

TOMO I

Capitulo 10

TRAGEDY, DISHONOR and MORAL PROFILAXIS in ARGENTINE CULTURE.

published

in

<http://www.youdebate.com/cgi-bin/scarecrow/topic.cgi?forum=17&topic=457>

In this article I would like to expand myself around a topic that belongs to the sociology of knowledge, specifically the different politico-psychological traumas produced in the cultural field as a result of tragedies untied by state terrorism, such as intellectual exile, moral indifference, and collaborationism, as well as the subsequent need to generate a moral profilaxis in the interior of cultural institutions that deeply dig in all those marks that have been undermining academic freedoms.

1.- Intellectual Exile as Political Resistance Against State Terrorism. Argentina and the Maryland Conference (1984).

With respect to exile, it is well known that it is as old as human history, where it was achieved in all times and places and in Argentina specially during Rosas regime (1836-52), afterwards in Quintana's time (1905), Uriburu's (1930-1931) and in times of the 1943 Revolution and its extension during Peron's government (1946-55), also from the revolution which hurled him down in 1955, as well as during the time of the auto-named Argentine Revolution (1966-72) [1]. But it is also certain that not all exiles were of the same entity or consideration, as in the history of humanity different exiles were given, external and internal ones, the purely economic known as mere emigration as well as the exclusively political and also the strictly intellectual.

With reference to the external exile experienced during the Argentine genocide regime (1976-1983), increased prolongation of a purely academic previous exile (1966-72), I have been asking myself for some time, why an investigation on the purpose of same has not continued? Saul Sosnoswski, who organized in December 1984 a Conference of Argentine intellectuals in the University of Maryland (U.S.A.), who participated among others, Leon Rozitchner, Tomás Eloy Martínez, Noé Jitrik, Tulio Halperin Donghi, Beatriz Sarlo, José Pablo Feinmann, Liliana Hecker, Luis Gregorich, Kive Staiff and Juan Carlos Martini, afterwards reported - in 1988 published compilation - their remembrances of said meeting "The climax was tense before inauguration. Strategies of Confronting and Distension were faced, accusation of denunciations and silences, for geographic displacements and permanence" [2] The same guest distribution and its different contribution and contents in five (5) different sessions revealed the existing friendships and rivalries. Halperin also integrated session I called "Contexts" only with Solari Yrigoyen and Peralta Ramos. And Kive Staiff and Kovadloff accepted to integrate the session named "Debate and reconstruction

process" only with Luis Gregorich and Solari Yrigoyen. Only in the other three sessions a debate suggestion was established having into consideration the ideological rivalry of contenders.

Nevertheless Conference efforts to start an enriching discussion on said conference Sosnowski complained in the years following that conference " it could not be done, it would not be accomplished or it was not wanted to be done" in a rigorous analysis of what had happened in the intellectual field. "It would only wish that the subject -- as among others-- to cover a fugitive trajectory and "disappear" among the rethoric constellations of the tasks to be performed "for a full national reconstruction". There was no time to reflect upon." [3]

With the purpose of answering the challenge formulated, two decades ago by Sosnowski and similar to the numerous debates and conferences which happened during after war Germany over the intellectual's responsibility for the Holocaust (Kampe, 1985) and ignoring if any other colleague had made any contribution with respect to the referenced Argentine case, asking oneself, which were those denunciations and silences? Which were the questioned permanencies and which were the geographic displacements?. Leon Rozitchner's text stood out by its criticism of Rodolfo Puiggros and the "disappearance" interpretation of his son. As far as the Hecker text is concerned it is a well known fact of its polemic with Cortázar. That of Gregorich, at that time EUDEBA's director, stood out also because he had commanded during the dictatorship the cultural weekly edition of La Opinion newspaper. [4]. But it is even more pathetic due to an article of his, which turned to be bitterly noticed, entitled "Literature divided", published in the Clarin's newspaper when he commanded its international page, where he established a mere geographic distinction, between ironic and satirical, among the writers who stayed to the so called internal exile and the others who left Argentina during the military dictatorship. (5). Differing from the distinction merely in space established by Gregorich, historian Osvaldo Bayer tried in that Conference to point out divisory waters founded by "marks left by the dictatorship". In his crude report Bayer remembers the preference grades, the schizophrenia, the cultural repression ways, the violence interpretation, the dictatorial publicity campaign, TV slogans, etc..

But there is no doubt that the report arising more intrigues and suspicions, was the one of Gregorich, due to rancours and resentments which his Clarin article had spread. In his report and participation, Gregorich tried laboriously to clarify the "misunderstanding" adding cynically that that division was thought to "desorient" censors, but really covered the wish to emphasize the exil writers presence (or the disappeared ones) such as Puig, Viñas, Constantini, Conti, Walsh, Di Benedetto and Tizon. In an indirect answer to fiction writer Juan Carlos Martini present in the Conference, Gregorich stated that: "nobody has deciphered its obvious and evident sense: the revindication of the critic tradition in Argentine literature, the recovery of a space where literature engages itself with political and social reality".[6] But the pretended "clarification" sounded as a late excuse and deepened suspicions and resentments over moral conscience of certain "internal exile" by part of other Conference members.

It was hard to decipher the text sense, when the same was tarnished of an irony hurting the ones who have opted for exile. Also it was difficult to sense the so-called "revindication of the Argentine critical tradition" in a passage contaminated by an ironic mordacity on the proscribers.

