



LUND UNIVERSITY

From Las Casas to Che : An Introduction to Contemporary Latin America

Flores, Fernando

2007

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Flores, F. (2007). *From Las Casas to Che : An Introduction to Contemporary Latin America*. Lund University.

Total number of authors:

1

General rights

Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117
221 00 Lund
+46 46-222 00 00

From Las Casas to Che

Omslagsbild: Las, Casas/Che Guevara
© Maria Crossa, 2007

From Las Casas to Che

**An Introduction to Contemporary
Latin America**

Fernando Flores Morador



Lund University

2007

Department of History of Science and Ideas at
Lund University, Biskopsgatan 7, 223 62 Lund
From Las Casas to Che. An Introduction to Contemporary
Latin-America

© Fernando Flores Morador, 2007

©Translation from Swedish: Oscar Ralsmark

Print: Media-Tryck, Lund University, 2007

ISBN: 978-91-633-1106-2

Dedicated to:

Alfredo Armando Aguirre
Bibiana Apolonia del Brutto
Dario Arce Asenjo
Silvia Austerlich
Gustavo Carrizo
Ubiratán D'Ambrosio
Mauricio Langón
Raúl Plazas Galindo
Ana María Tomeo
Nelson Villareal
and to UVLA

INDEX

INDEX.....	7
PREFACE.....	11
PART I: METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS.....	13
CHAPTER 1: THE CULTURAL MAIN EQUATION OF LATIN AMERICA	15
WHAT DRIVES HISTORY?.....	15
THE ARCHAIC AND THE MODERN IN THE LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY OF IDEAS	16
CHAPTER 2: ERUDITION IN THE PERIPHERY.....	21
THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN CULTURAL HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL MECHANICAL ACTIONS.....	26
ORIGINALITY AND PERIPHERY	27
“DELAY” DOES NOT IMPLY “RETARDATION”	29
THE WORLDVIEW OF ENGAGEMENT	30
SOME IMPORTANT DICHOTOMIES IN THE LATIN AMERICAN DEBATE.....	32
BARTOLOMÉ DE LAS CASAS, THE FIRST <i>PENSADOR</i> OF LATIN AMERICA.....	33
INDIVIDUAL AND PUBLIC INFLUENCE	34
THE LIBERATION MOVEMENT AND THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION.....	36
PART II: PERIODIZATION.....	39
CHAPTER 3: DISCOVERY, CONQUEST AND COLONISATION... 41	
INDIAN CULTURES PRIOR TO COLUMBUS.....	41
THE COLONISATION, A CONSTANT SOURCE OF GUILT AND SHAME	45
THE SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT, 1492-1810	47
THE UNIVERSITY IN SPANISH AMERICA.....	51
COLONIAL LIBRARIES AND PRINTING HOUSES.....	52
THE FIRST WRITERS OF IBERO-AMERICA.....	54
THE JESUIT MISSIONS IN PARAGUAY AND URUGUAY	61
CARLOS DE SIGÜENZA Y GÓNGORA AND OLOF RUDBECK	65
FRANCISCO DE VITORIA, THE SCHOOL OF SALAMANCA AND INDIAN RIGHTS 68	
WOMEN AND MARRIAGE DURING THE COLONIAL AGE.....	69

CHAPTER 4: THE PRE-REVOLUTIONARY PERIOD	73
THE ENLIGHTENMENT IN IBERO-AMERICA	73
CONSERVATIVES AGAINST REFORMERS: “CIVILISATION OR BARBARISM”	73
THE IDEOLOGICAL ROOTS OF THE REVOLUTION: BENITO JERÓNIMO FEIJÓO	75
ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL IDEOLOGIES	77
THE REBELLION OF TUPAC AMARU	83
CHAPTER 5: THE LIBERATION	85
THE POLITICAL AND IDEOLOGICAL ENTERPRISE	85
SPANISH POLITICAL THOUGHT IN THE 17 TH AND 18 TH CENTURY	86
LIBERAL CURRENTS: THE ENLIGHTENED DESPOTISM	87
JOSÉ ARTIGAS AND SAMUEL PUFENDORF	88
LOCKE, MONTESQUIEU AND THE LATIN AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONS	89
ROUSSEAU, THE FRENCH REVOLUTION, NAPOLEON AND THE DEMOCRATIC IDEAS	90
THE UTILITARIANISM OF BENTHAM IN SPANISH AMERICA	91
THE CONSTITUTION OF CÁDIZ FROM 1812, AND ITS IMPORTANCE TO THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION	92
JOSÉ DE SAN MARTÍN AND JOSÉ ARTIGAS: THE CONDITIONS OF THE HISTORY OF IDEAS	93
ANDRES BELLO	94
THE INITIAL STRIDES OF THE REVOLUTION ON THE CONTINENT: MIGUEL HIDALGO AND JOSÉ MARÍA MORELOS	95
FRANCISCO DE MIRANDA: <i>EL PRECURSOR</i>	96
SIMÓN BOLIVAR: <i>EL LIBERTADOR</i>	97
MARIANO MORENO AND THE MAY REVOLUTION OF 1810	101
JOSÉ ARTIGAS: “THE MOST MISERABLE ARE TO BECOME THE MOST PRIVILEGED”	101
CHAPTER 6: LIBERALISM, ROMANTICISM AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE NEW NATIONS	105
LITERARY AMERICANISM AND NATIONALISM: THE BIRTH OF LATIN AMERICA	106
JUAN BAUTISTA ALBERDI	109
DOMINGO FAUSTINO SARMIENTO	110
PART III: MODERNITY	113
CHAPTER 7: POSITIVISM AND KRAUSISM IN LATIN AMERICA	115
POSITIVISM	115

