

1979

## Julio Cortázar: Utopia and Everyday Life

Jean Franco

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.providence.edu/inti>



Part of the [Fiction Commons](#), [Latin American Literature Commons](#), [Modern Literature Commons](#), and the [Poetry Commons](#)

---

### Citas recomendadas

Franco, Jean (Otoño-Primavera 1979) "Julio Cortázar: Utopia and Everyday Life," *Inti: Revista de literatura hispánica*: No. 10, Article 15.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.providence.edu/inti/vol1/iss10/15>

This Cortázar's Novels is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@Providence. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Inti: Revista de literatura hispánica* by an authorized editor of DigitalCommons@Providence. For more information, please contact [dps@providence.edu](mailto:dps@providence.edu).

## **JULIO CORTAZAR: UTOPIA AND EVERYDAY LIFE**

**Jean Franco**

The display-window of neo- and post-Marxist thinking offers a wide range of alternatives to old-style class analysis. Repression is now located not in a dominant, single-minded and exploitative class-subject but rather in a far more extensive variety of practises and institutions, including everyday life (the family, the environment and leisure). At the same time, the bureaucratisation of the state, the concentration of technical knowledge in the hands of specialists and the increasing privatization of daily life have made the old familiar political battlegrounds appear anachronistic. The possibility of meaningful political action under the old banners has given way to small group practises and new forms of solidarity which no longer depend on the consciousness of a rising class, formed in the work-place, and acting in accordance with its own interests. Rather, liberatory politics shift along the fault lines of the system as race, class, sex, religion, language or environment pressure the structure.<sup>1</sup>

Plainly, it is along the fault lines that we have to locate Cortázar's writing not only because the characters in his novels are outside the workplace, not only because his novels are clearly intended to undermine the institutionalization of literature itself by allowing heterogeneous material to invade the texts but also because his texts perform a break with tradition (whether of the reader or the characters) in order to establish new kinds of relationship — one of complicity between reader and writer which is reflected dia-ge-tically in the relations between a Utopian group. In this respect, his writing offers an instructive contrast to that of Borges. For it seems that Cortázar's texts deliberately put on display what Borges excluded in the interest of distancing himself and the reader from everyday life. Borges' fictions are machines for the deconstruction of familiar frames of reference. They create radical uncertainty in the reader, an uncertainty which cannot be translated into social practice but only into *askesis*, that is to say, they move "not towards a sharing-with-others . . . but towards a being-with-one-self."<sup>2</sup> The very efficiency of the Borges' fiction as a machine for activating the reader's renun-

ciation of the world is in stark contrast to the "inefficiency" of Cortázar's writing — the sentences cannot be ended, the right person for telling the story cannot be found, the climax of a novel is botched (e.g. *Libro de Manuel*) and the texts themselves constantly refuse to be terminated. In fact such breakdowns are intended to close the distance between author and reader. Instead of the mastery which Borges' fictions convey, Cortázar's writing attempts to convince the reader of the author's absent-mindedness. In part, this absent-mindedness is conveyed through narrators who can not control their production (Michel in "Las babas del diablo"), narrators whose meditations are "prescindibles" (Morelli in *Rayuela*), narrators who fail at crucial moments in the narration ("El que te dije" in *Libro de Manuel*). Even after writing his "purest" text, *62 Modelo para armar*, Cortázar felt the need to supply the material that he had excluded and explain the interruptions which he had experienced during the writing of the novel. These are recorded in an essay, "La muñeca rota" (*Ultimo Round*) in which he also commented that the reader seldom reads a novel continuously: "las interacciones de la vida y de la lectura son apenas tenidas en cuenta por el novelista, un poco como si solamente él y sus criaturas estuvieran metidos en el continuo espacio-tiempo y su lector fuese en cambio una entidad abstracta que sostendrá en algún momento un paquete de doscientas páginas entre los dedos de la mano izquierda y dispondrá de un tiempo corrido para agotarlas."<sup>3</sup> Reading is, then, always a process in which there are pauses during which "everyday life" intervenes.

