prestige and authority. Again Vargas Llosa's ideological ambivalence appears: ironically, throughout the novel this underlying sense of superiority is continually in contradiction with his implicit fear that the mass media's dominance threatens the viability of high culture.

As I noted, this reading of the parody sections represents an initial stage of understanding the novel: the short story asserts itself over mass culture in the ways outlined above. This reading is important not only because it offers a glimpse of a contemporary Latin American novelist's response to the growing predominance of the mass media, but because it reveals how Vargas Llosa's use of the mass media is different from that in the autobiographical sections. Again he seems to waver ideologically. Where serialization together with exposés of the infrastructure and superstructural effects of the mass media were used constructively to combat the effects of the mass media on human consciousness in the autobiography, the mass media is not used positively in the parodies. The extreme exaggerations allow the reader a certain aloofness; one is not caught up in the suspense of the parodies of radio dramas as is the case in the autobiographic sections. This aloofness permits the reader to identify with Vargas Llosa's implicit superiority, instead of allowing an understanding of mass culture from within.¹⁰ In contrast, in the autobiographic sections, while continually caught up in the aspects of mass media, the reader is often at the same time made aware of this very dependence.

The above reading of the parody sections remains incomplete, however, until it takes into account that they are also the writer's self-commentary on his own early short stories. Vargas Llosa signals this intention in various ways, ranging from the specific representation of the character Lituma of the short story, "Un visitante" in several of the parodic sections, to the more general level of thematic repetition of the grotesque throughout the parodies.

In Chapter IV Sargento Lituma has now reached the formulaic "flor de la edad, la cincuentena" and has the exact characteristics of all of Pedro Camacho's male protagonists as they are referred to in the parodies: "frente ancha, nariz aguileña, mirada penetrante, rectitud y bondad en el espíritu." (77). In Vargas Llosa's early short

story, Lituma appeared as an accomplice to the betrayal of a betrayer; the military police used a Jamaican informer to help them make an arrest and then left him behind to most likely be murdered by the prisoner's friends. Sergeant Lituma did his lieutenant's bidding and joined his fellow soldiers in laughing at the Jamaican's plight. In the novel's parody, Lituma must decide for himself whether or not to follow orders to kill a starving, naked black man whom the police have found running in the streets of Callao. This parody distinguishes itself from the others in the novel by dealing with a serious political theme but it ultimately undercuts itself by employing the light, humorous trappings of the radio serial. At the end, for example, we are left with Lituma pointing his gun at the black:

Pero pasaron dos, tres, varios segundos y no disparaba. ¿Lo haría? ¿Obedecería? ¿Estallaría el disparo? ¿Rodaría sobre las basuras indescifrables el misterioso inmigrante? ¿O le sería perdonada la vida y huiría ciego, salvaje, por las afueras, mientras un sargento irreprochable quedaba allí, en medio de pútridos olores y del vaivén de las olas, confuso y adolorido por haber faltado a su deber? ¿Cómo terminaría esa tragedia chalaca? (103)

Thus, though we suspect that Lituma has changed or is about to change from the character of the early story "Un visitante," the conventions of parody which Vargas Llosa is attempting to follow have prevented the ultimate unfolding of this change. One might argue that such an open ending is positive, allowing the reader to analyze the situation and decide how Lituma would finally act. In the context of the novel, however, this question is most likely not pondered because one is immediately reimmersed in Vargas Llosa's autobiography on the following page.

Later this parody will itself be parodied. In Chapter XIV Jaime Concha, who had previously ordered Lituma to shoot the black man, now appears as a neighborhood *curandero*. We are told that he had resigned from the Guardia Civil after being ordered to execute a poor Oriental who had arrived in Callao. In Chapter XVI the facts again change: Concha is now a sergeant, Lituma is his Captain, and vague allusions are made to the black man's having been allowed to escape that night when a sergeant was to execute him. At this point Concha does shoot the black, and, according to the confused text, is thereby fulfilling the previously received order. Thus, Lituma's important decision, unresolved in the open ending of Chapter IV, has been deflected into examples of Pedro Camacho's character mistakes as his writing skills deteriorated. Parodic humor has again led us away from serious

consideration of the social issues involved in Lituma's decision.

Other links between Vargas Llosa's early short stories and the parodies are the grotesque elements common to both. In the story "El abuelo" the grandfather experiences perverse pleasure in seeing his grandson's fright before the flaming skull which the old man has deliberately arranged to scare the boy. A comparable perversity occurs in another story, "El hermano menor" in which the character, Juan, as he advances to shoot an Indian with whom his brother is fighting, experiences serenity when realizing that he might accidentally kill his brother as well. (This story also offers a more specific comparison to the parody in chapter VI in which a young girl accuses Gumercindo Tello of raping her. In "El hermano menor" Juan murders an Indian, only later learning that his sister's accusation that the Indian had raped her is false.) Other examples which verge on the grotesque include Leonidas in "El desafío" who passively watches his son die in a knife fight, in effect consenting to the death by refusing to stop the fight when the opponent asks him to do so, and the compulsion of Rubén and Miguel in "Día domingo" as they insist on swimming a race in the ocean one night in mid-winter after a drinking contest.

These events are not repeated specifically in the novel but they recur in kind. One senses that many of the grotesque exaggerations of the parodies are commentaries not only on mass culture but on these very events from Vargas Llosa's early stories as well. For example, Gumercindo Tello, the Jehova's Witness accused of raping the young girl in Chapter VI, threatens to castrate himself to prove his innocence. In episode VIII we read of Don Federico Tellez Unzátegui, who has dedicated his life to exterminating all of the rodents in the nation, in order to compensate for the death of his small sister. Tellez had been in charge of watching her when they were young but had fallen asleep. When he awoke she had been eaten alive by rats. As Pedro Camacho begins to mix characters and events in the various radio dramas, the grotesque events become more unbelievable, often verging on the fantastic or Gothic.

In effect, Vargas Llosa is using parody not only to humorously denigrate mass cultural elements but aspects of his early short stories as well. Thus, the initial contention that the author is asserting the dominance of the short story over mass culture becomes problematic. Here the functioning of the novel as a whole is essential to fully understand the role of parody. At this second level of meaning, then, Vargas Llosa is attempting to assert the importance of one specific high cultural genre, the novel, over that of mass culture (the radio dramas) through these parodies. (A

similar intention might have partially inspired the grotesque and mass media elements of *Pantaleón y las visitadoras*, though in this earlier novel the grotesque elements are not obviously parodic of his early short stories.) Once again, the reader's experience of the novel primarily as autobiography is important. As chapters of a novel-autobiography, the parodies are not solely about mass culture or examples of Pedro Camacho's breakdown but also about Vargas Llosa's literary attempts in the 1950s and his progression to the novel in his post-1950s writing. As previously noted, these early literary products were intimately connected to the mass media and Camacho's radio dramas. What is straightforwardly related in the autobiographic sections is substantiated and indirectly communicated through the parodies. If Camacho exacerbated the conflict between art and mass culture by insisting that his radio dramas were art, Vargas Llosa will attempt to obliterate this conflict (or at least render it innocuous) by rewriting Camacho's radio dramas as art. The novel can thus encompass both the writer's early literary production and the threat posed by mass culture as well.

In the end, one senses that Vargas Llosa's primary concern is more with the revitalization of the novel as a genre than with the criticism of the mass media. Perhaps he saw the latter as a means to the former. Certainly the novel succeeds in exposing many of the ideological effects of the mass media on human consciousness and several aspects of the infrastructural organization of the communications industry. It also examines the relations between art and mass culture in contemporary society and effectively uses the media against itself in the autobiographic sections. Clearly the novel has achieved positive results in these respects. Though its readership will undoubtedly be small in comparison to the millions of people whose daily lives are affected by the mass media, at the very least it will increase the new novel reader's consciousness of the mass media in contemporary Latin American society. At the same time, the ambivalence toward the media which Vargas Llosa demonstrated at times in the novel tends to obscure the critique and suggests that he was interested in criticizing the media primarily as a means of novelistic experimentation.

NOTES

1. I distinguish between mass culture and high culture as follows: primarily produced to create profit, mass culture is a commodity bought and sold on the market; its ideological functions of upholding the prevailing order is perhaps secondary, though no less important. Its consumption by immense numbers of people is necessary both to the ensuring of profits and to the upholding of the predominant order. Obvious examples of mass culture include television programs, comics, magazines, advertising, radio dramas, etc. High culture, in contrast, is directed to an elite or special sector of society. One primary operations rule which it establishes for itself is that it cannot be understood by the majority of the population. High culture insists that one must be taught to understand and appreciate it. In contrast to mass culture, high culture prides itself on the small numbers of people reached. Examples include the masterpieces of world literature taught in the universities (the novels of the Boom), classical music, and the ballet.
2. See for example, Vicente Leñero's *Estudio Q*, Julio Cortázar's *Libro de Manuel* and *Fantomas Contra los vampiros multinacionales*, and Manuel Puig's *Boquitas pintadas*.
3. Mario Vargas Llosa, *La tía Julia y el escribidor* (Barcelona: Editorial Seix Barral, 1977). Subsequent references will be to this edition and will be included in the text.
4. For a succinct documentation of this concentration see Jeremy Tunstall, *The Media Are American* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977), especially pages 166-177.
5. *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (New York: Seabury Press, 1972), p. 125.
6. Not uncommon in Latin America, this conflict continues to shape the conditions of production of many contemporary writers. Vicente Leñero, for example, was to experience a similar tension well into the 1960s, one which did not disappear for him as it did for Vargas Llosa when the Peruvian's novels had succeeded. See Vicente Leñero, *Vicente Leñero* (Mexico: Empresas Editoriales, 1967).
7. "Interviewing and Literary Criticism," *Ideologies and Literature*, I (May-June 1977), pp. 69-72.
8. See for instance, Joseph Sommers, "Literatura e ideología: la evaluación novelística del militarismo en Vargas Llosa," *Hispanérica*, 4 (1975), anejo 1, pp. 83-117, in which the boom is situated between 1959 and 1973.
9. "La Parodie, le grotesque, et le carnavalesque: Quelques conceptions du personnage dans le roman latino-américain," in *Idéologies, littérature et société en Amérique-latine* (Brussels: Editions de l'Université de Bruxelles, 1975), pp. 59-60.
10. One might contrast it with Manuel Puig's parodic use of mass culture in *Boquitas pintadas* in which the reader experiences the attractiveness of mass culture while simultaneously learning to analyze it critically.

A Peruvian *Indigenista* Forum of the 1920s: José Carlos Mariátegui's *Amauta*

David Wise

Texas Woman's University

During the decade 1920-1930 the sweeping reexamination of Peru's Incaic heritage known as *indigenismo* (Indianism) dominated much of the nation's intellectual and cultural life. Social scientists, jurists, educational reformers and political revolutionaries produced a spate of books, monographs, and essays dealing with the organization of social life under the Incas and with the contemporary native Peruvian. Simultaneously, *indigenismo* replaced Lima-based *criollismo* as the dominant style in Peruvian arts, both visual and literary. The shifting of national attention to the provinces implied by "Indianism" was, in turn, connected to profound changes in Peru's social structure, notably to the massive migration of highland *provincianos* to the coast in the years immediately following the First World War. "Indianism" further played an important role in the nationalist rhetoric of the eleven-year regime (1919-1930) of President Augusto B. Leguía. During Leguía's *oncenio* the figure of the Indian—frequently still a fanciful or semi-literary entity—dominated much of Peru's ideological and artistic production. Nevertheless, *indigenismo* never succeeded in coalescing into a stable and coherent ideology.¹

The present study examines Peruvian *indigenismo* of the 1920s through the prism of José Carlos Mariátegui's *Amauta* (Lima, 1926-1930), one of Latin America's major "vanguardist" magazines of the decade. Until recently, the Peruvian magazines of the 1920s, especially the "little" publications devoted to literature and politics, have been largely neglected, although they constitute one of the most valuable sources of materials for the cultural history of the *oncenio*. Alberto Flores-Galindo has pointed out that the formation of an extra-university intellectual movement in Peru early in this century was tied to two phenomena: a rise in the number of readers, accompanied by the opening of new book stores and publishing houses, and a dramatic increase in the total

number of newspapers and magazines published throughout the country.² Mariátegui, clearly, occupies pride of place among Peru's "extra-university intellectuals," while his magazine *Amauta* continues to enjoy an international reputation for journalistic excellence. In addition, *Amauta's* recent republication (1976) in a high-quality facsimile edition has greatly simplified access to the magazine.³

The mid-1920s (especially 1926-1928) saw the appearance of a major cycle of Peruvian Indianist magazines, published both in the provinces and in Lima. Like the "vanguardist" magazines of the same decade, the Indianist journals generally had a small circulation and a short life span. Nevertheless, the impressive number of these publications attests to the strength of the *indigenista* movement. Major titles include *Kosko* (Cuzco), *Attusparia* (Huaraz), *Kúntur* (Cuzco), *Boletín Titikaka* (Puno), *Chirapu* (Arequipa), *Inti* (Huancayo), *Puna* (Ayaviri), *La Sierra* (Lima, directed by J. Guillermo Guevara), and others. Collectively, the Indianist magazines published much of the work of the social scientists, land-reformers, educators and creative writers who dealt with aspects of the "Indian problem" of the 1920s. Only recently have such studies as Luis Enrique Tord's uneven *El indio en los ensayistas peruanos, 1848-1948* and Marfil Francke Ballve's excellent "El movimiento indigenista en el Cuzco (1910-1930)" made effective use of *indigenista* journals.⁴ Case studies of individual journals, however, have yet to appear, nor is a thorough study of the information network linking *indigenista* intellectuals through Peru yet available.

Amauta, while perhaps most commonly remembered as "la primera revista socialista marxista" of Latin America, also ranked both artistic vanguardism and Peru's "Indian problem" among its principal concerns.⁵ As Jesús Chavarría notes in his recently published *José Carlos Mariátegui and the Rise of Modern Peru, 1890-1930*, until 1923-1924 no mention of special concern for the Indian cause appears in Mariátegui's writings.⁶ By the time of *Amauta's* appearance in September 1926, however, Mariátegui had become a zealous *indigenista*. Although not devoted exclusively to Indianist themes, *Amauta* consciously adopted an Indianist artistic style, published large quantities of *indigenista* poetry and prose, and addressed itself to the multifaceted "Indian problem" during its four years of publication. Given *Amauta's* relatively large circulation and its international reputation, it is indeed accurate to speak of the magazine as a major *indigenista* forum. It is, certainly, an excellent source of information for the novice beginning his examination of 1920s *indigenismo*.

The Origins of 20th-Century Indigenismo

The "discovery" of the Peruvian Indian by the middle-class intellectual (whether located in Lima or in a departmental- or provincial capital) had, to be sure, begun well before the inauguration of Augusto B. Leguía's "Patria Nueva" in 1919. In the wake of the War of the Pacific (1879-1883) a number of university professors collectively termed "neo-Positivists" by both Jesús Chavarría and Thomas M. Davies, turned their attention to the Indian as a result of their conviction that Peru's crushing defeat by Chile had been due to the failure to incorporate the Indian majority into national life. Figures such as Carlos Lissón, dean of the faculty at the University of San Marcos, sociologist Mariano H. Cornejo, *Civilista* professor-politician Manuel Vicente Villarán, and Joaquín Capelo (later an influential senator from Junín), vigorously stressed the need to do away with racial prejudice and to provide adequate education for the Indian.⁷

From outside the intellectual "establishment," Manuel González Prada (1848-1918), literary figure and anarchist pamphleteer, clamored against the state of servitude in which the highland Indian was held, and in his essay "Nuestros indios" (written in 1904, published only posthumously) stressed the need for armed rebellion against white oppression. In "Nuestros indios" González Prada advanced a thesis that would be echoed incessantly by the Marxist *indigenistas* of the 1920s: "La cuestión del indio," he asserted, "más que pedagógica, es económica, es social."⁸

González Prada was among the first Peruvian writers to point out the economic bases of Indian servitude, a condition which, he asserted, could have only two possible resolutions:

La condición del indígena puede mejorar de dos maneras: o el corazón de los opresores se conduce al extremo de reconocer el derecho de los oprimidos, o el ánimo de los oprimidos adquiere la virilidad suficiente para escarmentar a los opresores. . . . Al indio no se le predique humildad y resignación sino orgullo y rebeldía. ¿Qué ha ganado con trescientos o cuatrocientos años de conformidad y paciencia? Mientras menos autoridades sufre, de mayores daños se liberta. (*Horas de lucha*, pp. 337-38)

González Prada concluded "Nuestros indios" by rejecting as impossible any humanitarian solution to the "Indian problem": ". . . el indio se redimirá merced a su esfuerzo propio, no por la humanización de sus opresores." He thus provided the *indigenistas* of the 1920s, notably the Marxists associated with magazines such as *Amauta* and Cuzco's *Kúntur* (1927-1928) with two main themes: first, the "Indian problem" was an economic

and social struggle that could be resolved only by radical material changes; second, the Indian could be "regenerated" only through his own efforts, not through the good offices of philanthropic whites and mestizos.⁹

Despite González Prada's call for a revolutionary solution to the oppression of the Indian, most Peruvians who seriously concerned themselves with the nation's Quechua- and Aymara-speaking majority before (and after) World War I adopted reformist, educationist, and philanthropic stances. Novels such as Clorinda Matto de Turner's *Aves sin nido* (1899), while raising public consciousness abuses to which highland Indians were subjected, generally failed to examine the actual forms of servitude under which the Indian suffered. And as Dan Chapin Hazen points out, the great majority of reformist proposals relied overwhelmingly on the supposed redemptive powers of effective education.¹⁰

