

TOWARDS A READING OF THE ARGENTINE LITERARY MAGAZINE *SUR**

John King
University of Warwick

INTRODUCTION

This article is concerned with the problem of reading and interpreting the Argentine literary magazine *Sur*, which was published regularly between 1931 and 1970 (and irregularly thereafter) as an elegant fusion of fiction, poetry, philosophy, plastic arts, and social commentary. That a magazine should be chosen as a research topic reflects the reality of Argentine literary life in the twentieth century. Such publications offered many writers their main opportunity to put forward ideas in the forms of works of literature and critical or general essays. Most magazines lasted for very few years, but *Sur*, thanks to the quality of its contributors and the sound financial base of its founder, Victoria Ocampo, was to have an important influence on several generations.¹

As yet, few comprehensive studies have been made of literary magazines from any part of the world, which has meant that the specific problems of dealing with a composite text are only just beginning to be recognized and elaborated.² The introductory remark made by Francis Mulhern in his recent book on the English critical magazine *Scrutiny* can equally apply to this study:

It will doubtless be noticed that the book lacks a systematic theoretical and methodological preamble. . . . This was largely a matter of necessity. Few precedents exist for the study of a journal as such; it would quite evidently have been inadequate to construct a schema, by derivation and specification from the existing conceptual resources . . . , and it would just as evidently have been illegitimate to elicit one by induction from the investigation of a single case.³

Yet, with this qualification, it will be argued that *Sur* should not just be treated as an anthology that came out every month or two, but rather as a process—with its own internal history and contradictions—which developed in a certain political and cultural setting. Its discourse remained coherent throughout the period of its publication and can thus be traced through the changing conditions of Argentina in the mid-

*I would like to thank Paul Commack, Tim Duncan, and Gerald Martin for their comments on this manuscript.

twentieth century. To analyze this magazine also helps to locate in their ideological and social context writers, such as Jorge Luis Borges, who are normally seen as only inhabiting the abstract world of literature. Most literary critics accept the fact that texts exist in an intertextual world, that conventions, precursors, and styles restrict the notion of individual production.⁴ Yet few consider, especially in the case of Borges, that institutional and ideological determinants might act in a similar way. Literary magazines, by their very nature, ask the reader actively to explore the mediations between literature, history, and sociology, disciplines that are often closed up around their own premises and assumptions.

THE ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF *SUR*

The 1920s had seen the growth of a number of “little magazines” in Buenos Aires, which came to be grouped around the two geographical and ideological poles of Florida and Boedo.⁵ The little magazines of Florida—named after the fashionable main street of Buenos Aires—experimented with the many and varied avant-garde movements spawned by the 1920s. The publications of Boedo—a working class district—attempted to define a new “realist” socialist consciousness. There has been much debate as to the differences between these two groups of young writers: Borges has dismissed the whole experience as a “sham literary feud, cooked up in Buenos Aires.”⁶ Yet it seems clear that there was more to the dispute than this and other memoir accounts suggest.⁷

One notable polemic inside the pages of the most representative and irreverent of the Florida magazines, *Martín Fierro*, illustrates this point. Roberto Mariani of the Boedo group opens his attack on the magazine by disputing its use of “nationalist symbols”: “¿Por qué los que hacen *Martín Fierro*, revista literaria, se han puesto bajo la advocación de tal símbolo, si precisamente tienen toda una cultura europea, un lenguaje literario complicado y sutil y una elegancia francesa?”⁸ Evar Méndez, the editor of *Martín Fierro*, rejects such an approach by pouring scorn on the left’s answer to the avant-garde: “Apareció *Extrema Izquierda*, ¡‘Salutte’! Muy realista, muy muy humana. Sobre todo esto—hay en sus páginas un realismo exuberante, el léxico que zardan sus redactores es de un extremado realismo: masturbación, prostitución, placas sifilíticas, piojos, pelandrunas, que le parió etc. etc. Muy, muy realista.”⁹

Although one cannot divide the Buenos Aires cultural groups into rigidly defined ideological positions, the differences between them were marked. The solemn, rather pious young radicals of Boedo were faced with problems similar to those of Henri Barbusse, the founder of the Clarté movement in France: both tried to disseminate the teachings

of rationalism and socialism to the masses with no real working class support, and in a climate of increasing censorship.¹⁰ Evar Méndez, on the other hand, closed *Martín Fierro* rather than have his magazine take an overtly political stand.¹¹ It is interesting in this context that in 1926, Ricardo Güiraldes published *Don Segundo Sombra*, and Roberto Arlt *El juguete rabioso*. These two writers, with their divergent views as to the social function of literature, can be taken as symbols of the split that existed in Argentina even in the 1920s and continued with the appearance of *Sur* in 1931: whereas Güiraldes is a constant memory in *Sur*—the first edition bears his photograph—Arlt never would be published.

One magazine stood apart from these acrimonious, but youthful, debates, on occasion offering paternal advice: *Nosotros*, founded by Roberto Giusti and Alfredo Bianchi in 1907. This is the only magazine to rival *Sur* in terms of length and scope of publication, but the differences are marked. *Nosotros* was willing to maintain dialogues with all sectors of Argentine cultural life and was interested in problems of Latin America; it tended to be eclectic and include work of very varied quality.¹² This should be contrasted to *Sur*, which maintained its standards and restricted its dialogue. As Giusti, the editor of *Nosotros*, says: "*Nosotros* estaba abierta a todos los escritores argentinos, así tuviera 60 como 25 años. *Sur* en cambio estaba limitada a un pequeño grupo y a ciertos escritores extranjeros."¹³ *Nosotros* continued into the 1930s, but in decline; its moment ended in the 1920s. Similarly, the avant-garde movements to a large extent ran out of ideas and energy. It was *Sur* that was to "set the standard" for the coming years, and was to recruit from the ranks of the Florida magazines.

Sur was supported by the personal fortune of its founder, Victoria Ocampo. Initially, it began as a family enterprise, albeit a divided one: Victoria Ocampo; her sister Silvina, who later married Bioy Casares, the friend and collaborator of Borges; Borges himself;¹⁴ Eduardo Mallea, the literary editor of *La Nación* and close friend of Victoria Ocampo; María Rosa Oliver, who lived "just across the road";¹⁵ and Guillermo de Torre, who married Borges' sister. Other Argentines also participated, most significantly José Bianco and the two most distinguished Latin American writers resident at the time in Buenos Aires: Alfonso Reyes and Pedro Henríquez Ureña.¹⁶

In addition to financial support, the magazine was sustained by the energy of Victoria Ocampo: "*Sur* me ha pertenecido y pertenece materialmente. En lo espiritual ha sido compartida con un grupo de escritores."¹⁷ This material/spiritual division is important in any definition of *Sur*. It aspired to be the expression of a clerisy disinterested in everyday affairs, and yet was deeply rooted in a liberal aristocratic tradition (this conflict will be analyzed below). The quotation underlines

another important point: to read the magazine merely as a reflection of Victoria Ocampo's very personal literary tastes or class background is to simplify and distort.¹⁸ At best this can produce only a partial reading and at worst a merely anecdotal one. No editor can ensure that a composite text confirms his own ideas and tastes unless he writes every article himself. We thus speak of a group acting under the direction and even censorship of Victoria Ocampo and José Bianco, the writer, who served as managing editor (*jefe de redacción*) from 1938 to 1961 and who was largely responsible for guaranteeing the quality and continuity of the contributions over that period.

