

## **The Crisis of the Intellectual? Nation Building, Intellectuals and Political Contributions in Europe and Latin America, a Comparative View**

Maria Odette Canivell  
James Madison University  
[canivemx@jmu.edu](mailto:canivemx@jmu.edu)

The intersection of politics and literature has a long-standing tradition in Latin America. Intellectuals in Latin America, particularly writers, have contributed to the political arena since the time of the Foundation of the Nation. As Angel Rama suggests, the might of the pen, wielded by the Spanish speaking *letrados*, is a well known fact in the political life of the Spanish American nations.

Although the role of these intellectuals as presidents, ambassadors, ministers and high profile politicians has not always been beneficial to their countries of birth, intellectuals in Latin America feel the need to actively participate in politics. In Europe and the United States, it would appear as if intellectuals feel more skeptical about their participation in public affairs, particularly when the posts imply a greater degree of public exposure. Are these differences historical, political, cultural, or is the apparent paucity of intellectuals-politicians due more to the intrinsic characteristics of the political field in Europe and the United States?

In this essay, I will explore the political connotations of the term intellectual and contrast it with the views of intellectuals in Europe, Latin America and the United States. I will attempt to explain similarities and differences in their conception of what an intellectual is, as well as give possible explanations for these sometimes diverging perspectives.

# The Crisis of the Intellectual? Nation Building, Intellectuals and Political Contributions in Europe and Latin America, a Comparative View<sup>1</sup>

An intellectual cannot change anything. I don't recall any revolution won with a sonnet.  
(Mario Benedetti)

In this age of cyberspace, sophisticated technologies, and mind-boggling advances in the Natural Sciences, the role of the intellectual appears to have lost the luster associated with the label. Intellectuals, all over the world, seem to be suffering a crisis of identity. Some, like Noam Chomsky, who many lay readers might characterize as an intellectual, flatly refuse to claim the title. Others, like Bruce Chapman head of the Discovery Institute, notorious for promoting the theory of Intelligent Design, do not view themselves as such.<sup>2</sup> Conservative and Left Wing intellectuals alike would seem to be at a loss as to how to define their role and/or declare the designation. The reasons for such hesitancy are varied. The collapse of the Left, the professionalization of Academia, the conflict of interest stemming from employment in state sponsored research venues and universities, as well as public complaints about a lack of commitment on the part of the late 20<sup>th</sup> century intellectual may have contributed to this state of affairs.

There is also a feeling, on the part of the intellectuals themselves, of disillusionment with their work and that of their contemporaries. Reading the accounts of many intellectuals, the perception that the fruit of their labor is not well received (on the part of the general public) is apparent. The reason for such malaise, however, is not as evident. Although intellectuals might share a dim outlook about their line of work, they appear to be unable to agree on what is ailing the profession. Is the intellectual in *crisis*? According to the views stated by a large number of North American and European intellectuals, the answer is yes.

The case of Latin America, however, appears to be somewhat different. Perhaps because intellectuals in Latin America have a long-standing tradition of reconciling their academic endeavors with a vigorous career in politics, both the public's perception and their own seems to be systematically different from their European and North American counterparts. Writers and intellectuals like Rómulo Gallegos in Venezuela, José Martí in Cuba, Domingo Sarmiento in Argentina or Juan Bosch, in the Dominican Republic, have been both statesmen and scholars, fulfilling, without apparent conflict, affairs of state and of the mind.

In this essay, I pose that the concept of what an intellectual is, as well as his/her role in public matters differs, in Latin America, from the role intellectuals play in Europe and the United States. Intellectuals in Latin America, for the most part, fall under the category of public intellectuals; that is their function in society is clearly perceived as belonging within the public sphere. Intellectuals in Europe and the United States are divided as to where their role should be placed. Some claim they should vigorously pursue the path of "public intellectuals", while others argue their academic obligations supersede any other type of work.