In 1909, the year of Matto de Turner's death in Argentine exile, Pedro S. Zulen and others founded in Lima the philanthropic "Asociación Pro-Indígena." The members of this association consisted primarily of educated Lima humanitarians, such as Zulen and the German-born Dora Mayer, who lacked direct political power. A major exception was Senator Joaquín Capelo from the department of Junín, who served as co-director of the "Asociación" and sponsored numerous pro-Indian bills in Congress during the 1910s. Zulen, who became professor of philosophy and librarian at San Marcos before his death in 1925, directed the "Asociación Pro-Indígena" until 1916, while Dora Mayer edited its journal, *El Deber Pro-Indígena*, from 1912 to 1916.¹¹ This monthly magazine reported the Putumayo rubber-gathering scandal in 1912, documented abuses by highland hacienda owners, demanded official pro-Indian reforms, and published articles on Indian life in an attempt to bring the plight of the *indígena* to public attention. Unlike González Prada and the Marxists of the 1920s, the members of the "Pro-Indígena" emphasized the education (or at least the literacy) of the Indian as a necessary first step in incorporating him into the national mainstream. Although it could point to a few concrete accomplishments at the end of its seven-year life, the "Pro-Indígena" was warmly praised by Mariátegui and other *Amauta* contributors as a precursor of their own revolutionary *Indigenismo*. Dora Mayer, by 1926 an elder stateswoman of the Indianist cause, was invited to collaborate in the first issue of *Amauta* and subsequently became a regular contributor.¹²

As Françoise Chevalier reports, in the first decade of the twentieth century the more concrete and practical aspects of the

Indian question began to attract the attention of a growing number of jurists, sociologists, and politicians based in Lima, Cuzco, and Arequipa. In 1911 Arequipa hosted the "First Regional Congress of Normal School Graduates" (Lima's famous *Escuela Normal de Varones*, designed to produce Indian teachers, had been established in 1905), and in 1915 Arequipa's Bar Association sponsored a contest for the preparation of "Indian tutelary legislation." Numerous peasant uprisings in the South, especially in the *altiplano* department of Puno after 1914, made an examination of the "Indian problem" a matter of especially acute concern for provincial intellectuals.¹³ In Cuzco during the 1910s, the *Revista Universitaria* of the reformed Universidad de San Antonio Abad poured forth a series of studies on the Indian and on land tenure within the department of Cuzco.¹⁴

The years immediately following the end of World War I witnessed a proliferation of sociological and juridical studies on the Indian and especially on the *comunidad indígena*, a "collective" landholding system which had survived since Colonial times. Some of the more important studies were Ricardo Bustamante Cisneros's "Las comunidades indígenas en el Perú" (1919); José Antonio Encinas's two monographs, *Contribución a una legislación tutelar indígena* (1918) and *Causas de la criminalidad indígena en el Perú* (1919); and especially Hildebrando Castro Pozo's highly influential *Nuestra comunidad indígena* (1924). As Davies points out, much of the generalized interest in the Indian *comunidad* stemmed from an article authored in 1907 by San Marcos professor Manuel Vicente Villarán, in which Villarán argued for official protection of the *comunidad* against land-hungry hacendados.¹⁵

Hildebrando Castro Pozo's 1924 work on the *comunidad* was lent additional prestige by the author's having held the position of head of the Section of Indian affairs in Leguía's government between 1921 and 1923. Like many of the sociological studies produced in the 1920s, *Nuestra comunidad indígena* lacked methodological rigor, but it nevertheless achieved widespread popularity. Castro Pozo emphasized the continuing vitality of the *comunidad* despite a century of encroachments by hacendados and of indifference or official hostility on the part of Peru's liberal republican regimes. He stressed, especially, the capacity of the *comunidad* for continued development along the line of the modern cooperative, exerting a substantial (and acknowledged) influence on José Carlos Mariátegui's *Siete ensayos de interpretación de la realidad peruana* (1928).¹⁶

During the 1920s numerous other authors stressed the

"communistic" (or at least communal) tradition of land tenure among Peru's Indians. Louis Baudin's *L'empire socialiste des Inkas* (1928) greatly popularized the notion of "Incan Socialism," while Peruvian works in the same vein include César Antonio Ugarte's *Bosquejo de la historia económica del Perú* (1926), Abelardo Solís's *Ante el problema agrario peruano* (1928), and a triad of books by the University of Cuzco's messianic cultural anthropologist, Luis E. Valcárcel (*De la vida incaica*, 1925; *Del ayllu al Imperio*, 1925; *Tempestad en los Andes*, 1927). The Peruvian writers predicted, from differing perspectives, an Indian "renaissance" based on the *comunidades*' adoption of modern farming methods and the formation of agricultural cooperatives. Mariátegui and other *Amauta* contributors accepted without criticism three arguments which originated with Castro Pozo and were echoed by Valcárcel and other radical *indigenistas*: first, Peru's Indians possessed a still-vital tradition of economic "communism;" second, the *comunidades* were a major key to national economic development, and should be converted into productive cooperatives; third, the Indian was a "natural" candidate for conversion to modern Socialism. A strong romantic vein, inspired by the rhapsodies of Valcárcel's *Tempestad en los Andes*, runs through the "Indian problem" writings of almost all the members of the *Amauta* group.¹⁷

On the literary scene, theoretical attempts were made early in the century to disengage Peruvian literature from the weight of Hispanic tradition. José de la Riva Agüero's doctoral thesis, *Carácter de la literatura del Perú independiente* (1905), asserted that Peru's literature up to that time had been merely "Castilian provincial literature," and suggested that Peruvian writers choose other European models. José Gálvez's *Posibilidad de una genuina literatura nacional* (1915) proposed a national literature, one which would constitute a "literature de lo criollo." Even Luis Alberto Sánchez, who was later to decry the excesses of artistic *indigenismo*, wrote in his bachelor's thesis at San Marcos:

Nuestra literatura de hoy debe inspirarse en las tradiciones prehistóricas: debe ser QUECHUISTA; nuestra literatura de mañana fundirá en un molde único y representativo toda la materia dispersa, todas las características, todas las modalidades de la realidad nacional: será NATIVISTA. El quechuismo es una "disciplina", una gimnasia indispensable para la mejor asimilación de todos los factores de la sociedad peruana.¹⁸

The 1920s saw the almost complete displacement of both *criollismo* and *modernismo* by an artistic "Indianism" accompanied by many of the features of a mass-culture fad. Luis

Monguió in his *La poesía postmodernista peruana* (1954), pointed to the year 1926 as the beginning of the Indianist "boom" in Peruvian literature.¹⁹ There had, to be sure, been antecedents in such works as Enrique López Albújar's *Cuentos andinos* (1920) and, more remotely, Matto de Turner's *Aves sin nido*, but poetic *indigenismo* was definitely launched in 1926 by a triad of books: Alejandro Peralta's *Ande*, J. Mario Chávez's *Coca*, and Emilio Armaza's *Falo*. According to Monguió, the specifically "indianist" phase in poetry was brief (1926-1930) because of several inherent problems: a rapid exhaustion of themes, an equally rapid exhaustion of images, and an ideological and taste shift to another type of literary nativism—"cholismo"—which would dominate Peruvian literature in the decade 1930-40. After the publication of three more major collections of Indianist poetry in 1928—Guillermo Mercado's *Un chullo de poemas*, José Varallanos's *El hombre del Ande que asesinó su esperanza*, and Nazario Chávez Aliaga's *Parábolas del Ande*—the vogue of pure "indianism" faded as works such as the novels of Ciro Alegría came to dominate Peru's nativist literature. Significantly, the years of *Amauta's* publication (1926-1930) correspond precisely to the period marked by Monguió as the apogee of extreme literary "Indianism" in Peru.

In the field of the visual arts, the most striking phenomenon of the 1920s was the rise of José Sabogal (1888-1956), founder and long-time leader of the so-called "Peruvian School" of painting. After receiving training in Europe and in Argentina, Sabogal crossed the Andes from Jujuy to Cuzco in 1918 and began to paint the landscapes and human types of the *sierra* in splashy polychromes. In 1919 a Lima exhibition of his vivid *indigenista* oil paintings established him as one of Peru's leading artists, despite the fact that traditionally-minded critics considered his work deficient in technique and cloyingly picturesque in its themes.²⁰ Sabogal quickly made disciples of a generation of Peruvian artists, including Julia Codesido (b. 1892), "Camilo Blas" (José Alfonso Sánchez Urteaga, b. 1903), and Enrique Camino Brent (1909-1960). First as professor and then as director of Lima's Escuela de Bellas Artes from 1920-1943, Sabogal established *indigenismo* as Peru's major painting style, one which dominated the national art scene for three decades.²¹

The "Official" Indigenismo of the "Patria Nueva" (1919-1930)

President Augusto B. Leguía, who came to power for the second time in 1919, represented the interests of the progressive sector of

the Peruvian "oligarchy" and those of the middle-sector groups whose expansion had been inhibited by the policies of previous regimes.²² Chevalier (pp. 189-90) maintains that the middle-sector urban groups which had grown in size and power as the result of wartime (1914-1918) prosperity were more sympathetic to the complaints of the Indian than was the *Partido Civil*, whose leaders had ruled Peru from 1899 to 1919. More importantly, Leguía, a self-made "businessman President," held national economic growth as his main (and publicly-stated) goal. The new President regarded the quasi-feudal land and labor relationships which predominated in the *sierra* as a hindrance to the development of an integrated capitalist economy, and considered the *gamonal* (petty highland hacendado²³) an anachronism. He once declared:

... the *gamonal* is not bad by nature. He is rather diseased in his moral and civic sensibilities, and retarded in his business sense. . . . The *gamonal* is retarded in his business sense for his failure to realize that the toll he forcibly exacts from the Indians would multiply a hundredfold if he worked to keep them well paid, well fed, and content, instead of squeezing out their very last energies. The *gamonal* seems to have a heart of stone for the Indians' tribulations because he has a head of cement for the most elementary principles of modern economics.²⁴

Given Leguía's concern for developing a national communications/transportation infrastructure and for rationalizing obsolescent modes of production, the *oncenio*, particularly in its first years, provided a more favorable climate for pro-Indian legislation than had previous regimes.

The *oncenio* was, in the words of conservative intellectual Víctor Andrés Belaúnde, an era of "bureaucratic Caesarism" characterized by autocracy and by the expansion of the governmental apparatus.²⁵ Although Fredrick B. Pike correctly notes that the new constitution promulgated on January 18, 1920 was an "instrument to be used, ignored, or altered as he [Leguía] saw fit," the document did mark a radical break with the hands-off policies of previous governments in the realm of social welfare.²⁶ The new constitution pledged the state to improve the conditions of the working classes and to build primary schools, hospitals, and other facilities for all Peru's needy. Although success was less visible outside the department of Lima, by 1930 the government could indeed point to substantial social-welfare accomplishments. It had constructed more than 800 new elementary schools, with the result that the number of primary school students in Peru had increased from 176,680 to 318,735 between 1921 and 1929. In addition, it had mounted campaigns against various childhood

diseases, and had greatly expanded clinical facilities within metropolitan Lima itself (Pike, pp. 180-81).

After taking office, Leguía substantially modified the policies of preceding regimes in regard to the Indian *comunidades*. Both the liberal governments of the nineteenth century and the recent *Civilista* regimes had, almost without exception, regarded the *comunidades* as an obstacle to economic development and had denied them the legal status they had held during the Colonial period. However, article 41 of the 1920 constitution explicitly recognized the legal existence of the *comunidades*, making them part of the state domain and thus inalienable and imprescriptible. Article 58 of the new constitution marked the end of the legal fiction that Peru's Indians were in fact free and equal citizens of the Republic. It read: "The state will protect the Indian race and will dictate special laws for its development and culture in keeping with its needs. The nation recognizes the legal existence of the *comunidades* and the law will decide the rights that pertain to them."²⁷ In a related move, on September 12, 1921, Leguía created a Section of Indian Affairs within the Ministry of Development and picked *indigenista* Hildebrando Castro Pozo to head it. By such moves Leguía hoped to defuse the tense situation in the southern *sierra*, where hacendado land-grabbing had sparked peasant revolts the central government had been obliged to extinguish at considerable cost.²⁸

Leguía, a politician well schooled in the use of public-relations techniques, took pains throughout his tenure to appear as the fatherly protector of Peru's Indians, and exploited the trappings of popular-culture *indigenismo* to maintain his personal popularity.²⁹ He also sponsored and subsidized a "Sociedad Pro-Derecho Indígena 'Tahuantinsuyo'" (founded in Lima June 16, 1920), whose stated purpose was "to unify the race and explain its political, economic, and social rights. . . ." Never popular with Congress, this Society's annual congresses managed to meet until 1926.³⁰ Leguía also created (May 22, 1929) a *Patronato de la raza indígena* with a central committee under the chairmanship of the archbishop of Lima, for the purpose of settling the increasingly numerous and bitter disputes between *comunidades* and hacendados. The *Patronato* produced mountains of *papel sellado* and, like other ineffective institutions of "official" *indigenismo*, was bitterly criticized by anti-Leguía Indianists in the late 1920s.

Not all "official" *indigenismo* was limited to speech-making and the creation of paternalistic associations. A law of March 18, 1920 granted departmental courts jurisdiction over cases involving Indian questions, cases which had previously been settled in the

local courts dominated by hacendados. In another action, on August 28, 1925 the Ministry of Development opened a record office for the registration of Peru's *comunidades indígenas*; while only 321 communities (out of several thousands) had been registered by the time of Leguía's fall from power in August 1930, this number compared favorably with that of communities registered in the following five-year period (Davies, p. 90, Chevalier, pp. 193-94).

Leguía's government thus officially reversed the traditional non-interventionist policies of Peru's post-Independence regimes, under which much of Indian community land had been lost to private ownership. However, Chevalier argues that the same forces of increased national prosperity and urban development which had created a new middle class more sympathetic to the problems of the Indian, also aggravated these problems by vastly increasing urban demands for highland agricultural products. To meet an increased demand for beef to feed Lima's growing (and more affluent) population, many hacendados now found it profitable to drive "their" Indians off the previously marginal communal lands bordering their haciendas, a process described in fictional fashion in José María Arguedas's novel *Yawar Fiesta* (1941).³¹ The expansion of a capitalist agricultural economy into previously remote areas of the highlands (although dating from the last decades of the nineteenth century and tied to wool rather than to beef)³² continued into the 1920s and caused many of Leguía's reforms to remain dead letters. Chevalier writes:

Paradoxically, the same forces that had occasioned the rise of a new middle class sensitive to the ideas of indigenismo also worked against the movement's goals by commercializing such products of the highlands as wool, leather, and cattle, which came into great demand in the capital, the coastal region, and abroad. The parallel commercialization of land then encouraged entrepreneurs and hacendados to new aggressions against the Indians. Meanwhile, the first legal obstacles to this despoliation instituted by the Leguía regime were too weak to control the forces at work. (Chevalier, p. 193).

Peru's *comunidades* actually declined in size and prosperity during the *oncenio* because of increased hacendado pressure, and also suffered from Leguía's institution of a program of *conscripción vial* (obligatory road labor) in order to modernize Peru's communications/transportation system. Although in theory the law required all adult Peruvian males to work for either six or twelve days each year on the construction or maintenance of roads, Dan Chapin Hazen reports that, "In fact, only Indians and

urban poor did any work, while the scheme lent itself to unprecedented abuses" (Hazen, p. 206). Numerous contemporary writers, both radical and conservative, characterized *conscripción vial* as a new form of the Incaic *mita* (obligatory labor for the state).³³ During the 1920s, many *serranos*, unable to make even a subsistence living on their communal lands or individual *minifundia*, or lured by the relatively high wages paid on the northern sugar plantations, migrated to the coast. There, on the plantations and in the cities (especially in Lima), the *serrano* came, willy-nilly, to participate in Peru's mainstream culture. Forced out of his village by economic necessity, the *serrano* became "cholified" in a time far shorter than the members of the "Asociación Pro-Indígena" would ever have predicted.³⁴

During the first two years of the "Patria Nueva" (1919-1921), Leguía received the support of almost all groups dissatisfied with *Civilista* rule, including the provincial members of the commerial and bureaucratic middle classes, who were no friends of the locally dominant *gamonales*. He also had the support of the students and intellectuals of socialist and *indigenista* leanings who grouped together to publish the university newspaper *Germinal* in 1918-1919; this group included not only Leguía's cousin Germán Leguía y Martínez, a disciple of González Prada, but also educators and social scientists such as José Antonio Encinas, Erasmo Roca, and Hildebrando Castro Pozo (Chevalier, pp. 190-92). During the early years of the *oncenio*, Leguía extended the considerable power of his patronage, multiplied by Peru's economic prosperity of the 1920s, to both coastal and highland middle-sector groups, as the increase in the size of the national budget made it possible to hire an increased number of government employees, teachers, and technicians. "Official" *indigenismo* served to consolidate middle-sector support during the crucial early years of the regime. After 1923, however, in order to maintain himself in office, Leguía aligned himself increasingly with the traditional "dueños del Perú," the owners of the coastal plantations and the large highland haciendas, splitting with his early *indigenista* supporters. By 1924, Encinas, Roca, Castro Pozo, Abelardo Solís, and others were in exile as declared opponents of Leguía's autocratic regime, although Indianist rhetoric continued to occupy a prominent place in the propaganda of the "Patria Nueva" (Chevalier, pp. 191-192).