The name *Sur* originally derived from an attempt at a dialogue with North America. The American novelist and essayist, Waldo Frank, visited Argentina and persuaded Victoria Ocampo into a Pan-American cultural venture, *Norte-Sur*. It became clear, however, after a brief flirtation with "Americanism" in the first few issues, that the dominant cultural matrix would be Europe: "¿Volver la espalda a Europa? ¿Siente el ridículo infinito de esa frase?" The scope of the magazine would thus be enlarged to: "De los que han venido a América, de los que piensan en América, y de los que son de América."¹⁹

A number of foreign visitors arrived in the 1920s and 1930s: Tagore, Drieu de la Rochelle, Waldo Frank, Conde de Keyserling, and José Ortega y Gasset; hospitality was always offered them. The family house was thus of great importance and in many ways the *Sur* publishing house was an extension of the Ocampo estate in San Isidro, a Buenos Aires suburb. It served as a meeting place or perhaps a rallying point for Argentine intellectuals, as Emir Rodríguez Monegal points out, with one of Borges' favorite anecdotes: "Cuando Victoria quería que fuésemos a San Isidro, no nos invitaba: she summoned us."²⁰ Equally, it gave refuge to visiting intellectuals who were passing through Buenos Aires on lecture tours or sponsored trips: those not there in person became accessible through translation. Some of the most significant names of contemporary literature were first published in Spanish in *Sur*: Sartre, Camus, Malraux, Caillois, and Graham Greene are only a few of a lengthy list.

A constant preoccupation of Argentine cultural groups in the twentieth century has been that their country, and in particular Buenos Aires, should be recognized internationally as an important cultural center.²¹ It was felt that Argentine writers and artists could benefit greatly from closer contact with those from other countries. In this way, the problems of geographical distance and isolation from metropolitan centers could be overcome: "*Sur* ha servido de puente entre Europa y nuestros escritores."²² It became apparent, subsequently, that the traffic on this bridge would be largely one way: of *Sur* writers, only Borges would be taken up with enthusiasm abroad.

The “family” nature of the publishing house might also account for the lack of accurate records as to the size and geographical basis of *Sur*’s readership. Circulation figures are given as five thousand, which is quite substantial for an elite magazine. Readership was concentrated in Buenos Aires, although subscriptions were taken out in all parts of Argentina. Similarly, other Latin American countries were influenced by the magazine: both Octavio Paz and Mario Vargas Llosa have talked of the impact of *Sur* in their respective countries.²³ In Europe and North America, copies were received by academic institutions and certain friends of the *Sur* group. It is clear that, at least until the 1960s, the magazine was read by those with a specific or general interest in literary matters. José Bianco makes an interesting point about the heterogeneity of the readership (from an interview with the author):

Aquí había una clase media muy lectora. Lo malo que pasaba con *Sur* era que la leían personas de muy diversa condición social. En otros países cada revista tiene su público. En Francia, por ejemplo, el lector que compra una revista va preparado a encontrar en ella un determinado material de lectura. Sabe que no encontrará artículos conservadores en *Temps Modernes*, o socializantes en la *Revue de Paris*, o edificantes en *Crapouillot*. Pero en *Sur* se corría siempre el albur de molestar a alguien. Una maestra normal que lee un artículo de Breton cree que se están burlando de ella.

It is clear that there were very few “ideal” readers of *Sur*; we will return to this point later.

In the early years *Sur* suffered from a lack of direction. It started off boldly and lavishly for several issues, then appeared irregularly before finally settling as a monthly publication in issue 10 (July 1935). It appeared monthly until 1953, and every two months thereafter. The usual format is a series of leading articles and then a section of notes comprised mainly of book reviews.

A content analysis of the magazine reveals certain distinguishing characteristics:

a. The magazine is made up of “foreign” authors and critics, and a group of Argentine writers; as such its strategy is clear even if the choice is on occasion somewhat eclectic.

b. Foreign names usually take pride of place in terms of hierarchy within the magazine; of the Argentine writers only Borges and perhaps Victoria Ocampo can be guaranteed to have their contribution as the “leading” article.

c. Argentine and foreign contributions account for roughly 50 percent each of the main articles, though the subject matter of the Argentine writers is often related to “universal” literature or general philosophical ideas. There is very little specific reference to problems in Argentina or Latin America—apart from contributions by Raimundo Lida and Carlos Erro—for this is felt to be outside the scope of the magazine.

d. No systematic attempt is made to publish other Latin American authors. Certain writers appear regularly, mainly due to personal friendship—Gabriela Mistral, Octavio Paz, Alfonso Reyes, and later Virgilio Piñera—but the main developments in Latin American literature are not well represented in the pages of *Sur*, and hardly any critical reference is made to them. Writers with a specific interest in Latin American cultural problems, such as Reyes and Henríquez Ureña, do publish occasional articles, but not sufficiently regularly to constitute a critical strategy. In the main, there is indifference, or sometimes open polemic, as in the case of Neruda.²⁴

e. The *Notas* section occasionally contains essays on contemporary affairs, but is mainly a book review section. It varies in length over the forty years, becoming more consistent (about one third of the magazine) in the 1940s and 1950s. Contributors tend to be younger Argentine writers as well as the regular group. Short notes cover a number of themes from philosophy to poetry. The critics always pay particular attention to the titles produced by the *Sur* publishing house (70 percent of which are translations), but the selection is not narrowly confined to a “club.” It tends to cover all important Spanish language titles and a range of foreign language texts. The review section is followed by a regular column on art, and some of the best coverage of contemporary movements is offered by Julio Payró, Hugo Parpagnoli; and Damián Bayón. There is an occasional column on cinema and theatre, but little attempt to examine the specificity of each. A *Calendario*, notes on contemporary affairs in the arts and in politics, appears in the war years and intermittently thereafter.

From the outset, certain elements can be said to define *Sur*. One aspect that has already been mentioned is the “European ideal.” This should be seen in relation to another fundamental concept, that the writer, whatever his sympathies, should have no commitment to political activity. André Gide and the *Nouvelle Revue Française* offered a literary model, and Julien Benda and José Ortega y Gasset systematized such ideas. Benda’s *La trahison des clercs* (1927) theorized the notion of a small disinterested clerisy which was committed to the pursuit of human values and philosophical enquiry, rather than to an involvement in the political and social spheres. Ortega added that the gap between the elite and the masses was unbridgeable, and that the intellectual found more in common with elites from other countries than with the mass of his fellow countrymen. Traditional functions such as leader, politician, and priest were rejected in favor of a mission to preserve intelligence and culture. Ortega visited Argentina twice and influenced writers through his lectures and the journal he edited, the *Revista de Occidente*. Contact with other intellectuals could be made through magazines such as the

Nouvelle Revue Française, the *Criterion*, and the *Revista de Occidente*. The role of the intellectual, in a world that E. M. Forster gloomily described in the early 1920s as "a planetful of scraps" was to preserve the continuity of culture and thus give shape and order to human existence.²⁵

Yet, no writer lives in a historical vacuum. Victoria Ocampo always saw herself in the tradition of Sarmiento and viewed the development of Argentina very much as a family affair: "La historia argentina, que era la de nuestras familias, justo es recordarlo."²⁶ What made the Argentine establishment of the early twentieth century notable was that its wealth and power were paralleled by exacting standards of cultivation. There is a tradition of the gentleman/scholar/politician in Argentina, with men and women of culture having strong formal and informal links with the dominant interest groups of society. When the Prince of Wales came to Buenos Aires to promote a trade fair at this time, he was entertained by Victoria Ocampo and her friends. *Sur* was never just a literary magazine, although perhaps its contributors would argue that it is the appreciation of literature that makes one fit for life. However, once defined as fit for life, a contributor had a right to make general statements about contemporary matters: the magazine was always to have an outlook on politics and history which included certain views and excluded a number of others.