In order to prove my thesis, I will compare the perspectives of European intellectuals (mainly in France, Germany, England and the United States) with those of their counterparts

- 
- 1 This article is part of a larger effort in mapping the activities of intellectuals in Latin America. The book, with the provisional title, *The Might of the Pen: Intellectuals in Latin America* explores in great detail the evolution of the class and the repercussions of their political accomplishments and/or lack of them.
  - 2 I asked Bruce Chapman this question in a conversation we had at a luncheon at my house. He claimed he did not consider himself an intellectual. As for Chomsky, see bibliography.

in Latin America, analyzed within a historical framework as well as from personal comments regarding their *métier*. I hope to demonstrate that, according to their own judgment in the matter, intellectuals face a crisis: that of defining their own identity.

The complexity of the term may be partly to blame for the difficulty in delineating a precise map of the profession. Historically, the concept was born in France at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. As Kemp Welch and Jennings argue, “by common consent, the word intellectual, used as a noun to describe a particular kind of person, enters Western European usage at the end of the nineteenth century with the Dreyfuss affair” (7). The action of intervening in politics, on the part of a group of French writers, “was constitutive of the definition of the noun” (7). At the time of the inception of the word into the French vocabulary, political action – in the face of injustice – was the defining characteristic.

For the purpose of this essay, I utilize the term intellectual following its historical precedent. I refer to intellectuals as writers (both fiction and non-fiction/academic) whose role in the political arena has been clearly demonstrated. The term, however, is applied to many other members who may not share the “political or public label”. The list below shows some of the most common roles associated with the profession:

1. Intellectuals as aesthetes, and/or academics:
  - i. These are men and women who dwell in matters of the spirit, often associated with the humanities. They are generally connected with the university milieu.
2. Intellectual meaning simply “intelligent people”.
3. Intellectuals in the category traditional/elitist: A derogatory connotation where intellectuals are viewed as literary and/or cultural snobs.
4. Intellectuals as normative thinkers, referring to persons who *think* in depth and use abstract reasoning to reflect on essential aspects of human existence.
5. Functional intellectuals: Intellectuals who perform certain functions in/for society. Among them are cultural leadership and a secular understanding of the world.
6. Intellectuals as critics of society.
7. Intellectuals as policy-makers: Thinkers and writers who seek to fulfill a role as cultural and political leaders, bringing to society an understanding of legislative, political and social aspects of life.

Every definition stated above was collected from different sources, ranging from dictionaries to articles about intellectuals. It surprised me that there were so many different explications for the term, as well as such a wealth of apparent functions associated with the overall role intellectuals play in society. It is particularly relevant to comment on heading number 3. The appellation of intellectuals as cultural or literary snobs must be reflected upon, as it stresses another common belief regarding the class: that the intellectual is isolated in the “Ivory Tower”, short hand for the academic world, and has no contact with the general population. Bertrand Russell may shed some light on why this particular category appears to carry such negative weight. The British Mathematician, scholar and philosopher stated: “an intellectuals may be defined as a person who pretends to have more intellectuals than he really has. I hope this definition does not fit me” (cited in Diggins, 91). Coming from someone who was vehemently opposed to World War I, and took political action to prevent it, this may appear strange. In Great Britain and the Anglo-Saxon world, however, the word intellectual attains a derogatory quality, seldom matched by other cultures. We will study this phenomenon, in greater detail, in the following pages.

In spite of the ambiguity of the term, product of the many features attributed to its members, there are some more complete definitions retaining most of the original 19<sup>th</sup> century

features. I believe the role of the intellectual was stated best by Vaclav Havel, who posits that, an “intellectual is a person who should disturb, question, bear witness and be provocative. Someone independent, rebelling against oppression, who is not subject to the open manipulations of power” and who is the “chief doubter of systems, of power and its incantations, (and) should be witness to their mendacity” (Cited by Karabel 205).