Amauta, Revista Indigenista: I

Amauta's first issue appeared in September 1926, its cover adorned by José Sabogal's engraving of the head of a resolute

indígena, an engraving destined to become the unofficial *logo* of both the magazine and the "Sociedad Editora Amauta" which funded it. The Indianist title "Amauta" (in Quechua, "wise man," "scholar," or "counselor"), also proposed by Sabogal, was explained by Mariátegui in the magazine's "presentación:"

El título preocupará probablemente a algunos. Esto se deberá a la importancia excesiva, fundamental, que tiene entre nosotros el rótulo. No se mire en este caso a la acepción estricta de la palabra. El título no traduce sino nuestro homenaje al Incaísmo. Pero específicamente la palabra "Amauta" adquiere con esta revista una nueva acepción. La vamos a crear otra vez.³⁵

As Mariátegui made clear in the following paragraph, *Amauta's* guiding spirit was by no means to be understood as an exclusive, nationalist Indianism; rather, the magazine had more ambitious aims:

El objeto de esta revista es el de plantear, esclarecer y conocer los problemas peruanos desde puntos de vista doctrinarios y científicos. Pero consideraremos siempre al Perú dentro del panorama del mundo. Estudiaremos todos los grandes movimientos de renovación—políticos, filosóficos, artísticos, literarios, científicos. Todo lo humano es nuestro. Esta revista vinculará a los hombres nuevos del Perú, primero con los de otros pueblos de América, en seguida con los de los otros pueblos del mundo. (Mariátegui, "Presentación")

The problems of Peru (and, to be understood, the "Indian problem") could not be fruitfully considered outside the context of the contemporary world situation—which for Mariátegui and many other *Amauta* collaborators meant the realities of finance capitalism, economic imperialism, and the revolutionary labor movement. The magazine's grand design, expressed in its "Presentación," was to "create a new Peru in a new world" through the collaborative labors of progressive intellectuals.

By means of its promotion of *indigenista* graphic art, its publication of Indianist short stories and poetry, its editorial pronouncements, and its articles and essays by well-known social scientists, *Amauta* quickly established itself as a major "Indianist" forum. Although Mariátegui's editorial stance was consistently internationalist and Socialist, a close examination of the "Indian problem" necessarily formed part of any attempt to comprehend national (and Latin American) reality. And while its precise parameters varied considerably from contributor to contributor, *indigenismo* was rarely conceived in narrow national terms.

Many of *Amauta's* contributors, despite their professed Marxism, viewed *indigenismo* as a movement destined to bring

about sweeping changes in every aspect of Peruvian life. This "global" Indianism was strikingly expressed by Mariátegui in an article announcing the formation of the pro-Indian "Grupo Resurgimiento" in Cuzco under the leadership of Luis E. Valcárcel:

Este movimiento [el indigenismo] anuncia y prepara una profunda transformación nacional. Quienes lo consideran una artificial corriente literaria, que se agotará en una declamación pasajera, no perciben lo hondo de sus raíces ni lo universal de su savia. . . . Se cumple un fenómeno espiritual, que expresan distinta pero coherentemente la pintura de Sabogal y la poesía de Vallejo, la interpretación histórica de Valcárcel y la especulación filosófica de Orrego, en todos los cuales se advierte un espíritu purgado de colonialismo intelectual y estético. Por los cuadros de Sabogal y Camilo Blas y los poemas de Vallejo y Peralta, circula la misma sangre. En los apóstrofes de Valcárcel, de Haya de la Torre y de Gamaliel Churata se encuentra idéntico sentimiento.³⁶

Mariátegui's comments reveal two procedures typical of many of *Amauta's* Indianist contributors. First, a tendency to view the Indianist movement as a global or totalizing movement results in a failure to discriminate between the style and the substance of *indigenismo*, or to distinguish between the contributions of the movement's ideologues and its artists. Second, an evaluation of the Indianist movement in idealistic and voluntaristic terms neglects *indigenismo's* antecedents and historical causes. Mariátegui refers to Indianism as a "spiritual phenomenon," asserts that the same "sentiment" characterizes the disparate work of Sabogal, Vallejo, Valcárcel, and Haya de la Torre, and speaks admiringly of the "messianic intonation" of the leaders of the movement.

Nevertheless, for all Mariátegui's perception of *indigenismo* as a spiritual movement, he did not consider either artistic Indianism or the social ferment which accompanied it to be isolated phenomena. The new "indianist" preoccupations had to be seen in a Marxist world context before they could become truly comprehensible, he insisted:

Y el fenómeno nacional no se diferencia ni se desconecta, en su espíritu, del fenómeno mundial. Por el contrario, de él recibe su fermento y su impulso. La levadura de las nuevas reivindicaciones indigenistas es la idea socialista, no como la hemos heredado instintivamente del extinto Incario sino como la hemos aprendido de la civilización occidental, en cuya ciencia y en cuya técnica solo romanticismos [sic], utopistas pueden dejar de ver adquisiciones irrenunciables y magníficas del hombre moderno. (Mariátegui, "La nueva cruzada," p. 37)

Mariátegui, Ricardo Martínez de la Torre, Hugo Pesce and other contributors consistently advocated a revolutionary Socialist solution to the problems of Peru's Indians, a position which won them the epithet of "Europeanizers" from their more nationalistic *aprista* colleagues. *Amauta's* Socialism also won the magazine an outright rejection from some intransigent *indigenistas*, among them Guillermo Guevara, editor of *La Sierra*, who branded Mariátegui a "Limeño charlatán."³⁷

Both Socialist and *aprista* contributors to *Amauta* accepted as an article of faith González Prada's dictum that the solution to the Indian problem must be an "economic" one. Despite the high-visibility collaboration of philanthropists and educationists such as Dora Mayer and José Antonio Encinas, *Amauta's* editorial policy rejected the education of the Indian as a precondition for upgrading his economic and political status. On one occasion, Mariátegui expressed the view that without a change in the economic relationships in force in the highlands, the literate Indian would simply become another of the many exploiters of his own race.³⁸ In his prologue to Valcárcel's *Tempestad en los Andes* (published by the "Editorial Minerva" in 1927), Mariátegui set forth what was to remain *Amauta's* editorial position:

El problema indígena no admite ya la mistificación a que perpetuamente lo han sometido una turba de abogados y literatos, consciente or inconscientemente mancomunados con los intereses de la casta latifundista. La miseria moral y material de la raza indígena aparece demasiado netamente como una simple consecuencia del regimen económico y social que sobre ella pesa desde hace siglos. Este régimen, sucesor de la feudalidad colonial, es el gamonalismo. Bajo su imperio, no se puede hablar seriamente de redención del indio.³⁹

Both Valcárcel and Mariátegui (the latter heavily influenced by the anthropologist's writings) directly tied the Indian question to that of Peru's system of land ownership, and both were followed in this approach by *Amauta's* younger contributors, such as future *aprista* leader Carlos Manuel Cox, who explicitly adopted the slogan of the Mexican Revolution: "The land to him who works it."⁴⁰

The prominence accorded Valcárcel's writings is a striking feature of *Amauta* during its first two years of life.⁴¹ The rhapsodic *Tempestad en los Andes* was serialized in the magazine, while Valcárcel's works were often cited by other *Amauta's* contributors when they needed to appeal to authority. The object of eulogies and interviews published in *Amauta*, Valcárcel repaid Mariátegui the favor of prologuing his *Tempestad* with a laudatory review of

the *Siete ensayos* in 1929.⁴²

Valcárcel identified the "Indian problem" directly with that of agrarian reform. In *Amauta*, No. 6 (February 1927), he observed:

Indudablemente que el punto de vista económico es como el apoyo que pedía Arquímedes para mover el mundo. La Conquista consumó el despojo de la tierra y la explotación del hombre por el hombre. La República no es sino una prolongación del Coloniaje. Sólo hemos cambiado de etiquetas. El encomendero de ayer es el gamonal de hoy. En la sierra del Perú y en los valles de la costa el régimen feudal es una supervivencia. El problema indio está inseparablemente ligado al problema agrario.⁴³

The anthropologist also propagated the theory of the "communistic" nature of Incan society. In *De la vida incaica* (1925) he had written:

Ellos [los Incas] fundaron el Tawantinsuyu como una sociedad modelo de comunismo . . . imponiendo por doquiera el triunfante arquetipo de una esencial cultura agraria.⁴⁴

Stressing the communistic "tradition" of Peru's natives, Valcárcel claimed that the Indian was a "natural" convert to modern Socialism; under the influence of the works of Marx and González Prada, he sometimes spoke of the Indian as if he were a proletarian militant. In a lecture (1927) at the University of Arequipa which caused him a brief imprisonment, Valcárcel referred to a hypothetical "huelga general del proletariado andino" and wrote ominously: "la dictadura del proletariado indígena busca su Lenin."⁴⁵ In the sonorous prose of *Tempestad en los Andes*, Valcárcel painted an apocalyptic picture of a "socialist" Indian aroused from his lethargy of centuries and about to launch himself in a destructive war of revenge against the exploiting coast:

Un día alumbrará el Sol de Sangre, el Yawar-Inti, y todas las aguas se teñirán de rojo: de Púrpura tornarán las linfas del Titikaka; de púrpura, aún los arroyos cristalinos. Subirá la sangre hasta las altas y nevadas cúspides. Terrible Día de Sol de Sangre. (Valcárcel, *Tempestad*, p. 23)⁴⁶

Although few of *Amauta's* contributors shared Valcárcel's belief in the imminence of a massive Indian uprising, many did accept his assertion that the Quechua "race" was on the verge of a new flowering, and shared his harsh judgment on four centuries of unequal Indian-white relationships. Adopting the *gonzalezpradista* dictum that the Indian must redeem himself through his own strenuous efforts, Valcárcel wrote:

Pro-Indígena, Patronato, siempre el gesto del señor para el esclavo, siempre el aire protector en el semblante de quien domina cinco siglos. Nunca el

gesto severo de justicia, nunca la palabra viril del hombre honrado, no vibraron jamás los truenos de bíblica indignación. Ni los pocos apóstoles que en tierras del Perú nacieron pronunciaron jamás la santa palabra regeneradora. (Valcárcel, *Tempestad*, p. 26)⁴⁷

Paternalism, however, was virtually inescapable for the *indigenista* reformer or revolutionary of the 1920s, and Valcárcel's denunciation of previous "patronizing" attempts at improving the lot of Peru's Indians did not prevent his founding in Cuzco a short-lived pro-Indian group whose first declared principle read: "Amparárá material y moralmente a los indígenas, a quienes considera como hermanos menores en desgracia."⁴⁸

José Carlos Mariátegui, *Amauta's* editor, showed himself heavily influenced by Valcárcel's messianic *indigenismo*, although he did not share the anthropologist's condemnation of mestizo culture as inherently inferior to that of the full-blooded and -cultured Indian. More frequently and consistently than did Valcárcel, Mariátegui linked the "Indian problem" with that of land tenure. The *Siete ensayos*, which begins with three intimately interrelated essays ("Esquema de la evolución económica," "El problema del indio," and "El problema de la tierra") contains most of Mariátegui's major observations on the Indian/land problems in Peru. This work (significant portions of which were serialized in *Amauta* before the appearance of the book in November 1928), however, must be omitted from direct discussion in the present essay.⁴⁹

Mariátegui's mature position on the Indian and his relationship to Socialism was best summed up in his study "El problema de las razas en América Latina," sent to the First Latin American Communist Congress held in Buenos Aires in June 1929. The same essay was published in *Amauta* with the title "Esquema del problema indígena" in the July-August 1929 issue.⁵⁰ In "El problema de las razas" (p. 69), Mariátegui effectively reduced both the problem of the Indian and that of the land to "the liquidation of feudalism" in Peru. He denied that the Indian was racially inferior to any other group, and argued that he was perfectly capable of assimilating modern technology (p. 71). He cautioned *indigenistas* not to be carried away by a "fe mesiánica" into an unproductive reverse racism (p. 73), a clear reference to such intemperate Indianists as Bolivia's "Tristán Marof" (Gustavo A. Navarro). The roots of the "Indian problem," claimed Mariátegui, were economic ones:

Las posibilidades de que el indio se eleve material e intelectualmente dependen del cambio de las condiciones económico-sociales. No están

determinadas por la raza sino por la economía y la política. (Mariátegui, "El problema de las razas," p. 73)

Mariátegui then proceeded to describe the economic realities under which Peru's Indian population lived. Ninety percent of Peru's Indians worked in agriculture, he claimed, and of these, ninety percent were serfs rather than proletarians (p. 75). Even the technically advanced coastal plantations conserved strong feudal traits in the treatment of their predominantly Indian work force (p. 77). In the highlands wage-labor was scarcely known outside the mines, and there the Indian *campesino* also suffered the abuses of *conscripción vial*. Racism, Mariátegui asserted, was indeed one component of the "Indian problem," but that problem's solution depended not on a change in attitudes toward race but on a transformation of the economic structure of the *sierra*.

Mariátegui proceeded to make specific, programmatic recommendations: in the highlands, individually owned latifundia should be expropriated and transferred to the *comunidades*, while on the coast small holdings should be encouraged and the property of absentee landlords given to the *yanaconas* (sharecroppers) who worked it. At the same time, agricultural workers on the industrialized plantations were to fight for the freedom to organize unions, for the suppression of the *enganche* system of hiring,⁵¹ the eight-hour day, and the enforcement of Peru's existing labor laws (p. 79). Propaganda and education work was to be carried out among highland Indians, preferably by native militants who had been converted to Socialism in Peru's mining centers or towns before returning to their villages. Only native militants could break down the skepticism of Indians who trusted only those who spoke their own language, asserted Mariátegui (p. 80). In addition, the *comunidades* should organize themselves on a regional basis to defend themselves and their property, and militants should set up small libraries and study centers where the members of the *comunidad* could be instructed in Socialist doctrine (p. 80).

Despite Hugo Pesce's energetic presentation of Mariátegui's position paper in Buenos Aires, the delegates to the First Latin American Communist Congress paid little attention to "El problema de las razas en América Latina." The Congress was more alarmed by Mariátegui's unauthorized formation of a "multi-class" party in Peru (the Peruvian Socialist Party, like the rival APRA, did not exclude members of the petit bourgeoisie) at a time when the policy of the Communist International specifically ruled out political collaboration with the middle class.⁵² As the Congress drew to its close, its delegates voted a resolution

condemning the heterodox stance of the PSP.⁵³

Other articles published in *Amauta* shed light on Mariátegui's Marxist variety of *indigenismo*. The desire to bring about a proletarian revolution in a country where a true proletariat barely existed frequently led Mariátegui (and his associates) to blur the class lines that separated *campesinos* from factory workers. And the desire to usher in Socialism in a largely Indian and peasant country led, as it did in the case of Víctor Raúl Haya de la Torre, to a peculiarly Leninist-flavored Indianism.⁵⁴ By 1927, Mariátegui had managed to cast his own *indigenismo* in specifically Marxist terms. Rebutting Luis Alberto Sánchez's claim that *indigenismo* (a national phenomenon) and Socialism (an international political doctrine) were incompatible, Mariátegui declared in *Amauta's* No. 78 (March 1927):

El socialismo ordena y define las reivindicaciones de las masas, de la clase trabajadora. Y en el Perú las masas,—la clase trabajadora—son en sus cuatro quintas partes indígenas. Nuestro socialismo no sería, pues, peruano,—ni sería siquiera socialismo—si no se solidarizase, primeramente, con las reivindicaciones indígenas.⁵⁵

In an article titled "Réplica a Luis Alberto Sánchez" (one of the exchanges in what has come to be known as the "polémica del indigenismo" between Mariátegui and Sánchez), reproduced in the same No. 7 of *Amauta*, Mariátegui emphasized that he was not interested in the re-creation of the Incan Empire or in the formation of an ideal Indian republic: "No es mi ideal el Perú colonial ni el Perú incaico sino un Perú integral."⁵⁶ His concern with the Indian, he stated, stemmed from the native Peruvian's role as one of Peru's primary producers, rather than as a member of a unique racial group. Despite the differences which separated them, *campesino* and proletarian could collaborate in building a new order in Peru because both were producers exploited by the existing political and economic system:

La reivindicación que sostenemos es la del trabajo. Es la de las clases trabajadoras, sin distinción de costa ni de sierra, de indio ni de cholo. Si en el debate, —esto es en la teoría— diferenciamos el problema del indio, es porque en la práctica, en el hecho también se diferencia. El obrero urbano es un proletario: el indio campesino es todavía un siervo. (Mariátegui, "Réplica," pp. 38-39)

Disputing an assertion by Sánchez, Mariátegui declared that just as no contradiction existed between Socialism and *indigenismo*, neither were Socialism and nationalism opposed to each other in semicolonial countries such as Peru:

El nacionalismo de las naciones europeas—donde nacionalismo y conservantismo se identifican y consustancian—se propone fines imperialistas. Es reaccionario y anti-socialista. Pero el nacionalismo de los pueblos coloniales—sí, coloniales económicamente, aunque se vanaglorien de su autonomía política—tiene un origen y un impulso totalmente diversos. En estos pueblos, el nacionalismo es revolucionario y, por ende, confluye con el socialismo. En estos pueblos la idea de la nación no ha cumplido aún su trayectoria ni ha agotado su misión histórica. (Mariátegui, "Réplica," p. 38)