" What will happen now, what is happening now to the ones gone? Separated from their art sources, each time less protected by omnipotent ideologies, facing a world which offers few heroic expectations, what will they do, how will they write when they do not listen to the voices of their people neither breath their suffering and relief? It can be foreseen that they will pass from indignation to melancholy, from despair to nostalgia and that their books will suffer inexorably, once the treasury of memory exhausted, by an estrangement each time more unbearable. Their texts, with the lack of readers and sense, will cover an arch which will start lifting itself in its pride and certainty and which will be finished dejected in its insignificance and doubt".[7]

It is difficult to give credit to the irony of this paragraph, resulting from a poisonous conscience, bordering state terrorism collaboration, specially considering that the expatriations were forced by menaces and dangers of prison or death and not for mere emigrations. They are correct, according to Sloterdijk (2003) ", the escapes, as with them it rejects a stupid intention and only the crazy people consume themselves in hopeless fights" [8]. As well as in ancient times living in exile was considered one of the maximum despairs, to the extreme that Socrates preferred to drink cicute, in late modernity it was considered a blessing -- not only of freedom airs warranted, but essentially by the safety that meant of the life itself, whatever painful the experience might be. The great poet Heine emigrated to Paris in 1831 "... to breathe the citadin air which made one free. "I left because I had to go" [9]. I know cases of many colleagues that lacked the "omnipotent ideology" by their kwnown social-democratic militancy, but whose staying in the country became unbearable, as their police records and their left-wing friendships had inevitably marked. As a consequence of same they suffered menaces and in some cases kidnapping simulation and due to those actions they accelerated their exile voyage.

But at the same I must point out that exiles differed much among themselves, not only for the social and professional condition of the exiled, but also by their belonging or not to a political apparatus which make common cause with their disgrace, by the geographical place where they would land, but also by the cultural-political resistance practised during same. One thing is to exile oneself with a diploma and curriculum at hand and another thing is to do it without them. In their brief and first exile in Chile, during Ongania's dictatorship, in their condition of students without scholarships, the exiles of that rank suffered one and a thousand nightmares. But in the second exile with Videla & Co., accounting with the background and academic recommendations they could ship with scholarships in their knapsacks. As far as the geographic place was concerned, for a South-American, specially that of the Southern Cone, the exile in Europe or Mexico is a blessing compared with that of Australia, United States Mid-West or Scandinavian countries [10].

Finally one thing is to exile oneself and afterward deepening into mutism and contemplation and another one is to exile oneself preserving their contesting and solidary spirit for the ones who continued suffering in their native land [11]. Which are the responsibilities and ethic virtues of an intellectual elite exiled in dark times? It is not to be true to their moral conscience, without which "...the corrupting power of the institutions could not be resisted"? [12]

2.- Collaborationism with State Terrorism in Argentine Culture during the last Dictatorship (1976-83)

In this second section, I would like to point out the connotations of those criminal behaviours, such as collaborationist activities, or complicity with de facto governments which practise state terrorism.

It is old as the world collaboration with despotic regimes, as the Egyptians pharaohs can attest, Roman emperors, medieval popes, absolute monarchies, nineteenth century dictatorships and modern totalitarianism (fascism, nazism, stalinism). But it is also true that not all collaborationist regimes were of the same entity, as through human history different types of collaborationism were given, starting with collaborationism obtained by torture, through venal or economic collaborationism, and through institutional and ideological collaborationism, as to achieve the maximum degree with state collaborationism, grade given during the last world wars by the states menaced by conquer or invasion (ej. Vichy France, Horthy's Hungary, Quisling's Norway).

In the lowest levels of the scale, the most hypocrite of the rotten or economic-tactical collaborationism was orientated towards the mere economic interest, as our history shows in innumerable examples in the recent past as well in remote situations. It is impossible to forget the political behaviour of the Communist Party during Videla's government for the purpose of warranting the corn sale to the Soviet Union. We remember always the Industrial Union behaviour, the Rural Society one and that of our great newspapers, interested voraciously in the *Papel Prensa's* public tender, which belonged to the Graiver-Papaleo family.

As far as institutional collaborationism is concerned we must establish a new difference in outlook, as union, clergy, education and culture collaborationism took place, which were not for free, as in the case of our union bureaucracy seduced by the control of trade-union social assistance, in case of the education bureaucracy with the granting of professional degrees, in the case of the church with the maintenance of the army's vicarage and the coverup of clergy's pedophilia and in the case of cultural collaborationism, as in the National Academies, they were bought with a lentil soup (subsidies for international congresses with the consequent presidential paying of humble respects publicly advertised).

As far as intellectual collaborationism is concerned it was the highest in the rank of responsibilities, as they were the more perverse and deleterious taking into account that they legitimated intellectually, in an active or passive way, the oppression and genocide, which have innumerable precedents in the history of mankind, unanimously condemned by historic judgement. This ideological collaborationism can be likewise segregated in mass media, university and scientific collaborationism, each one having also a different reach in the population. Certainly, the one which accounts with the largest dosis of responsibility is the mass media collaborationism, as it took over the task, during the last and genocidal dictatorship, to feed an irrational and blind hatred against the so called "subversives" and after the mentioned dictatorship, tried curiously to take on a pacifying role claiming for peace and forgetfulness, divulging until repletion the THEORY OF THE TWO DEMONS. Likewise, this mass media collaborationism must be segregated in written, radio and TV collaborationism, the same accounting with different reaches, where written collaborationism

reaches the highest classes and the radio-TV media collaborationism (e.g.: Neustadt-Grondona's political show) flooded common population [13]

