

Delaware Review of Latin American Studies

Vol. 16 No. 1 August 31, 2015

Exile and Subversive Writing: A Fertile Soil for Critical Thinking: *Encontros com a Civilização Brasileira*, *Cadernos de Marcha* and *Controversia*.

Cristiano Pinheiro de Paula Couto
Department of Modern Languages
University of São Paulo
cristianoppc@usp.edu

Abstract

During the seventies, many Latin American intellectuals were forced to leave their home countries and sent into exile. By analyzing three cultural journals, namely *Encontros com a Civilização Brasileira* (1978–82), *Cadernos de Marcha* in its second series (1979–85) and *Controversia* (1979–83), I develop the argument that the exile in Mexico of a Latin American *intelligentsia* segment, in the context of the Cold War, redirected the political ponderings of dissident intellectual groups toward a course of critical revision and reorganization of both political thought and *praxis*. Instead of bringing about the stagnation of thought or choking off democratic resistance, the distinctive atmosphere of anxiety, bewilderment, and frantic agitation favored the accumulation of a critical mass. I notice that these journals played an important role as sociability structures in the maintenance of Latin American intellectual networks. Since I am interested in the impact caused by exile in Mexico on the ideological strata and on the political intervention strategies of dissident intellectual groups from Latin America, I analyze texts published in these three periodicals to investigate how they worked as a space for resistance and intervention within the authoritarian context produced by repressive political regimes widespread on the subcontinent during the Cold War.

Keywords: Exile, Cultural Latin American journals, Intellectuals

Acknowledgment: I would like to thank the Brazilian National Council of Technological and Scientific Development for giving its support to the current study.

In this study I analyze how cultural journals worked as a space for resistance and intervention within the authoritarian context produced by repressive political regimes widespread in Latin America during the Cold War. My specific aim is to do a comparative analysis of three remarkable journals: *Encontros com a Civilização Brasileira* (1978–1982), *Cadernos de Marcha*, in its second series (1979–1985) and *Controversia* (1979–1983). The criteria for this choice were the ideological tie that united them, the coincidental period in which they were published, and the different nationalities of their core leadership. Finally, by taking under consideration that “the study of the experience of exile can contribute to form a research agenda that emphasizes the transnational structure of political life in Latin America” (Grann & Roniger 2007: 108), the current study additionally analyzes journals edited by Latin American intellectuals directly or indirectly affected by political persecution and by the ruptures and connections resulting from this experience. It should be noted that the emphasis is not on the analysis of exile as a value in itself. The focus is rather on the narratives¹ these three journals published about exile.

With its editorial board composed of intellectuals coming from several left-wing parties and different sectors of Brazilian society, such as Carlos Nelson Coutinho (1943–2012), Leandro Konder (1936–2014), Ferreira Gullar (1930) and Arthur Giannotti (1930), and directed by Ênio Silveira (1925–1996), *Encontros com a Civilização Brasileira* (1978–1980) was published in Brazil and maintained the line of intellectual conduct of its successful predecessor, *Revista Civilização Brasileira* (1965–1968). The political-cultural project of the 1970s collection, which had 29 issues, established an identity that was strongly defined by populist nationalism. Of the 49 members of the publication, only three were women: the economist Maria da Conceição Tavares, the researcher and translator Maria Helena Kühner and the researcher of cinema Maria Rita Galvão, a tiny number that attests to the disproportionate asymmetry of the Brazilian intellectual milieu of the time and the role of cultural journals in suppressing views of minorities like women (Wolff 2010: 138-155).

Cadernos de Marcha in its second series (1979–1985) was published in Mexico and was directed by Carlos Quijano (1900–1984). It continued the political-cultural project that had begun in 1939, in Montevideo, in the weekly

Marcha, and was crushed in 1974 by the Uruguayan dictatorship, a project equally irradiated in the first series of *Cuadernos de Marcha* (1967–1974). The editorial board consisted of Teresa De Barbieri (1937), Samuel Lichtensztein (1934), Carlos Martínez Moreno (1917–1986), Gustavo Melazzi, Nelson Minello, José Manuel Quijano, Ruben Svirsky, Raúl Trajtenberg, and Guillermo Waksman. The publication had 27 issues and was launched during the exile of its director and members not as an *ex nihilo* creation. Instead of establishing a field of unprecedented reflection, it was inscribed in the history of its precursor, the first series of *Cuadernos de Marcha*. The intention was to maintain an established project, addressing the analysis of national (i.e., Uruguayans) and Latin American problems from the point of view of socialism, anti-imperialism, and Latin-Americanism.