The case of Latin America, as I mentioned before, is somewhat different to Europe and the United States. Although the Spanish-speaking geographical mass shares with Europe a penchant for indulging in the multiplicity of meanings of the term, the role of intellectuals appears to be better defined.<sup>3</sup> Almost all the functions contemplated within the class are associated with the role a public intellectual plays. In addition to that, there seems to be a more favorable response from the public (and the members of the profession) regarding the subject of intellectuals. As Jorge Ibargüengóitia testifies, in a symposium convened in México in 1968 to speak about the role of the intellectual, a delegate took the floor declaring that the Latin American intellectual had not played a relevant part in the political life of Spanish-speaking countries. The reaction of the participants was immediate:

There was great commotion. Before this declaration could be finished, fifteen Latin Americans were asking for the floor. When this was in turn conceded each spoke of the fight against oppression and named a long list of martyrs among the intellectuals" (Ibargüengóitia 225)

Even the categories described by Sanchez Gomez for the Spanish-speaking Southern hemisphere intellectual are described in terms of his/her role in terms of political and social action. According to this scholar, the Latin American *intelligentsia* may be divided as follows.

- a. Intellectuals as teachers and founding fathers, best exemplified by Domingo Sarmiento or Romulo Gallegos
- b. Intellectual as critics, who improve on society as a whole. This group also believes they are on a “prophetic mission” and fit into the definition of the committed writer espoused by Sartre. Among them Paz, Poniatowska and Storni may be mentioned.
- c. Intellectuals as mediators. Their role is to mediate between centers of power and the periphery, more recently between insurgency and the governments. Examples may be Ernesto Cardenal or Gioconda Belli.
- d. Intellectuals for democracy: Activists who make their goal to restore democracy. Among them one may cite Neruda or Skarmeta.

Perhaps it is fitting that Latin America claims its intellectuals have a greater degree of personal involvement in politics than other cultures. The degree of political volatility of the region, coupled with the low investment on education places pressure in the *intelligentsia* to devote their thinking skills to try to improve the social and political realities of the region. As Rama suggests, intellectuals in Latin America have a long history of contribution to politics. “The power of the ‘grupo letrado’” he states, “can be seen in its extraordinary longevity” (29, my translation). The might of the “lettered city”, a term he applies to Latin American *urbes* founded as mytho-poetic locus where “intelligence gives birth to a ‘dream metropolis’

---

3 When I refer to Latin America, I am speaking exclusively about Spanish-speaking America. I am not including Brazil or the French-speaking colonies.

embodying the illusions of universal culture” (1), has endured beyond the normal cycles of its individual members. Intellectuals in Latin America, he claims, have maintained their status from the time of the Colony to our days. In claiming ownership of the ‘written sign’, intellectuals have “reached and fulfilled a social role (...) becoming an independent force among the institutions of (political) power” (30).

According to the author, intellectuals as a class have had an important effect on political matters from the foundation of the nation to the present time. Sommer agrees with Rama assessment, adding that there is a distinguished list of intellectuals (particularly novelists) who have held posts of importance in the area (4). Among them one may remember, vice-presidents (Luis Alberto Sanchez), presidents, (Gallego, Sarmientos, Bosch), senators, (Neruda), Ambassadors (Fuentes, Asturias, Paz) and many other intellectuals who have held appointments in education, culture, and other sensitive political areas.

In general, the intellectual in Latin America is well regarded. Even when their incursions into politics have not resulted into success (Vargas Llosa, for example), for the most part, they are still revered as public figures. The public feels represented by them. A taxi driver in Cartagena will proudly show you the house of Garcia Marquez and comment on his recent endeavors. The press will ask their opinions on matters from the general state of the economy to who is more likely to win the national soccer cup. Even if the books they write have not been read by the general population, intellectuals in Latin America have “brand recognition”. The public is aware of who they are, what they do and appears to be satisfied with the role they play in the public arena.