KRAUSISM.....	118
CHAPTER 8: THE REACTION AGAINST NEO-COLONIALISM, LATIN-AMERICANISM	121
JOSÉ ENRIQUE RODÓ	122
JOSÉ MARTÍ	122
THE PHILOSOPHY OF BERGSON IN LATIN AMERICA	123
JOSÉ ORTEGA Y GASSET AND <i>PERSPECTIVISM</i>	124
CHAPTER 9: PHILOSOPHICAL AND SCIENTIFIC THOUGHT IN THE 20TH CENTURY	127
THE GENERATION OF THE FOUNDERS	127
THE OPPOSITION BETWEEN UNIVERSALISTS AND REGIONALISTS: IS THERE A LATIN AMERICAN PHILOSOPHY?	128
A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE DEBATE BETWEEN INTERNATIONALISTS AND REGIONALISTS	129
ARTURO ROSENBLUETH, HUMBERTO MATURANA AND FRANCISCO VARELA: PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE AND POSTMODERN INFORMATION SOCIETY	131
RODOLFO KUSCH AND AMERICA <i>PROFUNDA</i>	134
ENRIQUE DUSSEL AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF LIBERATION	134
UBIRATÁN D'AMBROSIO AND ETHNOMATHEMATICS	135
CHAPTER 10: LATIN AMERICAN POLITICAL THOUGHT IN THE 1950S AND 1960S.....	137
MARX, ENGELS AND LATIN AMERICA	137
THE POPULIST REFORM IN LATIN AMERICA	139
FROM THE UTOPIAN SOCIALISTS TO THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION	143
FEMINISM IN ARGENTINA, CHILE AND URUGUAY 1890-1949	145
JOSÉ CARLOS MARIATEGUI AND LATIN AMERICAN MARXISM	149
THE CUBAN REVOLUTION.....	150
CHE GUEVARA AND THE NEW MAN.....	152
THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW SOCIO-POLITICAL REALITIES: THE “BASISMO” OF PAULO FREIRE	155
REVOLUTION WITHIN THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT: THE LIBERATION THEOLOGY	156
ERNESTO LACLAU AND POSTMARXISM.....	159
LITERATURE	163
VOCABULARY	169
INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS	171

Preface

This little book is intended to provide a short introduction to some of the most important events that took place within the ideological process that ranges from the thousand years old American culture of the Indians, over the Spanish and Portuguese colonisation, and finally to the “Latin America” of our days.

The book is in progress. Thus, it can only paint an incomplete picture of this intricate ideological reality. The idea is to develop a supplementary text along with the pedagogical experience, so that future students in this way will have a better educational material.

The author wants to thank Oscar Ralsmark for the fine translation he achieved and Anna Cappi for her critical readings with many important observations.

Lund, July 2007

Part I: Methodological Problems

Chapter 1: The Cultural Main Equation of Latin America

What Drives History?

In the Communist Manifesto by Marx and Engels it is said that history is driven by the *class struggle*. After some hundred years of experience and much searching one could say that the Marxist thesis of the importance of the class struggle to the development of history still is very useful. The doctrine seems to be one of those Marxist theoretical assumptions that still today have a high value of explanation. The class society developed in ancient Greece – together with the cultural milieu of the city – as a consequence of population growth and an increasing social complexity. This development was preceded by an age in which society mainly was governed on the basis of ties of blood and marital rules. I will refer to this ancient social order as the *archaic* society. Thus, archaic traits in a society are all those social conditions that originate in the relations between individuals.

The relations based on ties of blood were, with the revolution of the city culture, superseded by *political* conditions. “Political” conditions are based on “mechanisms” not grounded in ties of blood. The selection of a king within a royal dynasty is, the way I see it, an archaic procedure, but the election of a leader, that avoids relations based on ties of blood, as for example through voting, is, the way I see it, a political action. I will refer to this process of politicisation as the process of modernisation and to its consequence as *modernity*.

With the city culture and the historical entry of the classes the archaic traits of society were not, however, totally superseded. The relations based on ties of blood have their origin in human nature and will always be present and dictate the global conditions of man.

As from the first days of ancient Greece, archaic and modern traits have coexisted to generate a series of social structures – and this is the consequence of a power struggle between an archaic world and a

modern world. As the process of modernisation aims to eliminate the archaic mechanisms by means of new political measures, the archaic traits in society will strike back and also find new mechanisms by means of which to reappear. Thus, I will give an account of *relations based on ties of blood as a causal factor*, i.e., of that situation in which family relations act structurally on the human free will to control her decisions and actions. Its archaic traits can be recognised in the dialectics of the processes of honour and reciprocation, i.e., in on the one hand the *gift* and on the other hand the *vengeance*. To this type of causality belong also such phenomena as the increased domain of family influence, groups of friendship, the region (regionalism), the nation (nationalism) and the concept of “race” (racism).

History is then, the way I see it, a consequence of the class struggle, but also of the relations based on ties of blood and the conflicts within the family, the clan, the group and the nation. History is also a consequence of the power struggle that is generated between the biological (archaic) and the cultural (modern) conditions of man.

The Archaic and the Modern in the Latin American History of Ideas

Spanish America is a geographical area within which the power struggle between archaic and modern traits stands out very clearly. The reason for this might be found in the significant initial historical distance between the society of the Europeans and the society of the Indians. For this reason, it is very difficult to comprehend the history of ideas of this area, if one disregards the dialectics of modernity and archaicity. This dialectics was at an early stage formulated in a classical work by the Argentinean Domingo Sarmiento (*Facundo*, 1845) as a power struggle between *civilisation* and *barbarism*.

The opposition between modernity and archaicity generated yet another historical equation that controls the main patterns in the Latin American history of ideas: the fact that the individual freedom increases at the expense of the independence of the collective, and vice versa.

Archaisms and modernities have taken the form of oppositions such as that between Indian and European culture, between European colonial thought and revolutionary nationalistic thought, between conservative and liberal thought, between scholastic and modern phi-

losophy, between provincial culture and urban culture, etc. Sarmiento's conception of Spanish Latin America as barbaric has in the 20th century found new expressions in the works of writers such as Jorge Luis Borges and his, by Anglo-Saxon culture inspired, literature. On the other hand, we have an archaically inspired philosophical thought, in which the nation is located at the centre, which has gained much space within political thought after the war of independence.

Inasmuch as all the grand heroes of liberation have been in a defensive position against foreign superpowers and in deep consent with the provincial population (the majority), they have all fallen into conflict with the liberal individualistic forces, often defended by the urban intellectuals (the minority). This opposition has resulted in a "negative" expression of the nationalism of the liberals. That is, one has collaborated with foreign superpowers in the firm conviction that this would lead to an improvement of the Latin American conditions of life.

Both the liberator and the freedom fighter are in love with freedom, but the former has a collectivist conception of it, while the latter has an individualistic conception of it. The liberator in the Latin American history of ideas sees discipline as the submission of the individual to the interest of the collective. In the 19th century the collective was primarily made up by the provincial population; an uncultivated mass made up by Indians and *Mestizos*. The liberals, on the other hand, view discipline as the taming of the instincts of the clan, i.e., as the repression of the mythological worldview, so typical of relations based on ties of blood, in favour of the modern scientifically inspired ideologies, as presented by powerful foreign civilisations.

The process of submission was meant to be realised by means of indoctrination together with a massive immigration of people from the "civilised" countries. The situation is often very intricate and a suitable categorisation of certain historical actors is hard to find. Some historical actors, who in a certain context work towards collective ends, might very well immediately afterwards work in the opposite direction. This relativism is, however, not apparent to the subject who is experiencing history. During the struggles of life, these men and women might be blindly controlled by firm convictions that will prevent them from correctly confronting the events from a somewhat objective perspective.