Founded in 1979 by Jorge Tula (1939–2008), with 13 issues until 1981, *Controversia* was a result of a series of reflections that started inside Argentinian-Marxist and socialist circles, as well as those of left-Peronism-revolutionary factions coming from the community of Argentinian exiles in Mexico, whose relations with the armed struggle, in the recent past, had been close. In its editorial board there were, among others, Nicolás Casullo (1944–2008), Héctor Schmucler (1931), Oscar Terán (1938–2008), José Aricó (1931–1991), and Juan Carlos Portantiero (1934–2007). Its name fully represents the guiding attitude adopted by its political-cultural project, expressed by the attempt to publish critical thoughts on the defeat of political projects that its members were committed to, as well as on Marxism, democracy, Argentinian populism, socialism in countries from the Warsaw Pact, and so on.

In contemporary Latin America, cultural journals should be highlighted among the “sociability structures” (Sirinelli 1996) that significantly contributed to overcoming the feeling of rootlessness caused by the experience of exile, since these journals worked as a resistance platform for preserving and creating identities, especially those constructed in groups, and as a means of strengthening solidarity networks (Valdés 1999) through the propagation and circulation of ideas. This contribution of cultural journals is underlined by Angel Rama’s considerations on *Cuadernos de Marcha* new appearance in Mexico:

La reaparición de los *Cuadernos de Marcha* podría interpretarse [...] como un esfuerzo de conjunción y de reclamado fortalecimiento del equipo intelectual disperso, tal como antes lo fue el establecimiento de nuestra comedia nacional y popular, “El Galpón”, en tierras mexicanas y la tarea de los músicos (la Camerata, Viglietti, Zitarrosa, etc.) (1979: 79).

Sectarian or independent, progressive or conservative, proselytizing or not, a “newspaper is not only a collective propagandist and a collective agitator, but also a collective organizer” (Lenin 2005: 215). Even though the historical and geographical context of this study – Latin America during the seventies – had nothing to do with the early twentieth century Bolshevik Russia, it can be pointed out that cultural journals were also “collective organizers”, and a space of belonging for the exiled Latin American intellectual community, particularly in Mexico, being moreover an unifying instrument for ideological trends opposed to Latin American military-sponsored state terrorism. Carlos Monsiváis (1938-2010) – a Mexican writer and critic – argued that the cultural journals in Latin America of this context had the following social role: “una revista puede ser instrumento de defensa social, el apuntalamiento de una resistencia que es espíritu de sobrevivencia” (1981: 111).

As previously mentioned, two samples from the three journals analyzed in the current study were published in the second series of *Cuadernos de Marcha* and *Controversia* by intellectuals from the River Plate region, Argentina and Uruguay, during the period they were exiled in Mexico, between 1979 and 1985. The end of *Cuadernos* not only coincides with the fall of the dictatorship cycle in Latin America and the subsequent repatriation of the intellectuals who led it, but also the death of its founder and director, Carlos Quijano, on June 10th 1984. The events and setbacks that caused the closure of *Controversia* were related to the clash of positions within the group that formed it. This kind of clash of perspectives allows assertive statements about the divisions of the Argentine exile community:

Of all of the Latin American exile communities in Mexico, the Argentine was, without a doubt, the most politically divided. This division reflected the different positions taken by members in relation to the political struggle in Argentina, some of which were irreconcilable (Yankelevich 2007: 71).