To trace the development and modifications of this discourse over forty years is a complex task. *Sur* appeared almost without a break throughout this period, and charted its own progress in commemorative issues, celebrating 10, 20, 30, 35, and 40 years of publication. In these issues, the emphasis is always on the continuity of culture, the unchanging order, and the discipline of the intellectual even in troubled times. A reading of the magazine within the context of Argentina's historical development, however, suggests certain divisions clearly determined by "external" factors. "El juego político no tiene nada que ver en cierto sentido, con la actividad invisible y constante de las élites que se realiza sobre un plano moral—diría yo—casi metafísico."²⁷ Such a statement could be justified in the early years of the magazine, until 1936–37, since no real definition was necessary. Different ideologies coexisted, as the right-wing nationalist Julio Irazusta comments on his collaboration with the early issues: "Eduardo Mallea, Henríquez Ureña, María de Maeztu, Carmen Gándara, Carlos Alberto Erro, . . . e innumerables otros que no tengo presentes, alternaban con nosotros en un ambiente de convivencia civilizada que habrá sido acaso igualado, pero no superado en otro salón literario."²⁸

This conviviality was lost with the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War and the build-up to the Second World War. Right-wing nationalist critics, such as the Irazusta brothers and Carlos Ibarguren, moved away from the magazine's increasingly defined liberal "third position" (be-

tween communism and fascism, rather than the Peronist use of the term). In August 1937, the magazine declared itself “outside” politics when accused of being too radical by a right-wing Catholic newspaper, yet it is clear that the jealous guarding of the middle ground, under fire from both left and right, was in itself a political stance. The magazine supported the Catholic personalism of the *Esprit* group, such as Maritain and Mounier, and was constantly behind the Allied cause throughout the Second World War. Victoria Ocampo, for example, helped to fund a French literary journal in exile, *Lettres Françaises*. In these years especially, *Sur* was as much a magazine of ideas as a critical and literary journal, and published a number of essays concerning the impact of the war and the general polarization of the world into different ideologies.

This need to defend a position reflects the reality of Argentine economic and social development in the 1930s. The emergence of *Sur* in 1931, with its model of literary decorum after the high spirited iconoclasm of the 1920s, coincides with a time of deepening crisis. Economically, the Great Depression and Britain’s move towards Imperial Preference threatened the peaceful triangular relationship of the 1920s, when Argentina sold to Britain and bought increasingly in the United States. In politics, the Radical strategy proved bankrupt, and the country moved towards open conservative control through a military takeover and electoral fraud, opening what has been called “la década infame.” *Sur*’s response to this crisis will be analyzed below. At this stage it is sufficient to say that it defended “civilization” against fascism from without and protested against fascism from within—the growth of Peronism.

This period also caused certain internal shifts in the magazine. The Spanish literary exile community increased during the Civil War, and poets such as Alberti became regular contributors to *Sur*. During the war years it was difficult to maintain the flow of articles from Europe, and this led to what might be termed cultural import substitution. Borges, Silvina Ocampo, Bioy Casares, José Bianco, and others directed their attack against realism and the psychological novel, with the re-examination of the formal complexities and perfection of fantastic literature and detective fiction. It is only in 1939 that Borges is published as the lead article in *Sur*, but by 1945 his preeminence is established.

1945 sees the reopening of cultural links with Europe, but also precludes the closure of Argentine intellectual life under Perón. Immediately after the war, Victoria Ocampo and José Bianco travelled to Europe and this clearly helped to reestablish contacts. *Sur* produced several anthologies of contemporary literature and published early essays by Sartre, Camus, Malraux, Moravia, and Genet. But already in 1946, essays were suggesting that, with the growing influence of Perón, totalitarianism had taken root in Argentina. One very blunt statement comes in a

poem by Augusto Federico Schmidt, commemorating the anti-Peronist rally of 12 October 1945:

“Yo os ví gentes de Buenos Aires
 Ví a Victoria Ocampo, espléndida en
 el tiempo . . . ,
 Oí el canto del pueblo
 Clamando por la libertad.”²⁹

It was, however, in the massive pro-Peronist rally of 17 October that the real working-class *canto del pueblo* was heard. From this moment, Peronism becomes equated with dictatorship in *Sur*'s discourse. Borges also wrote in 1946: “Las dictaduras fomentan la opresión, las dictaduras fomentan el servilismo, las dictaduras fomentan la crueldad, más abominable es el hecho de fomentar la idiotez. . . . Combatir estas tristes monotonías es uno de los muchos deberes del autor.”³⁰

The late 1940s saw an attempt to maintain the strategy of European contact but with an increasing sense that the group were living as exiles in their own country. No direct censorship was made of the magazine, but an increasing self-censorship operated. There was no comment on Evita Perón's death in 1952, only a small black borderline placed on the cover of issues 213–214 to comply with the government decree on national mourning. Victoria Ocampo was imprisoned for a fortnight in 1953, and Borges' sister Norah and *Sur* contributors Carlos Erro, Vicente Fatone, and Francisco Romero all spent time in Peronist jails. It is not surprising, therefore, that with the downfall of Perón, *Sur* brought out an entire issue entitled “Por la reconstrucción nacional” (*Sur* 237 [Nov.–Dec. 1955]). The issue condemns the past and makes vague general promises about a future in which freedom and good literature (the two terms are synonymous in this issue) will be the norm. Victor Massuh condemns Peronism because “Sus valores eran suburbanos y su expresión no alcanzó a ser literatura.”³¹

Certainly, the post-Peronist years can be seen as heralding a process of modernization, but *Sur* was not to be in the vanguard of this movement. With the downfall of Perón, Argentina was once again receptive to contemporary movements and fashions. The optimism of the Frondizi years, which saw a massive inflow of foreign capital into industry, was reflected in the cultural field in middle-class groups eager to “consume” new trends and reject traditional norms. Juan Carlos Portantiero, makes the following observation: “La emergencia de ese estrato era indicativa de una modernización general de la sociedad argentina, presente tanto en el tipo de consumos . . . de las clases medias, cuanto en la estructura anti-tradicionalista que comenzó a darse durante ese período a los patrones ideológicos dominantes, desde la universidad, en

plena expansión 'cientificista' hasta los medios de comunicación."³² In these conditions, *Sur*, which had always seen itself as the bridge with the best of Europe, was increasingly under attack as traditional and "amateurish," defining standards that no longer seemed applicable to the new generation. Faced with this threat, how would *Sur* adapt to the 1960s?