Europe and the United States share a different experience. If one is to take into account the impressions of the intellectuals themselves, the “letrados” of the First World are in a state of discontent regarding their role, their labors and their participation in public matters. From Russell’s revelation that “an intellectual is someone pretending to have more intellect than he really has”, to Orwell’s: “Intellectuals take their cookery from Paris and their opinions from Moscow”, (cited by Heyck, 194) the general perception of the intelligentsia in the Anglo-Saxon world, France and Germany strikes readers as somewhat skewed. As Dennis Brogan comments regarding Britain’s *intelligentsia*, “we British do not take our intellectuals too seriously”.<sup>4</sup>

I will begin by examining the English-speaking world, namely Britain and the United States, as a way to showcase the differences with their Latin American peers. Some of the most common perceptions about intellectuals, in this part of the world, are that, as Orwell puts it, they are associated with the Left, a subtle way of proclaiming they are biased. As a result, their political opinions and their participation in politics is scrutinized as serving “foreign interests” (Orwell’s cookery from France and orders from Moscow). Thus, right wing would-be intellectuals steer clear of the label, as they fear to be associated with socialist and/or communist practices.

The second complaint I found repeatedly stated is that intellectuals are isolated in the Ivory Tower and thus become detached from the common man. Eagleton argues this case most convincingly, stating that intellectuals:

...live in a world of schizoid disheveled subjects whose abilities to tie their own shoelaces, let alone topple the state, would be bound to remain something of a mystery  
(16)

The author of *The Illusions of Postmodernism* posits that, because of the vagaries of postmodernism and the death of Theory associated with post modernity, intellectuals are left

---

4 Cited by Heyck, 192.

in a world of ambiguity, “rife with various veins of pseudo mysticism” where conference papers such as “Putting back the anus into Coriolanus’ would attract hordes of excited acolytes who knew little about the bourgeoisie but a lot about buggery” (4). As a scholar generally associated with the Left, he bemoans the sudden demise of the socialist oriented ideologies, going so far as to suggest that the death of the intellectual came about with the Death of Ideology. The crisis of the intellectual, consequently, becomes the crisis of the fragmented state of theory, in particular Marxist theory.

The Palestinian born, British raised and American tenured professor Edward Said claimed that intellectuals were a class badly in need of restructuring. Like his colleagues Jacoby and Eagleton, he argued that the seclusion of the Ivory Tower (namely Academia) had made them complacent, detached from the general public and isolated from the community. Trading a precarious bohemian existence for tenure and a stable career, as Jacoby points out, has made them self-satisfied, without need or motivation to take political action. Sometimes when intellectuals feel they have to intervene, as Sontag, Didion and Chomsky did after 9/11, they are vilified for not “understanding the American public” and called unpatriotic.

Chomsky and Vidal take the former argument one step further. The linguist/political activist argues that the intellectual is dead, as his role of unveiling the truth has been taken over by “the powers that be”. Power, he claims, already knows the truth; therefore, the role of the intellectual exists no more, as power will not listen.<sup>5</sup>

In *Requiem for the American Empire*, Gore Vidal joins the voices mourning the demise of the intellectual. Intellectuals in the United States, he argues, have played a very small role in the foundation of the “American Empire”. At the dawn of the empire, some writers and academics (Upton Sinclair, for example) might have tried to make a difference in the world by attacking the excesses of the ruling class. In present times, however, their voices are silent, standing by while the American Empire starts to decline. Intellectuals, Vidal offers, are ensconced under the protective mantle of Academia. They have stopped using their voices to decry the wrongdoings of the mighty (see also Diggins).<sup>6</sup>

The book *Impostors in the Temple* sheds some light into the apparent distaste of right wing intellectuals for the title. The author claims that the Left has high-jacked the term, turning it into a political campaign to sway the youth of America towards their liberal biases. Little wonder that Wolfowitz, Andersen and Chapman do not want to be associated with the profession. Like Orwell and Brogan, they feel that the title is more a mark of a “politically” motivated move than a serious academic analysis of culture and society.