It followed, stated Mariátegui, that in a colonial or semi-colonial society, it was permissible for the revolutionary proletariat to form alliances with peasant groups (the policy of the Third International before 1928), and even with progressive sectors of the middle class against the ruling oligarchy and their foreign partners. Showing his ideological debt to Haya de la Torre, Mariátegui cited the example of the nationalist Kuo Min Tang as one to be emulated by the working classes in other semicolonial countries. Mariátegui's praise of the Kuo Min Tang (to which the APRA was regularly compared by both its supporters and its detractors) shortly proved to have been a *faux pas*. However, despite the Communist-Kuo Min Tang rupture in 1927 and the International's subsequent condemnation of multi-class parties, worker-peasant collaboration was one of the guidelines of the Peruvian Socialist Party, formed by Mariátegui and others in 1928.⁵⁷

Given the pre-1928 policy of the International, it would indeed have been surprising had Mariátegui not "discovered" the need to win the Indian to the Socialist cause. Lenin's own blueprint for European revolution had placed great emphasis on the role of the peasantry, to the extent that worker-peasant collaboration was written into the "21 Conditions" adopted by the Second World Congress of the Communist International (1920) for membership in the Communist world organization. Condition 5 reads in full:

A regular and systematic agitation must be carried on in the country districts. The working class cannot achieve victory unless it is supported by the country proletariat and at least a part of the poorest peasantry, and unless it has assured itself by its policy of the neutrality of a proportion of the remaining inhabitants of the villages. At the present time Communist activity in the country districts is of the utmost importance. It must be pursued through the co-operation of revolutionary Communist workmen who have friends and relations among the peasantry. An abandonment of this activity or the entrusting of it to unreliable and not truly revolutionary workers would be tantamount to an abandonment of the proletarian revolution.⁵⁸

Under Mariátegui's leadership, the Peruvian Socialist Party had no difficulty in subscribing to the "21 Conditions," although it appears not to have formally affiliated with the International as a member party. On the surface, the agrarian policies of the International seemed highly applicable to Peru's feudal highland society, so that to members of the PSP, Marxism-Leninism promised a political solution to the "Indian problem."⁵⁹

Mariátegui's Marxist *indigenismo* set the tone for the majority of political pronouncements on the Indian question by both Socialist and *aprista* contributors. As Diego Meseguer Illán points out, Mariátegui's opinions on the Indian/land questions were shared by Haya de la Torre in his writings of 1927 and 1928.⁶⁰ Like Mariátegui, Haya de la Torre was aware that Peru's economy was a colonial one, and that no industrial proletariat of any significance yet existed. However, from these facts Haya drew the conclusion that Peru's revolution could not be a Socialist one. In *El anti-imperialismo y el Apra* (written in 1928 but published only in 1936) Haya wrote:

Los países de Indoamérica no son países industriales. La economía de estos pueblos es básicamente agraria o agrícola minera. . . . El proletariado está en minoría, en completa minoría, constituyendo una clase naciente. Son masas campesinas las que predominan dando una fisonomía feudal o semi-feudal a nuestras colectividades nacionales. Un partido de clase proletaria únicamente es un partido sin posibilidades de buen éxito político en estos pueblos.⁶¹

Haya's judgment proved correct for the short and medium runs, since for decades Peru's voters (mainly coastal and mestizo, due to Peru's literacy requirement for voting) showed a decided preference for the APRA's multi-class nationalism over the proletarian Socialism of the PSP and the Communist Party. As a visible token of Peruvian nationalism, *indigenismo* also played an important role in the propaganda of the APRA during its first decades of existence.⁶²

Amauta's aprista collaborators uniformly agreed with Mariátegui's assertion that the "Indian problem" was an economic one, that it could be resolved only by the "liquidation of feudalism," and that the peasant masses had to be enlisted in the struggle against Peru's capitalist regime. Carlos Manuel Cox, Trujillo-born party leader, wrote:

El problema indígena es el problema del 75% de los habitantes de nuestra América, de la América India tergiversada por el criollo y por el blanco latifundistas, herederos directos de los encomenderos españoles y de su sistema de feudalismo interior y de coloniaje económico externo.⁶³

Manuel Seoane echoed Cox, stating in a letter to Cuzco's "Grupo Resurgimiento," "Circunstancias peruanísimas reducen, casi exclusivamente, el problema indígena a un problema campesino, problema de tierras, que se resuelve modificando el régimen de la propiedad agrícola."⁶⁴ In short, prior to 1928, the year of the personal and political break between Mariátegui and Haya de la Torre, Socialist and *aprista* pronouncements on the Indian question are indistinguishable.

Mariátegui's writings on the "problema indígena" represent the first serious Peruvian attempt to examine the question within the framework of "scientific" Socialism. However, neither Mariátegui's "scientific" pretensions nor the immensely favorable reception of his *Siete ensayos* ought to obscure a fundamental romanticism in his view of the Indian. As Robert Paris has pointed out, it is easy, from a reading of Mariátegui's writings on the Incan Empire, to retain only "the idyllic idealization of the past, the effort to gloss over the embarrassing despotic aspects of the system in order to exalt its pure 'communism'."⁶⁵ Further, to a very great degree Mariátegui, a *limeño* who was only once able to visit the *sierra* personally, was forced to rely on second- and third-hand accounts and on personal visits by informants such as Emilio Romero and Luis E. Valcárcel in his investigation of highland Peru.⁶⁶ Indeed, given the tentative and literary nature of much of the material published in the 1920s on the *Incanato* and on the contemporary Indian, it is less surprising that Mariátegui's writings show traces of romantic idealization than that they often show a degree of penetration unexcelled even by professional Indologists.

Amauta, Revista Indigenista: II

Amauta's fifth number (January 1927) saw the first appearance of a section labeled "El proceso del gamonalismo," and subtitled "Boletín de defensa indígena." Strongly reminiscent in its intentions of the earlier publication *El Deber Pro-Indígena*, the new section's appearance was accompanied by an editorial note by Mariátegui:

Nuestro boletín se propone únicamente la acusación documentada de los desmanes contra los indios, con el doble propósito de iluminar la conciencia pública sobre la tragedia indígena y de aportar una nueva serie de testimonios al juicio, al proceso del gamonalismo.⁶⁷

Mariátegui went on to explain that *Amauta* was disposed to print, free of charge, any denunciations of *gamonal* abuses which Indians wished to contribute. The complaints were to be signed

and, if possible, notarized, and Mariátegui made it clear that *Amauta* in no way took responsibility in actions in the public courts. The magazine's readers were also notified that Dora Mayer and other surviving members of the Asociación Pro-Indígena were collaborating in "El proceso del gamonalismo."

The content of the section, which appeared in numbers 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, and 15 (1927 and 1928) with independent pagination, was heterogeneous, although its principal function was the exposure of crimes committed against Indians or against the *comunidades*. "El proceso del gamonalismo" publicized the formation of Cuzco's "Grupo Resurgimiento" and reproduced its statutes (No. 5), reprinted two of Mariátegui's *Mundial* articles from his "polémica del indigenismo" against Luis Alberto Sánchez (No. 7), and carried informative articles on the Indians of other Latin American countries, such as neighboring Bolivia. The quality of contributions was generally low, and the new section was obviously not considered a success by Mariátegui and business manager Ricardo Martínez de la Torre, since after issue No. 17, "El proceso del gamonalismo" was included in the more readable "Panorama Móvil" of the magazine.

The heart of "El proceso del gamonalismo" consisted of the letters of victimized Indians who directed themselves either to *Amauta* or to government officials in search of redress. The bulletin's No. 2 (in *Amauta*'s issue No. 6), for example, carried a long letter from the jailed survivors of the Huancané (Puno) Indian massacre of 1923. This letter was addressed both to *Amauta* ("el grupo vanguardista del Perú") and to President Leguía, and denounced the army action carried out on the pretext that the Indians of Huancané were in revolt against the central government. No. 6 (*Amauta*'s issue No. 15) contained a typical document, a letter directed to the Minister of Development and signed by three members of the *comunidad* "De todos los santos" in Jauja province. The signers of the letter described the incessant litigation caused the *comunidad* by one member who in 1910 had been bamboozled into signing over the lands of the entire community to an unscrupulous *gamonal*. The signers requested the Ministry of Development to designate a commission of engineers to survey the *comunidad* and to take its census, thus officially recognizing "De todos los santos" and placing it out of the reach of land-grabbers. Such letters formed the core of the contributions to "El proceso del gamonalismo."

The bulk of *Amauta*'s readers were concentrated in Lima; its readership in the *sierra* was lower, and in the Indian *comunidades*, non-existent. The contemporary impact of "El proceso del

gamonalismo," consequently, must be considered to have been minimal. Luis Enrique Tord is among those who have pointed out the lack of success enjoyed by this section of *Amauta*, noting the low quality of most of the contributions and surmising that it was difficult for Mariátegui to gather sufficient materials to maintain the section.⁶⁸ "El proceso del gamonalismo," in reality, served as a catch-all for articles related to the Indian Problem, including Mariátegui's already-discussed "Esquema del problema indígena."

Amauta's *indigenismo* was expressed artistically as well as polemically. The magazine featured a copious amount of poetry and short stories by the leaders of Peru's nativist literary movement: César "Atahualpa" Rodríguez, Mario Chávez, Alejandro Peralta, José Varallanos and Oscar Cerruto contributed their mixed *indigenista*-vanguardist poems. *Amauta* also published numerous short stories and other pieces of prose fiction on Indian themes, contributing to the growing reputation of "Gamaliel Churata" (Arturo Peralta, like his brother Alejandro, from Puno), and the older Enrique López Albújar, author of *Cuentos andinos*. Such stories included J. Eugenio Garro's "La hija de Cunca" (No. 5), Churata's "El gamonal" (No. 5) and "Tojrras: parábola de la alegría" (No. 18), Serafín del Mar's (Reynaldo Bolaños) "El perro negro" (No. 11), and López Albújar's "El fin de un redentor" (No. 10). Ernesto Reyna's novelized history of Peru's last large-scale Indian uprising, "El Amauta Atusparia: historia de la sublevación indígena de Huarás en 1885," was serialized in Nos. 26-28, while considerable portions of Luis E. Valcárcel's novelized essay, *Tempestad en los Andes*, were featured in Nos. 1, 2, 8, and 9. In addition, *Amauta's* bibliographical section "Libros y Revistas" carried numerous reviews of collections of *indigenista* poetry, including Peralta's *Ande*, Chávez's *Coca*, Mercado's *Un chullo de poemas*, and Varallanos's *El hombre del Ande que asesinó su esperanza*. *Amauta's* reviewers, with Mariátegui himself among the most prominent, critiqued numerous theoretical works on Indian topics, including Abelardo Solís's *Ante el problema agrario peruano* and Mexican philosopher educator José Vasconcelos's *Indología* and *La raza cósmica*.⁶⁹

Like many other "vanguardist" magazines of the 1920s, *Amauta* devoted considerable attention to the graphic arts, particularly to the work of contemporary Latin American painters. Each issue of *Amauta* dedicated from four to eight pages to the reproduction (on satin-finished paper) of paintings, sculptures, ceramics, and frescoes, together with commentary on the works or on the

featured artists. The graphics selected for reproduction in *Amauta* show a marked *indigenista* style bias. The works most often featured were by members of the "Peruvian School" of painting and sculpture represented by José Sabogal (featured in seven issues), Julia Codesido (in three), Carmen Saco (in four), and Camilo Blas (in five). Mexican revolutionary and *indigenista* artists such as Diego Rivera and Carlos Mérida also made frequent contributions to the magazine's art sections. While *Amauta* occasionally featured the works of such European "vanguardist" artists as Piero Marussig and Georg Grosz, its primary emphasis clearly fell on Peruvian *indigenista* painting.

José Sabogal, one of Mariátegui's intimates, not only suggested the title "Amauta" for Mariátegui's magazine, but also designed most of its covers.⁷⁰ Mariátegui, for his part, while not a trained critic of the visual arts, was lavish in his praise of Sabogal's "Indianist" work:

José Sabogal señala ya con su obra un capítulo de la historia del arte peruano. Es uno de nuestros valores-signos. Sólida, honda, vital, su obra no reclama los elogios que se prodigan, entre nosotros, tan barata y fácilmente. . . . Sabogal es, ante todo, el primer "pintor peruano". Antes de él, habíamos tenido algunos pintores, pero no habíamos tenido, en verdad, ningún "pintor peruano". . . . Después de él, se ha propagado la moda del indigensimo en la pintura; pero quien tenga mirada penetrante no podrá confundir jamás la profunda y austera versión que de lo indio nos dá Sabogal con la que nos dán tantos superficiales explotadores de esta veta plástica, en la cual se ceba ahora hasta la pintura turística.⁷¹

Mariátegui's comments are revealing. They show, first of all, that his admiration for Sabogal's work was based primarily on the painter's thematics rather than on his technique; secondly, they show Mariátegui's preference for representational art (in the same encomium he praised Sabogal for having rejected Europe's "anarchic," "individualist," and "dehumanizing" trends); thirdly, they make reference to the *kitsch*-like excesses to which artistic *indigensimo* was carried in Peru during the 1920s. Whatever the limitations of Mariátegui's evaluation of Sabogal, one of *Amauta's* accomplishments was clearly that of cementing Sabogal's position as Peru's leading painter.

Conclusion

In its *indigenismo*, as in other areas of its concern, *Amauta* was by no means free of contradictions. Perhaps most striking is the contrast between the magazine's stated editorial position that the position of the Indian *campesino* could not be bettered by

education alone, and its frequent publication of major articles devoted to Indian education. Such articles as César Acurio's and María Judith Arias's "La escuela hogar: proyecto de un nuevo tipo de escuela indígena" (Nos. 23 and 24), Miguelina Acosta Cárdenas's "Escuelas rurales ambulantes para la educación de los niños indígenas" (No. 12), and dean of *indigenismo* José Antonio Encinas's "Algunas consideraciones sobre la educación del indio en el Perú" (No. 32, under Martínez de la Torre's editorship) all attest to the strength of an "educationist" trend which coexisted with Mariátegui and others' advocacy of a revolutionary solution to Peru's Indian/land problem.

Further, Mariátegui's marked editorial tolerance for divergent viewpoints led to the publication of radically differing opinions on fundamental facets of the "Indian problem." In its eclecticism, *Amauta* printed not only Valcárcel's declarations that "la sierra es la nacionalidad," but also the articles of Abelardo Solís, who asserted that the only productive course open to the Indian was to adopt Western culture and technology outright and to discard his own inadequate language and customs. Stated Solís in an article entitled "La cuestión del quechua:"

Y si se anhela que el Perú se modernice, si se ha de *peruanizar el Perú*, tal proceso implica la occidentalización, la europeización del Perú, de su actual estado social.⁷²

Despite his denial that he assigned determining importance to racial factors, Solís seems at times to represent a throwback to the pre-*indigenista* days of Alejandro O. Deustua, Peru's positivist exponent of the superiority of the white race. A radically different point of view was put forward by J. Uriel García, Cuzco lawyer/journalist who first presented in *Amauta*, in embryonic form, his theory of the "nuevo indio."⁷³

García's "cholista" interpretation of Peruvian man was to replace Valcárcel's assertion of Indian superiority as Peruvian nativism's dominant myth of the 1930s, the same decade which saw (according to Monguió) the eclipse of "pure" literary *indigenismo* and the emergence of the predominantly mestizo APRA as Peru's leading popular political force. For García, the true Peruvian was the "nuevo indio," the modern heir of both Incaic and Spanish culture, a being shaped physically and spiritually by centuries-long contact with Peru's mystically nurturing Andean landscape. The contemporary Peruvian, no matter what his biological race, qualified as a "nuevo indio" if he felt his Andean heritage, since the "historic nature" of the Andes, according to García,

... nutre la conciencia nacional de la raza sin que ésto se comprenda en el sentido darwiniano o de Taine, del predominio del medio, sino sólo en el del influjo del paisaje sobre la actividad creadora de la conciencia, como un motivo y no como un fin. (García, "El nuevo indio," p. 20)

The Andes, Peru's dominant physical and psychological feature, formed the basis for what García viewed as the essential continuity of Peruvian culture, and constituted an unbroken chain that connected the *Incario* to twentieth-century Peru, despite the trauma of the Conquest. According to García, because of his consciousness of the unique Andean world he inhabited, the "nuevo indio," whatever his actual race, superseded the unassimilated Indian as the genuine representative of the Peruvian nation. Armed with a full consciousness of his heritage and guiding his conduct by the rationality imported by the Spanish conqueror, the "nuevo indio" faced a world rich in opportunities (García, "El nuevo indio," p. 25).

García's formulation of Peru's ethno-social "reality" appealed primarily to politically conscious mestizoš, who saw themselves, and not the *Civilista* or *leguiŕsta* oligarchs as the legitimate heirs of Peruvian cultural tradition. Americanist and mestizo cultural theories were also propounded by Antenor Orrego, *aprista* ideologue from Trujillo, in *Amauta* articles that demonstrated the influence of Vasconcelos's *La raza c3smica* and *Indologŕa*.⁷⁴ Clearly, as one can glean from an examination of the articles on national topics published in the last two years of *Amauta*, the question of Peruvian nationhood and culture was not to be reduced to the simple glorification of the Incaic past.