The cultural impact of the Cuban Revolution cannot be underestimated. In the early years especially, Cuba invited young writers, awarded literary prizes, and promoted discussion. The generation later to be called that of the "boom" was closely identified with this cultural "renaissance" offered by the Revolution. To take an anti-Cuban line in a literary magazine at the time was virtually to condemn that magazine to the wilderness. When Victoria Ocampo objected to a visit to Cuba by José Bianco, on the grounds that the magazine would be compromised, he resigned as jefe de redacción, a post in which he had been a guiding spirit for nearly twenty-five years. This anti-Cuban attitude lost *Sur* the cooperation of the boom writers, the Cubans, and a whole generation of Argentine intellectuals who were closely identified with the Revolution. Yet it was not the single instance of Cuba that caused this loss of direction; it was symptomatic rather of a general trend. Argentina in the 1960s experienced a general cultural boom. These were the years in which Cortázar's novels and short stories began to sell in the tens of thousands, newsweekly magazines such as *Primera Plana* (founded 1962) reflected and directed public taste with a circulation of up to one hundred thousand copies, and the films of Ingmar Bergman moved out of the cine clubs and played to full houses all over the city.

Enrique Pezzoni, who took over as jefe de redacción, has stated that he tried to persuade Victoria Ocampo to change the format of the magazine at that time, but she refused.³³ He tried to convince Argentine writers to write for *Sur*, but in the end found himself contributing to their magazines. Argentina of the 1960s belonged to newsweekly magazines, the most important of which was *Primera Plana*, or smaller theoretical or cultural magazines such as *Los Libros*. *Sur* was left adrift, unable to impose its traditional role or adapt to changing conditions. The thirty-fifth anniversary edition was very much a defensive publication, a mustering of the old guard. The end came in 1970, at a time when Argentina was experiencing the shock of the *cordobazo*, the growth of youth protest and guerilla violence. This was not a cultural climate that *Sur* could influence or even understand. As Victoria Ocampo says in the final regular issue: "Pero la difusión de la cultura no me parece ser el camino elegido por la mayoría de la turbulenta juventud contemporánea."³⁴

SUR AND THE CRITICS

Literary criticism is, of course, never innocent. It is necessary to ask certain questions about its conditions and aims. *Sur*, in fact, represents one side of a debate that might be described as universal versus national, or, more crudely, liberal versus populist. Since liberalism, equated with Europeanism, had been the dominant discourse in Argentina up to the 1930s, it was natural for opposition expressed in antiliberal ideologies to be nationalist and anti-European. The terms of the literary debate are set out clearly by Victoria Ocampo, answering the charge of cultural colonialism in the following way: "El colonialismo espiritual no existe puesto que los bienes espirituales como el verdadero amor (de que habla Shelley en *Epipsychidion*) no disminuyen con el reparto. Las riquezas de la literatura y el arte son un bien común."³⁵ Borges' justly famous essay, "El escritor argentino y la tradición," published in *Sur* in 1955, can also be read in this context, as an answer to certain nationalist excesses (those of Peronism). In this way, the *Sur* standpoint dissolves historical or geographical determinants: value, taste, and decorum are outside such crude debate.

The nationalist view is that "universal" criticism is either Eurocentric or class based (or both) and that it hides indigenous cultures from their own sense of origin or source. Sarmiento's division between civilization and barbarism (civilized Europe/barbarous America) has been the touchstone of this debate in Argentina. Victoria Ocampo, as mentioned previously, had always seen herself as part of this tradition, while the nationalists displayed wilfully barbarous symbols such as Caliban (or, in the case of Argentina, Martín Fierro and Rosas) and rejected the European model.³⁶ Critics of *Sur* dismiss its contributors as *europeizantes* concerned with upholding traditional dependency links. The nationalist critique often fuses with a class analysis: to be antinationalist is to defend aristocratic and/or bourgeois interests. It is alleged that the absolute values expressed are fundamentally European and their responsibility as critics is not in fact to *Art*, but to each other, to their own class. However, the debate has been advanced at such a level of polemic that the real significance of the study of *Sur* has been lost. *Sur* is interesting, not because it expresses or contradicts the world-view of a particular critic, but because it offers a model for the analysis of elite ideologies and their reproduction through the mechanisms and institutions of literature.³⁷ It is, therefore, necessary to define terms rather than remain at the level of generality.

An analysis of how the critical debate around *Sur* has developed throughout its history reveals certain continuities amid the changes. The criticism of socially committed writers was to continue weakly into the

1930s, although one cannot talk of a sustained “marxisant” analysis until the 1950s. Equally, criticism from the right tended to fall back on antiliberal, anti-European generalizations and put forward as an alternative system clericalism, hispanicism, and colonial values.³⁸ Victoria Ocampo and Carlos Ibarguren could be part of the same Argentine delegation to the PEN club conference in 1936, yet Ibarguren’s speech to that gathering shows the gap between them: “. . . de un lado, el factor del debilitamiento de la influencia europea—este eclipse de una cultura, esa desconfianza que nos inspira la inestabilidad de Europa, su porvenir, oscuro e incierto; del otro nuestro anhelo de una personalidad propia. Aún no hemos encontrado esa expresión propia, pero la buscamos.”³⁹

In the late 1930s, a minority nationalist group, FORJA, developed within radicalism, as a response to the confusion and lack of direction of the party in those years. It stressed the increasing split between liberalism and democracy and opposed the dominance of English imperialism. Liberalism was seen as the system which had allowed a landowning elite and foreign interest groups to run the country. The alternative to this order was to be based on popular antiliberal traditions. The group was small (as Perón scathingly pointed out: “There are fourteen of them and they make as much noise as fourteen thousand”⁴⁰), yet they produced a number of important cultural critics, the most persuasive of these being Arturo Jauretche. His writing from the 1940s has attempted to define the nature and the effects of elite hegemony and has focused on Victoria Ocampo as the cultural handmaiden to the dominant economic groups. In his analysis, the literary model for the Argentine “medio pelo” would continue to be Victoria Ocampo and her group.⁴¹ The two major critics who emerged from Peronism, Jorge Abelardo Ramos and Juan José Hernández Arrégui, provided little elaboration or refinement to this analysis. Ramos sets out the division that is at the basis of such criticism:

Imperialismo

Urquiza—Mitre, oligarquía
terratiente porteña, liberal, cultura
europeizante: *Sur*; *La Nación*;
Ocampo, Mallea, Borges.

Emancipación

Rosas, caudillos federales del interior,
revolución proletaria y popular.
Indo-américa—Perón. Conciencia
nacional, literatura americana popular
revolucionaria: Hernández, Gálvez,
Quiroga.⁴²

This model identifies Perón with a proletarian ideology, and expresses the simple faith that popular consciousness, if left to itself, free from European influences, will spontaneously intensify cultural exchange, deepen free communication, and liberate creative expression. A note by Sebrelí in *Sur* points out that this argument works more at the level of romantic idealism rather than historical materialism: “el libro sólo sirve para desvalorizar el materialismo dialéctico que se pretende sustentar.”⁴³

Imperialismo y cultura by Hernández Arrégui is dedicated almost exclusively to *Sur*, but it does not rise above generalities.⁴⁴ It offers a basic analysis of the “neocolonial” status of Argentina, then a reading of *Sur* in this light, focusing on a few individual writers and on the issue “Por la reconstrucción nacional.” It similarly posits values such as “el sentimiento nacional latente,” but the vagueness of such an idea is only too apparent. Any “essentialist” argument is open to question, but it is easier to put a convincing case for literature of the Caribbean, where the essential “otherness” can be defined in terms of color, rhythm, landscape, “marvelous realism” and the like. In Argentina, this is a more difficult generality to advance.