The written collaboration analysis must be taken into account precisely not due to terrorist press and its lackey journalists (e.g.: newspaper *Convicción*) or the confiscated press (e.g.: *La Opinión*) but for two articles, published on Saturday August 16th, 2003, on La Nación newspaper, signed by journalists Felix Luna and Santiago Kovadloff, in which those intellectuals confuse on purpose the historic truth by not differing state terrorism practised by legitimate governments (Triple A gang) from that practised by illegitimate governments, giving way to a known demonic theogony, metamorphosed with a dignified varnish of jesuit characteristics. How is it possible that Felix Luna, who aside from being a journalist acts as an historian, who shows himself "sad" and "confused" because a legitimate government tries to judge the dark past of an illegitimate government which has still not been punished? How is it possible that Luna the historian evokes with praise the firing of Cuitiño, Badia, Alen and other fellow murderers (Mazorqueros during Rosas dictatorship in the first half of the Nineteenth century) and I also suppose the death sentence of aide-de-camp Antonino Reyes, practised by State of Buenos Aires authorities, for simultaneously discrediting that praise supporting the idea that it was a cleaning out (blanqueo) by the city of Buenos Aires people, of Rosas terrorism accomplice, and in exchange when he refers to our own present reality, where they prevail the non still-punished state terrorists (who have not been duly judged, not even dreaming of their execution) he tries to suggest a convenient contradictory, cynical and eternal amnesia? How is it possible that historian Luna calls for the closing of a Pandora box when his own person, from the *Todo es Historia* journal, signed in November 1978 a condescending editorial in favor of the official campaign against the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (CIDH), or the Organization of American States, and tired himself to implement during the **Proceso** a domestic institutional self-censorship, in exchange of an interested official advertisement, similar to that practised by Pedro de Angelis in Rosas' Buenos Aires? [14]

How is it possible that a lucid journalist as Santiago Kovadloff falls into the Bicephalous Demon theory implementation equaling state terrorists to those that for better or worse tried to resist uselessly and daringly state terrorism? From which other way could be interpreted of his equal characterization of "inflexibility", "intolerance", "intransigence" and "aversion", expressed from a newspaper which in times of the Proceso kept a prudent and accomplice silence over State Terrorism? Or is it that those newspapers search rented penmanship to avoid investigation of its own corrupt collaboration with State Terrorism?

I must point out that for state terrorism to be definitively erased from the people and civil society justified fears not only the material authors of crimes against human rights should be prosecuted and condemned but also identify and punish the state-terrorist intellectual collaborators.

3.- Moral Indifference during the Dictatorship with the Desaparecidos on the part of an Argentine Intellectual Elite. The Halperin Donghi Case.

In each society happens to exist paradigmatic intellectuals whose moral pattern used to mark those societies for ever. In that sense, intellectuals such as Tulio Halperin Donghi, due to his celebrity as a scholar had the moral obligation of articulating, during the Military Process (1976-1982), "...public accusations and press conferences in Washington, advocating for human rights and for the defense of his own fellow citizen- colleagues and students who were in prison or had disappeared".[15] Furthermore, I disclosed that "...his prudent silence and self-censorship really obeyed his stingy eagerness to succeed in keeping his passport, regularly visit his family and control ties with institutions such as the Instituto Di Tella and CEDES/CISEA". I also underscored the fact that Halperín's "low profile" during such Military Process "...was not replicated by other colleagues who, as in the Ernesto Laclau case, in spite of having his family in Buenos Aires opted for not coming back during those long years".

I must make it clear that this is not the first time I mention such moral surrender --for I had previously pointed that out-- but only in reference to a "...reputed Argentine historian residing in Berkeley". As my critique was reproved by some colleagues, saying it was the result of chicanery, ingratitude, personal resentment, or a parricide zeal and extreme cruelty toward human miseries, and that who was I to question Halperín's moral integrity, I preferred not to insist on the issue. But today, vis-à-vis the great moral crisis we are experiencing, and faced with the new political instance of a just and redressing hope that seems willing to reopen with the fall of the Neoliberal Model, science and humanities must also stop living on their knees and stand up. That's why I decided to rehash on that bitter controversy, with all the professional risks this might entail, and certain that the apothegm "dogs will not eat dogs" can only be applicable to morally collapsed intellectuals, severed from all personal dignity.

Many might ask themselves why Halperín and not some other of the many who, like him, lived abroad and also kept quiet? Simply because, contrary to other colleagues who livened up the fire of an anachronistic and opportunistic adventure,[16] Halperín didn't show signs of a guilty flank or political reproach whatsoever, neither could anyone, in good faith, doubt that by then Halperín personified the summit of Argentine and Latin American intellectual elite, that his work in such historiography is unparalleled, and that its content will live on probably forever in continental records. But then, if the one who climbs to the summit "is silent and consents", what can be expected of those who ride on the hillside? Not to mention those who pasture in the deep valleys. How impressive must the Halperinian mirror have been and how many may have thus justified their silence?

Now then, how is it possible for an intellectual so sensitive and aware of the past and of the consequences of an unfortunate recurrence could have kept silent when such an unpromising and gloomy tragedy took place? A tragedy which Halperín himself had predicted in some of his writings,[17] and whose antecedent had premonitorily portrayed it as a "concealed civil war".[18]

We may be told that fear numbs people, constrains the keyboard and paralyzes the most daring of wills [Avellaneda, 1986), and that its syndrome self-transfers itself, even in the most remote of exiles, and in spite of enjoying guarantees and free press devices.[19] Indeed, there is no doubt that terror has the power of breaking all consciousness and is able to turn a hero into a coward, and even into a traitor, as in fact has historically happened in many instances.[20] Undoubtedly, Halperín's case is not one of treason, nor can one attribute ignorance of the cruel reality taking place in Argentina. But then, what brought about so much

omission and self-censorship, and so much forgetfulness, so much scorn or contempt at others' defeat and tragedy (politically speaking)? Can you be a man of science, an artist or an internationally renown intellectual, and be blind and deaf to a pervasive secret such as the Argentine holocaust? Is this about a selfish, narcissistic and/or cynical attitude, the result of a psychological, social and/or national identity crisis of someone who no longer cared to go back to his homeland, or as a warlock's apprentice who felt "...had lost control of his own product and heritage"? Or of someone who was unaware of the international weight of his own political opinion? [21] Or, rather, was it not a matter of an ironic pessimism, the same thinking some authors practice to first understand fear and war and then condemn it,[22] a mental strategy that has nevertheless led certain current American intellectuality (Richard Rorty, Michael Walzer, Bernard Lewis, etc.) to encourage the Iraq War? Or are we simply faced with an emotional distress inflicted upon oneself, a kind of slow and lengthy suicide of someone who was never a keen political activist nor intended to be a moral example or symbol whatsoever?