Amauta ceased publication in September 1920, several months after Mariátegui's death. Although primarily a Socialist magazine (explicitly so after September 1928), *Amauta* published contributions from many of the leading artists and ideologues of the Peruvian *indigenismo* and served as a major Indianist forum. The political importance assigned to the "Indian problem" by José Carlos Mariátegui, *Amauta*'s editor, can be seen in the strategic position assigned to the chapters on the Indian and on land tenure in his *Siete ensayos*. At the same time, such features of *Amauta* as "El proceso del gamonalismo" show the very real concern of Mariátegui and his associates with the abuses to which the highland Indian continued to be subjected in the modernizing "Patria Nueva." Despite the frequent idealization of the Incaic past by *Amauta*'s major contributors, these writers added a vitally important new dimension to the "Indian problem" by emphasizing economic rather than racial or educational considerations, and by linking the struggle for Indian liberation

with the struggle of the world's oppressed working classes against the capitalist system. *Amauta* also popularized the works of *indigenista* writers and graphic artists throughout the four years of its publication, although the years 1926-1928 mark the magazine's most emphatic "Indianist" phase. Finally, given the extreme heterogeneity of contributions to *Amauta*, it is hardly surprising that strikingly discrepant opinions coexisted in the same issue, or that "romantic" *indigenismo* persisted until the end.

Amauta, due largely to the intellectual leadership of Mariátegui, demonstrated that Socialism and *indigenismo* were in no way mutually exclusive doctrines, and channeled the debate on the "problema nacional" into a more objective course which owed much to Marx and much to a first-hand examination of Peruvian social and economic realities. Emilio Romero, Antenor Orrego, José Antonio Encinas, and other social scientists and educators attempted to examine the contemporary Indian as he actually lived, worked and produced, rather than in the racialist terms which had characterized the writings of positivists such as Alejandro O. Deustua. The majority of *Amauta's* contributors envisioned no idealized Indian republic as their goal, but recognized that both Indian and *costeño* had to be incorporated into a truly national modern state, in Mariátegui's words, a "Perú integral."

Notes

1. François Bourricaud, in "The Adventures of Ariel," *Daedalus* (Summer 1972), points out the importance of the *indigenista* movement as a rallying point for discontented middle-sector intellectuals throughout Latin America during the 1920s (see especially pp. 110-12). He also, however, asserts that *indigenista* ideology had severe shortcomings, notably its inability to build upon a developed indigenous intellectual tradition. In addition, indigenous culture (generally alive only on the village level) "did not provide a convincing model of political and social organization for countries asserting their participation in the race for modernization" (p. 112).
2. Alberto Flores-Galindo, "Los intelectuales y el problema nacional," in Emilio Romero and others, *Siete ensayos: 50 años en la historia* (Lima: Empresa Editora Amauta, 1979), pp. 139-56. Flores-Galindo points out that while in 1918 only 167 newspapers and magazines were published in Peru, by 1929 the number had risen to 473, of which two thirds had been established since 1919 (p. 143).
3. *Amauta, Revista Mensual de Doctrina, Literatura, Arte, Polémica*, 6 vols. (Lima: Empresa Editora Amauta, 1976). Facsimile edition, contains an introduction by Alberto Tauro and a cumulative index by Violeta de Guerra-García, as well as facsimiles of numbers 1 and 2 of the magazine *Libros y Revistas* (Lima, 1926), *Amauta's* direct bibliographical antecedent. (Unfortunately, much of *Amauta's* original advertising is omitted, and there are occasional discrepancies in pagination.)
4. Luis Enrique Tord, *El indio en los ensayistas peruanos, 1848-1948* (Lima: Editoriales Unidas, 1978), and Marfil Francke Ballve, "El movimiento indigenista en el Cuzco (1910-1930)," in Carlos Iván Degregori and others, *Indigenismo, clases sociales y problema nacional* (Lima: Ediciones CELATS, 1978), pp. 107-86. Francke Ballve's insightful study, presented initially as a bachelor's thesis at the Universidad Católica del Perú, provides an excellent example of the use that can be made of "little" magazines published by special-interest groups.
5. For a narrow view of *Amauta* as an instrument of Marxist-Leninist *praxis*, see Jorge Falcón, *Amauta: Polémica y acción de Mariátegui* (Lima: Empresa Editora Amauta, 1979). Other studies of Mariátegui's magazine include Beverly Bernadine Banning, "Amauta (1926-1930)," Ph.D. Diss. Tulane Univ. 1972; Danielle Maurice, "Dépouillement et Étude de 'Amauta,'" 2 vols. (primarily an index), Thèse pour le Doctorat du Troisième Cycle, Univ. de Paris 1975; and David Oakley Wise, "Amauta (1926-1930): A Critical Examination," Ph.D. Diss. Univ. of Illinois 1978. The antecedent of all the above-mentioned studies is Alberto Tauro's annotated index of the magazine, published in book form as *Amauta y su influencia* (Lima: Empresa Editora Amauta, 1960), Vol. XIX of the "Ediciones Populares" of Mariátegui's *OC*.
6. Jesús Chavarría, *José Carlos Mariátegui and the Rise of Modern Peru, 1890-1930* (Albuquerque: Univ. of New Mexico Press, 1979), p. 91. Chavarría's book, a long-overdue revision of his excellent 1967 doctoral thesis, "José Carlos Mariátegui, Revolutionary Nationalist: The Origins and Crisis of Modern Peruvian Nationalism, 1870-1930" (UCLA), constitutes by far the best English-language introduction to Mariátegui and his work.
7. For a discussion of Peru's neo-Positivist precursors of *indigenismo*, see Chavarría, "The Intellectuals and the Crisis of Modern Peruvian Nationalism," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, 50 (1970), 257-78, and Thomas M. Davies, Jr., *Indian Integration in Peru: A Half-Century of Experience, 1900-1948* (Lincoln, Neb.: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1974), pp. 36-37.

8. Manuel González Prada, "Nuestros indios," in his *Horas de lucha*, 2nd ed. (Callao: Tipografía "Lux," 1924), pp. 334-38. The impact of this essay (originally written in 1904) on José Carlos Mariátegui can be gauged by the fact that it was included in its entirety in issue No. 16 of *Amauta* (July 1928), which was dedicated to González Prada.

9. Although González Prada did not regard formal education (specifically, literacy) as either a sufficient or a necessary condition for the liberation of the Indian, he did not deny, at least in principle, the value of education. Formal instruction, nevertheless, was of value only in so far as one's will and strength made it possible to act in one's best interest. He asserted:

La instrucción puede mantener al hombre en la bajeza y la servidumbre: instruidos fueron los eunucos y gramáticos de Bizancio. Ocupar en la Tierra el puesto que le corresponde en vez de aceptar el que le designan: pedir y tomar su bocado; reclamar su techo y su pedazo de terruño, es el derecho de todo sér racional. (*Horas de lucha*, p. 336)

Over twenty years later, in his essay "Proceso de la educación pública," José Carlos Mariátegui would echo González Prada's words on the education of the Indian, affirming:

El problema del analfabetismo del indio resulta ser, en fin, un problema mucho mayor, que desborda del restringido marco de un plan meramente pedagógico. Cada día se comprueba más que alfabetizar no es educar. La escuela elemental no redime moral y socialmente al indio. El primer paso real hacia su redención, tiene que ser el de abolir su servidumbre.

Mariátegui, *Siete ensayos*, 26th ed., Vol II of the *OC* (Lima: Empresa Editora Amauta, 1973), p. 160.

10. Dan Chapin Hazen, "The Awakening of Puno: Government Policy and the Indian Problem in Southern Peru 1900-1955," Ph.D. Diss. Yale Univ. 1974, discusses the continuing stress placed on educational reform as a means of solving the "Indian problem" by twentieth-century Peruvian governments. Hazen details Peruvian education innovations during the first half of the century (see especially pp. 233-401), strongly suggesting that governments' emphasis on education reflected their inability to bring about structural economic change in the highlands.

11. On Zulen, Mayer, and the "Pro-Indígena," see Haze, pp. 90-95, and Davies, pp. 54-56.

12. Dora Mayer published numerous articles in *Amauta*, beginning with "Lo que ha significado la Pro-Indígena" in the magazine's first issue (September 1926), pp. 20-22, in which she provided a *resumé* of the "Pro-Indígena's" history and criticized the ineffectiveness of the governmental *Patronato de la raza indígena*.

Note: all mentions and citations of articles published in *Amauta* utilize the pagination of the facsimile edition. For the sake of convenience, citations from *Amauta* will specify number and month, but not the inconsistently used volume number.

13. François Chevalier, "Official *indigenismo* in Peru in 1920: Origins, Significance, and Socioeconomic Scope," in *Race and Class in Latin America*, ed. Magnus Mörner (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1970), pp. 187-88. François Bourricaud (cited by Hazen, p. 84) once noted that *indigenismo* often developed as a reaction among mestizo intellectuals frozen out of the provincial landholding elite. Bourricaud, "Algunas características. . . ." *Revista del Museo Nacional* (Lima), 23 (1954), 169-70.

14. On Cuzco university reform, see Francke Ballve, pp. 121-27.

15. Manuel Vicente Villarán, "Condición legal de las comunidades indígenas," *Revista Universitaria* (San Marcos), segundo semestre, 1907, pp. 1-9. On the importance of this article, see Davies, pp. 50-51, and Jorge Basadre, *Historia de la República del Perú*, 6th ed., XI (Lima: Editorial Universitaria, 1970), pp. 306-07.

16. *Nuestra comunidad indígena* is cited frequently in Mariátegui's essay, "El problema de la tierra," the third of the *Siete ensayos*. Mariátegui relies heavily on Castro Pozo (to whom he gives full credit) both for arguments and for statistical documentation. Basadre, *Historia de la República del Perú*, XVI, 28, notes the methodological limitations of Castro Pozo's work.

17. See, for example, comments on the Incas and on the contemporary Peruvian Indian by Víctor Raúl Haya de la Torre, in "Nuestro frente intelectual," *Amauta*, No. 4 (December 1926), pp. 3-1, 7-8, and in "Sentido de la lucha anti-imperialista," *Amauta*, No. 8 (April 1927), pp. 39-40; also by Manuel Seoane, "Carta al Grupo 'Resurgimiento,'" *Amauta*, No. 9 (May 1927), pp. 37-39.

18. Luis Monguió, *La Poesía postmodernista peruana* (México, D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1954), pp. 89-92. Sánchez citation p. 92. Twenty-five years after its publication, Monguió's book remains one of the best accounts of twentieth-century Peruvian poetry.

19. See Monguió's Chapter IV, "El Nativismo literario en la poesía peruana," pp. 87-131, on literary *indigenismo* and its variants in Peru.

20. Sabogal himself wrote: "Expuse mis telas pintadas en Cuzco, el 15 de julio de 1919, aprovechando un remanso de la borrasca política de esa hora. Cayó esta muestra como si fueran motivos de exótico país: el medio limeño aún permanecía entre los restos de sus murallas virreinales, con más conocimiento de mar afuera que de mar adentro." José Sabogal, "Autobiografía de José Sabogal," in the painter's *Del arte en el Perú y otros ensayos* (Lima: Instituto Nacional de Cultura, 1975). For a highly critical view of Sabogal's style, see Juan E. Ríos, *La pintura contemporánea en el Perú* (Lima: Editorial Cultura Antártica, 1946), pp. 35-42.

21. The degree of the "escuela indigenista's" dominance can be gauged by Grace L. McCann Morley's 1942 book, *An Introduction to Contemporary Peruvian Painting* (San Francisco: San Francisco Museum of Art). Morley's introduction to Peruvian painting omits any painters not associated with Sabogal's "Indianist School" at Lima's Escuela de Bellas Artes. For an extensive discussion of painterly *indigenismo* and its sociohistorical context, see Mirko Lauer, *Introducción a la pintura peruana del siglo XX* (Lima: Mosca Azul Editores, 1976), pp. 73-120.

22. See Baltazar Ceravedo Molinari, *Clases, lucha política y gobierno en el Perú, 1919-1933* (Lima: Retama Editorial, 1977), pp. 59-68, for a brief discussion of Leguía's initial political support. A more extensive study of Leguía and his program of national modernization is provided by Gary Richard Garrett, "The Oncenio of Augusto B. Leguía: Middle Sector Government and Leadership in Peru, 1919-1930," Ph.D. Diss. Univ. of New Mexico 1973.

23. *Gamonal*, derived from the name of a parasitic plant, is the Peruvian term used to refer to the small highland hacendado. Martha Hildebrandt, in her *Peruanismos* (Lima: Francisco Moncloa Editores, 1969), pp. 191-93, points out that *gamonal* as a synonym for *cacique* is generalized throughout numerous regions of Spanish America.

24. *La Prensa* (Lima), February 19, 1930, cited in Hazen, p. 196. For a full discussion of the Indian legislation of the *oncenio*, see Davies, pp. 68-95. Davies suggests that Leguía's break with the policies of preceding administrations was in fact less

radical than it seemed, since the President took care not to overly antagonize large hacendados in the process of mollifying his pro-Indian supporters.

25. Víctor Andrés Belaúnde, *La realidad nacional* (Paris: Editorial Le Livre Libre, 1931), p. 282.

26. Fredrick B. Pike, *The United States and the Andean Republics: Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1977), p. 183.

27. Cited in Davies, p. 70.

28. Twentieth-century revolts in the Department of Puno (including the "Rumi Maqui" uprising) are discussed by Hazen, pp. 128-51, 170-78. Also of value is Wilfredo Kapsoli, *Los movimientos campesinos en el Perú, 1879-1965* (Lima: Delva Editores, 1977).

29. For example, a decree of May 1930 established June 24 as "Día del Indio," while Leguía was often pictured greeting Indian delegations in the government palace, and official propaganda transcribed his *indigenista* declarations in both Spanish and Quechua (see Hazen, pp. 195-96). Davies (p. 91) quotes from a 1928 presidential address, in which Leguía declared: "The Indians are all the past and all the future. They made the great past and now . . . are building, as if they were craftsmen of bronze in the volcanic bowels of the Andes, the glorious future of Peru."

30. On the "Sociedad Tahuantinsuyo" see Hazen, pp. 151-59.

31. José María Arguedas, *Yawar fiesta* (Santiago de Chile: Editorial Universaria, 1968), Chapter II, "El despojo," pp. 25-31. The historical value of Arguedas's novel is emphasized by Chevalier in his article, "L'Expansion de la grande propriété dans le Haut-Pérou au XXe Siècle," *Annales; Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations*, 21 (1966), 815-31.

32. Recent studies have made it clear that the hacendado "offensive" against Indian lands dates from the later nineteenth century and resulted directly from the high prices Peruvian wool commanded abroad. See especially Alberto Flores-Galindo's *Arequipa y el sur andino: ensayo de historia regional (siglos XVIII-XX)* (Lima: Editorial Horizonte, 1977), Chapters II and III, as well as Hazen, pp. 18-23.

33. Highway construction was one of the major goals of the Leguía government and, indeed, one of its major successes: the total length of roads in use in Peru jumped from 10,643 kilometers to 19,465 kilometers between 1926 and 1930 alone. For a thumbnail sketch of *conscripción vial*, see Stephen Jay Stein, "Populism and Mass Politics in Peru: The Political Behavior of the Lima Working Classes in the 1931 Presidential Election," Ph.D. Diss. Stanford Univ. 1974, p. 151-53, or Hazen, pp. 205-08. A very negative view of the effects of Leguía's forced-labor program is provided by Wilfredo Kapsoli, "El campesino peruano y la ley vial," *Campesino* (Lima), 1, No. 2 (May-August 1969), 1-17. Kapsoli documents the abuses to which Indian laborers were subjected and concludes that the groups which received the greatest benefits from the *conscripción vial* program were: a) foreign road-construction firms, who obtained virtually free labor; b) owners of large haciendas who managed to have roads constructed to their estates, thus better linking them to markets; and c) local political authorities.

34. The most synthetic account of Peruvian rural-urban migration in the 1920s is provided by Stein's "Populism and Mass Politics." Stein points out (pp. 159-60) that the largest number of migrants came from regions with a) the best road systems, and b) the most intense concentration of latifundia; approximately 60 percent of all migration to Lima between 1920 and 1931 originated in the Central

and Southern *sierra*. During the 1920s some 65,000 *provincianos* flooded to the capital; the 1931 (Department of Lima) census showed that 19 percent of the capital's population had moved there within the preceding eleven years (p. 165), and that the vast majority of these migrants occupied "working class" jobs.

35. Mariátegui, "Presentación de 'Amauta,'" *Amauta*, No. 1 (September 1926), p. 1. Hereafter cited as "Presentación," without page number.

36. Mariátegui, "La nueva cruzada Pro-Indígena," *Amauta*, No. 5 (January 1927), p. 37.

37. J. Guillermo Guevara, "Oportunismo indigenista," *La Sierra* (Lima), I, No. 4 (April 1927), 4-5. On *La Sierra's* "right-wing" Indianism, see Francke Ballve, pp. 145-51.

38. Mariátegui, in his essay "Esquema del problema indígena," stressed the necessity of using Indian militants who had already been converted to Socialism to propagandize and organize the Indians of the *sierra*. He wrote: "El indio alfabeto, al que la ciudad corrompe, se convierte regularmente en el auxiliar de los explotadores de su raza. Pero en la ciudad, en el ambiente obrero revolucionario, el indio empieza ya a asimilar la idea revolucionaria, a apropiarse de ella, a entender su valor como instrumento de emancipación de esta raza, oprimida por la misma clase que explota en la fábrica al obrero, en el que descubre un hermano de clase." *Amauta*, No. 25 (July-August 1929), p. 74.

39. Mariátegui, "Prólogo" to *Tempestad en los Andes*, by Luis E. Valcárcel (Lima: Editorial Minerva, 1927), p. 12.

40. Carlos Manuel Cox, "Revolución y peruanidad (discurso pronunciado en la Universidad de Arequipa)," *Amauta*, No. 8 (April 1928), p. 25.