The socialist and Gramscian core of *Controversia*, however, met again in Buenos Aires and, in 1984, founded the *Club de Cultura Socialista* (1984–2008) in a joint initiative with some members of *Punto de Vista* journal (1978–2003), including Beatriz Sarlo and Carlos Altamirano. It is important to note that Mexico built a foreign policy traditionally receptive to the exiled in the period after the fall of Porfirio Díaz. It was a significant aspect taken into account by the intellectuals who founded *Controversia* and the second series of *Cuadernos de Marcha* when they decided to look for a receptive place where they could keep their critical activity alive, away from the political persecution suffered in their home countries. In Mexico, they joined thousands who were in exile:

During the 1970s, Mexico became the primary destination for thousands of refugees fleeing Latin American military-sponsored state terrorism. South American groups considered Mexico a nation whose international policies had historically created a safe haven for the politically persecuted. Of the thousands of exiles who arrived in Mexico, the Argentines constituted one of the largest communities (Yankelevich 2007: 68).

Those who did not go to Mexico and sought refuge in South American countries experienced vicissitudes and wandered from one country to another as the dictatorial authoritarianism wave advanced throughout the subcontinent. The route of the Brazilian poet and critic Ferreira Gullar, who belonged to the editorial board of *Encontros com a Civilização Brasileira*, exemplifies the events undergone by many intellectuals persecuted by state terrorism in Latin America. After being reported by a fellow member of the Brazilian Communist Party who was subjected to torture, Gullar clandestinely left Brazil in 1971 and went to Moscow. He returned, however, to Latin America. First, in 1973, he lived in Salvador Allende's Chile. After the coup d'état in Chile, he went to Peru and then lived in Argentina. Finally, in March 1977, he returned to Brazil, where he was intercepted at the airport by the Destacamento de Operações de Informações do Centro de Operações de Defesa Interna, the Brazilian intelligence and repression agency during the dictatorship (1964 - 1985). After seventy-two hours of interrogation, he was released. The success of his acclaimed *Poema Sujo*, recorded and put into circulation in Brazil by Vinicius de Moraes, made him an "untouchable" public figure. Gullar's frantic route returning to Latin America was not, obviously, voluntary. Once harassed, the author of *Poema Sujo* left a country where a military coup had occurred, looking for exile beyond its borders. Shortly after settling, he was forced to abandon the new country of refuge when its institutions were also disrupted by authoritarianism (Gullar 2010). The Uruguayan critic Angel Rama wrote about Gullar's exile in Argentina and about the exile of other Brazilian intellectuals such as Mario Pedroza, in Chile; Darcy Ribeiro in Uruguay, and Francisco Julião in Mexico; and he stressed that "si por un lado se constituyeron en embajadores de una cultura ignota ante los grupos políticamente afines, por la otra hicieron experiencias de culturas desconocidas" (1978: 10).

Once exiled in Barcelona, the Uruguayan writer Eduardo Galeano declared in the inaugural issue of *Cuadernos de Marcha's* second series: "El exilio, que siempre nace de una derrota, no solamente proporciona experiencias dolorosas. Cierra unas puertas, pero abre otras. Es una penitencia y, a la vez, una libertad y una responsabilidad. Tiene una cara negra y tiene una cara roja" (1979: 86). The dark side of exile, the "penance" emphasized by the Uruguayan writer, appeared in losses, separations, and uprooting, whereas the bright side, the one that in Galeano's words called for "responsibility and compromise," could be expressed in the attempt to reflect on the way in which the policies chosen had inevitably led to exile.

If, on the one hand, the difficulty in organizing and uniting the social forces in opposition to state terrorism had nothing to do with the lack of political leadership – because, in fact, there were leaders –, or with the lack of bonding projects, then it could be stated that, within the context in which military regimes oppressed Latin American societies during the Cold War, the lines of action were the most significant factor that fragmented political insurgent groups. As far as the Argentinian's political scene is concerned, one might ponder that "the support or criticism of the armed groups' actions divided the Argentinian left-wing" (Gillespie 1987; Gasparini 1988; Seoane 1991; Pozzi 2001). Sergio Bufano, a *Controversia* group member, made a critical assessment and expressed his personal perception about the meaning of exile imposed on nearly nine thousand Argentinians in Mexico² alone. According to Bufano, referring to political radicalization, the armed struggle was the main target in this moment of critical reflection:

El exilio fue el momento de interrogarnos cómo habíamos llegado hasta ahí y qué hacíamos entonces. Desde un primer momento, apareció la crítica a la lucha armada. El haber elegido las armas como herramienta de lucha en los '70 había ayudado a impulsar el autoritarismo y había generado una mirada muy esquemática de la realidad. En definitiva, había conducido a la derrota (2009).