The case is complex because Halperín did not remain idle in USA, he would frequently travel to Buenos Aires, he went to Mexico to share academic events with exiled Argentine intellectuals, he had phone contact with the cultural elite of the Di Tella Institute and CEDES/CISEA, and he probably intervened off the record to rescue Emilio de Ipola from his kidnapping. We therefore ask ourselves, no one from the Di Tella (Botana, Gallo, Cortés Conde), or from the CEDES/CISEA (Romero Jr., O'Donnell, J. Sábato, Caputo) or those in exile,[23] demanded he then take on a public attitude in the US consistent with his liberal and humanitarian ideas and with his previous dignified resignation from the University of Buenos Aires [UBA] (1966)? No one reproached his silence nor hinted what his mentor José Luis Romero (deceased in January 1976) would have done under such circumstances? For what reason or reasons didn't these hints or insinuations occur? It could be said, then, that in exile there was no political friendship whatsoever nor did its members know or visit each other but, why did his closest colleagues hide or consent to his moral weaknesses? Why is it that his most notorious critics, among which were Carlos Altamirano and Jorge Myers, haven't mentioned any of these painful absences?

As far as Halperín's political behavior, why was he not consistent with the commitment displayed during the struggle against Peronism prior to '55 (Contorno, Sur), or when the Argentine Revolution (1966) took place, at which time he gave up his chair at the University and opted for exile? Or is it that the tyrannical change of events we suffered during the Military Process was less cruel or bloody than those endured during the times of well known torturers (Lombilla, Amoresano and the Cardozo brothers, 1950-54), or in the time of the Argentine Revolution (1966)? Or is it that the Military Process victims (1976-82) didn't deserve an advocacy similar to that of those who were tortured and murdered during the first Peronist period (Bravo, Ingalinella)? If, as a result of the **Noche de los Bastones Largos** [Night of the Long Sticks] (1966), Halperín resigned from his university chair and futilely looked for the protection and shelter of our Nobel Prize and CONICET President Bernardo Houssay, what leading attitude should he have taken ten (10) years later, when in his long exile the Videla Coup (1976) and subsequent "disappearances" of colleagues and former disciples occurred? Was it right for him to have judged these crimes against humanity under the Theory of the Two Demons or with Guariglia's doctrine (1987)? [23]

We will be told, then, that this Halperín was not the same as he once was, that circumstances have changed, that those twenty (20) years gone by from the fall of Perón

(1955); can change anyone, and that Halperín never alleged having been exiled nor did he try to come back or be a moral symbol or paradigm whatsoever, but that he no longer could bear the northern winters or loneliness, and that he was skeptical, unconscious of his own moral power, nostalgic and tired. That same recurrent tiredness that overwhelmed our Asturias Prize Ernesto Sábato when he refused to go into exile and visited Videla instead to beg for the “disappeared” poets (Urondo, Bustos, Santoro, etc.). Or our Nobel Prize Houssay when he accepted to continue with the CONICET Presidency during Onganía’s Dictatorship (1966-71), in turn emulating Mariano R. Castex’ “moral fatigue” in giving up when accepting the post of Vice-Chancellor of the UBA in the time of Uriburu dictatorship (1930). The latter emulating the exhaustion of **Juvenilia** author Senator Miguel Cané and that of the author of “**The National Tradition**” and Minister of the Interior Joaquín V. González when the **Ley de Residencia** (Residence Act) or the expulsion of “undesirable” foreigners was imposed (1902). And the latter in turn copied the capitulations practiced in times of Rosas (1836-1852) by the later reputed codifier Dalmacio Vélez Sársfield. But, can moral fatigue reproduce itself in the intellectual elites as just another cultural pattern, and can the spiritual resignation this entails be accepted without demanding any right of inventory at all? Can this reflex mechanism be accepted, that of a “perpetual return”, of someone who paradoxically devoted his life to probe into the behavior and “pathetic miseries” of patrician elites?

What is the responsibility and ethical virtues of a modern intellectual elite in dull and drab times? Aren’t they justice, truth and truthfulness, without which “...the corrupting power of institutions couldn’t be resisted” ? [24] What are the roles members of an elite should serve under gruesome circumstances? Aren’t they those same “stable fly or sting” roles,[25] or those of “legislator and guide” which Halperín himself refers to constantly in his work? [26] Wasn’t this the attitude adopted during the Military Process by David Viñas, Osvaldo Bayer and Gregorio Selser? and in times of the Nazi threat, María Rosa Oliver, Victoria Ocampo and Renata Donghi de Halperin (mother of Tulio Halperin Donghi), and even more remotely Echeverría, Mármol and Varela (Generation of 1837), issues Halperín spoke about in depth more than a decade ago,[27] and upon which he also narrated one of the most beautiful and memorable pages of Argentine historiography [A Nation for the Argentine Desert]? Can an intellectual elite relinquish moral responsibilities? Can it stop telling the truth to everyone and at all times? Can it remain indifferent, motionless and disciplined vis-à-vis tragedy, whatever the ideology? Can such intellectual leadership, in case of deserting, pretend to continue setting itself up as an elite and demand acknowledgment as such? Shouldn’t it provide some explanation or self-criticism?

This is the issue we should address now. Those who serve and have served Halperín as a complacent and subservient court, and have even reproduced in its shadow a kind of patron-client network at an international scale, pretend to go on holding the academic power, as if nothing at all had happened in the country, as if the surrenders of the past –even those that took place during the times of Afonsín, Menem, De la Rúa and Duhalde-- had been for free, and no one had to pay a price for them, as if all this disciplining were a title of honor to seek when, the truth is, they deserve the harsh treatment of a critique which is lacking till this day, and why not also the treatment of some moral tribunal?

4.- The Purge as cleansing instrument of the State Terrorism survival in Argentine culture.