The enigma of the Latin American civilisation will be solved the day the interests of the nation, the clan and the family, are successfully reconciled with the set of problems concerning the individual and his

freedom. In other words, when the process of modernisation finds an expression that is able to coexist with the conditions of the archaic reason.

When it comes to the world around them, the superpowers have all, since the days of colonisation, trimmed their sails according to the wind. Either nationalistic solutions have been supported – as in the support of the United States to the Cuban liberators against Spain at the end of the 19th century – or the individual freedom has been supported – as in the support of the United States to the opposition in communist Cuba. In each case there is talk about “freedom”, a freedom that the superpower will bring together with its own interests.



Latin America about 1800: The Viceroyalties

Latin America about 1800: The Viceroyalties

Chapter 2: Erudition in the Periphery

Before one starts to consider the Latin American history of ideas from a European perspective, it is necessary to make precise the application of those concepts that were created to describe the European historical development. One of those concepts is the term “philosophy”, which in Latin America refers to a much broader way of thinking. I would describe the Latin American philosophical genre as analogous to the essay, i.e., as a product between philosophy and literature. This is obvious when it comes to the important output of essays of the 19th and 20th century, with works by authors such as Domingo Faustino Sarmiento, José Martí, Juan Bautista Alberdi and José Enrique Rodó, but also in an earlier output by Spanish thinkers who were writing outside of the institutions of the university and who also were motivated by a different set of problems. The primary example is the much celebrated *Brevísima Relación*,¹ by Bartolomé de Las Casas, the book behind the so-called *leyenda negra*, which depicted Spain as a ruthless colonial power.

The genre of the essay was developed in Europe in the 15th and 16th century. Later it got its name from the famous collection of essays written by Montaigne.² During this period a very important intellectual production grew outside of the institutions of the university, and thus at a great distance to the influence of the “scholastic style of the tractates”. The essays addressed a wider audience with a non-academic education. The university was controlled by the church and by scholastic thought. For this reason a style of writing, better suited to the activity of free journalism, was developed.

The importance of the style of the essay to the Latin American philosophical reflection also made the development of the reflection of the history of ideas easier, a reflection with elements of anthropology and traditional historical thought. This is the reason why one cannot, concerning Latin America, speak of “philosophers”, but rather of *pensadores* (thinkers).³

The Latin American *pensador* works within a broad field that stretches from philosophy to anthropology, with elements of literature

studies, economics and sociology. This phenomenon has been looked upon in two different ways: on the one hand, the phenomenon has been described – as above – in relation to European thought. On the other hand, it has been perceived as an independent phenomenon, which forms an independent cognitive model, in principle not comparable to any European model. Actually, the Latin American genre of the essay is derived from European references, but its importance to the general culture is significantly greater in Latin America.

We could say that the object of the study conducted by the *pensador* always is “reality” as it is perceived in its historical and sociological aspect. *Pensadores* are seldom interested in purely theoretical reflection, unless it can be directly tied to our immediate concerns, to the political and economic consequences. *Pensadores* first and foremost act as moulders of public opinion and as pedagogues. They are interested in influencing and their reflection frequently falls victim to the predominant ideologies. As the genre of the essay was born at the time of the discovery of America there has always been *pensadores* in Spanish America.

It is first with the advent of the 20th century, and with works by philosophers such as Antonio Caso, Carlos Vaz Ferreira and Alejandro Korn, that a domestically inspired academic philosophy is developed at the universities. As from this moment there would be a Latin American philosophical production that, in spite of an obvious European influence, can be considered to constitute a relatively original reflection. The discussion concerning the value of Latin American thought will from now on concern the debate on content rather than form. If the form is considered rigorous enough to be compared with European philosophy, the content is called in question, i.e., it is faced with the charge of not reflecting the Latin American reality anymore. But the development of an academic philosophy did not end the existence of the free literature of the essay, instead it remained the most important form of expression to the intellectual scientific production. In this context, one could argue that the academic philosophy has had a limited impact on the latest intellectual development of the continent and that the opposition between *pensamiento* and philosophy remains one of those key criteria that characterise the intellectual output of Latin America.

To discuss the genre of the essay with respect to philosophical “style” is to discuss the relationship between the philosophical content of a text and the form and structure of the text. This is the approach chosen by Professor Carlos Real de Azúa in his *Antología del Ensayo*

Uruguayo Contemporáneo.⁴ The philosophical expression that prefers the style of the essay gives an argument for this by reminding us of the need for a closer contact with reality. By “reality” what is often meant is the immediate world, that world which is revealed through common sense. To recognise the limits of common sense is to stay within the parameters of that which can be understood and shared by most people. Thus, the “style” of the essay is related to a number of non-theoretical qualities such as language proficiency, intense employment of metaphors, analogies and all those other literary qualities that render a text “readable”. Accordingly, the style of the essay is suitable to a conversation with non-philosophers or non-scientists, beyond the limits of science and beyond the limits of the educated, with the intention of making an immediate difference. According to Carlos Real de Azúa, the essayists are trying to be “popular”. In spite of this, most of the essayists are acquainted with the classical works of philosophy and do not hesitate to take on difficult theoretical tasks. One frequently comes across several references to classical works in a very popular essay. The style of the essay is, as is made clear by the description of the genre given by Carlos Real de Azúa, theoretical, speculative and referring. It is neither an imperative nor an advice. It is characterised by practical thought and by an immediate need to accomplish change. As a style it is personal and literary.⁵ It is a consequence of the human need to experiment but it also manifests a certain laziness, concerned to avoid the great demands of scientific methodology.⁶

An essay is not a thinking of a foundational kind, for it begins with a closed system or a completed ideology, and works its way from this. It is more of a commentary than it is information, it is more of an interpretation than it is data, it is more of a reflection than it is substance, it is more about creativity than it is about erudition, it consists more of postulates than of proofs, it is more about opinion than it is about epistemic value.⁷ The essay would always be, according to Carlos Real de Azúa, a reaction against the “imperialism” of science, against the scientific rigorousness, against its specialisation. The essay is able to form a reaction against the dogmatic, demanding, precise, complete, and final form, and replace it with freedom and improvisation.