Another way of closing the gulf between writer and reader is by revealing the authorial position to be just that — a position which is assumed in one particular text but does not imply a consistent authorial identity. An interesting example occurs in the case of "Un turismo aconsejable", a travel essay Cortázar wrote on India. The moral indignation he felt at the sight of the Indian poor had to be reactivated in very different circumstances when he came to write the essay in his country home in Saignon in the south of France. Saignon is a place of friendship and pleasure. Violence invades it in the form of news from the outside world but also through memory as the writer sits down to compose his account of the visit to India between sunbathing on the terrace and talking to his friends. It is not easy for him to make the leap from this idyllic pastoral to the horror of the East. The danger is that the horror ceases to be felt as horror. "Habrà que describirlo desde la otra punta del estilo, de la máquina, de uno mismo, al cabo de una mutación vertiginosa que no soy capaz de operar; me quedo en el asco superficial, en el horror previo a la fabricación de una buena conciencia que consiste probablemente en escribir este texto, como si pudiera servirle de algo al niño que hundía la mano en el vómito del perro, a la mujer que vi en Bombay bajo un sol de abril a mediodía, napalm de los pobres, tendida en una plazoleta en pleno centro, exactamente tendida en la ridículalínea de sombra de

un poste de alumbrado, arrastrándose para seguir la sombra en su desplazamiento de monstruosa aguja de reloj de muerte."<sup>4</sup>

Such a statement helps us to understand how far Cortázar is from "scientific socialism." As he himself admitted, "no llegué a sentirme un escritor de izquierda a consecuencia de un proceso intelectual sino por el mismo mecanismo que me hace escribir como escribo o vivir como vivo, un estado en el que la intuición, la participación al modo mágico en el ritmo de los hombres y las cosas, decide mi camino sin dar ni pedir explicaciones."<sup>5</sup> To dismiss such statements as "irrationalism" implies some supremely rational and conscious position from which adherence to socialism is alone possible. It also underestimates the Utopian element in socialism — the loss of which accounts for the widespread disillusion with socialist states. Indeed one could argue that what scientific socialism has overlooked is both the Utopian and the nature of everyday life in the modern world which has been irreducible to the logics of science and of academic disciplines such as sociology.<sup>6</sup> Cortázar's terrain is thus precisely the one which scientific socialism has ignored. If he can be faulted at all, it is on other grounds, namely his wholehearted and uncritical adoption of an avant-garde view of everyday life which confuses it with the banal.

Precisely because the avant-garde who wanted to change both man and society found modern life and so-called ordinary language to be totally automatized, they invested revolutionary potential only in the great outsiders and transgressors, whether artists or madmen. This romantic view was taken over by the militant left in the sixties, and especially by the proponents of "foquismo" who conceived of the new socialist state as arising as a result of the abrupt detonation of revolution. This detonation could only be achieved by a group of exceptionally heroic people.<sup>7</sup> Despite Che Guevara's distinction between the militant and the intellectual, his model for militancy closely resembled the avant-garde's conception of the dynamics of change. The fact that Cortázar tried to reconcile the militant and the artistic avant-garde in *Libro de Manuel* is, therefore, not particularly surprising. The problem — and this runs deeply through Cortázar's work — is that reconciliation can only be achieved by oversimplifying everyday life under capitalism and by overlooking the points of resistance within everyday life. For Cortázar, the new man can only emerge as a result of a heroic break with what has gone before. Yet, it is important not simply to dismiss his writing as petit bourgeois for he has had the courage to ask questions for which there are no easy answers and has therefore taken more risks than some other writers (e.g. Neruda) whose revolutionary contribution has never been doubted.