In the three previous sections, I circumscribed myself to the emblematic figures of collaborationism and moral indifference to state terrorism.[29] In this new writing I want further to write over the purge figure, as a politically necessary tool destined to clean institutions which collaborated actively for the endurance of the terrorist-authoritarian Regime (1966-1983).

It is well known that at the petition of the present National Executive Power (PEN) the purging or purifying of the Process reminiscence -- interrupted by Pardon Laws enforcement (1987) -- has restarted with new emphasis in military force and security institutions. Nevertheless, it is gaudy and really suggestive the lack of similar instruments for other spheres of public labor struck very hard by terror, such as journalism, education, religion and its Churches, professional colleges, editing houses and cultural institutions in general. In France, during post-war, in order to erase collaboration experiences in the cultural field, new measures were taken, which went from simple administrative transfers, going through interdictions and suspensions in professional activities, dismissal, civic right deprivation, reaching out up to imprisonments (Maurras), death sentences (Drieu La Rochelle, Rebatet) and summary trials (Robert Brasillach, Paul Chack, Georges Suarez).[30]

In our country, on the contrary, collaborationists in the cultural field remained totally unpunished, to the extreme that some of them were paradoxically invited to international events to debate on state terrorism together with exiled persons who had suffered it in cold and blood, as it happened in the Maryland Conference (1984), this immunity implying that it is much more negative to have resisted the authoritarian-terrorist regimes than having fought against them [31]. Since the coming of that long period of "night and fog" -- which was first the Argentine Revolution (1966), followed past Campora's spring interregnum (1973-1974), by Isabel Martinez Peron presidential period with the Ivanissevich Mission in the Ministry of Education and the Otalagano's Intervention in the University of Buenos Aires (UBA) and later on by the so called Proceso (1976-83), the authoritarian-terrorist regime induced different collaborationist accomplishments to multiple cultural institutions such as churches, public and private universities, National Academies, editing houses and professional colleges. [32] Certainly, daily and weekly press was the great victim.[33]. With reference to the great press, it must be stressed the fact the criminal silence kept and never unfolded over the numerous Habeas Corpus submitted and rejected, when it is well known that those newspapers have judicial journalists on guard, permanently in Tribunales (Courts). Likewise it must be pointed out the collaborationist fervent role -- even if not the only one -- shown by certain newspapers like Nueva Provincia and Convicción. [34]

As far as the National Academies are concerned, among all of them it must be stressed the active role played by the History National Academy. At the request of the then Minister of Education Juan Llerena Amadeo, the History National Academy - in its strong pretention of imposing an official history - issued in May 1980 a regulation over what history in national education must be. The content of said Regulation --judging from a numerous group of democratic historians (Viñas, Pomer, Bayer, Chavez, Teran, Bonaudo, etc.)-- was "...in contradiction with Constitution principles, being a collective resignation of the most important principles of all academic life, hurts our thinking and chair freedom, goes against science integrity, underestimates prestige and harms that corporation representativity, exceeds its competence, exposes its autonomy, its immunity and pluralism and engages its future members". [35]

Apart from that Report questioned, the National Academy of History collaborated also in the make-up operation of the terrorist-authoritarian regime, offering several times the tribune to their most notorious leaders, having invited in 1977 the then Army Commander in Chief Admiral Eduardo Emilio Massera, to inaugurate an historic exhibit in its main headquarters; in November 1979 to the then Minister of Interior General Albano Harguindeguy to give the inaugurating speech of the National Congress of Desert Conquest taken place in General Roca (Rio Negro); and in October 13, 1980 to the then Municipal Mayor Brig. Osvaldo Cacciatore, to preside the opening of the IV International Congress of Latin American History. Not satisfied with this last invitation, the Directing Board of the National Academy of History, its President Enrique Barba and the numerous numbered academicians decided to visit collectively the then de-facto President General Jorge Rafael Videla, with the excuse of accompanying the foreign guests belonging to the National Academies of History in other countries of Latin America, event profusely advertised by the daily press.

Facing such a cosmetic active collaboration with the authoritarian-terrorist regime, through a public and state honored intellectuality, the question would be, if talent and canonized illustration excuse themselves of political responsibilities, to the historians collaborating in said Regime? In the case of France, during Post-war, General De Gaulle thought that "...the greater the artist, more powerful his influence was supposed to be". [36] Therefore, for De Gaulle, being a writer does not mean an excuse.." because in letters as well as in everything in life, talent is a responsibility degree" [37].

Nevertheless, we must point out that none of the institutions detailed in note [4], complicated in actions or omissions referring to Human Rights and with the true democratic oath had verified any contrition nor they never expressed their will to produce it. Neither the National Academy of History though it was referred to when publicly it was recriminated its complicity with the Proceso [38]. None of the members later incorporated (Botana, Gallo, Luna, Cortes Conde, Amaral, Mayo) declared themselves on said subject. And neither the national state, the Secretary on Human Rights nor the Country's Secretary of Culture, from which the National Academies depend, started a proceeding or administrative action whatsoever. If it is expected that the present Human Right Secretary Dr. Eduardo L. Duhalde takes actions, we would expect vainly for a public satisfaction from Eng. Torcuato Di Tella, present Country's Culture Secretary when the Instituto Di Tella itself and owned by him, elected during the Proceso to preside the Institution, an Army Colonel (Col. Beltran) to preside over the institution. In the same sense, in post-war France, each public or private writer's society, performed its own purification work, creating to that purpose The National Committees of Purification of Writers and Men of Letters.[39] In any way, according to Lottman (1998), "...all societies were obliged to do so".[40]

Finally, we must conclude that for a democratic regime be definitely established and the thinking, academic and critic freedoms be a tangible reality -- as they are in France and in Europe in general -- and not a pusillanimous expression of wishes, the political power (Secretary of Culture and Human Rights) must intervene so that the cultural and professional institutions be purified, so that authoritarian-terrorist regime collaborationists pay or compensate their guilts and omissions and those that resisted dictatorial regimes do not continue to be unjustly discriminated.