A partial way out of this problem was offered by the group of young critics who were to form the magazine *Contorno*: (Nov. 1953–Apr. 1959): Ismael Viñas, David Viñas, Noé Jitrik, Adelaida Gigli, Ramón Alcalde, León Rozitchner, and later Adolfo Prieto. By a detailed reading of key Argentine literary texts and con-texts, an attempt was made to analyze specific literary forms in their politico-cultural conjuncture. They reinterpreted Arlt (issue no. 2) and Martínez Estrada (issue no. 4), and offered a reading of nineteenth/twentieth century Argentine novels (issue no. 5, 6 September 1955). *Sur* was seen as a product of a master subject as is shown in Adelaida Gigli’s comment: “Porque V.O., no descubre sino que verifica sus gustos largamente cultivados; no crea sino que se identifica con las ya determinadas cosas perdurables en un cerciorarse constante, no lanzada a la verdadera vida espiritual . . . sino a la sociedad de la gente espiritual.”⁴⁵

The journal was also the repository of anti-Peronism as is seen in Oscar Masotta’s article, “*Sur* o el anti-peronismo colonialista” (issue 7, 8 July 1956). This piece is part of a well-balanced issue on Peronism and once again takes exception to *Sur*’s “Por la reconstrucción nacional.” Yet Masotta’s reading of even one number is confined to only two articles and there is no attempt to see the development of the magazine over a period of time. Labels such as “V.O.” and “anti-peronismo” simply point towards important ideas, rather than developing them critically. This group has been responsible for the most substantive criticism of Argentine literature, often reworking their earlier *Contorno* insights, and has revealed much that was weak in *Sur*’s criticism in the 1950s and 1960s. Yet certain key questions—how to analyze a composite text, the nature of the *Sur* group, the importance of cultural institutions, the European cultural matrix—have not been answered in any meaningful way.⁴⁷

There have also been more recent attempts at straightforward class analysis. In *Oligarquía y literatura*, genuine insights coexist with often mistaken readings of the authors under discussion. Blas Matamoros defines *Sur* in the following manner: “La estructura fundante de la

cultura de *Sur* es el salón literario presidido por las grandes damas del preciosismo heredadas de las reinas-escriitoras de Navarra y de la 'calle-juela' que corría junto al lecho de madame de Rambouillot."⁴⁷ Yet, later in his analysis, he concedes that the running of the magazine was left in the hands of the middle classes or petty bourgeoisie, although under the leadership of the oligarchy. The contradictions and confusion in the argument mask Matamoro's main point, that *Sur* was able to neutralize and assimilate different interest groups. A more scientific attempt to link class background with the production of ideas is offered by Juan Marsal in his analysis of Argentine and Mexican essayists. He divides them into two groups, based on their father's occupation: either (a) "clase alta y/o media acomodada" or (b) "clase media que no alcanza a ser acomodada," but comes to no positive conclusions.⁴⁸

TOWARDS A READING OF *SUR*

Sur's claim to be apolitical cannot be seen as an objective reality. Ernesto Sábato has recently stated that in the magazine "Jamás hubo allí ningún filtro ideológico o social, sólo había un filtro literario, que en ocasiones pudo ser equivocado, lo que es humano."⁴⁹ *Sur* can be said to have a clearly defined position in relation to the Spanish Civil War, the Second World War, and the Cuban Revolution. Sábato himself resigned from the Comité de Colaboración in 1961 because of Victoria Ocampo's attitude towards Cuba. The response of the magazine to Peronism was also unambiguous.⁵⁰ Similarly, the European orientation of the magazine should not be seen in purely "universalist" literary terms; it was to play a strategic political role throughout the Second World War and the Peronist administrations by defining the boundaries of civilization.

Yet the claim of the magazine to be apolitical is an important element to be analyzed. In its pages culture was removed from history and placed in an abstract world of literary tradition. It was defined as a repository of eternal human values. The unifying element between a short story by Borges, an essay by Mallea, and a memoir by Victoria Ocampo is the practical negation of politics, the displacement of history in the name of a spiritual body which exists outside its confines. This apparent paradox between commitment and withdrawal becomes clearer if it is seen in the context of the crisis of liberalism since the 1930s.

Throughout its publication, *Sur* was a standard-bearer of civilization at a time when its very values were seen to be threatened worldwide. The emergence of *Sur* and its espousal of liberalism and elitism occurs precisely when these are on the defensive in Europe and Argentina in the face of nationalist and authoritarian regimes. The response of *Sur* in this context is to claim to be above or beyond politics and to reconstitute liberalism in eternal terms and on a purely cultural level:

literature demonstrates the superiority of art over life and sets up an alternative tribunal against which events can be judged.

At the same time, it is asserted that the virtues of literature are inaccessible to the masses; cultural standards can only be maintained by a few. Victoria Ocampo illustrates this point when talking of the mass consumption of Cortázar's novels:

Al mismo tiempo, hecho insólito, el vulgo compra las obras de Cortázar, (tan luego de Cortázar) y se pasea con sus libros en Torino, o en subte o en colectivo. Sin embargo, Cortázar es netamente un autor para minorías, no para lectores a quienes ha de aburrir fabulosamente . . . porque no están preparados para digerirlo y saborearlo. . . . Y que nadie se me ofenda. Frente a la máquina (sin ir mas lejos, la de mi auto, que manejo) soy el vulgo y requetevulgo.⁵¹

Standards are "known," they are not defined, in fact probably could not be defined. *Sur* addressed a group of ideal readers and made a perfectly circular value judgement, recalling the English critic Leavis' famous remark: "That is so, isn't it?" If the readers did not feel or know "that" already, it could not be explained to them.⁵² This made the magazine particularly vulnerable when asked to explain its premises, especially in the 1950s and 1960s. As representatives of a minority culture, they could only defend standards rather than question them. This militant elitism, with its attempt to reconstitute the lost hegemony of liberalism in universal terms, is perfectly consistent with *Sur's* more overtly political stand. The magazine manifested a natural view of the world. What could be more legitimate than that excellence should assume leadership? For its "innocence," *Sur* paid the price. Juaretche charged it in telling fashion:

Así a Victoria Ocampo, durante mucho tiempo no le perdonaron su modernismo oponiéndole la reticencia de la gazmoñería y tardan bastante en comprender en que medida la dama culta, por el simple hecho de transferir su visión europeizante y formar núcleo en su redor era . . . un aliado tácito del sector de donde provenía y que vino a cumplir en el terreno de las letras, la tarea que la Sociedad Rural cumplía respecto de la burguesía . . . un prestigio, con el sello de "las formas tradicionales."⁵³

The battle was to be a losing one, as even the optimism caused by the downfall of Perón could not be sustained. The next generation became increasingly antiliberal, nationalist, and, in the more radical groups, socialist. The values that had sustained *Sur* for so long were seen as largely irrelevant.