It is also important to distinguish Cortázar's Utopian vision of new forms of solidarity (of which more later) from the romantic nostalgia for an original unity. When Hernán Vidal accuses him of mediating his arguments with the nineteenth-century concept of the artistic genius as an "esemplastic

psyche" which synthesizes disparate elements of reality, he cites as evidence the phrase "una síntesis mágico-poético de los elementos más heterogéneos de una cultura" — which Cortázar used to describe Lezama Lima's writing, not his own. Indeed, Cortázar specifically rejects facile syntheses and deliberately includes heterogeneous elements in his novels as fragments irreducible to some imposed narrative coherence. For him, art becomes a mode of cognition, made up of "experiencias tangibles de contactos directos que no tiene nada que ver con la información o la erudición, pero que es su equivalente vital."<sup>9</sup>

Rather than synthesis, Cortázar consistently stresses the incompatibility of the "horror cotidiano" and the Utopian pleasure which he finds in art. Art does not reconcile the viewer to horror but provides him or her with the moment of repose before the battle. "Qué dulce culpa la de haberme dado tanta felicidad en estos tiempos yermos, en este horror cotidiano de abrir el periódico y encontrarlo salpicado de sangre y de vergüenza, qué interregnos de alegría en este siniestro horizonte de máquinas de muerte, en esta dura necesidad de estar despierto y de frente, de viajar y hablar y escribir porque hay que hacerlo, porque somos muchos los que no queremos aceptar el destino latinoamericano que buscan imponernos desde fuera y desde dentro. Por eso cada una de estas páginas es un acto de gratitud, y a la vez un nuevo impulso para no olvidar lo que tenemos que seguir haciendo; entre nosotros el reposo del guerrero es siempre alguna forma de belleza."<sup>10</sup>

Utopia and everyday life are then the complementary aspects of Cortázar's writing. If we accept, as I do, the view that advanced capitalism has drastically altered the composition of modern life, has broken down traditional forms of community and loyalty, has reorganized populations by persuasion or force and has modified the whole concept of culture, then it is possible to consider his writing as a serious, if flawed, attempt to constitute a new and more adequate rapport between literature and reality, by transforming both into practice.

Everyday life has, of course, traditionally been the province of literature. In the nineteenth century, it was narrativised as the story of family life. "Marriage" became the symbolic union of the private and the social and adultery the primary form that transgression took. The banalisation of these themes in mass literature accounts for the reaction of the avant-garde which, from the end of the nineteenth century, began to turn against an aesthetic based on mimesis and representation. In order to acquire freedom from contingency, the pure avant-garde (Mallarmé in literature and Mondrian in painting) required the abstraction of art from daily life, from ordinary language and representation since the latter were, in their view stereotyped and automatized. Cortázar's own flirtation with abstraction is reflected in *Rayuela*, in Morelli's attempt to write a novel which left him "sin palabras, sin gente, sin cosas, y potencialmente claro, sin lectores"<sup>11</sup>; more dras-

tically in *62 Modelo para armar*, he projected a work "que ocurre prácticamente fuera del tiempo y del espacio históricos." <sup>12</sup> At the same time, he is careful to differentiate his project from that of Mallarmé for whom all reality culminated in a book. In his own case, the reverse applies, "en París nació un hombre para quien los libros deberán culminar en la realidad."<sup>13</sup>

"Realidad," however, cannot be equated with social life which, in Cortázar's view is now simply a web of dead routine and responses whose mode of expression is the cliché. "Ahí tenés tu agua de colonia, tomá mi pañuelo aunque en blancura dista de ser perfecta" says Oliveira when Maga discovers that her child has died. For Cortázar, there is no other public language or public ritual so that it is logical that destruction of cliché should become a necessary part of his writing (whether in the form of irony or parody). Oliveira, for instance, describes himself arriving in Paris, "con la suficiencia de una cultura de tres por cinco, entendido en todo, al día en todo, con un buen gusto aceptable, la historia de la raza humana bien sabida, los períodos artísticos, el románico y el gótico, las corrientes filosóficas, las tensiones políticas, la Shell Mex, la acción y la reflexión, el compromiso y la libertad, Piero de la Francesca y Anton Webern, la tecnología bien catalogada, Lettera 22, Fiat 1600, Juan xxxiii, qué bien, qué bien." (p. 485) Considering the dead weight of education, fashionable trends and consumer culture, only radical destruction and complete change can bring about a new society. Plainly, "la historia de la raza humana bien sabida" has nothing to do with a shared sense of history, with community or with a culture which is lived by its participants. History is simply a sign or a status symbol. Hence each of Cortázar's main characters must destroy their past and also their inert cultural baggage either by going to the extreme of self-destruction (Oliveira), by radical forms of transgression (as when Andrés sodomises Francine in *Libro de Manuel*) or by political violence (the Joda). The prospect of building up new forms of solidarity from the dead fragments is, however, slight given the view of everyday life which informs all Cortázar's writing. Solidarity, in his novels, can only come about as a violent break with the past, with a "beginning intention" (to use Edward Said's term).