41. Valcárcel authored thirteen separate *Amauta* entries, several of them feature articles. He was also the subject of a highly flattering interview by Carlos Manuel Cox, transcribed as "Con Luis E. Valcárcel," *Amauta*, No. 6 (February 1927), "Libros y Revistas" section, pp. 1-2.

42. Luis E. Valcárcel, "Un libro de Mariátegui," *Amauta*, No. 23 (May 1929), pp. 83-86. In this generally superficial review, Valcárcel characterized the *Siete ensayos* as "... el primer esfuerzo serio y sistemático para 'comprender' la realidad peruana" (pp. 83-84).

43. In Carlos Manuel Cox's "Con Luis E. Valcárcel," p. 1.

44. Valcárcel, *De la vida incaica* (Lima: Editorial Garcilaso, 1925), p. 90-91, 93, cited in Diego Meseguer Illán *José Carlos Mariátegui y su pensamiento revolucionario* (Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, 1974), p. 170.

45. Valcárcel, *Tempestad en los Andes*, pp. 127, 129. This portion of *Tempestad* stemmed from a lecture delivered at the University of Arequipa, January 22, 1927, and reproduced in *Amauta* as "El problema indígena," No. 7 (March 1927), pp. 2-4.

46. Also in *Amauta*, No. 1 (September 1926), p. 3.

47. Also in *Amauta*, No. 1 (September 1926), p. 4.

48. "Estatutos del Grupo 'Resurgimiento,'" *Amauta*, No. 5 (January 1927), p. 2 of the separately numbered section "El proceso del gamonalismo." The "Grupo 'Resurgimiento'" managed in its statutes to appear at once overly idealistic and patronizing, announcing that it was inspired in "principios de ABNEGACION,

VERACIDAD, HONRADEZ I SOLIDARIDAD" [sic]." and placing great emphasis on the cultural betterment of the Indian. On the history of the organization, see Francke Ballve, p. 141-45.

49. For a discussion of how Mariátegui's articles for the magazines *Varietades* and *Mundial* (articles written over the space of four years) were assembled into the *Siete ensayos*, see Jorge Falcón's polemical *Anatomía de los Siete ensayos de Mariátegui* (Lima: Empresa Editora Amauta, 1978). A number of the same articles were reproduced in *Amauta* before the appearance of *Siete ensayos* in November 1928. Among them is the key essay, "El problema de la tierra en el Perú," *Amauta*, Nos. 10 and 11 (December 1927 and January 1928), pp. 9-15 and pp. 5-8, 13-15.

50. Mariátegui, "Esquema del problema indígena," *Amauta*, No. 25 (July-August 1929), pp. 69-80.

51. Peter F. Klarén offers an excellent description of the *enganche* (literally, "hooking") system of hiring in his *Modernization, Dislocation, and Aprismo: Origins of the Peruvian Aprista Party, 1870-1932* (Austin, Tex.: Univ. of Texas Press, 1973), pp. 26-30. Typically, the *enganchador* advanced the Indian laborer sufficient money to make it virtually impossible for him to pay off his debt in the time period stipulated by his contract. *Enganche* thus led directly to debt peonage.

52. The Sixth World Congress of the Communist International, meeting in Moscow in 1928, declared that a "third period" had begun in the international revolutionary movement. The first phase, from 1917 to 1923, had been one of direct armed struggle against the capitalist regimes, while in the years 1923-1928 official policy had been that of a united front of Communists, Social Democrats, and anarchists against fascism. In the "Third Period," which lasted from 1928-1934, any form of collaboration with the Social Democrats was ruled out, and national Communist Parties were instructed to step up their revolutionary activities. For a discussion of "Third Period" Communism in Latin America, see the introduction of Luis E. Aguilar's *Marxism in Latin America*, revised ed. (Philadelphia: Temple Univ. Press, 1978), pp. 20-27.

53. For an account of the proceedings of the First Latin American Communist Conference of 1929, see Ricardo Martínez de la Torre, "La Conferencia Comunista de Buenos Aires," in his *Apuntes para una interpretación marxista de historia social del Perú*, II (Lima: Editorial Peruana, 1947), 409-85. A more synthetic account is provided by Chavarría, José Carlos Mariátegui, pp. 157-62.

54. For a schematic delineation of the revolutionary positions adopted by Mariátegui and Haya de la Torre, see César Germaná, *La Polémica Haya de la Torre-Mariátegui: reforma o revolución en el Perú*. Cuadernos de Sociedad y Política, 2 (Lima: Delva Editores, 1977). Also published in *Análisis: Cuadernos de Investigación* (Lima), 1, Nos. 2-3 (1977), 143-81.

55. Mariátegui, "Indigenismo y socialismo: intermezzo polémico," *Amauta*, No. 7 (March 1927), p. 37. Originally published in *Mundial*, February 25, 1927. The lengthy written debate between Sánchez and Mariátegui on *indigenismo* (carried on in *Mundial* between February 18 and March 25, 1927) has been made available, together with supporting documentation, by Manuel Aquézo Castro (compiler) as *La polémica del indigenismo* (Lima: Mosca Azul Editores, 1976).

56. Mariátegui, "Réplica a Luis Alberto Sánchez," *Amauta*, No. 7 (March 1927), p. 38. Originally published in *Mundial*, March 11, 1927. Hereafter cited as "Réplica."

57. For the text of the program of the Peruvian Socialist Party, drawn up by Mariátegui in late 1928, see Martínez de la Torre, *Apuntes*, II, 398-402, or

Mariátegui, *Ideología y política* (Lima: Empresa Editora Amauta, 1969), Vol. XII of the *OC*, pp. 159-64.

58. Cited in Arthur Rosenberg, *A History of Bolshevism From Marx to The First Five Years' Plan*, trans. Ian F. D. Morrow (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1967), pp. 163-64.

59. For a discussion of Mariátegui's evaluation of the revolutionary potential of the Peruvian *campesino*, see Harry E. Vanden, "The Peasants as a Revolutionary Class: An Early Latin American View," *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs*, 20 (1978), 191-209. Vanden credits Mariátegui with having developed a revolutionary theory similar to that originated in the same years by Mao Tse-Tung. For a useful diachronic survey of evaluations of Mariátegui's Marxism, see Vanden's "Mariátegui: Marxismo, Comunismo, and Other Bibliographic Notes," *Latin American Research Review*, 14, No. 3 (1979), pp. 61-86.

60. Meseguer Illán, pp. 193-94.

61. Víctor Raúl Haya de la Torre, *El anti-imperialismo y el Apra*, 2nd ed. (Santiago de Chile: Editorial Ercilla, 1936), p. 54. Also cited by Meseguer Illán, p. 196.

62. For a critical view of *aprista* Indianism and of the party's failure to carry through on its promises of reform, see Thomas M. Davies, Jr., "The *indigenismo* of the Peruvian Aprista Party: A Reinterpretation," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, 51 (November 1971), 626-45.

63. Carlos Manuel Cox, "El indio y la escuela en México," *Amauta*, No. 15 (May-June 1928), p. 15.

64. Manuel A. Seoane, "Carta al Grupo 'Resurgimiento,'" *Amauta*, No. 9 (May 1927), p. 38.

65. Robert Paris, "José Carlos Mariátegui et le modèle du 'comunisme' inca," *Annales: Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations* (Paris), 21 (1966), 1065-72. The citation is from p. 1066.

66. The late Guillermo Rouillón, in *La creación heroica de José Carlos Mariátegui*, Vol I (Lima: Editorial Arica, 1975), p. 227, mentions a three-week trip made by Mariátegui to Huancayo in 1918. This was Mariátegui's only direct contact with the *sierra*. Physically immobilized by the amputation of a leg in 1924, he received in his house in Lima's Washington Street a stream of visitors whose task was to inform him of social and economic conditions in the highlands. Written testimonies by informants include Emilio Romero, "El siglo de Mariátegui," in Emilio Romero and others, *Siete ensayos: 50 años en la historia* (Lima: Empresa Editora Amauta, 1979), pp. 14-15, and Luis E. Varcácel, *El problema del indio*, by Valcárcel and others (Lima: Empresa Editora Amauta, 1976), p. 13.

67. (Mariátegui), "El Proceso del Gamonalismo," *Amauta*, No. 5 (January 1927), p. 1 of the separately numbered section bearing the same title.

68. Luis Enrique Tord, *El indio en los ensayistas peruanos, 1848-1948* (Lima: Editoriales Unidas, 1978), p. 157. In a related article, "Amauta y el indigenismo," *La Prensa* (Lima), September 25, 1976, p. 11, Tord comments on "el escaso o ningún conocimiento sólido y real que había sobre el indio y lo indio entre los mismos que habían levantado banderas por su reivindicación."

69. Mariátegui's critical stance in regard to literary *indigenismo* continues to attract scholarly attention (largely focused on his essay "El proceso de la

literatura"). The most recent (and extensive) discussion is that of Thomás G. Escjadillo, "Para leer a Mariátegui: 2 tesis de los '7 ensayos,'" in Romero and others, *Siete ensayos: 50 años en la historia*, pp. 57-138. Of special interest is Escjadillo's discussion of Mariátegui and Enrique López Albújar (pp. 83-87).

70. According to María Wiese (Sabogal's wife) in her biography, *José Carlos Mariátegui: etapas de su vida* (Lima: Ediciones Hora del Hombre, 1945).

71. Mariátegui, "José Sabogal," *Amauta*, No. 6 (February 1927), pp. 9-10.

72. Abelardo Solís, "La cuestión del quechua," *Amauta*, No. 29 (February-March 1930), p. 32. However, Solís's *Ante el problema agrario peruano* (1928) was given a favorable review by Mariátegui in *Amauta*, No. 20 (January 1929), pp. 100-02.

73. Francke Ballve, p. 173-83, provides a sympathetic overview of José Uriel García's career and writings. The first book edition of García's *El nuevo indio* appeared in 1930, a revised edition in 1937. The *Amauta* article in question is "El nuevo indio," No. 8 (April 1925), pp. 19-20, 25.

74. See especially Orrego's "El gran destino de América," *Amauta*, No. 12 (February 1928), pp. 13-14, and his "¿Cuál es la cultura que creará América?" in *Amauta*, No 14 (April 1928), pp. 3-4; No 17 (September 1928), pp. 14-16; and No. 18 (October 1928), pp. 8-9.



Thomas Carlyle on Dr. Francia: The Functional Role of the Carlylean Hero

Frederick Stirton Weaver

Hampshire College

This essay explores Carlyle's representation of social and cultural change by focussing on his essay "Dr. Francia" (1843). The essay on Francia, who was the Perpetual Dictator of Paraguay from 1814 until his death in 1840, was Carlyle's first study of a modern "hero" and was written at the time Carlyle was struggling to formulate a coherent social theory consistent with his effort to combine the roles of literary critic and social critic.¹ The change in Carlyle's approach to historical study has been described and documented, but neither its analytical significance nor its ideological purpose has been adequately delineated.² By looking closely at the "Dr. Francia" essay, which illustrates the new directions of Carlyle's thinking with exceptional clarity, and placing the article in the context of his earlier work, I argue that we can come to terms with Carlyle's historical method in a new and fruitful way.

My first section discusses the evolution of Carlyle's conception of social and cultural change, emphasizing the increasing importance of the individual leader to the coherence of his commentary. In the second section I deal with the "Dr. Francia" essay, and in the third I consider some more general aspects of Carlyle's method and its historical meaning.

I

In such early essays as "Signs of the Times" (1928) and "Count Cagliostro" (1833), Carlyle's holistic conception of social and cultural change is apparent: he viewed social and cultural change in a general, evolving historical process. In "Count Cagliostro," although the periodization is dubious (i.e., feudalism's decline in the eighteenth century), he explicitly identified the ultimate cause of social tensions and moral decay to Europe's being in a period of transition — the demise of feudalism and the emergence of a new, industrial order.³

"Signs of the Times" is an even more important statement of this kind, for in this essay interdependencies of different dimensions of social life are central to his understanding of sweeping changes in contemporary England. He decries most of these changes, but he has no doubt as to their source: throughout the essay Carlyle considered industrialism, or more specifically, mechanization of production as the underlying cause. It promoted far reaching changes in practically every aspect of social life and elevated "the great art of adapting means to ends" to the point of intellectual dominance.⁴ "The shuttle drops from the fingers of the weaver, and falls into iron fingers that ply it faster." (p. 59) This sentence (and the paragraph from which it is drawn) indicates Carlyle's sympathy with the ruined artisans, but Carlyle immediately proceeds to stress how important it was that the iron fingers did indeed ply the shuttle faster. Carlyle's acknowledgment, even celebration, of the material benefits from raising the productivity of human labor through mechanization distinguishes him from the main stream of Victorian criticism, including that of his disciple Ruskin. The lauding of economic progress was not a causal, incidental statement; it was a consistent theme in Carlyle's thought at this time and its recognition is crucial for understanding the development of his historical method.

Nevertheless, it is the negative aspects, the social, cultural, and spiritual costs of mechanization, which dominated the remainder of "Signs of the Times." Industrialism had rent the fabric of society, "strangely altering old relations, and increasing the distance between the rich and poor," and introduced new tensions and conflicts. Individual initiative, creativity, and accomplishment were being subordinated to formal institutions which were organized in a mechanical fashion and produced art, music, literature, philosophy, and even governance in a manner not unlike that of a cotton textile factory.⁶

Taken together, "Cagliostro" and "Signs of the Times" clearly indicate some important features of Carlyle's thinking. First of all there are his preferences: the economic progress of industrialism and the social, cultural, and spiritual qualities he saw in Europe's pre-industrial past. Second, he perceived and clearly stated that the rise of industrialism, with its social and ideational consequences, was the reason for the disintegration of those aspects of social and cultural life he valued. His linking of the material and moral spheres of social life is more intuitive than analytical, but the means by which he became convinced that the two were inextricably connected made the conviction neither less real nor

less damaging to his role as a critic and prophet. How could he be taken seriously if he were to champion goals which his own writings recognized as being mutually incompatible?

Carlyle's response to this quandry was to retreat from attempts to identify the sources of what he considered to be the spiritual and cultural malaise of contemporary England and to focus more narrowly on what earlier had been seen as the consequences of social and economic change. Understanding the nature of social change in its full complexity was no longer central to Carlyle's work, and although this retreat deprived his social commentary of the historical force of "Signs of the Times," it freed him to applaud economic progress and simultaneously to advocate the re-establishment of pre-industrial institutions and values.

While Carlyle had managed in his thinking to sever the relationship between the rise of industrialism and the ascendance of undesirable social and cultural forms, the need remained for some force capable of mediating material and moral spheres of life in Carlyle's work. This was the function of the Carlylian hero. The hero's charismatic nature and stance was crucial to the flow of his narrative and to give it an historical dynamic; it was the hero, by the strength of his personal authority and will, who could further economic activity while recreating the organic, harmonious, and ethical society that Carlyle saw in Europe's past. This social and spiritual leader, then, linked together, and even embodied, the different facets of social life that Carlyle as a writer and social critic was no longer willing to relate through broader social analysis. Thus the Carlylian hero became "the man in the middle who orders the muddle of his society."

II

The elevation of the hero was not as sudden as perhaps I have implied; Carlyle's earlier writings contained many references to heroes and to the value of individual initiative and the force of individual personality. On the other hand, the hero for Carlyle became more than a convenient means to avoid a logical contradiction; the importance of heroes in his later writings transcended this functional quality and became an end in themselves. But I am arguing that Carlyle's first fully developed heroes did indeed play this particular role and that understanding this role is vital for comprehending Carlyle's method of historical interpretation.

In 1843, Carlyle presented two heroes to the English public. One was Abbot Samson, the 12th century monk of *Past and Present* (1843). Harsh but paternalistic, conservative socially but rational

and progressive in economic manners, Abbot Samson brought order and prosperity to his abbey in northern England. It appears to be precisely these characteristics which interested Carlyle in the fragmentary reports available in England about The Perpetual Dictator of Paraguay and stimulated him to write "Doctor Francia" and to publish it in the same year as *Past and Present*.

For the detail of Francia's reign, Carlyle relied most heavily on a short book by two Swiss naturalists, Messrs. Johann R. Rengger and Lonchamps on and a two volume work by Scottish merchants, the Robertson brothers,⁸ but throughout the essay, Carlyle was scathingly critical of the historical materials available to him. Clearly the major irritant was not the paucity of factual material; indeed, it is striking how closely Carlyle's narrative corresponds to modern accounts of Francia's life.⁹ The main problem, as Carlyle saw it, was the democratic bias with the resulting outrage, "a running shriek of constitutional denunciation" that dominated the sources. Certainly, there were some sympathetic treatments of Francia and his policies which had appeared in English language journals at the time Carlyle was working on "Dr. Francia," but they were generally short and uninspired, and Carlyle repeatedly implored some talented writer, possibly a Paraguayan, to write a "real life of Francia."¹⁰

Carlyle deeply admired Francia's ability to isolate Paraguay from the turbulence and disruption experienced by other Spanish American nations in the immediate post-independence period. Unlike the other nations, which Carlyle likened to kennels of rabid dogs, Paraguay had not "brought in the reign of liberty and driven out the reign of law and regularity" but rather, through Francia, had avoided the "agonies of republican reform" and experienced a "reign of rigour"¹¹ But this was not a static rigor; according to Carlyle, stability was but the necessary first step in a far reaching but not clearly defined program of moral reform. Depicting the life of the Paraguayan people as rude, drowsy, sluttish, and full of nomadic idleness and Jesuit superstition, Carlyle celebrated Francia's suppression of corruption in government and criticism of his government, promotion of a work ethic, and erection of a Workman's Gallows as a guarantor of quality work. Furthermore, Carlyle reproduced long anecdotes from his sources to establish Francia's personal integrity and sense of justice, and he quotes Rengger's description of Francia's daily schedule to emphasize his extremely austere personal habits even after assuming absolute power. (pp. 288-293, 306, 314-317).