When the "utopia was disarmed"³, its beautiful caryatids felt the weight of the adorned cornices that they supported with such grace. The real contradictions of socialism, the demise of "grand narratives", the exile and the defeat of the radicalized segments of society knocked down the revolutionary political culture in Latin America. In the early twentieth century, Lenin sought practical answers to the challenges of the Russian socialist movement, asking himself and his readers *What is to be done?*⁴. At the beginning of the last quarter of the same century, his Latin American counterparts –no less concerned with practical problems but certainly more restless concerning issues of morality and theory due to the emergence of relativism and the crisis of paradigms –, sought inclusion in the emerging forms of democratizing political culture. The question that they might have asked themselves when trying to deeply examine the mistakes of the past and the impasses and requirements of the present, may, rather, have been how to do it. When the theoretical assumptions and beliefs, which had offered consistent foundations to the Latin American left-wing political culture during much of the twentieth century, vanished, the cloud of dust raised by

the collapse of the revolutionary utopia produced a painful uncertainty. Amid the turmoil and commotion, the time was ripe for the abandonment of “rifles” and suitable for rethinking – in the “winter of self-criticism”, as Angel Rama metaphorically suggests –, the place of critical thinking in the new developing Latin American context.

In Mexico, there were two attitudes that stood out most among groups of expatriates from authoritarian regimes: the *mea culpa* of those confronted by the weakening of the once hegemonic policy intervention strategies, such as the armed struggle, and the insistence of those who remained adamant in defense of the military option, convinced that it was the only effective alternative to resistance and to political *praxis*. This dichotomy favored the rupture of the exile community. James Grenn and Luis Roniger examined the tensions between these two attitudes and observed that: “[...] the tensions and confrontations between the retrospective evaluation of failed projects and the forward-looking perspective of individuals translocated abroad constitute a major axis for future systematic research” (2007: 106).

Forcibly separated from their emotional and political references, the community of intellectuals exiled in Mexico, particularly those enrolled in *Controversia* and *Cuadernos de Marcha*, was able to create “extraterritorial” spaces of sociability, such as cultural journals, despite the feeling of defeat. Such spaces greatly contributed to the preservation of identities and represented a trench of resistance against the silence imposed on the Latin American intellectual left-wing groups (Rollemberg 1999: 205). It can be argued that, just as the exile of German intellectuals such as Thomas Mann was once considered to be a privileged space for the construction and maintenance of the criticism activity, the experience of Latin American exiles in the hands of repressive systems during the Cold War had an analogous quality. As ironic as it may sound, when one thinks about exile and its disruptive element by taking into account the motivation of military leaders in exiling those who confronted them, it is possible to come to the conclusion that the expected effect was expressively reversed, as Angel Rama pondered in *Cuadernos de Marcha*:

Ya se ha dicho varias veces que los militares conservadores han fortalecido la compenetración de la intelectualidad del continente, que han ayudado a su mejor formación y ampliación de conocimientos, aunque esto venía ocurriendo desde hace bastantes décadas, sólo que se aplicaba a los “otros” del continente y, no a los “sureños”, como se había aplicado a los españoles transterrados a Hispanoamérica y ahora a los hispanoamericanos que han buscado cobijo en una España que por razones obvias no puede sino recibirlos a pesar de sus presentes dificultades (1979: 79).