What will come after the beginning can only be suggested, never described. In *Rajuela*, for instance, it is conceived of as a kind of ubiquitous collective spirit:

si al mismo tiempo pudiera asistir a esa realidad desde mí, o desde Babs, si te fue dada una ubicuidad, entendés, y pudieras estar ahora mismo en esta misma pieza desde donde soy yo y con todo lo que es y lo que ha sido Babs comprenderás tal vez que tu egocentrismo barato no te da ninguna realidad válida. Te da solamente una creencia fundada en el terror, una necesidad de afirmar lo que te rodea para no caerte dentro del embudo y salir por el otro lado y vaya a saber adonde (p. 193).

or in Morelli's terms:

una instancia de ese flujo de la materia animada, de las infinitas interacciones de lo que antaño llamábamos deseos, simpatías, voluntades, convicciones, y que aparecen aquí como algo irreductible a toda razón y a toda descripción; fuerzas habitantes extranjeras, que avanzan en procura de su derecho de ciudad: una búsqueda superior a nosotros mismos como individuos y que nos usa para sus fines, una oscura necesidad de evadir el estado de *homo sapiens*. (p. 417)

The decentered group with its faint suggestion of the Platonic Banquet recurs insistently as the Utopian model. But because narrative is still part of the prehistory of the human race, it is not an adequate instrument for a collective consciousness. Cortázar, like other Utopian writers, looks forward to new forms of collective art and more than this, shares with them the conviction that society itself must eventually function as participatory art. In Robert Elliott's words, "Those who respond in this way have a dazzling, almost hallucinatory sense of what progress will have wrought in the Golden Age they contemplate."<sup>15</sup> Yet, at the same time, what they contemplate, is also self-destruction.

In order to emphasize the gulf between the two states, — between the old ego-centred standpoint and the collective consciousness of the future, Cortázar resorts to a device that is of increasing importance in his work — the device of *collage*. Collage must be carefully differentiated from montage and metaphor. It has been described as "the most heterogeneous and permissive of formal principles. Indeed it is a formal principle only after the fact — it does not require certain kinds of parts or rule any out." In collage, (unlike montage and metaphor), the different elements retain their discreteness, their fragmentary quality.<sup>16</sup> In Godard movies, for example, which rely heavily on collage tenuous unity is only maintained thanks to the sound track. In *Rayuela*, similarly the search provides the merest vestige of a narrative element. The collage principle consists in this novel of a number of set pieces (the death of Rocamadour, Berthe Trèpat, Emmanuelle, connected only by Oliveira), the insertion of "capítulos prescindibles" which include quotations from books, newspapers, the comments of various characters, their conversations, and the journals of Morelli. The inevitably fragmented reading that results encourages the reader's distraction i.e. the reading cannot be continuous and the text is constantly provided with pauses during which the reader's everyday comes into play or during which he or she may simply be "absent-minded" and therefore, able to evade programmed and instrumental activity.

As Walter Benjamin has pointed out, distraction is a different and peculiarly modern way of responding to art. In his essay, "The Work of Art in the

Age of Mechanical Reproduction," Benjamin described architecture as the prototype of an art that calls for distracted participation. The viewer makes contact with buildings through the senses of touch and sight. "Noticing in incidental fashion, the distracted person can form habits. Reception in a state of distraction which is increasing noticeably in all fields of art is symptomatic of profound changes in apperception and finds in the film its true means of exercise."<sup>17</sup> Now, from this Benjamin concludes that new arts like film are profoundly democratic in their potentiality. The entire public is able to become critics even though they are "absent-minded" viewers. In contrast, Cortázar, while recognizing the importance of distraction only comes tardily to recognize that participatory activities cannot be reserved for a special elite.