It has been assumed from the outset that *Sur* can be read as a text, rather than as a mere anthology with no internal cohesion save for the sum of its individual parts. The arguments against such a reading are (1) that *Sur* contains many different literary and ideological viewpoints;⁵⁴ (2) that, in the world of literary texts, difference causes no

discord—only the criterion of quality applies; and (3) that *Sur* expressed no single ideology of a social class or group—*Sur* is neither oligarchic, since, as Rodriguez Monegal points out, “Borges never owned a ranch in his life,”⁵⁵ nor liberal, since it publishes Marxist critics such as Gramsci or Sartre. Yet Gramsci demonstrates the fallacy of this position: his work shows that hegemony is not maintained by imposing a uniform ideology, but by the way in which different ideological viewpoints are absorbed by the dominant discourse.⁵⁶

The one example of Gramsci’s publication in *Sur* illustrates this point. An issue devoted to Italian literature appeared in 1953, after Victoria Ocampo’s release from a Peronist jail, and the selection of Gramsci’s prison letters shows him as a fellow-suffering intellectual rather than one of the most original Marxist thinkers of the twentieth century. In the same way, the publication of Sartre’s ideas on literature is neutralized by the fact that he is a great French writer. It is only when Sartre and Merleau Ponty escape from the pages of *Sur* into magazines such as *Contorno* that the social and political implications of their writings emerge. Certain ideologies and certain writers were excluded from *Sur*—the case of Roberto Arlt has already been mentioned—but it is more significant to look at how the magazine managed to combine dissonant elements within its discourse. *Sur* published “ideas,” but it was also a cultural institution occupying a specific place in Argentine letters. It could be argued that the context in which articles are read can often determine how they are read. Thus, it is not just by analyzing ideas, but the institutions that uphold these ideas, that the cultural and social impact of *Sur* can be fully understood.

Among the Argentine contributors, using very general categories, two main groups can be discerned—the one moral, idealist, and essentially unstructured (Victoria Ocampo, Mallea, early Martínez Estrada, González Lanuza, and Murena), the other more intellectualized, structured, and linguistic (Borges, Bioy Casares, Silvina Ocampo, José Bianco, Alberto Girri). For the second group, all that redeems the content of a Mallea essay from the realism of *Boedo* is its spiritualist dimension and intention. The division, to use traditional critical terms, is thus between content and form, but the outlook is fundamentally the same. Both groups comprise a civilizing minority with similar views as to the nature of universalism and the role of the intellectual, which have been defined above. The pages of *Sur*, in this way, become more than a selection of heterogeneous texts, and offer a view of literature and life which has been extremely influential, yet increasingly vulnerable to attack.

It remains to show how much can be gained by reading such writers as Borges in the context of *Sur*. Borges himself mocks the whole idea of a “social” reading: “La interpretación económica de la literatura

(y de la física) no es menos vana que una interpretación heráldica del marxismo o culinaria de las ecuaciones cuadráticas, o metalúrgica de la fiebre palúdica."⁵⁷ It has already been stated that the 1940s saw the influence of fantastic literature in Argentina. The study of fantasy has always been formalist,⁵⁸ and the case of Borges is no exception.⁵⁹ A recent critic, John Sturrock, remarks: "There is nothing in them [the stories of Borges] for those whose tastes are moralistic or sociological; everything in them is for those whose tastes are literary."⁶⁰ A study of *Sur*, however, can add to this rather one-dimensional view. First, fantasy can be seen as a group practice: Silvina Ocampo, Borges, Bioy Casares, and José Bianco were all exploring similar themes at the same time. In fact, they met regularly over dinner to elaborate their attack on psychologism and advance the formal perfection of the fantastic/detective story. This intertextual referent is important: the magazine did not create this circle, but they certainly used its pages to put forward their ideas. Another point easily overlooked is that since they were writing for a magazine of about one hundred pages, the short story was an obvious genre to use, a genre that lends itself easily to fantasy.

The stories are often juxtaposed with comments on literature and politics. Borges published the short story "Tlön, Uqbar, Orbis Tertius" in *Sur* 68 (May 1940) and wrote in a book review, two issues later: "Escribo en julio de 1940: cada mañana la realidad se parece más a una pesadilla. Sólo es posible la lectura de páginas que no aluden siquiera a la realidad: fantasías cosmogónicas de Olaf Stapledon, obras de teología, o de metafísica, discusiones verbales, problemas frívolos de Queen o de Nicolas Blake."⁶¹ After this, passages such as the 1947 Postdata to "Tlön" (written, of course, in 1940) seem to make more sense:

Hace 10 años bastaba cualquier simetría con apariencia de orden—el materialismo dialéctico, el anti-semitismo, el nazismo—para embelesar a los hombres. ¿Como no someter a Tlön a la minuciosa y vasta evidencia de un planeta ordenado? Inútil responder que la realidad también está ordenada. Quizá lo esté, pero de acuerdo a leyes divinas—traduzco a leyes inhumanas—que no acabamos nunca de percibir.⁶²

However ironic these passages may be, they still suggest Borges' deep pessimism about conflicting ideologies and his mistrust of history as "development."

Critics are usually content to analyze Borges' explicit philosophy or else give him the benefit of the ironic doubt. In the story "El jardín de senderos que se bifurcan"—(important to *Sur* because it published a protest issue when the anthology of that name failed to win the municipal prize)—we are given T'sui Pen's version of a novel in which all options are open at every stage in the development of the story. Since we are not reading T'sui Pen's novel, but Borges' fiction, we soon realize that such a novel is an impossibility, it would literally be non-sense. The

act of writing is a choice among options and Borges' deliberately incomplete style is one such choice which should not always be taken on its own terms.

Pierre Macherey has pointed out that, following logically from a Borges short story, it would be possible to write in such an insufficient way that the importance of what was *not* being said could be highlighted.⁶³ Borges states once again in "Tlön, Uqbar, Orbis Tertius": "Bioy Casares había cenado conmigo y nos demoró una vasta polémica sobre la ejecución de una novela en primera persona, cuyo narrador omitiera o desfigurara los hechos e incurriera en diversas contradicciones, que permitieran a unos pocos lectores—a muy pocos lectores—la adivinación de una realidad banal o atroz."⁶⁴ The reality of a Borges short story, of what is *not* said, might be seen not as "banal" or "atroz," but rather as a specific response to certain historical options: a reordering of a world that had ceased to make sense in fictions whose abstract perfection ultimately stifle thought as an active principle. Like Victoria Ocampo, Borges sees Argentine history as a family affair. In the stories written at this time, he turns from the "barbarity" of his mother's lineage to the shelter of his father's library, full of English books. Characters such as Funes are condemned to die of pulmonary congestion, rather than encounter their "American Destiny" in a cavalry charge or a knife fight.⁶⁵ In this enclosed world of literature, history is transformed into art, into fictions which obey certain rules, however eclectic. The problem with movements such as Peronism is that they do not obey the rules, and therefore produce bad art: "Hubo así dos historias: una de índole criminal, hecho de cárceles, torturas, prostituciones, robos, e incendios; otra, de carácter escénico, hecha de necedades y fábulas para consumo de patanes."⁶⁶

This can be seen as an intellectualized rewriting of the *Sur* maxim concerning the response to art and the ability to live a civilized, humane life. The notion of elite culture and the growing gap between culture and civilization have a social and political character in so far as the threat of "levelling-down" is clear. *Sur* felt that it alone could define terms such as "art" and "civilization." Borges' fiction and essays can thus be seen as a production at a certain time, in and for a certain group. Such points are rarely raised by formalist literary criticism.