The style of the essay is predominant also in the 20th century and characterises the output of the so-called *liberation philosophy*. This style also permeates most of the theological works that are written during this period, referred to as *liberation theology*. Although they do not

avoid demanding speculative problems, they do address a wider audience. They are transdisciplinary in the sense that it is hard to separate the sociological subject matter from the philosophical, and the theological subject matter from the political. As a natural consequence, already completed systems of thought are inherited from Europe, particularly from Marxism, but also from existentialism and phenomenology. By and large one could say that the Marxist philosophy, with respect to style, suits the Latin American repudiation of the models of speculative philosophy very well. Here one walks on the same path that Marx once began walking in his “The Misery of Philosophy”.

An author that has paid attention to the works of the *pensadores* is William Rex Crawford, in his classical book *A Century of Latin-American Thought*. It is a well-written book that reveals a well-read scholar. Crawford’s view agrees with that commonly accepted model, which restricts the more or less independent Latin American thought to the period after the struggle for liberation (the end of the 18th century). It is my firm belief that this is a view that immediately needs to be abandoned. Otherwise one underestimates most of that which is interesting in the Latin American culture, i.e., thousands of years of culture of the indigenous population, but also the African influence and the days of European colonialism, from the 16th century and on. Crawford is well aware of the difference between *pensadores* and philosophers, but when the time comes to apply it in his own research, he puts it aside. To Crawford – as to most scholars – the phenomenon of the *pensador* is a curiosity without an explanation that appears after the year of 1810, and an expression of a still not mature philosophical production. Latin American thought consists, for that matter and according to Crawford, only of those works that are written and published with political or social intentions. Music, art, literature and dance are not treated at all.

Crawford points to the typical elements of Latin American erudition: the predilection for history, political philosophy, social philosophy and, first and foremost, anthropological philosophy. We are also told what might lay behind this tendency:

[...] perhaps in a young country, philosophy is bound to be social philosophy; such in any rate, is the case with Latin America.⁸

Although we can approve of his description of the Latin American predilection for social and anthropological philosophy, we cannot accept his model of explanation. Much of Crawford’s model of interpretation and much of his usage is actual still today among those

scholars who are studying Latin American culture. From this point of view, it is reasonable to compare different cultural-historical achievements to each other and put them into some form of ranking order. This ranking is always grounded in some *theory* that is held to be *true*, even though the author doesn't always give an account of his theoretical assumptions. Most frequently, as in this case, the theory comes sneaking up on us as Crawford is introducing his comparison between "older" and "younger" countries. One doesn't have to do much analysing in order to see that the age of a culture doesn't have very much to do with the "age" of the state, and that that which is valid for a part of a culture, might not be valid for the culture in its totality. Assuming that the population in these countries partially is transplanted from European soil, with what right can we speak of a "young culture"? And what's more, as one is referring to that part of the population which is heir to the legacy of the thousand-years old culture of the indigenous population, in what sense is it reasonable to speak of a "young culture"? Also, as we are talking about the culture of the African man, why should we consider this culture "young"? Also, plenty of the European states are at least as young, but no one would consider the European culture to be "young". Note that one could state, with exactly the same right, that the so-called culture of "high technology" is "young", while the rites within some still existent Indian tribe are "ancient".

The problem associated with the use of different kinds of adjectives to rank various cultures leads us to the core of the historical analysis, which, the way I see it, cannot consist in developing simple analogies. The Crawfordian dichotomy "young-old" is also very popular among Americanists: We read that America is "the future", while the "old" and "decadent" Europe is "the past". One could say – and perhaps this is what Crawford really meant to say – that that which is "young" in the case of Latin America, is the *resulting* culture. In that case, however, it would be more appropriate to speak of an isolated cultivation of ancient cultures.

It has very often been said that what is important, according to scientific standards, are *facts*. All interpretations – all so-called "theories" – are, however, manifestations of different values that cannot avoid reflecting the beliefs of the scholar. But those days, in which it was considered possible to, by a simple act of the will, guarantee objectivity, are over. One example of a value judgement is the division of the world into "young" and "old" cultures. The same thing can be said of divi-

sions into categories like “rich” and “poor”, “primitive” and “refined”, “simple” and “complex”, “oppressed” and “superior”. Perhaps it ought to be emphasised that an historical science completely free from values cannot, on grounds of principle, be accomplished. It is my belief that a description of an historical course of events or of an anthropological quality must not be perceived as completely free from values. But one must still try to accomplish this, i.e., at least to work in this direction.

Another way to classify cultures would be to start out from their interior “wealth” or “complexity”. This model might explain why the Romans appropriated the Greek culture, and why Europe did not appropriate the American indigenous culture. But still, one is able to find situations, in which “poorer” or “simpler” cultures (as defined by the same theory that put judgement on the Greek culture) make an impression on a “complex” and “wealthy” culture. This is the relationship between the ancient African culture and the European culture in the whole of America. The culture of the black man was the source of some of the most palpable cultural revolutions within areas such as music and dance (jazz, samba, son, salsa, tango, etc., including various developments of each). It rather seems as if the African culture more or less laid dormant in America, until new opportunities prepared the way for a new expansion. From a strictly scientific point of view all cultures have the same value. Thus, all things considered, it is impossible to make an argument for or against the study of one or another form of culture.

The difference between Cultural Historical and Political Mechanical Actions

One might think that one culture is superior to another when it turns out that it is politically and militarily superior. Such a theory would “explain” why the European culture managed to impress the indigenous population of Latin America. But in this case two levels of “reality” are confused. It is true that a political and military superiority will allow the ruling side to try to make the defeated people abandon their culture, but there’s nothing to guarantee the success of such an endeavour. This is all the more true as the time required for a complete acculturation to take place is unknown. Those who believe themselves capable of asserting that the indigenous culture of Latin America, after the massive European cultural invasion, is forever gone, start out from a view of

cultural essence that is far from obvious. A culture is, according to this view, in some way or another, analogous to a living creature (and, therefore, analogous to the different stages of life: “young” or “old”). Oppression and submission would then be enough to take the life of a culture, in much the same way that one would take the life of a person. The death of the cultural agent is in this case confused with the death of the culture itself. Even if we accept the point of departure – that a culture might be perceived as something “living” – there are other interpretations that do not lead to the same conclusions. Let us instead view the culture as an information bank, much similar to a genetic system of codes. Such an interpretation of the nature of cultures attributes qualities to them that will allow us to imagine a situation in which a seemingly lost culture returns after an unknown time, perhaps in its original state, as if nothing had happened. Even if economic and political power leads to an apparent acculturation of a defeated people, this power must not be seen as a proof of the superiority of the culture. Not even with respect to the survival skills of a culture. It can be demonstrated that there are several well-known examples, which indicate quite the opposite, i.e., that a ruling culture appropriated the culture of the defeated people; this is the relationship between the Roman and the Greek culture.