It is Morelli who first mentions collage in *Rayuela*, conceiving it as something like a series of photographs: "no es cine sino fotografía, es decir que no podemos aprehender la acción sino tan solo sus fragmentos eleáticamente recortados. No hay más que los momentos en que estamos con ese otro cuya vida creemos entender, o cuando nos hablan de él, o cuando él nos cuenta lo que le ha pasado o proyecta ante nosotros lo que tiene intención de hacer. Al final queda un album de fotos, de instantes fijos: jamás la vida realizándose ante nosotros, el paso de ayer al hoy, la primera aguja del olvido en el recuerdo." (p. 532) Thus for Morelli, collage would appear to be a more accurate form of mimesis. The commentary continues, "Por eso no tenía nada de extraño que él hablara de sus personajes en la forma más espasmódica imaginable; dar coherencia a la serie de fotos para que pasarán a ser cine .. significaba rellenar con literatura, presunciones, hipótesis e invenciones los hiatos entre una y otra foto. A veces las fotos mostraban una espalda, una mano apoyada en una puerta, el final de un paseo por el campo, la boca que se abre para gritar, unos zapatos en el ropero, personas andando por el Champ de Mars, una estampilla usada, el olor de *Ma Griffe*, cosas así." (p. 323)

This method of composition foreshadows a new kind of narrator — the "el que te dije" of *Libro de Manuel* who is neither a storyteller nor author but a compiler, a kind of "third person" rather like Sartre's third in the *Critique of Dialectical Reason*. "El que te dije" cannot know the characters in the novel. He can only observe, record and collect and, to some extent, interact and criticise. He is more akin to a reader than to an author in the traditional sense. On the one occasion on which he attempts to narrate (during the attack on the villa at the end of the novel), he fails. Instead of narrating, he simply collects "una considerable cantidad de fichas y papelitos, esperando al parecer que terminarán por aglutinarse sin demasiada pérdida (p. 7)." <sup>18</sup> As he compiles the novel, he mixes up his characters' names, forgets who has said what and finds it hard to write about sex and masturbation. He is neither a theorist nor a prophet, "no soy nada de eso y entonces me callo pero sigo llenando mis fichitas, se me cae la birrome y la vuelvo a levantar (p. 233)."

Collage in this novel has many functions. Indeed, Cortázar felt the need to explain in an introduction his incorporation of "noticias de la prensa, leídas a medida que el libro se iba haciendo: coincidencias y analogías estimulantes me llevaron desde el principio a aceptar una regla del juego harto simple, la de hacer participar a los personajes en esa lectura cotidiana de diarios latino-americanos y franceses." Thus he would incorporate newspaper clippings for the day on which he wrote a certain part of the novel while acknowledging that "el relato como tal no siempre aceptaba de lleno esas irrupciones aleatorias." The newspaper cuttings are, however, not simply aleatory devices. Most of them record acts of state terrorism and thus indicate the dynamic which allows oppositional groups to take form. However, because the newspaper cuttings are taken out of context, they do not supply the contextual information that would really allow the reader to take a position or devise strategies of resistance. But "Manuel's book" is also a collection of collages put together by the Joda as they wait in the villa at Verrieres. Their intention is to provide a kind of archaeology of the present which will be read by the new generation (represented by Manuel or Emmanuel as the Messiah). It also foreshadows the kind of collective creation which has no need for a narrator or author.

Collage is thus directly related to the Utopian vision of the *Libro de Manuel* but so is avant-garde art insofar as this breaks violently with tradition in order to establish a radically new mode of being. In an interesting meditation on Stockhausen's *Prozession*, Andrés violently rejects any possibility of the coexistence of the old and the new. Only a violent break can establish a new mode of being "que busca abarcarlo todo. La cosecha de azúcar en Cuba, el amor de los cuerpos, la pintura y la familia y la descolonización y la vestimenta." We note that this does not suggest a synthesis of heterogeneous elements but a coexistence of different Utopian entities — in other words a kind of collage.