But Francia was more than a moral reformer; he was acquainted with and valued rational, scientific methods and applied them to

material problems. Carlyle praises the dictator's achievements in proving that Paraguay's agriculture could produce two rather than the traditional one crop a year, drastically simplifying worship, and relaying the city of Asunción along geometric lines with Francia personally wielding the theodolite. On the last point, Carlyle spends almost a full page of his essay arguing with the interpretation of the brothers Robertson, who maintained that it was the fear of assassination, not an abstract sense of efficiency and regularity, that had led Francia to restructure Asunción's confused jumble of streets, paths, buildings and hedges into straight lines. (pp. 310-311).

So here we have the ideal Carlylean hero: social conservative, rational and progressive in economic affairs, and morally above reproach in his personal life. Or do we? Carlyle's candor in openly disagreeing with his sources about the matter of redesigning Asunción is not consistent with his use of his sources in other matters. In his praise of Francia's rationalism, Carlyle states that Francia "introduced schools, boarding schools, and others on which Rengger has a chapter; everywhere he promoted education as he could, repressed superstition as he could." (pp. 305-306). This is a cavalier disregard of fact; Rengger's two and a half page chapter clearly states that Francia's only act in regard to education was to close a forty year old college of theology.¹² Education was an important part of Carlyle's view of the hero as an authoritarian teacher of his people, and the falsity of his claim about Francia's promotion of education certainly weakens Francia's position as a true Carlylean hero.

Even more damaging, however, were Francia's motivations. Throughout the essay, Carlyle criticizes his sources for not more fully developing the inner Francia — his thoughts, beliefs, aspirations, etc. — yet he does not include in his essay one of the most revealing passages available in his sources. J. P. Robertson quotes Francia as saying:

Now, without entering upon the discussion, as to whether this continent is ripe for popular institutions (you know, I think, it is not), it cannot be denied that, in an old and civilized country like Britain, where these institutions have gradually and practically (not theoretically) superseded forms of government originally feudal, till they have forced themselves upon legislative notice, in a ratio proportional to the growing education of the majority, they are those best adapted to secure the greatness and stability of a nation.¹³

Suppressing this material was vital for Carlyle's presentation of Francia as a hero. First, the Carlylian hero was not supposed to be

aware of his role, as we can see from Carlyle's sardonic criticism in the "Dr. Francia" essay of San Martin's hanging his own portrait between those of Napoleon and the Duke of Wellington (263-264, 267) and from "The Diamond Necklace" (1837): "Your true hero, your true Roland, is ever unconscious that he is a hero; this is the condition of all greatness."¹⁴ More serious than the problem of consciousness is that which Francia was consciously trying to do. From the above quotation and from other discussions in the primary sources,¹⁵ the clear implication emerges that Francia not only admired England's groping toward republican institutions but that he considered himself preparing Paraguay for them in his own particular style, a style that involved measures necessary for Paraguay but not for England. This is directly contrary to the lessons which Carlyle, speaking through Sauerteig, derives from the essay for England. (p. 304).

In "Dr. Francia" then, we see Carlyle constructing a hero to demonstrate to his English audience the modern possibility of economic advance without overturning what Carlyle considered to be the virtues residing in traditional institutions and values. In the course of such construction, however, Carlyle manipulated means to achieve a didactic end and thereby practiced the "unveracity" against which he continually flailed. Carlyle's selection of Francia as a hero and the way he was fabricated for the English audience reveal with startling clarity the structural role of the hero in Carlyle's thinking and the ideological purpose of his method.

III

Apart from Francia's personal qualities, there were very definite limits on what Francia could do in Paraguay, limits that Carlyle does not recognize. For example, Francia's pursuit of social and political stability, so lavishly praised by Carlyle, was self-defeating within a time horizon that extended beyond the dictator's lifetime. The intensely personal nature of Francia's rule in Paraguay necessitated destroying any important intermediate political institutions that might have diluted the dictator's direct exercise of power, suppressing secondary social institutions (including the propertied class), and neutralizing, by exile and prison if necessary, outstanding individuals who might challenge him. As a result, when Francia died, Paraguayan society had neither the institutional structure to give it continuity and stability independent of the dictator's personal charisma and authority, nor a sufficient number of able, knowledgeable, and experienced individuals who could fill the vacuum. Potential effective

successors and the strata most likely to generate them had, for the safety of the dictator during his lifetime, been suppressed. In Carlyle's view this suppression would not have affected the rise of a true hero who could draw on divine inspiration for support, but the broader social view of politics would seem to have been borne out by subsequent events. Paraguay's political history in the century after Francia was marked by frequent and turbulent personal power struggles that devastated the country and eventually led it into two major wars which were disasters, ruining it economically, smashing whatever institutional structure it had, and killing almost half of the male population. The legacy of Francia's policies was chaos and disaster, and this was already readily apparent in 1841-1842 when Carlyle was writing the "Dr. Francia" essay.

Furthermore, returning to my earlier theme, Francia apparently did encourage economic growth but he could do so only within very narrow limits. Like Abbot Samson, Francia was in absolute control of a small, simple agrarian society, and advancing beyond the levels of productivity possible in a self-sufficient agricultural economy would have entailed substantial transformations and the emergence of a considerably more complex and differentiated society requiring mechanisms of economic co-ordination and political control more compatible with class rather than individual preeminence. This is precisely the kind of analysis which Carlyle suggested in "Signs of the Times," and he dealt with the issue of industrialization and class formation in "Chartism" (1839) and *Latter-Day Pamphlets* (1850) by nominating the new "Captains of Industry" as the most likely source of leaders with the needed qualities and perceptions to reinstitute traditional social forms. This indicates how far Carlyle had come from "Signs of the Times;" in these essays Carlyle represents the very agents of industrialism, those individuals most closely associated with Machinery, as the heroes who could free not only themselves but all society from the influence of the new economic order. Marx and Engels, probably with Carlyle's 1829 essay still in mind, were incredulous that he could hate bourgeois society while lionizing the bourgeoisie.¹⁶ But this was to miss how far Carlyle was from the earlier essay's logic and implications; Carlyle was not looking to the class itself for leadership, but to individuals from that class though not representative of it. The hero was to be as independent of his own past as the malleable society which he was to remake was from its history. The ideological intention of this effort is especially clear in "Dr. Francia" where we see Carlyle engaged in fiction-making on two levels. He endowed an historical figure with fictional qualities in

order to construct a hero, and he placed the fictional hero in a fictionally malleable social milieu.

With the advantage of over 100 years of hindsight, it is remarkable, even superbly ironical, that Carlyle's prescriptive vision of a conservative society of material abundance, a synthesis of industrialism with pre-industrial validity that transcends, even negates, the literary fictions he developed to give the vision reality. Beginning in the second half of the nineteenth century, the experience of Germany and Japan demonstrated that the process of industrialization did not have to seriously disrupt pre-existing social, political, and cultural forms.¹⁷ The changed nature of industrial technology, allowing centralized control of the new source of economic power, is probably one of the principal reasons later industrializations could succeed without the accompanying decentralization of social control, liberalization of political authority, and general "individualization" of values.¹⁸ Even in England, by the turn of the twentieth century social critics were describing English government and society in terms that would have encouraged Carlyle.¹⁹

Perhaps this is where we see the consequences of Carlyle's romanticism and witness the triumph of his unreason: to understand why Carlyle was in some ways a truer prophet than, say, Marx, one must use a framework of social analysis more like that used by Marx than the fictions upon which Carlyle eventually based his prophecy.

Notes

1. Philip Rosenberg, *The Seventh Hero: Thomas Carlyle and the Theory of Radical Activism* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974) is an excellent study of Carlyle's pioneering effort to resolve the conflicting demands of the dual roles. Ernst Cassirer, *Myth of the State* (New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press, 1946), pp. 189-223, and Mark Roberts, "Carlyle and the Rhetoric of Unreason," *Essays in Criticism*, Vol. 18 (October 1968), pp. 397-419 are more typical studies of Carlyle's social thought in that they dismiss it as rhetoric, unreason, fiction, etc. without sufficiently considering why it took on its particular character.

2. Raymond Williams, *Culture and Society, 1780-1950* (New York: Harper & Row, 1958), p. 77-93 has a well documented treatment of the shift in Carlyle's treatment of social phenomena.

3. All citations to Carlyle's writings are to the Centenary Edition of *The Works of Thomas Carlyle in Thirty Volumes*, ed. H. D. Thraill (London: 1899), hereafter cited as *Works*. The quotation from "Cagliostro" is in *Works*, XXVII, p. 270.

4. *Works*, XXVII, p. 59. On p. 74, Carlyle laments that "'Cause and effect' is almost the only category under which we look at, and work with, all Nature. . . ."

5. Herbert Sussman, *Victorians and the Machine: The Literary Response to Technology* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968), particularly pages 13-40, stresses how Carlyle's acceptance of industrialism as a method of commodity production was distinguished from the pastoral ideal which haunted so much of contemporary social criticism.

6. On Pages 60 and 62-63 of "Signs of the Times" Carlyle summarizes his view of these changes:

Not the external and physical alone is now managed by machinery, but the internal and spiritual also.

These things . . . are . . . of deep import, and indicate a mighty change in our whole manner of existence. For the same habit regulates not our modes of action alone, but our modes of thought and feeling. Men are grown mechanical in head and in heart, as well as in hand. They have lost faith in individual endeavour, and in natural force, of any kind. Not for internal perfection, but for external combinations and arrangements, for institutions, constitutions, —for Mechanism of one sort or other, do they hope and struggle. Their whole efforts, attachments, opinions, turn on mechanism, and are of a mechanical character.

7. Philip Rosenberg, *The Seventh Son, passim*, and Charles Frederick Harrold, "Introduction" to the 1937 edition of Thomas Carlyle, *Sartor Resartus* (Indianapolis and New York: Odyssey Press, 1937), pp. xiv-xv show the seriousness of Carlyle's ambitions as critic and prophet.

8. Johann R. Rengger and Lonchamps, *The Reign of Dr. Joseph Gaspard de Francia* (London: Thomas Hurst, Edward Chance, and Co., 1827); J. T. and W. P. Robertson, *Letters on Paraguay*, two volumes, John Murray, 1838).

9. For some representative treatments of Francia's life, see L. W. Bealer, "Francia, Supreme Dictator of Paraguay," in *South American Dictators*, ed. by A. C. Wilgus (New York: Russell and Russell, 1963), pp. 58-77; George Pendle, *Paraguay: A Riverside Nation* (London and New York: Oxford University Press for RIAA, third edition, 1966); Philip Raine, *Paraguay* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Scarecrow

Press, 1956), pp. 60-113; and H. G. Warren, *Paraguay, an Informal History* (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1949), pp. 142-177.

10. Examples of these are: an unsigned article "Dr. Francia, the Dictator of Paraguay," originally appearing in *The Monthly Magazine* and available in *Museum of Foreign Literature, Science and Art*, Vol. 20, pp. 387-393; the anonymous review of the books by Rengger and Lonchamps and by the Robertson brothers in *Quarterly Review*, Vol. 63, no. 126 (1839), pp. 342-369; and the unsigned article "Dr. Francia, Dictator of Paraguay," originally appearing in *London Quarterly Review* available in *The Hesperian—A Monthly Miscellany* (November 1839), pp. 484-489. For contemporary critical assessments of Francia, see A. H. Everett's review of Rengger and Lonchamps in *The North American Review*, Vol. 26 (1828), pp. 444-478; and the Honorable Mrs. Erskine Norton, "Francia, Dictator of Paraguay," in *New Monthly Magazine*, vol. 43, p. 331-346, continued in Vol. 44, pp. 183-189.

Carlyle might have approved of Edward Lucas White's adulatory *El Supremo: A Romance of the Great Dictator of Paraguay* (New York: Dutton, 1916).

11. *Works*, XXVII, p. 327.

12. *The Reign of Dr. Joseph Gaspard Roderick de Francia*, p. 185-188.

13. *Letters on Paraguay*, II, p. 203.

14. *Works*, XXVII, p. 327.

15. E.G., *Letters on Paraguay*, I, p. 335; *The Reign of Dr. Joseph Gaspard Roderick de Francia*, p. 41.

16. For the response to Carlyle by Marx and Engels, see their review of Numbers 1 and 2 of *Latter-Day Pamphlets*, reprinted in Marx and Engels, *Literature and Art* (New York: International Publishers, 1947), pp. 117-132.

17. For good treatments of German and Japanese industrial growth stressing its non-revolutionary character, see Kenneth D. Barkin, *The Controversy Over German Industrialization, 1890-1902* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1970), Alexander Gerschenkron, *Bread and Democracy in Germany* (Berkeley, Calif.: University Press, 1943), David Landes, "Japan and Europe: Contrasts in Industrialization," in *State and Economic Enterprise in Japan*, ed. W. W. Lockwood (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1966), pp. 93-182, James C. Abbegeen, *The Japanese Factory: Aspects of Its Social Organization* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1958), and Thomas C. Smith, "Japan's Aristocratic Revolution," *Yale Review*, vol. 5 (1960-1961), pp. 370-383. Clifton Geertz, *Peddlers and Princes* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963) is an excellent study by a cultural anthropologist who concludes that "a modern economic system may be compatible with a wider range of non-economic cultural patterns and social structures than has often been thought." (p. 144)

18. I have made this argument in my "Relative Backwardness and Cumulative Change: A Comparative Approach to European Industrialization," *Studies in Comparative International Development*, vol. 9 (Summer 1974), 70-97. Also see the title essay from Alexander Gerschenkron, *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1962), pp. 5-30.

19. The Marxist and Fabian schools of socialist writers produced several good examples for this point, but probably the liberal's almost poignant sense of loss is the most telling: see John Hobson, *Imperialism: A Study* (London: George Allen

and Union, Ltd., 1902). Interestingly, Lenin's *Imperialism: The Highest Stages of Capitalism* (New York: International Publishers Co., Inc., 1939, first published 1917) also conveys a sense of nostalgia for mid-nineteenth century English liberalism.

Teoría de la Dependencia y Crítica Literaria

Hernán Vidal

University of Minnesota

Dada la actual crisis económica, social y política latinoamericana existe la urgencia de encarar los estudios literarios del área con una mayor conciencia de lo que implica la literatura como fenómeno histórico. Esto requiere cuestionar la capacidad de las metodologías intratextuales para abrir perspectivas que orgánicamente unen las relaciones estructurales internas con la contextualidad social. De ningún modo se trata de negar los aportes de esas metodologías al establecimiento de la crítica literaria como disciplina científica. Más bien apunto a que captar la historicidad de un texto literario forzosamente lleva a considerar el análisis formalista como un instrumento más en el arsenal crítico, no como el único; y que, además, debe ser integrado a un conjunto más amplio de cuestiones, ahora de orientación socio-histórica. Me parece que la respuesta de una crítica literaria a la presión ineludible de la historia latinoamericana implica la necesidad de aprender a plantear nuevas preguntas a los textos literarios y, por tanto, la de readecuar los instrumentos críticos de que disponemos junto con la economía de su productividad. Por ejemplo, creo que en la actualidad ya no es válido escribir una tesis doctoral de trescientas páginas para describir los aspectos formales de una sola obra.

Cuestionar la literatura como fenómeno histórico abre dos áreas de inquisición: una de tipo gnoseológico y otra que obliga a una comprensión global de la cultura como producción social.

Aunque el practicante no tenga claridad al respecto, una aproximación intratextual lleva a posturas idealistas o agnósticas sobre la realidad y el conocimiento posible de ella. Terminar el análisis interpretativo sin ir más allá de las estructuras lingüísticas del texto estudiado es una decisión consciente de limitar las preguntas y las respuestas que se puedan dirigir y adquirir sobre el objeto literario. Equivale, además, a una contemplación de una forma espiritual aislada de sus orígenes en la materialidad social.

Si es que se afirma, por otra parte, que las obras literarias son visiones de mundo nacidas de sensibilidades privadas o en una conciencia o inconciencia colectivas, los nexos concretos con la sociedad se hacen oscuros y vaporosos. Por el contrario, me parece más acertada y próxima a un cuestionamiento socio-histórico una crítica que parte de un estudio de los rasgos formales de una obra proponiéndolos como reflejo imaginario de acciones humanas concretamente situadas en el espacio, en el tiempo, de motivaciones personales y transpersonales, del uso y creación instrumental de utensilios, valores, ideas, conceptos e instituciones por hombres que luchan para transformar y habilitar el espacio y la sociedad en que viven. Ese reflejo imaginario es una reelaboración de la realidad social pre-existente, de acuerdo con los recursos técnicos históricamente acumulados y las exigencias de los diferentes géneros. Esto significa una reformulación gnoseológica materialista de la literatura que exige conjuntamente el soporte de un modelo general del modo en que los hombres entran en esas relaciones sociales. Es aquí donde se podría considerar la contribución de la teoría de la dependencia a la crítica literaria latinoamericana.