Intellectuals in Germany do not seem to fare much better than in the United States and Britain. According to Karabel, the problem lies primarily in the definition of what an intellectual is which, for the most part, is self-referential. A second obstacle intellectuals face, according to the former social theorist, is the “moralist” quality imbedded within the term. Although it is true that intellectuals hold a dominating status within the cultural sphere, they are not part of the upper echelons of the political or economic elite. Thus, Karabel argues:

---

5 “Overcoming Orthodoxies”, Interview. December 16, 2000, <http://www.zmag.org/chomskyarticles.htm>.

6 It is certainly paradoxical that *The Jungle*, Sinclairs literary “socialist manifesto”, failed to do what his author originally intended. Sinclair wrote the novel to show the horrifying work-conditions of new immigrant labor in the United States. The meat-packing Industry in Chicago had the worst record of labor violations. Therefore, the novelist chose this exploitative environs to portray the plight of the laborers. The novel did produce the outrage Sinclair was expecting. The public’s ire, however, was not directed at the inhumane conditions of the workplace, but rather against the unsanitary procedures for food-handling in the meat-packer plants. As a result, the Pure Food and Drug Act was passed.

It is thus misleading to assume, as does much of the existing literature, that intellectuals will typically adopt an oppositional stance towards the existing order; most of them have, after all, attained a relatively privileged position within it, and their well-being often depends upon the acquisition of resources controlled by political and economic elites with whom they are socially and culturally linked (209)

Since intellectuals attain positions of prestige within the inner circles of power, it may be naïve to think they will argue against the hand that feeds them. On the contrary, Karabel believes that intellectuals “share” a predisposition towards reinforcing the status quo, as opposed to acting against the regime they are serving.

Werner Muller agrees. German intellectuals, he argues, share a lack of identification with the common people. When one examines the recent history of Germany, the political situation as well as the apparent submissive stance of most intellectuals advances the thesis of the failure of the intellectual. East Germany, for example, can be used to illustrate his claim. According to Muller, East German intellectuals engaged in “patterns of domination (and) complicity” within the Regime. The first by using the power they had to survive within the Communist party. The second by excusing or condoning the abuses of the regime (17). As intellectuals, he offers, they not only faced a “thinking crisis, but also an existence-threatening crisis” (18).

Jens Reich supports this contention. In his article: *Intelligentsia in Eastern Europe before and after 1989*, the author reveals a similar panorama to that of his colleagues, Muller and Karabel. The *intelligentsia* in the East, as defined by Konrad and Szeleny, were entrusted with the task to be the intellectual executors of the socialist project. In that respect they were successful. Intellectuals stood by while the rights of their citizens were trampled. In some cases, they enabled the State to carry out its policies with political, social and moral justifications based on the assumption that the Marxist policies were for the “greater good” of the people. In all Eastern European countries, Reich argues, the *intelligentsia* was conscious that, even if they were just merely fulfilling their duty as “the thinking arm of the party”, they had “substantially contributed towards the functioning of the system” (319). A lovely cinematic depiction of this last statement can be found in the recent film: *The Lives of Others*, directed by Florian Henckel von Donnersmarck. The film narrates the political persecution of an East German intellectual by the Stasi, entrusted to entrap the former “golden boy” of the German *intelligentsia* merely because he lives with a woman a high ranking East German official desired.