Up to and including *Libro de Manuel*, Cortázar uses the narrator's relation with the reader to symbolize social relationships and practices. Conversations and play are models of interaction and the modes by which solidarity can be established without being institutionalized. On the thematic level, this is also illustrated in the *Libro de Manuel* by the meeting of the Joda at the villa in Verrieres. Here they are constituted as a solidarity group by an act of violence (the kidnapping) and they are pledged in a series of symbolic acts — a kiss, a meal and a conversation, as well as by their act for the future — the compilation of the book for Manuel. But both the "lector — cómplice" who is capable of achieving solidarity with the narrator and the vanguard group represented by the Joda are still a privileged group marked by their opposition to daily life and mundane reality. As however quickly became obvious in the early seventies, an elite revolution which has no contact with ordinary people or everyday life quickly becomes a failed revolution.

It is significant that when Cortázar came to write *Fantomas contra los vampiros multinacionales*, he should for the first time seriously entertain the idea that there might be forms of resistance which had nothing to do with the literary avant-garde.<sup>19</sup>

In this comic-strip novel, the role of the narrator (Cortázar) once again undergoes transformation. This time, the narrator becomes a character in a comic strip. The story begins in familiar terrain with the author's abrupt transition from horror (the evidence of the Russell Tribunal on torture in Latin America) to pleasure — in this case a *Fantomas* comic strip which the narrator picks up to read on the train.

The pleasure arises not only from the satisfactory way that *Fantomas* confronts the international conspiracy to destroy books but also from the feeling of solidarity the comic-strip immediately arouses among the narrator's fellow passengers in the train. Cortázar's fantasy is described as an "achievable Utopia." In it, the comic-strip is prolonged into real life as he and his friends become the victims of a C.I.A. plot to destroy knowledge. This in itself represents an interesting about turn since Cortázar and an international group of writers, rather than being avant-garde destroyers of the past, become the defenders of the libraries. Even more surprising, special insight is granted not to *Fantomas* or the narrator but to ordinary people whom as a character called "Susan Sontag" claims know quite well what is going on. "Esas cosas se saben, Julio, las sabe un maestro o un ciclista, en el fondo todo el mundo las sabe, pero somos flojos o andamos desconcertados, o nos han lavado el cerebro y creemos que tan mal no nos va simplemente porque no nos allanan la casa o no nos matan a patadas." The people in this novel are no longer simply automatized mass men but are thousands of anonymous voices of resistance (Cortázar still distinguishes "writers" from the mass by naming them) — which are heard over the telephone wires as "una inatajable catarata de pechos y de voluntades".

It is *Fantomas* who facilitates this massive call-in which, for the first time, allows the intellectuals to hear the voices of those who are never mentioned in the newspapers. At the end of the story, *Fantomas* flies out of the window and finds a child playing with stones:

Jugaba muy seriamente, como hay que jugar, juntaba las piedritas, las tiraba entres sus pies tratando de que se entrechocaran, volvía a juntarlas, las tiraba de nuevo.

*Fantomas* takes a sweet out of his pocked and gives it to the child in an act of symbolic exchange. He represents the Utopian in mass culture and its transmission from one generation to another.

With this text, Cortázar himself for the first time seems to recognize that mass culture also has Utopian potential. At the same time, as in *Libro de Manuel*, the collage principle is not the aleatory device he had once claimed it to

be but rather forms a set of references to establish the "horror cotidiano." Further these references are no longer made to appear random but frame the text itself which begins with the narrator emerging from the Russell Tribunal meeting in Brussels and ends with the report of the Russell Tribunal on torture in Latin America.