CONCLUSION: HOUSE/PUBLISHING HOUSE

On a visit to Buenos Aires in 1929, Waldo Frank offered an interesting insight into the house—and by extension, publishing house—of Victoria Ocampo. It was during this visit that the idea of setting up a magazine was first discussed.

En este conglomerado de elegancias prestadas . . . se ve una casa sencilla, espaldo con espaldo del palacio retórico de la embajada española. Las paredes de esta casa son ladrillos blanqueados. . . . Al pie de la escalera se ve un cactus en una caja de espejos . . . la dueña de esta casa es una hija de conquistadores, llamada Victoria Ocampo. . . . “¿Que quise hacer?”—nos dice—“Quise hacer entrar el cielo y los árboles en mis cuartos—Y entraron—Quise espacio . . . ámbito . . . paredes blancas y desnudas, un fondo tan neutral y tan claro, que el color de la cubierta de un libro . . . una flor en un vaso, fuesen de pronto una fiesta para los ojos”—Se puede aun ir más lejos—Dona Victoria ha copiado muchas cosas de Europa: Los tapetes son de un francés . . . las mesas son inglesas, el amplio globo del hall es del Renacimiento y las líneas arquitectónicas son deudoras de las escuelas de Alemania y de Francia. Pero todos estos detalles han sido transfigurados y dispuestos por una argentina, por una voluntad americana. Victoria Ocampo . . . en su culto a la luz y en su trabajo de estructuración dentro del caos de la Pampa, se ha dado cuenta de que debe tomar el cactus amargo entre sus manos y apretarle contra su corazón—Y ha sido la profetisa de su país.⁶⁷

This long quotation neatly summarizes the various themes that have been discussed here. *Sur* perceived its role as that of a civilizing minority in the literary and ideological “chaos of the Pampa.” It “ordered” the literary world after the effervescence and experimentation of the 1920s, and attempted to maintain standards of literary decorum throughout “troubled” periods such as the Second World War, Peronism, and the growth of alternative cultural models in the 1960s. As a mirror of Argentine cultural activity—“a cactus in a mirror-box”—it must be seen as fragmented, offering a partial, selective reflection.⁶⁸ The significance of *Sur*’s discourse lies as much in what it does *not* say as in what it reveals. Similarly, it must not be seen exclusively as the refraction of its founder’s taste, but as the work of a group.

Sur’s practice involved an opening to the world, in an attempt to break away from cultural provincialism—“quise espacio . . . ámbito.” This involved bringing many writers from Europe and “arranging” them with Argentine contributors in the pages of the magazine. The arrangement has provoked a bitter controversy. Critics of *Sur* have seen its strategy as that of “whitewashing” Argentine culture so that the objects of value—European—can be shown to better effect (“white walls,” a “neutral” background). For Waldo Frank and many others, however, the organization proved harmonious, not just a copy of foreign styles, but a real process of transformation. However its work is judged, *Sur* is one of the most important achievements in the cultural life of Latin America in the twentieth century. In this way its founder Victoria Ocampo—who died recently—can still lay claim, after a lifetime’s work in *Sur*, to being a “profetisa de su país.”

NOTES

1. For a general survey of Argentine literary magazines, see H. Lafleur, S. Provenzano, and F. Alonso, *Las revistas literarias argentinas, 1893–1960* (Buenos Aires: Ed. Culturales Argentinas, 1962).
2. Two comprehensive accounts of the development of specific literary magazines can be found in F. Mulhern, *The Moment of Scrutiny* (London: NLB, 1979) and A. Anglès, *André Gide et le premier groupe de la Nouvelle Revue Française* (Paris: NRF, 1978).
3. Mulhern, *The Moment*, p. ix.
4. See the introduction to E. Said, *Orientalism* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980).
5. Néida Salvador, *Revistas argentinas de vanguardia (1920–1930)* (Buenos Aires: Universidad de Buenos Aires, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, 1962); María Luisa Bastos, *Borges ante la crítica argentina, 1923–1960* (Buenos Aires: Ed. Hispamérica, 1974).
6. J. L. Borges, "Autobiographical Essay." Quoted in E. Rodríguez Monegal, *J. L. Borges: A Literary Biography* (New York: Dutton, 1978), p. 129.
7. See M. R. Oliver, *La vida cotidiana* (Buenos Aires: Ed. Sudamericana, 1969) and E. González Lanuza, *Los martinfierristas* (Buenos Aires: Ed. Culturales Argentinas, 1961).
8. R. Mariani, *Martín Fierro* 7 (25 julio 1924).
9. Evar Méndez, *Martín Fierro* 8–9 (agosto–setiembre 1924).
10. See Frank Field, *Three French Writers and the Great War* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1975).
11. Rodríguez Monegal is of the opinion that the Florida/Boedo polemic was a publicity stunt, but also a "determined effort by some writers more or less connected with the emerging Argentine Communist party, to gain control of or destroy the avant-garde movement." Monegal, *J. L. Borges*, p. 192.
12. In an interview with the author, José Bianco, jefe de redacción of *Sur*, pointed out that he published his most adolescent work in *Nosotros*.
13. Interview with Roberto Giusti. Oral History Project, Instituto Torcuato Di Tella, Buenos Aires, 1971.
14. The literary division between Borges and Victoria Ocampo has been recently illustrated by Borges: "Yo juzgaba a los escritores por su retórica o por su facultad de invención, Victoria por su indole o por su contexto biográfico. Detrás del libro, que es la máscara, indagaba el rostro secreto" (*La Prensa*, suplemento, 8 abril 1979).
15. See Oliver, *La vida cotidiana*.
16. An account of Alfonso Reyes in Buenos Aires is given in P. Patout, *Alfonso Reyes et La France* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1978), pp. 463–500.
17. Victoria Ocampo, "Después de cuarenta años," *Sur* 325 (julio–agosto 1970), p. 1.
18. The problems of such an approach are illustrated in Ian Hamilton, *The Little Magazines: A Study of Six Editors* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1976).
19. Victoria Ocampo, "Carta a Waldo Frank," *Sur* 1 (verano 1931), pp. 11, 16.
20. Emir Rodríguez Monegal, as part of an homage to Victoria Ocampo, in *Vuelta*, 30 mayo 1979, p. 46.
21. A comparison could be made in this respect with the project of the Di Tella Arts Centers in the 1960s. The author is presently engaged in a study of these centers.
22. Victoria Ocampo, "Vida de la revista *Sur*: 35 años de una labor," *Sur* 303–305 (noviembre 1966–abril 1967), p. 19.
23. Interview with the author.
24. See especially "Pablo Neruda y *Sur*," *Sur* 221 (marzo–abril 1953), p. 121.
25. Quoted in Ian Wright, "F. R. Leavis, the *Scrutiny* Movement, and the Crisis," in *Culture and Crisis in Britain in the 30s* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1979), p. 41.
26. Victoria Ocampo, *Testimonios (quinta serie)* (Buenos Aires: Ed. Sur, 1957), p. 28.
27. Leo Ferrero, "Carta de Norteamérica, crisis de elites," *Sur* 8 (setiembre 1933), p. 114.
28. Julio Irazusta, "Historia de una revista," *La Opinión Cultural*, 4 marzo 1979.
29. A. F. Schmidt, "12 de octubre de 1945," *Sur* 137 (febrero 1944), p. 74.
30. J. L. Borges, "Palabras pronunciadas por J. L. Borges en la comida que le ofrecieron los escritores," *Sur* 142 (agosto 1946), p. 115.
31. V. Massuh, "Restitución de la verdad," *Sur* 237 (noviembre–diciembre 1955), p. 107.