Notes:

- 1.- For characteristics, purposes and actions of the Argentines banned in the fight against Rosas, see Piccirilli, 1965; and Paez de la Torre (h) 1980-81. For exiled and banned in Argentine history, see Caro Figueroa, 1987. Over exile during Uriburu's times (1930-31), see Oyhanarte, 1932. Over exile, coups d'état, intellectuals and Buenos Aires university (1966-86), see Jitrik 1984; and Funes 1997. With reference to Argentine asylum in Mexico (1976-83), see Bernetti and Giardinelli, 2003. For tales over the Dirty War in Argentina (1975-80), see Corbatta, 1999. Over Concentration Fields in Argentina, see Calveiro 1998. For reports to Argentine writers (Constenla, Lopez Echague, Piazzolla, Torchelli, Walger), see Gomez 1999. Over the Argentine exile children (1975-1984), see Guelar, Jarach; and Ruiz, 2002. Over the surviving dreams of a prisoner "Montonera" in the Esma, see Ramus, 2000.
- 2.- see Sosnowski, 1988, 8.
- 3.- see Sosnowski, 1988, 13.
- 4.- Luis Gregorich has been director of the Weekly Cultural section of La Opinion newspaper between 1975 and 1979, afterwards head of Clarin's international edition and later on, when his naming as ambassador was rejected by parliament, he was named EUDEBA's head (1984-86). During the year 1983 (recruited by Leopoldo Moreau at that time fellow journalist of La Opinión) he was head of Political Participation Movement (CPP) of the Radical Civic Union (UCR) together with Eng. Roulet, Marcelo Stubrin and Pacho O'Donnell.
- 5.- see Clarin newspaper (Buenos Aires) January 29, 1981.
- 6.- see Gregorich, 1988, 111.
- 7.- see Gregorich, 1988, 123.
- 8.- see Sloterdijk, 2003, 202.
- 9.- see Sloterdijk, 2003, 195.
- 10.- Once the mentioned exiled people landed in the Mid-West, they started missing the sidewalks, coffee-shops and friends, up-till the most heart-breaking homesickness, envying fellow journalists exiled in Mexico or Paris, because in the American Mid-West there was nobody to talk to except in cases of European colleagues. This hard and tremendous solitude lasted until they went to Mexico, where they could recover their language and many other things that they missed, to finally return to Buenos Aires, on January 1984.
- 11.- see contribution of my authorship entitled "Moral indifference during the Dictatorship to the Disappeared, by part of the Argentine Intellectual Elite" <http://www.hipforums.com/thread-13-112453.html>.
- 12.- see MacIntyre, 1987, 241.
13. see Avellaneda, 1986; and Knudson, 1997.
14. see Editorial of Todo es Historia, November 1978, n.138. For the advertising of the Banco Central, Banco Nacion, Banco Provincia de Buenos Aires, Cinturon Ecologico, DGI, Secretaria de Hacienda de la Nacion, Parques Industriales de la Pcia. de Buenos Aires, etc. (Todo es Historia, Nos. 131, 136, 148, 151, 159, p.51; 160, pp.37 y 43; y 161, pp. 41 y 42;
- 15 entitled "Mutar los Silencios en Lenguaje" [Muting Silences in Language], published in the Pol-Cien Electronic Discussion List (Buenos Aires), on July 9th of the current year.
- 16 see Pasado y Presente editorial entitled La "Larga Marcha" al Socialismo en la Argentina, 1973) [The 'Long March' to Socialism in Argentina]
- 17 see Argentina en el Callejón, 1964) [Argentina in the Alley]

- 18 see Myers, 1997, p.160.
- 19 see Foster, 1987, 97.
20. see Bodei, 1995, 163-165.
21. Bauman, 1995, 223.
- 22 see González, 1997, 122.
- 23 in Mexico (Puiggrós, Jitrik, Aricó, Assadourian, Chiaramonte, Portantiero, Pucciarelli, Constantini, Giardinelli, Borón, etc.), in Canada (Nun, Murmis), in France (Saer, Garavaglia), in England (Tandeter, H. Sábato, Míguez), in Brazil (Pomer, González), Ecuador (Roig), or in Venezuela (Plá, Calello),
- 24 Report to Tulio Halperin Donghi by Felipe Pigna, 2002:
<http://www.elhistoriador.com.ar/php/prueba.php?archivo=57>).
- 25 see MacIntyre, 1984.
- 26 see Todorov, 1991.
- 27 see Altamirano, 1997, 21.
- 28 see Halperin Donghi, 1987.
- 29.- see Saguier, 2003a and 2003b.
- 30.- see Lottman, 1998, sixth part, chapter 4 and 5; and p. 478.
- 31.- see Saguier, 2003 c.
- 32.- For book censorship and persecution of public and private editing houses during Proceso according to archives discovered in the exNational Development Bank (BANADE), see Invernizzi and Gociol, 2002. Over the rendering of public tribune to the Process authorities by professional colleges (Argentine Federation of Business and Professional Women, Argentine Chamber of Advertisers, Enterprise and Market Management Association,), religious institutions (Pastoral Council of Buenos Aires Archbishopric, National Meeting of Catholic Professionals) and numerous private associations (Buenos Aires Rotary Club, Pro-Human Behaviour League, Institute for Executive Development in Argentina, Dinner of Book, Non-religious Culture Argentine League), see Avellaneda 1986, II, p. 159, 161, 163, 167, 171, 173, 182, 185, 187, 197 and 208.
- 33.- Over the Argentine press and the Dirty War, 1976-1983, see Knudson, 1997. Over El Cronista Comercial and disappeared journalists Rafael Perrota and Julian Delgado, see Arriba, 1999. Over Atlantida Editing House, Gente magazine and journalist Chiche Gelblung, see Blaustein, 1999. Over Ambito Financiero (Financing Ambit) and Julio Ramos, see Bonaldi, 1999. For documentary reproduction of daily press recopilation texts during the Proceso, including three hundred reproductions of covers of publications and numerous and interesting journalistic extracts, see Blaustein and Zubieta, 1999.
- 34.- Over Conviccion newspaper, see Uriarte, 1999. In the Conviccion newspaper managed by Hugo Ezequiel Lezama, several conspicuous cultural establishment representatives took part, such as Professor Luis Alberto Romero, Mariano Montemayor, Alejandro Horowicz, Edgardo Arrivillaga, Ernesto Schoo, Hector Grossi, Delgado "the fat" and a La Prensa journalist whose last name was Lanus. According to Captain (Ret.) Adolfo Scilingo statements done in 1997, in those political-journalistic entrepreneurial affairs the industrialist Alberto Pierri collaborated with his factory paper as well as Moron Politician Carlos Rousselot, the attorney of Mar del Plata fishing companies Carlos Corach, the Vatican diplomat Esteban Caselli and the officer later on of Migrations Hugo Franco (Jornada, Mexico: UNAM, Monday August 28, 2000).
- 35.- see La Nacion, June 4, 1980, and Sunday August 4, 1985; Clarin, Saturday August 17, 1985 and La Razon, Wednesday August 14, 1985.