La teoría de la dependencia propone tal modelo general de la historia latinoamericana.¹ Surgió de los estudios del Consejo Económico para la América Latina de las Naciones Unidas (CEPAL) sobre el desarrollo económico.² La frustración de las grandes expectativas sobre la modernización capitalista durante la década de 1960 llevó a científicos sociales como Fernando Henrique Cardoso, Osvaldo Sunkel, Enzo Faletto, André Gunder Frank, Theotonio dos Santos, Aníbal Quijano, entre otros, a enfrentar el problema de la influencia económica, social, política e ideológica de las grandes potencias capitalistas como condicionadora de la historia latinoamericana. La adopción de un punto de vista crítico los condujo al uso y adaptación de los conceptos marxista-leninistas de formación social y de imperialismo.

De acuerdo con el primero, las sociedades latinoamericanas fueron estudiadas como totalidades orgánicas, dialécticamente interpenetradas en sus diversos niveles estructurales, de clases, relaciones sociales, instituciones políticas, y sistemas ideológicos sostenidos sobre la base de un modo de producción material específico. Arrancando de la descripción leninista de la estructura del imperialismo definieron las formaciones sociales latinoamericanas como dependientes. Con esto se indica que la dinámica de cambio de sus estructuras económicas, sociales, políticas e ideológicas no está impulsada por la satisfacción de las

necesidades materiales y espirituales internas de su población, sino por las necesidades y requerimientos impuestos por las potencias foráneas que las han integrado a su esfera de influencia económica, política y militar. Por tanto, la historia latinoamericana aparece como la crónica de la forma en que estas regiones y sociedades fueron integradas a los objetivos del capital mercantilista hispano-portugués; a los del sistema capitalista internacional consolidado durante el siglo XIX bajo la hegemonía británica; y, actualmente, a los de los conglomerados multinacionales acuartelados especialmente en Estados Unidos.

Esa integración implica el establecimiento de mecanismos económicos y políticos de transferencia de gran parte de la riqueza producida colectivamente en Latinoamérica a las naciones metropolitanas. A nivel social la teoría de la dependencia propone que el movimiento de la historia continental es el de las luchas de diferentes clases sociales bien sea para cimentar alianzas que permitan insertarse en esos sistemas económico-políticos internacionales, o para modificar o rechazar esa integración. A nivel de desarrollo de los medios productivos se propone que la habilitación espacial del continente—ubicación, construcción y disposición de ciudades, puertos, redes comunicativo-distributivas, zonas agrícolas, mineras e industriales—está regida por la manera en que la producción nacional infiltrada por consorcios extranjeros participa en el servicio de los mercados internos o externos controlados por el capital foráneo. A nivel ideológico se cuestiona el modo en que la transferencia de discursos científicos, tecnológicos, legales, políticos, religiosos y artísticos desde la metrópolis facilita o impide una producción, distribución y consumo cultural favorable a los intereses de las poblaciones nacionales. La dependencia es un escenario en cuyos límites los latinoamericanos usan de su libertad para decidir la forma en que construirán sus culturas nacionales según sus perspectivas e intereses de clase frente a la gravitación imperial. La literatura—definida en los términos anteriormente expuestos—inescapablemente refleja las estructuras de la dependencia, con las mediaciones correspondientes a cada región, país, grupo, género y tradición literaria. Consciente o inconscientemente, el uso de temas, motivos, imágenes y metáforas queda inscrito en las luchas por iniciar, continuar, estabilizar o liberarse de la dependencia, como en Cuba, para iniciar una historia auténtica, en que los frutos del trabajo colectivo de estas sociedades permanezca en ellas para hacer más humanos a sus hombres.

Dentro de este marco—y con el sustento y complemento del análisis intratextual—se abren diversas posibilidades de

investigación literaria. Menciono algunas sólo a modo de ejemplificación. Se podría determinar una tipología del modo en que los escritores latinoamericanos se definen ante el prestigio de la "universalidad" representada por el país o los países metropolitanos (por ejemplo, Güiraldes y Cortázar hablan de su estancia en París casi como experiencias místicas totalizadoras de la cultura argentina y latinoamericana). Se podría captar los sistemas metafóricos creados para representar las relaciones espaciales de la dependencia (los sectores de las ciudades principales en que se exhiben o venden los productos importados de la metrópolis adquieren visos mágicos en que los que acuden allí sufren transformaciones metafísicas, como lo atestigua la narrativa de Roberto Arlt). Se podría estudiar la adopción, adaptación y usos funcionales de los discursos filosóficos y literarios importados, en su capacidad para reconocer, captar, explicar y permitir una actuación sobre la realidad continental (el escolasticismo, el aristotelismo y el gongorismo en la época colonial, por ejemplo). Se podría explorar la relación entre estructuras literarias y proyectos económico-políticos de clase (la recurrencia de obras épicas durante los períodos mercantilista y librecambista como correlatos de la conquista y desarrollo territorial para la exportación de metales preciosos, alimentos y materias primas, por ejemplo). Se podría investigar la forma en que el estado promueve y disemina formas artísticas dentro de una campaña de modernización capitalista (el teatro de clase media asentado dentro de organismos ministeriales y universitarios durante el período de industrialización sustitutiva de la importación en las décadas de 1940-1950). Las técnicas literarias vanguardistas como reflejo de dislocaciones estructurales en la sociedad causadas por las etapas de modernización capitalista (el naturalismo en referencia a la consolidación del imperialismo a fines del siglo XIX y comienzos del XX; el surrealismo desde la segunda mitad del siglo XX frente a la orientación consumista de las economías latinoamericanas más avanzadas). Se podría resumir el sentido de estas sugerencias diciendo que la teoría de la dependencia ha contribuido una periodización y una aprehensión estructural de las influencias imperiales de manera tal que los resultados del análisis intratextual pueden ser rápidamente referidos a ellas para complementar su sentido social sobre la premisa doble de la literatura como reflejo y producto de la práctica socio-política de diferentes clases sociales.

Demás esta reiterar que, como intento de comprensión totalizadora de la cultura latinoamericana, la teoría de la dependencia es políticamente democrática y progresista frente a la

dominación imperialista, aunque no necesariamente ante la dominación capitalista interna. Es preciso, por tanto, llamar la atención sobre los puntos de divergencia y debate que contiene. A pesar de que la teoría se fundamenta en los conceptos marxista-leninistas de formación social e imperialismo, algunos autores los han instrumentalizado de manera que su origen como armas conceptuales del proletariado en la lucha de clases queda cancelado. El proletariado desaparece o queda oscurecido como agente de transformación hacia el socialismo y es reemplazado por los sectores medios como agentes de una modernización capitalista lograda con una movilización populista que busca "la afirmación nacional" frente a los conglomerados multinacionales.³

Es posible atribuir este pensamiento a las contradicciones de sectores pequeño burgueses y burgueses nacionalistas amenazados por las burguesías monopolistas asociadas con el capital imperial. Ellos necesitan simultáneamente luchar contra él y mantener su hegemonía sobre los proletariados nacionales. Se ha señalado la imagen de nostalgia que se desliza en sus argumentos en cuanto a un capitalismo ideal weberiano que no ha logrado plasmarse realmente y que no puede solidificarse ante el vigor arrollador del capitalismo imperial que se apodera de los sectores más dinámicos de las economías nacionales, desalojando a los burguesías locales.⁴ Quizás por esta razón en algunos autores las relaciones de dependencia aparecen como simples relaciones geográficas, en que la metrópolis succiona excedente económico dañándose el bienestar nacional sin ahondarse en la explotación burguesa de los proletariados nacionales.⁵ De reconocerse los conflictos de clase, se lo hace de manera del todo funcional, describiéndose empíricamente agentes, objetivos, obstáculos, aliados y expresión ideológica en igualdad de condiciones, desconociéndose la diferencia cualitativa de la lucha proletaria.

La eliminación del concepto de explotación como categoría central interna de las formaciones sociales basadas en la propiedad privada de los medios de producción tiene profundas consecuencias para un acercamiento socio-histórico a la literatura. Esencialmente inutiliza la capacidad desmitificadora de la crítica literaria en el estudio de la literatura cuando es expresión de ideologías hegemónicas. Repitiendo en parte ideas anteriores, las ideologías (como la literatura) son representaciones imaginarias de relaciones sociales concretas elaboradas por los diversos sectores que componen una sociedad, dentro del marco institucional que asegura las condiciones de reproducción de la explotación laboral en beneficio de un sector dominante que derrama beneficios indirectos a la sociedad general. La literatura, entonces, no sólo

debe ser estudiada como la estructuración de una visión de mundo elaborada por diversos sectores conflictivos, sino también como argumentación reproductora y/o justificadora de un sistema de explotación laboral. Es decir, a menos que se reconozca la acción política del proletariado organizado para terminar con los mecanismos de la alienación social, será imposible desvelar las formas literarias como instrumentos conducentes a esa liberación o como retardatarios de ella.

Finalmente, a pesar de los reparos que puedan suscitar, los teóricos de la dependencia han hecho un aporte que desde la perspectiva de la crítica literaria es preciso resaltar. Han propuesto un modelo global y una periodización históricas de los modos en que factores socio-políticos internos y externos de las sociedades latinoamericanas condicionan su inserción en los parámetros del capitalismo imperial. Han, además, acumulado material empírico sobre el funcionamiento de los procesos imperiales que puede ser usado por estudiosos de la cultura latinoamericana tanto marxistas como no marxistas.⁶

Notas

1. Para una bibliografía e introducción generales sobre teoría de la dependencia consultar *Latin American Perspectives*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Spring, 1974 y Ronald H. Chilcote and Joel C. Edelstein, *Latin America: The Struggle with Dependency and Beyond* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1974).
2. Para una taxonomía de los orígenes autores y argumentos de la teoría de la dependencia ver: C. Richard Bath and Dilmus D. James, "Dependency Analysis of Latin America: Some Criticisms, Some Suggestions." *Latin American Research Review*, Vol. XI, No. 3, 3-54. Se podría decir que este estudio adolece del defecto principal de no captar la influencia fundamental de conceptos marxista-leninistas que indicamos más adelante. Mucho más acertada es la evaluación histórica de la elaboración del concepto de dependencia hecha por Fernando H. Cardoso, "The Consumption of Dependency Theory in the United States." *Latin American Research Review*, Vol. XII, No. 3, 1977, 7-24. Este trabajo hace, además, suficiente énfasis en el sentido dialéctico con que los iniciadores de este pensamiento enfrentaron su trabajo, a diferencia de continuadores que han optado por una formalización estática de él que le ha quitado dimensión histórica.
3. Osvaldo Sunkel, "Política Nacional de Desarrollo y Dependencia Externa." *Serie documentos teóricos No. 4* (Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, 1967), pp. 3/1-3/40; Fernando H. Cardoso, "Los Agentes Sociales de Cambio y Conservación en América Latina." *Serie documentos No. 9* (Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, 1967), pp. 8/1-8/27.
4. Agustín Cueva, "Problemas y Perspectivas de la Teoría de la Dependencia." *Serie Estudios 15*. Centro de Estudios Latinoamericanos, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Facultad de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales, S.F.
5. José Matos Mar, "Idea y Diagnóstico del Perú." *Cidoc Cuaderno No. 18*, Cuernavaca, México, 1968; Augusto Salazar Bondy, "La Cultura de la Dependencia." *Ibid.*; se ha señalado el mismo error en André Gunder Frank, *Lumpenbourgeoisie: lumpendevelopment. Dependence, Class and Politics on Latin America*. (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972).
6. Es interesante notar que el excelente libro *El desarrollo del capitalismo en América Latina* (México: Siglo XXI Editores, S.A., 1978) de Agustín Cueva puede ser entendido, en parte, como polémica dirigida a los "dependentistas" para corregir ciertos aspectos de su argumento desde una postura materialista histórica, a la vez usando material producido por ellos. Ronald H. Chilcote en "A Question of Dependency" *Latin American Research Review*, Vol. XIII, No. 2, 1978, 55-68 intenta un análisis diferenciador de la comprensión burguesa y la marxista del problema de la dependencia.

Reportagem

Ronald W. Sousa

University of Minnesota

Como foi anunciado num "Editorial" publicado em Vol. II, No. 7 deste título, *The Institute for the Study of Ideologies and Literature* está a lançar uma série de simpósios anuais em investigação colaborativa da história social da literatura portuguesa. O simpósio inaugurador da série realizou-se, em Minneapolis, em 4 e 5 de Maio de 1979. Juntamente com 14 colegas, de várias disciplinas, de dentro da University of Minnesota, participaram os seguintes colegas de outras instituições: Onésimo Almeida, Center for Portuguese and Brazilian Studies, Brown University; Vicente Ataíde, Universidade Católica do Paraná; Milton Azevedo, University of California at Berkeley; John Beverley, University of Pittsburgh; Maria Duarte, Centro Cultural Cabrilho, University of California at Los Angeles; Robert Krueger, University of Maryland; Carlos Felipe Moisés, University of California at Berkeley e Centro de Estudos Portugueses, Universidade de São Paulo; José Ornelas, University of Massachusetts at Amherst; Ana Maria Marques Ramalhe, Nova Universidade de Lisboa; Alexandrino Severino, Vanderbilt University; Douglas Wheeler, University of New Hampshire e International Conference Group on Modern Portugal.

Em dois dias de discussões, concentradas sobre cinco comunicações-base, o grupo assim constituído procurava, implícita e explicitamente, estabelecer uma "linguagem" comum—por meio de questionamento do que é a análise literária fundamentada na história social, estabelecimento de áreas processuais dentro de tal enquadramento analítico, argumentação de definições dentro do processo, etc.—tudo isso com referência directa à problemática portuguesa. (Duas das aludidas comunicações-base, em forma revisada, constituem o "Debate" inserido no número 17 de *I&L*.) E, visto que o grupo foi

constituído como um grupo planificador, também dirigia sua acção ao estabelecimento de um protocolo para reuniões a vir, levando em consideração objectivos imediatos tanto como de longo prazo. Nesse respeito, foi resolvido que para continuarmos em nosso esforço de forjar uma “linguagem” minimamente coesiva, cada participante escreveria, segundo os conceitos metodológicos que ele/ela formulou para se como resultadó da primeira reunião,—na expectativa de que as comunicações resultantes servissem para continuar a elaboração e argumentação de definições. Assim esperamos produzir para o futura uma língua colectiva mais ou menos coesiva. Também foi decidido limitar nossa concentração ao período entre 1745 e 1825. Visto que quase todos os participantes tinham interesse no Portugal moderno, concordámos em que seria melhor começarmos com a época da mudança do antigo regime para o das instituições liberais modernos. Também na sua capacidade executiva, o grupo sugeriu nomes de possíveis colaboradores—colegas que trabalham no período indicado e/ou em metodologias afins. Como resultado, algumas das comunicações que forfmarão a base da segunda reunião—marcada para 3, 4 e 5 de Novembro de 1980—provirão de colegas que não participaram no primeiro simpósio.

Mais uma vez, daqueles colegas que se interessem nos simpósios, convida-se a correspondência.

new german critique



an interdisciplinary journal of german studies
editors: David Bathrick, Helen Fehervary, Andreas Huysen,
Anson G. Rabinbach and Jack Zipes

New German Critique is the first American journal to develop a comprehensive discussion of German politics, social theory, art, and literature on an international level.

Our current issue (#20) includes:

Special Issue II: Germans and Jews

- | | |
|-----------------|--|
| Manès Sperber | My Jewishness |
| Jean Améry | On the Necessity and Impossibility of Being a Jew |
| Toni Oelsner | Dreams of a Better Life |
| Dany Diner | Fragments of an Uncompleted Journey |
| Yudit Yago-Jung | Growing Up in Germany |
| Paul Breines | Jewish-Leftist Identity Confusion in America |
| Michael Löwy | Jewish Messianism & Libertarian Utopia in Central Europe |
| Ivan Szelenyi | Whose Alternative? |
| Frederick Weil | Anti-Semitism in West Germany Since the Holocaust |
| Jack Zipes | The Holocaust and the Vicissitudes of Jewish Identity |
| Ludo Abicht | The Holocaust as Suicidal Enterprise |

ORDER FORM

New German Critique
German Department
Box 413
The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201

3 Issues per Year

	Individual	Institution
1 yr.	\$ 8.00	\$16.00
2 yrs.	\$15.00	\$32.00
3 yrs.	\$22.00	\$48.00
back issues	\$ 3.00	

Please begin my subscription with issue # _____

Back issues _____

Enclosed is my check for _____

Add \$1.00 for all foreign subscriptions

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____

IDEOLOGIES & LITERATURE

(A Journal of Hispanic and Luso-Brazilain Literatures)

Please enter my subscription as indicated below:

No. of subscriptions

- Student * \$9 per year _____
- Library/Institutional \$15 per year _____
- Regular _____
- Patron \$25 per year _____

(Patron's name and address will be published in the Patron's list)

Price per Issue: \$3. Please include 50¢ postage and handling.

Payment enclosed _____ Amount _____

Bill me _____ Amount _____

Name: _____

Street: _____

City, State, Zip _____

* (If a Student, please indicate University and Department)

Send Order to:

Institute for the Study of Ideologies and Literature
4 Folwell Hall
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

I&L

IDEOLOGIES & LITERATURE

A TRILINGUAL AND BIMONTHLY MAGAZINE DEVOTED TO PROMOTING AND DEVELOPING A SOCIO-HISTORICAL APPROACH TO THE LITERATURE OF THE HISPANIC AND LUSO-BRAZILIAN CULTURES. PRODUCED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR THE INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF IDEOLOGIES AND LITERATURE (UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, MINNEAPOLIS)

Typeset by Peregrine Cold Type

Printed by Haymarket Press