Originality and Periphery

Latin American erudition is sometimes considered peripheral. But are there peripheral cultures? From a modernist European perspective the Latin American culture without a doubt is peripheral. But the fact that a culture is located in the Eurocentric periphery does not necessarily entail that it is lacking in quality, in originality or in other respects. The one who is doing research concerning anthropological and historical problems, cannot avoid “infecting” the subject matter with values that are predominant in the hegemonic cultures. In the case of Latin America, this has always meant the Spanish, the Portuguese and, in a wider sense, the European interpretation of historical facts. One ought to add to this, that when it comes to the erudition of the indigenous population, the greatest harm is not only the one which has its roots in the Eurocentric interpretation of cultural variables, but also the one which was caused by the massive European destruction of historical sources, and the irresponsible indifference which characterised the way

in which the as yet independent culture of the natives was treated by many Europeans. This was not done only in the name of European religion, but also in the name of European erudition.

There is a form of “originality” that is independent of any interpretation that is grounded in values. What makes a culture “original” in this sense is its unique identity, the quality of being unique from an anthropological and historical perspective. In the same sense as every living species is unique and carries a unique genetic heritage, every culture is the carrier of a unique cultural heritage. In the same sense as no species is more important than any other – in the sense that its importance to the genetic development cannot be known – no culture is more important than any other.

The original character of Latin American erudition is then, according to what has been said, an activity of thought, which is realised in a unique environment, under unique conditions. Even though the European “intelligentsia” remained in Spain and Portugal, and controlled the events in America from there, the real cultural problems were generated in the cultural clash with the indigenous population, and they were solved in the field by the conquerors, through a cultural synthesis that was necessary because of the demanding survival conditions.

I would say that, viewed from the total perspective of history, the cultural achievements of the natives and the missionaries, the slave owners and the slaves, are enough to make us believe in some kind of creativity. The point is thus to invest the required time in the immediate research concerning facts, as well as in the epistemological analysis that will liberate science from obvious value statements.

However, we ought to reject the use of the term “original” if it is supposed to mean “more original than...”, i.e., if it signifies sets of values. The variables that make up a culture are unknown and therefore a simple survey, which, for that matter, always is historically limited, cannot allow such a conclusion. One must keep in mind that the cultural scholar has no conception of where “the present” is to be “located” with respect to the total course of events. The task of the historian thus is, according to my view, not as much to “interpret” but to “recreate”, and when interpretation becomes necessary, always to present it with reservations.

“Delay” Does not Imply “Retardation”

During the age of colonisation a unique cultural life developed in Latin America and its main actors were – in the same way as in Europe – the religious orders and the church: the so-called “Sociedad Indiana”. Such religious orders followed, and took part in, the cultural developments of their native (European) countries with a certain *delay*. A study of this delay as a cultural factor might give us a much clearer insight into the uniqueness of the Latin American culture during this period. It is often said that this delay in relation to Europe automatically has entailed a certain *retardation*, but this opinion is easily rejected by pointing out the fact that this is not the same phenomenon. To the statement that the colonial culture was not “original”, but merely a copy of the European one, we might reply that such a conclusion is justified only if the European culture is accepted as a model of reference. If this isn’t done, one might instead draw the conclusion that Europe was unable to directly deal with what was the most important problem of those days, namely the cultural clash with the indigenous cultures. Thus we can turn this problem around and instead point out that the European intelligentsia experienced this cultural clash in a somewhat *retarded* way.

The erudite missionaries were, with their western cultural heritage, forced to confront a totally different form of culture, form of people, form of religion, form of philosophy, form of language, etc. In their efforts to acquire the “soul” of the natives, the missionaries were forced to develop a new kind of thought, that partially can be traced back to European thought, and partially to the European way of thinking that has informed studies of Latin American culture. In any case, the Europeans who participated in the colonisation ceased to be “real” Europeans without *knowing* it. From that first moment they were transformed by the surroundings and forever became a part of the new scenario. This made possible the Latin American trinity, consisting of Indians, Africans and Europeans, as a unique cultural milieu in the history of mankind. From this perspective the distant Europe was marginalised in a delayed position with respect to the development of the course of events. The result is the Criollo, the Mestizo, the Mulatto and their unique culture.

The Worldview of Engagement

The importance of the age of colonisation for an understanding of the Latin American worldview is enormous and it is difficult to grasp why the importance of this period has been neglected. This was when the three continents all came together in a unique clash. Perhaps it is a legacy from this age that the Latin American worldview always has been conceived of as *some form of mission*. The religious conversion of the Indian population and the African slaves became the mission that was to guide the comprehension of the entire scenario. Action and reflection became one and the same. But this form of outgoing activity was transformed because of the delays in the communications with Europe and turned inwards, to become a form of *feeling insight*. The Europeans had to study the language and the customs, and the religion and the myths of the indigenous population. They consumed their food according to their food customs, had their drinks, and danced to their rhythms. They made love in their manner, walked on their paths, used their clothes and lived in their houses. In this way they were introduced to the metaphysics of these cultural forms. How much of the European culture hasn't been affected by simple things such as the potato, corn and cacao? The Europeans considered it their task to free Indians and Africans from ignorance and sin, but instead they got increasingly involved in their lifestyle until they lost their own identity. All that was done to turn Indians and Blacks into Europeans was turned around against the Europeans themselves, to turn them into Indians and Blacks. Yet one kept insisting, until a Creole form of culture was born out of the original shell. The task of that time, the one related to the extermination of any deviating culture and the engagement in the religious mission, was turned into a quality belonging to the developing form of culture and into an expression of an identity crisis.

The Indian and the African situations were quite similar. The point was to resist the ruling colonial culture, using all means available. Resistance requires, more than any other social activity, an engagement. The idea was to raise ones descendants according to ones own values, while awaiting better times. In any culture there is a psychological base that cannot be broken by means of oppression and acculturation, but there are also mechanisms of adaptation. In this struggle for survival, Africans and Indians also had to change, and so they were also inevitably to find themselves in an identity crisis.

Based on this, we might say that the Latin American cultural originality rests exactly on the fact that it is an expression of these issues concerning identity. And because of this, it is also engaged, i.e., it is producing *roots*. It could, without a doubt, be called “the worldview of engagement”. It is not the content of the engagement that characterises Latin American thought. All forms of engagement, from the activity of the missionaries to the political works of Che Guevara, are an expression of that synthesis of reflection and action that is best formulated as “engagement”. It is not the “Marxism” of Che Guevara that should be judged from a philosophical perspective, but the way that this content was formulated in a certain engaged reality. It is not the theoretical value of the so-called liberation theology that has turned it into a “new solution” to the old theological problems, but how those old problems are grounded in actions that have a special meaning to the affected people. As disparate philosophers such as Alberdi and Sarmiento, Mariategui and Martí, Freyre and Ramos, Rodó and Bello, have something in common – their engagement in the course of events (“el compromiso con la causa”). An engagement independent of the specific content of their philosophical discourse.