36.- see Lottman, 1998, 413.

37 see De Gaulle, III, 135 and following; cited by Lottman, 1998, 413.

38 see La Razon, Tuesday November 12, 1985.

39. see Burrin, 1993; and Defrasne, 1989.

40 see Lottman, 1998, 429.

Sources

Altamirano, Carlos (1997): Hipótesis de lectura (sobre el tema de los intelectuales en la obra de Tulio Halperín Donghi), en Roy Hora y Javier Trímboli, comp., *Discutir Halperín. Siete ensayos sobre la contribución de Tulio Halperín Donghi a la historia argentina* (Buenos Aires: Ed. El Cielo por Asalto), 17-29;

Arriba, Alberto de (1999): Julian Delgado. *El Cronista Comercial. Prisioneros del Silencio*, en Blaustein, Eduardo y Martin Zubieta (1999), *Decíamos ayer. La prensa argentina bajo el Proceso* (Buenos Aires: Ed. Colihue), 224-232;

Avellaneda, Andrés (1986): *Censura, autoritarismo y cultura: Argentina, 1960-1983* (Buenos Aires: Centro Editor de América Latina, Biblioteca Política Argentina, nos.: 156-158);

Bauman, Zygmunt (1997): *Legisladores e Intérpretes. Sobre la modernidad, la posmodernidad y los intelectuales* (Bernal: Universidad Nacional de Quilmes);

Bayer, Osvaldo (1988): *Pequeño Recordatorio para un país sin memoria*, en Saúl Sosnowski (comp.), *Represión y reconstrucción de una cultura: el caso argentino*. (Buenos Aires: Eudeba), 203-228;

Bernetti, Jorge Luis y Mempo Giardinelli (2003): *México: El Exilio que hemos vivido. Memoria del exilio argentino en México durante la dictadura, 1976-1983* (Quilmes: Universidad Nacional de Quilmes);

Blaustein, Eduardo (1999): *Recuerdos de Editorial Atlantida. Nada como la Gente*, en Blaustein, Eduardo y Martin Zubieta (1999), *Decíamos ayer. La prensa argentina bajo el Proceso* (Buenos Aires: Ed. Colihue), 132-142;

Blaustein, Eduardo y Martin Zubieta (1999): *Decíamos ayer. La prensa argentina bajo el Proceso* (Buenos Aires: Ed. Colihue);

Bodei, Remo (1995): *Geometría de las Pasiones. Miedo, Esperanza, Felicidad: Filosofía y Uso Político* (México: Fondo de Cultura Económica);

Bonaldi, Pablo (1999): *Ambito Financiero y la Dictadura de los Mercados*, en Blaustein, Eduardo y Martin Zubieta (1999), *Decíamos ayer. La prensa argentina bajo el Proceso* (Buenos Aires: Ed. Colihue), 340-344;

- Burrin, F. (1993): *Le Collaborationisme*, en J.-P- Azema & F. Bedarida eds. *La France des années noires* (Paris: Seuil), v.I, 363-383;
- Calveiro, Pilar (1998): *Poder y desaparición. Los Campos de Concentración en la Argentina* (Buenos Aires: Ed. Colihue);
- Caro Figueroa, Gregorio (1987): "Exilados y proscriptos en la historia argentina", *Todo es Historia* (Buenos Aires), t.46, n.246, 6-39;
- Corbatta, Jorgelina (1999): *Narrativas de la Guerra Sucia en Argentina* (Buenos Aires: Ed. Corregidor);
- De Gaulle, Charles (1956): *Memoires de Guerre* (Paris: Plon);
- Defrasne, Jean France (1989): *Histoire de la Collaboration* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France);
- Foster, David William (1987): *Los Parámetros de la Narrativa Argentina durante el "Proceso de Reorganización Nacional"*, en Daniel Balderston, et. al., *Ficción y política: la narrativa argentina durante el proceso militar* (Buenos Aires: Alianza), 96-108;
- Funes, Patricia (1997): "Exilio y legitimidad académica: el golpe de estado de 1966, los intelectuales y la universidad de Buenos Aires", ponencia presentada en el XX Congreso Internacional de la Latin American Studies Association (LASA), celebrado en Guadalajara (México), entre el 17 y el 19 de Abril de 1997;
- Gómez, Albino (1999): *Exilios (Porqué volvieron)* (Rosario: Homo Sapiens Ediciones; y Buenos Aires: Edit. tea)
- González, Horacio (1997): *Culpa y escarmiento. Cómo habla la historia en el terror*, en Roy Hora y Javier Trímboli, comp., *Discutir Halperín Siete ensayos sobre la contribución de Tulio Halperín Donghi a la historia argentina* (Buenos Aires: Ed. El Cielo por Asalto), 113-124;
- Gregorich, Luis (1988): *Literatura. Una descripción del campo: Narrativa, Periodismo, Ideología*; en Saúl Sosnowski (comp.), *Represión y reconstrucción de una cultura: el caso argentino*. (Buenos Aires: Eudeba), 109-124;
- Guariglia, Osvaldo (1987): "La condena a los ex-comandantes y la ley de extinción de las causas: un punto de vista ético", Buenos Aires: *Vuelta* N°9, 9 a 13 pp.
- Guelar, Diana; Vera Jarach; y Beatriz Ruiz (2002): *Los chicos del exilio. Argentina (1975-1984)* (Buenos Aires: Ediciones El País de Nomeolvides);
- Halperín Donghi, Tulio (1987): *El Presente transforma el Pasado: El Impacto del Reciente Terror en la Imagen de la Historia Argentina*, en Daniel Balderston, et. al., *Ficción y política: la narrativa argentina durante el proceso militar* (Buenos Aires: Alianza), 71-95;
- Hecker, Liliana (1988): *Los Intelectuales ante la Instancia del Exilio: Militancia y Creación*, en Saúl Sosnowski (comp.), *Represión y reconstrucción de una cultura: el caso*