While those trapped within the confines of national borders – opposition groups, which at that time operated separately and disjointedly – were defeated and captured or dispersed, those who managed to go into exile, finding refuge in countries such as Mexico, frequently succeeded in something that has been historically encountered by all types of reactions in Latin America: the cultural exchange between the countries that constitute that subcontinent. In this regard, Eduardo Galeano stated in *Cuadernos de Marcha*: “El exilio desarrolló este intercambio en un grado improbable en situaciones ‘normales’, cuando lo ‘normal’ en América Latina es la ignorancia recíproca de sus partes” (1979: 86). Usually turning their backs on each other except for underground dialogues repeatedly established among some minority portions of their societies, the Latin American countries affected by the institutional crisis and the concomitant authoritarian oppression witnessed an unprecedented strengthening of relations among their artists and intellectuals. The exile, this experience “entre raíces e radares” as Denise Rollemberg said, “entre la nostalgia y la creación” as Eduardo Galeano poeticized, had a double face:

Similarly, translocation has both constrained and broadened the range of choices and alliances with co-nationals and others, leading to novel redefinitions of the political theory and practice and shaping new ways of relating to collective projects in the struggle for democratizing the home societies (Grenn & Roniger 2007: 107).

At the dawn of the Uruguayan nationality construction, the Oriental *exodus* of 1811 was a milestone, a foundational event that helped consolidate community values, an event that expressed a kind of “origin myth”. In the battered country whose democratic impetus was responsible for the formation of a literate society thirsty for culture, the massive departure of six hundred thousand Uruguayans that followed the 1973 coup expressed an unsuccessful attempt of the intimidated military government to annul the critical power engendered by social policies that helped build this society. According to Angel Rama, the exiled community became integrated, fully and active in the countries where it found refuge:

[...] el pueblo de la diáspora y sus intelectuales están participando en un activo intercambio, haciendo suyos los problemas de otras comunidades, viviendo sus afanes, conociendo su historia, apropiándose de su legado histórico, sirviendo a estas culturas de adopción como lo hicieron con la suya propia y aportando dentro de ellas. Si para muchos uruguayos conocer la América indígena o la

América negra ha sido una revelación que sin duda los favorecerá porque les proporciona un entendimiento más cabal de la pluralidad americana al tiempo que les hace copartícipes de ricas tradiciones intelectuales y artísticas, también ha sido grande la contribución que sus sistemas de referencias y sus percepciones culturales han hecho a las respectivas zonas en que se han instalado (1979: 80).

However, doubt may be raised about the determined effort that the collaborators of *Cuadernos* – in its Mexican era – made in order to enhance the positive aspects of the exile experience, as Eduardo Galeano and Angel Rama did in the above-mentioned passages. Such effort was not exclusive to the narratives about exile of *Cuadernos*. The zeal of the exile groups to minimize, if not extinguish, the sterilizing effects of expatriation is notorious. Once determined to defy the negativity of exile, the *Controversia* group not only published texts written under the landmark of this guiding attitude, but also had it as their shared goal. An allusion to this aim was made in the first issue's editorial:

Han pasado más de tres años desde que se produjera el golpe militar en la Argentina. Al estupor por la salvaje represión, al anonadamiento producido por el forzado alejamiento de la patria, al desconcierto inicial respecto de la dirección y efectividad de nuestros actos, hoy, o desde no hace mucho tiempo, (aunque siempre nos resistimos a la negatividad del exilio, enfrentando con variado éxito a la “melancolía, la frustración y la nostalgia”), existe la convicción cada vez más firme de convertir este exilio “en una experiencia positiva”.

It is important to identify an *ethos* of resistance in the *corpus* of the three journals that form the object of the current study, without underestimating the magnitude of the deleterious results brought about by the exile of large Latin American intellectual segments over the period in which military dictatorships were installed in many of their countries – effects that are still being felt in Latin American political and social life. It constituted a powerful attitude against the destabilizing forces released by the remoteness and the compulsory separation of the immediate space of political action. “Las dictaduras del sur han montado, como se sabe, una maquinaria del silencio” (Galeano: 1979). This machinery of silence Eduardo Galeano refers to could be seen in the banishment of those who resisted by using the written and spoken word--poets, writers, critics, playwrights, teachers and so on--in an attempt to drown out the insurgent voices. So, what served as the foundation to the optimistic assessments of this rupture experience formulated by the collaborators of these three cultural journals? Regarding the peculiar ability of exile to generate political “aphonia”, Ariel Dorfman⁵ perceived a disturbing contradiction: “This is one of the great paradoxes of exile: The very sanctuary that guarantees that a voice has survived, simultaneously cuts that voice off from direct access to the land it is responsible for keeping alive, the land that demands to be transmitted to others” (1998: 204).