We have already tried to explain how this situation came about. We have observed that the main set of problems distinguishing the Latin American people is the one related to identity. Concerning this, all scholars agree. It might very well be the case that the Latin American man seeks his roots through “engagement”, with the hope of transcending his rootlessness. The cultural identity, seen as a philosophical issue, also explains why the anthropological and social philosophies are so important in Latin America.

When describing Latin American philosophy as “the philosophy of engagement”, we do not deny that this kind of philosophy, for the same reasons or for other reasons, might develop in other places. Obviously, this possibility is compatible with man. It is, however, not independent of historical or geographical circumstances. With respect to Latin America, we ought to emphasise the principal anthropological cause of this cultural coherence.

We also ought to consider the difference as a matter of philosophical “style” rather than as a matter of philosophical “school”. Engagement, in Latin American philosophy, isn’t a consciously driven philosophical program, and therefore not a philosophical school but an anthropological necessity. Latin American philosophy might, for this

reason, be “pragmatic”, “Marxist”, “positivistic” or “existentialistic”, but always in a unique “engaged” way. The engagement is built into the Latin American outlook upon the world, into the metaphysical outlook, independent of any other intellectual inclination. The originality thus needs to be sought for in the ability to “transform” a metaphysical view into an engagement, irrespective of any other quality belonging to this particular metaphysics. Concerning this, Leopoldo Zea writes:

An attitude that reminds of our *pensadores* or philosophers, and apparently not of our teachers in philosophy; I refer to Sarmiento, Lastarria, Bilbao, Mora, Alberdi, among many others, who analysed the problems of reality, but in the same time engaged to solve them. *Engagés* philosophers, with an engaged philosophy, that could wield both the pen and the sword, irrespective of whether they wrote a book that analysed this reality or they wrote a manifesto of action.⁹

Earlier we have seen how certain anthropological qualities emerge to shape the destiny of a people. Often mentioned is the Greek talent for abstract contemplative thought, the Roman political and juridical talent, the empirical ingenuity of modern Europe, the initiative of North America, etc. In what way have those anthropological qualities determined the culture of a people? All we can do is to observe that they decide which metaphysics will develop. Even though Latin American philosophy might be perceived as “delayed”, with respect to European philosophy, there is a form of *being* that is unique and that makes any attempt at interpretation “delayed” with respect to this uniqueness.

The jazz-playing white man who dreams of playing like the black man, knows that his performance always will be *delayed* with respect to the performance of the black man. The white man who wants to play jazz without delay ought to play it according to the conditions of the white culture. It is not always the manifest content that matters, there is sometimes a hidden meaning, concealed in rhythms, in a silence only readable between the lines of ones own culture.

Some Important dichotomies in the Latin American debate

There are some important recurring ideological oppositions that are actualised throughout the ages, and that also lends a uniqueness to Latin American thought. One main opposition has biological and “racist” grounds. In Latin America people of different origins, i.e., from

America, Europe and Africa, unite. From these peoples a set of cultural and biological realities have developed, which Darcy Ribeiro describes as a.) “transplanted peoples” (in countries such as Argentina and Uruguay, very much represented by white Europeans), b.) “peoples of testimony” (in countries such as Bolivia, with a majority of Indians) and c.) “new peoples” (in countries such as Brazil, where mixes are the norm).¹⁰ While the Indians – and, to a certain extent, in certain regions, also the Africans – represent the archaic way of thinking and acting, the Europeans represent modern society, democracy and science. This opposition has been analysed as an alternative between barbarism and civilisation.

The legacy stemming from the Indian cultures, the genetic mixing and its uneven influence on the continent, created and still creates latent oppositions of an ideological importance. A recurring opposition, which by the way has a modernist undertone, is the one between *democracia* and *caudillismo* (democracy versus leadership with streaks of populism and hegemony). The modernist program has always used the concept “democracy” in its struggle against all thinkable ancient traditions. The answer has been to adduce another opposition between Europeanism versus nativism or indigenism.

The war of liberation against the Spaniards activated the opposition between Americanism (later, Latin Americanism) and Hispanism. An opposition that, within intellectual circles, still lives on today.

Bartolomé de Las Casas, the First *Pensador* of Latin America

The various historical periods of America are connected to some important political revolutions in the world. Obviously there was an Indian America prior to Columbus, which can be divided into the various local cultural regions on the continent. With the Spanish conquest the first “globalisation” of the area is achieved, and this is united into a total picture that remains until the English and French enterprises of conquest. From the days of Columbus and to the days of the birth of the American republics at the start of the 19th century one ought to speak of *Iberoamérica* (a Spanish and Portuguese America, i.e., an “Iberian America”) or *Hispanoamérica* (a “Spanish America”). As from the middle of the 19th century, and as a consequence of romantic ideas of a nationalistic kind, the term *Latinoamérica* was born. The term was created in the

1850s by the Colombian author José María Torres Caicedo (1830-1889).¹¹

Divisions into epochs contribute to the chronological development of ideas, but says nothing with respect to where the processes culturally belong. In this way one could – based on a set of most superficial assumptions – attribute an Ibero-American or a Spanish-American kinship to Bartolomé de Las Casas. If one, on the other hand, considers his most important output and his famous defence of the Indians, the most important components of those that would later characterise the Latin American culture can be found. Las Casas is correctly perceived as the father of modern anthropology, and together with Francisco de Vitoria he is correctly perceived as the creator of the modern view of basic human rights. And with the same right he might be viewed as the creator of the basic issues concerning ideas in Latin America. In other words, the set of problems associated with Las Casas, in time becomes the set of problems associated with the Latin American culture as a whole. Various approaches that constitute the embryo of the issues associated with the succeeding *pensadores* can easily be found in Las Casas. Consider, for example, his passion for and engagement with the weak, his strong and often exaggerated idealism, his recurring anthropological reflections and his cultural relativism. Not to mention his will to preserve and respect the cultural value of the natives, in contrast to the tension that characterised the Christian project of acculturation of that age. Beyond the 19th century, none of these problems would be problems in Spain. Neither would they be in North America. The Anglo-Saxon society is built “on the other side” of the indigenous cultures, while in the Spanish world, as from the first moment, an intricate and aggressive cultural interaction develops.