As in many other respects, the French are a case difficult to pinpoint. On the surface, they appear to share the same distaste for intellectuals as the British, North Americans and Germans. In spite of being the country home to the origin of the term, French intellectuals claim to share Benda’s distrust of the class. Perhaps the death of the French intellectual began in the 1920’s with Benda’s claim, in *La Trahison des Clercs*, that intellectuals had been assimilated by the political apparatus losing any hope of independent thought. According to Cristofferson, “war and occupation profoundly shaped the politics of French intellectuals in the years after liberation (1)”. French “clerks” expected justice, had a desire for radical change and engaged in a world of Manichean politics where the Right and Left intellectuals had distinctive associations stemming from their roles in WWII. The intellectuals “vehicle” for revolutionary change was the PCF. As expected, the members of the French *intelligentsia* were wary against reacting, in any way, against other Communist regimes or the directives of the Communist party. Even late in the 70’s after Solzhenitsyn’s publication of the accounts in the Siberian Gulags, French intellectuals were slow to react, according to Cristofferson. During the investigation following the alleged abuses of prisoners in 1970, Foucault’s led GIF refused to have any “intellectual or institutional authority” (29), arguing instead for a group *d’information* which could research, from first-hand accounts, the conditions of the prisoners.

Both Mitterrand and Regis du Bray (prime examples of French intellectuals in my view) certainly advanced a political agenda whilst in power. Their political accomplishments join the long list of political activism of intellectuals of the caliber of Merleau-Ponty, Sartre, de Beauvoir and Camus, just to name a few. The former, particularly, are better remembered, in the eyes of the public, as literary and philosophical stars rather than as intellectuals with a clear cut influence in the political dealings of their country. I must caution however, that in my personal opinion, de Beauvoir and Sartre's involvement in all aspects of political life (decrying the Algerian war, resistance to the Nazi occupation, and other important aspects of the 20<sup>th</sup> century history of France) seems to fit perfectly into the mold of the "Zolanian" intellectual.<sup>7</sup>

It might not have helped French intellectuals that one of their most beloved members, Malraux, took part in the suppression of the revolt of students (during his long term service as Minister of Culture for de Gaulle) as well as standing behind some controversial political measures of the government at the time. The truth is that, although French intellectuals appear to be somewhat dismissive of the title, they do, now and again, appear content to claim it. For the most part, however, their intellectuals have been chastised for forgetting their political agenda and being slow to react to the wrongs inflicted on the communities they serve.

In Latin America, on the contrary, intellectuals feel compelled to intervene in politics. At first, the impulse was born out of the necessity of giving birth to the nation, by the means of a political and economic separation from Spain. Many of the founding fathers of the Latin American nations were writers (particularly novelists). At a later moment in the history of the Spanish-speaking hemisphere, their efforts were displaced towards securing the state and cementing the political institutions needed for a country to run successfully as a nation. Finally, in the last fifty years or so, intellectuals have devoted their energy towards movements in favor of restoring democracy or safeguarding the precarious institutions of the State. It is my firm belief that intellectuals, in Latin America, hardly had time to argue against being intellectuals; nor engaging in speculation on what their role in the eye of the community might be. Academic tenure, in Spanish-speaking America, is practically unheard of. Many intellectuals have a second profession (career) as backup, and engage in writing, researching or academic pursuits on the side. The investment of GNP into education of the region, as a whole, is so minimal that the intellectuals of Latin America need other jobs just to survive economically. Oftentimes, political parties use them to "wash their image", believing that the prestige associated with their name will earn them a sure vote. Many intellectuals have fallen prey to this ruse. Naïve, perhaps, but the thinking elite of Spanish America feels compelled to intervene in politics acting under the premise that someone has to do it; as they are the better prepared elements in their communities, it is logical to assume that they would serve their nations best.

In Europe and the United States, for the most part, democracy and/or strong functional states have been a part of their recent history (hundred years, at least, for most cases). It is perhaps because of the relative political stability that intellectuals do not feel a pressing need to intervene in politics. In Latin America, the unstable situation of the political institutions coupled with the lack of viable political options may have pushed intellectuals towards firmer action. Maybe the reasons for this intervention are to be found in delicate (extraordinary) political situations; just as in the 19<sup>th</sup> century with the first French intellectuals, politics, would be the defining characteristic of the class.