One might well accept Dorfman's proposition as valid. When, however, one considers the ingenious method used by Thomas Mann during his exile in the United States to be heard by his fellow Germans at the height of World War II--although his voice had been banned from Germany and from the Nazi-occupied territories--, one could also conclude that, despite censorship and other impediments, the mere possibility of subverting the writing may provide a fertile soil for critical thinking. Unusual ways can be found to express ideas and pass them on. There are always those who dare to eavesdrop. It is through them that a voice in exile can speak to the land of origin. It can be assumed, therefore, that the consciousness of this faculty of speech and subversion of ideas produced and disseminated in the “networks” and in the “sociability structures”--such as cultural journals created in places that offered refuge to the exiles' community--was one of the foundation stones of the optimism of this community with regards to the possibilities of overcoming the losses generated by exile. As Mario Benedetti said in an interview published in *Encontros com a Civilização Brasileira*: “não conseguiram matar a cultura uruguaia. De certa maneira ela renasceu no exílio” (In: Montserrat 1980: 62-63).

The exile of the intellectuals grouped in *Controversia* and of those involved with the second series of *Cuadernos de Marcha* did not halt the production by dissidents banned by repressive systems put in place by dictatorships in Uruguay and Argentina. Insubordinate and proactive, fully integrated into the cultural life of their receiving countries such as Mexico, Venezuela, Cuba and Spain, the intellectuals who participated in these periodicals amplified the reflections on Latin American political and cultural traditions and also examined the changes emerging in the subcontinent: “Out of Uruguay and unable to return to his country, which was dominated by the military regime, Angel Rama, appointed in Venezuela as Director of ‘Library Ayacucho’, continued the reflections on Latin America against the background of exile” (Coelho 2009: 1005). If the reflections on Latin America remained a priority for the Uruguayan critic, the concern to keep alive the critical activity about national values was also instigated: “Todo lo que sea creado en el cauce de la cultura uruguaya, viniere de donde viniere, será la cultura uruguaya y ésta existirá en la medida en que sea intensa, variada, libre, combativa, en constante producción” (Rama 1979: 77). When one compares what was written by the editorial boards of these journals on the paradigmatic experience of

exile, it can be observed that, in most cases, they were unanimous in considering it a valuable opportunity for the restructuring of critical theory in Latin America: “Las voces del silencio--noted Carlos Quijano in *Cuadernos* evoking *Les Voix du Silence*, by Andre Malraux--entre ellas la nuestra, volverán a hacerse oír con nosotros o sin nosotros.” Carlos Fazio--a Uruguayan living in Mexico, editor of *La Jornada*, collaborator of the second series of *Cuadernos de Marcha* and *Brecha*--, spoke about Quijano's experience and made assumptions related to what the director of *Cuadernos* thought about the ambiguities of exile:

His exile did not negatively affect him. He used to say that he was an exile in his own land. A full-time exile. Then, here in Mexico, he considered himself an exile from exile. Though, for “elemental modesty”, wrote Quijano to Guillermo Chifflet, “we must quell the bitterness of exile.” However, he was like those who thought that exile also strengthens and opens horizons. It is another life (2007: 187).

The comparative study of the intellectual groups that participated in *Encontros com a Civilização Brasileira*, in the second series of *Cuadernos de Marcha* and in *Controversia*, as well as the analysis of the texts published in these cultural journals, shows that the branches of critical thought in Latin America during the Seventies--although proscribed from their immediate circumstances of activity--created conditions that allowed them to maintain, in exile, the influential reflections about politics and culture that they used to practice within their national contexts. As “structures of sociability”, these three journals were, each in their own way, alternative spaces for reflection on issues related to multiple projects and the contradictions of Latin America's heterogeneous left-wing intellectual field. These included the weakening of the paradigms that caused the failure of their strategies for political action against state terrorism. Finally, it should be highlighted that these cultural journals presented acute stretching debates on the emerging positions that characterized, in the crisis of Marxism, the rearrangement and reorganization of the left-wing Latin American *intelligentsia* in the democratic transition context.