Individual and Public Influence

To sum up, it could be said that the right thing to do is to designate all periods by their own name, as long as it is kept in mind that history always “explains itself” and that denominations mustn’t direct the clear language of the ideological material. The case of Las Casas is a key to unlocking once and for all the discussions that for centuries have given Latin American culture its character. These discussions concerned the “originality” of Latin American thought. As will be made clear in the following sections, historians of ideas have persisted in recounting the

course of events from a Eurocentric point of view. In 1958, José Gaos wrote: “The one who reads the first part of Sarmiento’s *Facundo* cannot avoid thinking of Taine, and the one who reads Andres Bello’s *Filosofía del entendimiento* cannot avoid thinking of Husserl and Bergson.”¹² Here, Gaos’ point is to emphasise the qualities in the writings of Sarmiento and Bello that anticipate future European works. Now, on the contrary, what is usually focused are the ideas and qualities that Sarmiento and Bello have adopted from European ideological streams. Even though the later process is just as important and even though neither Taine, Bergson nor Husserl were affected by Sarmiento or Bello, the cultural world out of which Taine, Bergson and Husserl developed is a *consequence* of the activity of Sarmiento and Bello. Even though there’s no evidence to support the idea of a personal connection between these thinkers, there’s plenty of evidence with respect to cultural connections that were active in the background.

Regarding Bartolomé de Las Casas’ thought, its “roots”, just as well as its “branches”, ought to be considered. His roots are Spanish, Christian and medieval, but thanks to the influence of Indian thought on his thinking, his ramifications undoubtedly became American.



Bartolomé de Las Casas

There is a form of cultural impact that originates in the cultural centres and affects the periphery, and this cultural impact is *individually influential*. It is known that this or that thinker, this or that peripheral institution, was affected by this or that thinker from the cultural centre. But there is also an opposite current that runs from the periphery to the

cultural centre that is *impersonal* or public. It is hard to tell just from where this influence arises, but its effects are clearly perceivable in specific institutions and persons. We have already studied this phenomenon once and called it “the principle of proportional cultural exchange”.¹³

The Liberation Movement and the Social Revolution

As the Dominican historian Juan Bosch wrote in his classical work *De Cristóbal Colón a Fidel Castro. El Caribe, Frontera Imperial*,¹⁴ one ought to differentiate between the *liberation movement* and the *social revolution* in the history of the Caribbean. During certain periods the liberation movement was driven by the great slave owners, and cacao and sugar barons, who had found themselves in a conflict of interests with Spain. During these periods the lower strata of society occasionally renounced the liberation struggle and fought on the Spanish side. The social revolution, on the other hand, was driven by Spanish descendants, free blacks, black slaves, mulattos, and zambos, sometimes with the aim of liberation and sometimes with the opposite aim. This is true of the entire Caribbean but more specifically of the first years of the Venezuelan liberation struggle. In Venezuela the social war reached high proportions and it was not until several political attempts had been made that Simón Bolívar managed to find a solution that reconciled the liberation struggle with the social revolution.

At the end of the 19th century, and during the first years of the 20th century, historians emphasised the importance of nationalistic emotions and assigned a pivotal significance to the liberation struggle with respect to the development of the continent. It was during this period that national romanticism flourished. However, since the triumph of the Cuban revolution the situation has reverted and a majority of historians emphasise the significance of the social revolution to the development of the region. Thus, one has moved from a romantic form of historiography, according to which history is driven by national heroes separated from the masses, towards a historiography in which history is driven by the revolutionary demands of the masses; and this independently of the liberation struggle and the various ideological notions of the bourgeoisie.

From our perspective, an adequate analysis of the relation between these two processes also ought to be studied with respect to the

relation between the emotions of liberation and the fast-growing individualism, which, together with the advancement of the bourgeoisie, dominated European development in the 18th and 19th century. Particularly, in the period of constitution and growth of the new nations, in the 19th century, the ideals of liberation were identified with the bourgeois demand for individual freedom. During this period the expanding bourgeoisie managed to reconcile the nationalistic ideals and the bourgeois individualistic demands, and in this way also to take over the political initiative of liberation from the conservative feudal landowners. It should not be forgotten that the majority of the Latin American population lived on the countryside and that these large poor masses still had very little to do with the culture of the city and the ideology of the bourgeoisie. One also ought to keep in mind that the relation between the large poor masses and the landowners was far from being a simple dialectics of the master and the slave. In a confrontation with the city culture and with modernity, the rich and the poor united to defend the traditional way of living.

If one considered – like Marx and Engels did – the bourgeois ideology to be a necessary stage in the development of the continent, then the social revolution could be considered to have feudal roots and a negative dampening effect. In other words, “the social revolution” might also be considered to be a historical *dampening factor*. When it comes to this, the *differences* between Marx’ and Engels’, on the one hand, and Sarmiento’s and the logical positivist’s, on the other, conceptions of most *candillos* and their popular movements probably are minor.

The relation between the liberation struggle, the social revolution and the individual rights movement is particularly important for an understanding of the Latin American development of ideas and is active from the 18th century to the present. The key conflicts are those that arise between the colonies and the colonial powers, between the masses and the individuals, between the countryside and the city, but also between the profound inherited native religious and mystical visions and an imported Graeco-Christian worldview. Undoubtedly, these conflicts are also important to many of the other religions of the world, but they are particularly important in a part of the world in which western values always have been threatened by the existence of a native, fully developed, mentality of an Indian origin. Further, the imported African culture has made contributions by offering new tensions and possibilities. If one wants to do justice to the Latin American development of

ideas, one ought to avoid reducing its development to a European by-product. Populist processes, like the one carried out by Peron and Evita in Argentina, or the one against all odds realised in the Cuban revolution, cannot be understood if the concrete factors that make this historical development a unique event are neglected.

Part II: Periodization

Chapter 3: Discovery, Conquest and Colonisation

Indian Cultures Prior to Columbus

To start off: a couple of observations concerning the denomination “Indians”, which since the days of colonisation has been used to designate the entire American population. “Indians” was the name given by Columbus to the new people he encountered at the Caribbean islands and the region was given the name the West Indies. The broader designation *Indias* was for a long time used in Spanish texts instead of the *New World*. At length the name *America* became the standard term. This transition from “Indias” to “America” was probably not a Spanish merit, since the Spaniards always preferred the name “Indias”. Las Casas discussed this:

This fraud or mistake, whatever it may have been, and the power of writing and narrating well and in a good style, as well as Amerigo’s silence regarding the name of his captain, which was Hojeda, and his care to mention no one but himself, and his dedication to King René, these things have led foreign writers to name our mainland America, as if Amerigo alone, and no other with him, had made the discovery before all others.¹⁵

The letter of Amerigo Vespucci and its historical consequences are certainly one of the best examples of the power of the word with respect to human action. All denominations used during different historical periods must, however, be looked upon with a certain amount of suspicion, and this is true also when it comes to the denomination the “New World”. Even though the New World wasn’t “new”, the “Indias” didn’t lay more to the west than to the east, and it wasn’t discovered by Amerigo Vespucci but by Columbus (if one neglects the fact that the Vikings reached the continent hundreds of years earlier, that is), there is hardly any alternative denomination available.