---

7 Simone de Beauvoir, in particular, with her writings about gender opened up the eyes of countless generations of women and helped bring about true changes in gender policies. Sartre's view of the "committed writer" is, in my opinion, another proof of his philosophy regarding intellectual life. See also, "Why Write?", London: Harcourt Brace, 1992.



## References

- Anderson, Martin. *Impostors in the Temple*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1992.
- Benda, Julien. *The Treason of the Intellectuals*. Aldington, Richard, trans. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1928.
- Chomsky, Noam. "Overcoming Orthodoxies". Interview excerpts, December 16, 2000, <http://www.zmag.org/chomskyarticles.htm>.
- Christofferson, Michael Scott. *French Intellectuals against the Left: The Antitotalitarian Movement of the 1970*. Oxford, Berghahn Books, 2004.
- Debray, Régis. *Teachers, Writers, Celebrities: The Intellectual of Modern Day France*. London: Verso, 1981.
- Diggins, John Patrick. "The Changing Role of the American Public Intellectual in American History". *The Public Intellectual: Between Philosophy and Politics*. Melzer et al eds. Lanham: Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield, 2003.
- Eagleton, Terry. *The Illusions of Postmodernism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996. February 12, 2001 issue.
- Heyck, Thomas William. "Myths and meanings of Intellectuals in Twentieth-Century British National Identity". JSTOR, *The Journal of British Studies*, Vol 37, No. 2, (April 1998), p. 192-221.
- Ibargüengóitia, Jorge. "The Fellow-Travelers". JSTOR, *Latin American Research Review*, Vol.4, No.1, p 223-226.
- Jacoby, Russell. "The Decline of the American Intellectual". *Cultural Politics in Contemporary America*. NY: Routledge, 1989.
- Jennings, Jeremy. Kemp-Welch, Anthony. Eds. *Intellectuals in Politics*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Karabel, Jerome. "Towards a Theory of Intellectuals and Politics". JSTOR, *Theory and Society*, Vol.25, No. 2 (April 1996), p. 205-233.
- Laski, Melvin. *Voices in a Revolution: Intellectuals and Others in the Collapse of the East German Communist Regime*. Sussex: Grange Press, 1991.
- Muller, Jan Werner. *Another Country: German Intellectuals, Unification and National Identity*. London: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Rama, Angel. *La Ciudad Letrada*. Hanover: Ediciones del Norte, 1984.
- Reich, Jen. "Intelligentsia and Class Power in Eastern Europe Before and After 1989". *Aussenpolitik* (English Edition), Vol. 43, 4<sup>th</sup> quarter 1992, p.315-323.
- Said, Edward. 'Opponents, audiences, constituencies and community'. *The Politics of Interpretation*. Chicago: U. Of Chicago Press, 1983.
- "Orientalism revisited: An Interview with Edward Said". JSTOR, *MERIP Middle East Report*, No. 150, Human Rights and the Palestine Conflict, p. 32-36.
- Sánchez Gómez, Gonzalo. "El compromiso social y político de los intelectuales". Speech upon reception of the Diskin Memorial Lectureship Award by the Latin American Studies Association and Oxfam America, Miami, March 2000. ([www.mamacoca.org-sanchez\\_intelectuales.htm](http://www.mamacoca.org-sanchez_intelectuales.htm)).
- Sartre, Jean Paul. "Why Write?" in *Critical Theory since Plato*. London: Harcourt Brace, 1992.
- Scott, Alan. "Between Autonomy and Responsibility: Max Weber on scholars, academics and intellectuals". *Intellectuals in Politics*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Sommer, Doris, *Foundational Fiction*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- Vargas Llosa, Mario. *El Pez en el Agua*. Barcelona: Seix Barralt, 1998.
- Vidal, Gore. "Requiem for the American Empire". *Cultural Politics in Contemporary America*. New York: Routledge, 1989.