Notes

1 It is worth remembering that, as carried out by Pablo Rocca (2004: 4), from what David Bennett observed about the operation of reading a journal, because, as readers, those who analyze a journal, by (re)constructing a narrative, select and omit fragments, as is done by the mere circumstantial reader: “It seems safe to assume that few issues of magazines are read *in toto*, fewer still from front to back cover. The reception of the magazine mimes its editorial production: reading, here, is an activity of selection and omission which produces the text as a (spatial) collage or (temporal) montage of fragments in provisional or indeterminate relations. The experience of periodical reading is an experience of discontinuity” (Bennett 1989: 480). Therefore, even if the choice of articles for analysis is properly justified, the links produced by this selection will probably be temporary and undetermined, resulting from an operation that is usually not linear.

2 From 1970 to 1980, the Mexican *Censo General de Población* reported a three hundred and fifty percent increase in the presence of Argentinians in the country (Secretaría de Industria y Comercio, 1970; Secretaría de Programación y Presupuesto, 1980). This community is ranked first in the list of foreign Latin Americans living in Mexico during the 1970s. A recent estimation showed that nine thousand Argentinians were exiled in Mexico (Yankelevich 2004). As far as Uruguay is concerned, it is estimated that of its total population of two million five hundred thousand, six hundred thousand were exiled, living in various countries such as Brazil, Mexico, Spain, etc (Montserrat 1980: 49-64).

3 Allusion to the book: Castañeda, Jorge. *La utopía desarmada*. Buenos Aires: Ariel, 1994. Despite the political and military defeat inflicted on most of the guerrilla warfare outbreaks which spread through Latin America after Havana's triumph, one cannot fail to mention the success of the Sandinista revolution in Nicaragua, in 1979, precisely at the same moment that the armed struggle was losing its strategic primacy and was placed on display. Ironically, when the leaders of the revolution decided to radicalize its political program, breaking the balance of interests that was formed between the different classes, the revolution had to face the counter-revolution and the invective of the United States, which eventually resulted in electoral defeat in 1990. However, the discontentment with the liberal reforms that followed the victory of Violeta Chamorro and lasted until the end of Enrique Bolaños' mandate strengthened the Sandinistas and, in 2006, Ortega won the elections again. Beyond a shadow of a doubt, this Ortega is not the same that fought in the guerrilla during the Sandinista revolution. Even so, Sandinism is still a political force in Nicaragua.

4 Allusion to the book published by Lenin in March 1902, which takes issue with the “economist” wing of the Russian Social-Democracy and discusses the practical problems of the socialist movement in Russia. The publication of the book's first edition in Brazil, in 1978, could be mere coincidence if the particularities of the political context in which it occurred, marked by the need for critical assessment of the Brazilian left-wing, weren't

considered.

5 Ariel Dorfman was also a collaborator of *Cuadernos de Marcha*, and published the following text in the issue entitled "Después de Pinochet": Dorfman, Ariel. "Versos de amor para Santiago". *Cuadernos de Marcha*. 7: 90-94. 1980.

References:

Aricó, José. "Editorial." *Controversia. Para el examen de la realidad argentina*. 1: 2. 1979.

Bennett, David. "Periodical fragments and organic culture: modernism, the avantgarde, and the little magazine." *Contemporary Literature* 30. 4: 480-502. 1989.

Bufano, Sergio. 2009. "Reeditan la colección completa de la revista *Controversia*". *Página/12*, September 16.

Castañeda, Jorge. *La Utopía Desarmada*. Buenos Aires: Ariel, 1994.

Coelho, Haydée Ribeiro. "Biblioteca Ayacucho: Exilio Latino-americano e Perspectiva Político-cultural: (meados de 70 e 80)." In *Anais do V Congresso Brasileiro de Hispanistas [e] I Congresso Internacional da Associação Brasileira de Hispanistas*, edited by Sara Rojo. Belo Horizonte: Faculdade de Letras da UFMG, 2009. 1 CD-ROM [3467 p.]