- argentino. (Buenos Aires: Eudeba), 195-202;
- Invernizzi, Hernan y Judith Gociol (2002): Un Golpe a los Libros. Represion a la cultura durante la ultima dictadura militar (Buenos Aires: EUDEBA);
- Jitrik, Noé (1984): Las armas y las razones: ensayos sobre el peronismo, el exilio, la literatura, 1975-1980 (Buenos Aires: Ed. Sudamericana);
- Kampe Norbert (1987): Normalizing the Holocaust? The Recent Historians' Debate in the Federal Republic of Germany", *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, 2, 61-80;
- Knudson, Jerry W. (1997): Veil of silence: the Argentine press and the Dirty War, 1976-1983. (*Latin American Perspectives*, 24:6, Nov. 1997, p. 93-112, bibl.)
- Lottman, Herbert (1998): *La Depuracion, 1943-1953* (Barcelona: Tusquets);
- MacIntyre, Alasdair (1987): *Tras la Virtud* (Barcelona: Ed. Crítica, Grupo Editorial Grijalbo);
- Martini, Juan Carlos (1988): Especificidad, alusiones y saber de una escritura, en Saúl Sosnowski (comp.), *Represión y reconstrucción de una cultura: el caso argentino*. (Buenos Aires: Eudeba), 125-132;
- Myers, Jorge (1997): Tulio Halperín Donghi y la historia de la Argentina contemporánea, en Roy Hora y Javier Trímboli, comp., *Discutir Halperín Siete ensayos sobre la contribución de Tulio Halperín Donghi a la historia argentina* (Buenos Aires: Ed. El Cielo por Asalto), 155-178;
- Oyhanarte, Horacio B. (1932, 1988): "El Régimen", en Horacio B. Oyhanarte, *Por la Patria desde el exilio digo* (Montevideo, 1932); y en Miguel Unamuno, *Horacio Oyhanarte y el golpe militar de 1930* (Buenos Aires: Centro Editor de América Latina, Biblioteca Política Argentina, n.231), 94-129;
- Páez de la Torre (h), Carlos (1980-81): "Aportes para el estudio de los propósitos y acciones conspirativas de los emigrados argentinos en Bolivia entre 1841 y 1852", *Investigaciones y Ensayos* (Buenos Aires: Academia Nacional de la Historia), 29, 425-451; y 30, 401-433;
- Piccirilli, Ricardo (1965): "Características de la emigración política argentina en la lucha contra Rosas", *Boletín de la Academia Nacional de la Historia* (Buenos Aires), 37, 21-41;
- Ramus, Susana Jorgelina (2000): *Sueños Sobrevivientes de una Montonera: A Pesar de la Esma* (Buenos Aires: Ed. Colihue);
- Rozitchner, León (1982): *Psychoanalyse et politique: la leçon de l'exil*, *Les Temps Modernes*;
- Rozitchner, León (1988): Exilio: Guerra y Democracia: Una Secuencia Ejemplar, en Saúl Sosnowski (comp.), *Represión y reconstrucción de una cultura: el caso argentino*. (Buenos Aires: Eudeba), 167-186;
- Saguié, Eduardo R. (2003a): "Indiferencia Moral durante la Dictadura para con los

Desaparecidos, por parte de una Elite Intelectual Argentina" <http://www.hipforums.com/thread-13-112453.html>;

Saguier, Eduardo R. (2003b): "Colaboracionismo con el Terrorismo de Estado Golpista en Argentina", <http://www.hipforums.com/thread-13-118692.html>;

Saguier, Eduardo R. (2003c): El Exilio Intelectual como Resistencia Política contra el Terrorismo de Estado. Argentina y el Coloquio de Maryland (1984), <http://www.hipforums.com/thread-13-120980.html>

Sarlo, Beatriz (1988): El Campo Intelectual: un espacio doblemente fracturado, en Saúl Sosnowski (comp.), Represión y reconstrucción de una cultura: el caso argentino. (Buenos Aires: Eudeba), 96-108;

Scilingo, Cap. Adolfo (2000): Declaraciones, Jornada (Mexico: UNAM, Lunes 28 de agosto de 2000).

Sloterdijk, Peter(2003): Crítica de la Razón Cínica (Madrid: Ed. Siruela);

Sosnowski, Saúl (1988): Introducción, en Saúl Sosnowski (comp.), Represión y reconstrucción de una cultura: el caso argentino. (Buenos Aires: Eudeba), 7-15;

Todorov, Tzvetan (1993): Las morales de la historia (Barcelona: Paidós);

Uriarte, Claudio (1999): Recuerdo de Redaccion. Invierno en Conviccion, en Blaustein, Eduardo y Martin Zubieta (1999): Deciamos ayer. La prensa argentina bajo el Proceso (Buenos Aires: Ed. Colihue), 314-318;