32. J. C. Portantiero, "Economía y política en la crisis argentina, 1958–1973," *Zona Abierta* 14–15 (1978), p. 126.
33. Interview with the author.
34. Victoria Ocampo, "Después de cuarenta años," p. 5.
35. Victoria Ocampo, *Testimonios (novena serie)* (Buenos Aires: Ed. Sur, 1975), p. 220.
36. R. Fernández Retamar, "'Calibán,'" *Casa de las Americas* 68 (setiembre–octubre 1971).
37. I will omit discussion of the the whole spectrum of magazines that produced similar material, because, first, *Sur* was very much a model of its kind and any general points made about it can apply to other, less ambitious "little magazines"; and, second, as Jaime Rest points out, no magazine was willing to take up the mantle of *Sur* in the 1950s or 1960s, when a new impetus was clearly necessary: "Una revista como ésta [*Sur*] tiene duración limitada, como expresión no sólo del ciclo vital de sus fundadores sino también de las cambiantes circunstancias del mundo. Sin embargo *Sur* no pudo desaparecer . . . porque no fue reemplazada. Las generaciones siguientes—incluida la mía—permanecieron atomizadas por un pasado inmediato atroz y un presente incierto" (*La Opinión Cultural*, 4 marzo 1979).
38. The works of R. Doll, L. Castellani, C. Ibarguren, and the Irazusta brothers that deal with this subject have been reprinted recently in the collection "Biblioteca del Pensamiento Nacionalista Argentino" ((Buenos Aires). See also the essay on populism in E. Laclau, *Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory* (London: NLB, 1979). Paul Commack pointed out the relevance of this essay to my argument.
39. C. Ibarguren, *La historia que he vivido* (Buenos Aires: Ed. Universitaria de Buenos Aires, 1969), pp. 466–67.
40. Quoted in OSS reports, Research and Analysis 3007, National Archive, Washington, 21 April 1945.
41. A. Juaretche, *El medio pelo en la sociedad argentina* (Buenos Aires: Ed. A. Peña Lillo, 1967).
42. J. A. Ramos, *Crisis y resurrección de la literatura argentina*, 2d. ed. (Buenos Aires: Ed. Coyoacán, 1961). The synopsis of his ideas, included here, is given in Ramón Alcalde, "Imperialismo cultural y literatura nacional," *Contorno* 5/6 (setiembre 1955).
43. J. Sebrelí, "J. A. Ramos: Crisis y resurrección de la literatura argentina," *Sur* 230 (setiembre–octubre 1954), p. 120.
44. J. J. Hernández Arréguí, *Imperialismo y cultura*, 3d ed. (Buenos Aires: Ed. Plus Ultra, 1973).
45. Adelaida Gigli, "'V. O.," *Contorno* 3 (setiembre 1954).
46. One text that deals with the complexities of *Sur* is David Viñas, *De Sarmiento a Cortázar* (Buenos Aires: Ed. Siglo Veintiuno, 1974).
47. Blas Matamoro, *Oligarquía y literatura* (Buenos Aires: Ed. del Sol, 1975), p. 59.
48. J. Marsal, "Los ensayistas socio-políticos de Argentina y Méjico," *Documento de Trabajo* 65 (Buenos Aires: Instituto Torcuato Di Tella, 1969). In her recent critique of this article, Francis Korn asks how a father's occupation helps to determine analytical inclinations, and concludes that categories such as "small" or "tall" fathers might be equally "helpful." "¿Clases sociales?" in F. Korn, ed., *Ciencias sociales, palabras y conjeturas* (Buenos Aires: Ed. Sudamericana, 1977), pp. 24–25.
49. E. Sábato, *La Prensa*, suplemento, 8 abril 1979.
50. Victoria Ocampo was perceived as an important political figure in the mid-1940s. "The Braden campaign can resolve itself into an attempt to unite against Perón the estanciero class, who have much to lose, and intellectual Radicals (especially the rich ones like Victoria Ocampo) whose leftist tendencies unite with their life of ease in their desire to keep out fascism." British Foreign Office dispatch, Hadow to Perowne, 13 December 1945 (AS 6572–317–51, F.O. 371–45019, Public Record Office, Kew, London).
51. Ocampo, "Después de cuarenta años," p. 3.
52. Mulhern, *The Moment*, pp. 172–76.
53. Juaretche, *El medio pelo*, p. 292.
54. José Bianco has pointed to his interest in diversity: "Si para que negarlo, me gustaba hacer conocer en la revista opiniones y puntos de vista diferentes. Tengo lo que Paulhan llamaba: 'le goût du monstre'" (interview with the author).
55. Rodríguez Monegal, *J. L. Borges*, p. 424.

56. See A. Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971), and Laclau, *Politics*, pp. 160–61.
57. J. L. Borges, "Jack Lindsay: A Short History of Culture," *Sur* 60 (setiembre 1939), p. 67.
58. V. Propp, *The Morphology of the Folk Tale* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1968); T. Todorov, *Introduction a la littérature fantastique* (Paris: Tel Quel, 1972).
59. For an analysis of this phenomenon, see the article by Noé Jitrik, "Estructura y significado en 'Ficciones' de Jorge Luis Borges," *Casa de las Américas* 53 (marzo-abril 1969)
60. J. Sturrock, *Paper Tigers: The Ideal Fictions of J. L. Borges* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 4.
61. J. L. Borges, "Ellery Queen. The New Adventures of E. Q.," *Sur* 70 (julio 1940), p. 62.
62. J. L. Borges, "Tlön, Uqbar, Orbis Tertius," *Sur* 68 (mayo 1940), p. 45.
63. P. Macherey, "Borges et le récit fictif," in *Pour une théorie de la production littéraire* (Paris: Maspero, 1966).
64. Borges, "Tlön," p. 30.
65. See Jitrik, "Estructura y significado." See also Ricardo Piglia, "Ideología y ficción en Borges," *Punto de Vista*, núm. 5 (marzo 1979).
66. J. L. Borges, "L'illusion comique," *Sur* 237 (noviembre-diciembre 1955), p. 9.
67. W. Frank, *América Hispana* (Buenos Aires: Ed. Losada, 1950), pp. 120–21.
68. See Macherey, *Pour une théorie*, especially the chapter on Lenin as critic of Tolstoy.