*Fantomas* is a much slighter piece of work than *Rayuela* and perhaps its main interest, is the shift it indicates in Cortázar's view of mass culture. Unlike his previous novels in which the Utopian was invested in an avant-garde collective, Cortázar here extends the Utopian to include more than lectores-cómplices. He thus makes the first tentative break with the common belief (particularly among French intellectuals) that daily life in modern society is totally manipulated and directed by the state and its institutions. At this point, it is useful to remind ourselves that the avant-garde attitude which Cortázar inherited from surrealism has a genealogy which renders it suspect for anyone seriously concerned with democratic participation and solidarity. For more than a hundred years, the stimulus of the avant-garde has been its effort to differentiate itself from mass culture and mass society which it had always defined as automatized and robot-like. Long before the New Left and the Frankfurt school, all that was not avant-garde had been denominated "mass" and the masses were both unthinking and uncreative. Artistic freedom and experiment meant freedom from the presumed demands of this mass as well as freedom from the market, freedom from factory hours and conditions, freedom from utility. The avant-garde artist could only maintain a sense of privilege and of being out front as long as the myth of this "inactive" mass remained.<sup>20</sup> This is the cliché which bonds all of Cortázar's writing and it is against this supposed world of cliché that active reading and practices take place. *Fantomas* constitutes a real change from this position. The text reveals that democratic solidarity cannot be based on an avant-garde aesthetic and that the Utopian does not need high culture for its transmission, nor do people need authors to create for them. The logic of this ought to lead Cortázar to follow Benjamin and accept the democratizing and collective potential of art. His contradiction is that he has never quite been able to do so.

#### NOTAS

1. See for instance the discussion between Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze in *L'Arc* (no 49 pp. 3-10) and, from another point of view, Jurgen Habermas, *Towards a Rational Society. Student Protest, Science and Politics* (Beacon Press, 1970)
2. Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence* (O.U.P., paperback edition, 1975) p. 123.
3. "La muñeca rota", *Ultimo Round* (Mexico, Siglo xxi, 1969) p. 105.

4. "Uno de tantos días en Saignon", *Ultimo Round* p. 20.
5. "Acerca de la situación del intelectual latinoamericano", *Ultimo Round* p. 208.
6. Michel de Certeau, *Arts de faire*, vol 1 of *L'invention du quotidien* (Paris, Union Générale d'Éditions, 1980).
7. Ernesto Guevara, *El socialismo y el hombre en Cuba* (La Habana, Ediciones Revolución, 1965). I briefly touch on this point in "From Modernization to Resistance. Latin American Literature 1959-76," *Latin American Perspectives* issue 16, vol v, no 1, (1978) pp. 77-97.
8. Hernán Vidal, "Cortázar y la Nueva Izquierda," *Ideologies and Literature*, vol 2, no 7, may-june) p. 47. Vidal is referring to the article already mentioned, "Acerca de la situación del intelectual latinoamericano".
9. "Acerca de la situación del intelectual latinoamericano," p. 211.
10. "Explicaciones más bien confusas," *Territorios* (Mexico, siglo xxi, 1978) p.7.
11. The page numbers for *Rajuela* refer to the first edition, (Buenos Aires, Sudamericana, 1963)
12. "Acerca de la situación del intelectual latinoamericano," p. 210.
13. *op.cit.* p. 207
14. I discussed the way irony undercuts the vision of community in "Paris, ciudad fabulosa", included in Juan Loveluck (ed.) *Novelistas hispanoamericanos de hoy*, (Madrid, Taurus, 1976) pp. 271-290
- 15 Robert Elliott, "The Costs of Utopia," *Studies in Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century*
- 16 Brian Henderson, *A Critique of Film Theory*, (N.Y., E. P. Dutton) p. 69.
17. Walter Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," *Illuminations* (London, Cape, 1970) p. 242.
18. Page references to *Libro de Manuel* are to the second edition (Buenos Aires, Sudamericana, 1973). See also Evelyn Picón Garfield, *Cortázar por Cortázar* (Universidad Veracruzana, 1978), especially pp. 56-7.
19. Julio Cortázar, *Fantomas contra los vampiros multinacionales* (México, Excelsior, 1975).
20. For further discussion see "On/Against Mass Culture," *Tabloid I* (June, 1980)