Dorfman, Ariel. *Heading South, Looking North: A Bilingual Journey*. United States of America: Penguin Books, 1st ed., 1998.

_____ "Versos de amor para Santiago". *Cuadernos de Marcha*. 7: 90-94. 1980.

Fazio, Carlos. *Contribuciones al Pensamiento Social de América Latina*. México: UNAM, Centro Mexicano de Estudios Sociales, 2007.

Galeano, Eduardo. "El Exilio, Entre la Nostalgia y la Creación." *Cuadernos de Marcha*. 1: 83-86. 1979.

_____ "En el Reino del Revés el Sol Sale a Medianoche." *Encontros com a Civilização Brasileira*. 2: 139-144. 1978.

Gasparini, Juan. *Montoneros, final de cuentaso*. Buenos Aires: Puntosur, 1988.

Gillespie, Richard. *Soldados de Perón: Los Montoneros*. Buenos Aires: Grijalbo, 1987.

Grann, James N. and Roniger, Luis. "Concluding Remarks. Exile and the Setting of Future Research Agendas." *Latin American Perspectives* 4: 106-108. 2007.

Gullar, Ferreira. *Rabo de Foguete – Os Anos do Exílio*. Lisboa: Editorial Verbo, 2010.

Christopher, Lasch. "The Cultural Cold War". *The Nation* (September 11, 1967): 198-212.

Lenin, V. I. . *The Birth of Bolshevism: Lenin's Struggle Against Economism*. Sydney: Resistance Books, 2005.

Mann, Thomas. *Ouvintes Alemães! Discursos contra Hitler (1940-1945)*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2009.

Montserrat, José. "Entrevista com Mario Benedetti." *Encontros com a Civilização Brasileira*. 23: 49-64. 1980.

Monsiváis, Carlos. "¿Qué es y para qué sirve una revista literaria?" *Texto Crítico*. 20: 108-113. 1981.

Pozzi, Pablo. *Por las sendas argentinas: El PRT-ERP, la guerrilla marxista*. Buenos Aires: Eudeba, 2001.

Rama, Angel. "La riesgosa navegación del escritor en el exilio." *Nueva Sociedad*. 35: 5-15. 1978.

_____ "Otra Vez la Utopía, en el Invierno de Nuestro Desconsuelo." *Cuadernos de Marcha*. 1: 75-81. 1979.

Rocca, Pablo. "Por qué, para qué una revista (Sobre su naturaleza y su función en el campo cultural latinoamericano)". *Hispanica*. 99: 3 - 20. 2004.

Rolleberg, Denise. *Exilios: Entre Raíces e Radares*. Rio de Janeiro: Record, 1999.

Sirinelli, Jean-François. Os Intelectuais. In *Por uma História Política*. René Rémond (ed.) Rio de Janeiro: Editora UFRJ. pp, 231-269. 1996.

Seoane, María. *Todo o nada: La historia secreta y la historia pública del jefe guerrillero Mario Roberto Santucho*. Buenos Aires: Planeta, 1991.

Valdés, Eduardo Devés. "La Red de los Pensadores Latinoamericanos de los Años 1920". *Boletín Americanista*. 49: 67-79. 1999.

Wolff, Cristina Scheibe. O gênero da esquerda em tempos de ditadura. In Pedro, Joana Maria; Wolff, Cristina Scheibe (orgs.). *Gênero, feminismos e ditaduras no Cone Sul*. Ilha de Santa Catarina: Editora Mulheres. pp. 138-155. 2010.

Yankelevivh, Pablo. "The COSPA. A Political Experience of the Argentine Exile in México". *Latin American Perspectives*. 155: 68-80. 2007.

_____. "Hacia una Cuantificación del Exilio Argentino en México, 1974-1983." Paper presented at Los extranjeros en México, Instituto Nacional de Migración, Secretaría de Gobernación, Mexico City, 2004.