The process of discovery was not symmetrical; the discovery

primarily concerned the Europeans. To the native population of the continent the process certainly meant the discovery of European culture, but not of Europe as such. Furthermore, when it comes to their own continent – the so-called “New World” – they had discovered it thousands of years earlier – to them it was not a new world. Concerning American history prior to Columbus, Björn Olsson writes:

Latin American history prior to Columbus is usually referred to as the pre-Columbian era. The first humans on the continent are supposed to have transmigrated from what today is known as Siberia, and then to have penetrated further into the south, as far as to Tierra del Fuego. Immigration surged, and the earliest one might have taken place as early as 80 000 years ago. There are finds that with certainty can be dated 15 000 years old. Remnants of Latin American cultures including settled, farming men that grew beans, squash and the symbolically important crop corn can be found from as early as 2000 BC., the oldest being located in the highlands of Guatemala and Belize. Thus, with respect to age these civilisations are almost as old as the cultural cradle of the western man in Egypt and the regions around Tigris and Euphrates.¹⁶

Regarding the opinions of the American people with respect to the consequences of the arrival of the Europeans, we are pretty much in the dark. Persuasive evidence indicates that the Europeans were seen as gods or demigods. Many Europeans, on the other hand, believed that the “New World” was a rediscovered world, depicted in the Bible and in other ancient texts. Thus, the title of a translation of Vespucci’s classical letter reads: *Lettera di Amerigo Vespucci delle isole nuovamente trovate in quattro suoi viaggi 1504*. Others preferred to see it as a “probable”, “possible” or “expected” reality. Olaus Magnus referred to this continent as *The anticipated continent (Crediti continentis)*. The discovered world might be a real “new world” but also an old world that is being rediscovered. It might also be a world that had been anticipated, that was “expected”.

In this encounter between the cultures from two continents several nations were directly involved, but also all of the non-directly involved peoples of the both continents were affected in a radical new way. The concept of “discovery” suggests phenomena such as news, surprise, change, and rebirth.

When I am using the term “Indians” in this text I refer to a large group of people of different cultures and languages. The designa-

tion will be used to – and this is the main usage in the literature since the 16th century – refer to the “American peoples”, or even better, to “the original population of the relevant area”. Using the words of Bartolomé de Las Casas I will refer to these “*indianas gentes*”. Thus, the term “Indians” is used in those cases when I want to study the main exchange between the American peoples and the “Europeans”, irrespective of the specific countries, cultures or languages involved. In other cases I will specify the relevant people by concrete names such as “the Aztecs” or “the Incas”. The more concrete denominations are, in most cases, not the names that the peoples assigned to themselves. The problem regarding denominations of peoples and regions is reactualised here. Are they fair or even respectful to the people that might feel violated even by the European denominations? In this book these terms will be used with a full awareness of the limitations and problems of denominations and their connection with political and ethical criteria.¹⁷

Pre-Columbian studies are quite another story and most often fall within the scientific domain of archaeology. There is, however, a great amount of cultures with whom Europeans got first hand contact, and that thus make up a significant part of the ideological legacy of the modern world.¹⁸ Concerning these Björn Olsson writes:

In Latin America high cultures have displaced one another. After the first, located in Central America, we soon enough find others of that kind also in South America. Some were built by stationary, farming men, others were more mobile, strongly expanding and in the process of constructing Empires. Many disappeared as much without a trace as they appeared. Among the pre-Columbian cultures there are, however, three civilisations that primarily are of interest: the Maya, the Inca and the Aztecs.¹⁹

The fact that most of the American peoples, at the time of the conquest, lived under archaic conditions seems to be non-disputed. However, there is a certain hesitation regarding this issue with respect to the most complex of the American civilisations, such as the Mexico of Montezuma and Cortes. Thus, let us invest some space and time in studying this reality in order to gain a clearer understanding of the American ideological material that affected the Europe of those days.

In his dissertation, *Two Worlds Merging. The Transformation of Society in the Valley of Puebla 1570-1640* (1993), Rik Hoekstra concludes:

In the last two decades, the concept of “Asiatic mode of produc-

tion” has become the point of departure for the description and analysis of prehispanic Mexican landownership. The pivot in the concept of the “Asiatic mode of production” is the control by the ruling classes of the means of production, in Mexico mainly land and labour. Control was exerted through social structure (class division) and political institutions (state, tribute, landownership) by which the ruling classes extracted the economic surplus consisting of labour and products. According to the idea of the “Asiatic mode of production”, the commoners were exploited by a ruling upper class, that used the arrangement of society as an instrument.²⁰

Rik Hoekstra uses the concept of the “Asiatic mode of production” but does not refer to its origin. Obviously, it is derived from Marx’ text “Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations” from 1857-58. In this work, which also is among Marx’ most influential, Marx compares the Mexican society of the New World with the European society of the 16th century and identifies the “Asian” forms of production with the American economic systems. In this form of production the extra work “manifests itself in tribute just as well as in common work to glorify the unity, [...] the unity might also include a community with respect to the work itself, which might result in a formal system such as in Mexico, and particularly in Perú”²¹. Here Marx presents the Asian form of production as an evolutionary alternative to the one he saw in Europe. The denomination “Asian” might be misleading because he finds Asian forms of production both in America and in Europe.²² The starting point for the development of the class society is the human transition from a nomadic way of life to settled communities. Marx writes:

The extent to which this original community is modified, if they finally settle, will depend on various external, climatic, geographical, physical and so on, conditions, as well as on their specific natural dispositions and so on – their tribal character. The, in nature originating, tribal community, or if you will, the herd – the common ties of blood, language, customs and so on – is the first precondition of their objective conditions of life and to the activity (as herdsmen, hunters, farmers, and so on), in which their lives are reproduced and objectified.²³

Such are, according to Marx, the common preconditions that are in effect within any group of men transitioning into a settled community and creating more complex ways of life. The Asian form of

production is one alternative of development among others. Marx continues:

Since the unity is the real owner, and the real precondition of common ownership, it is perfectly possible for it to appear as something separate and superior to the numerous real, particular communities. The individual is then in fact propertyless, or property — i.e., the relationship of the individual to the natural conditions of labour and reproduction, the inorganic nature which he finds and makes his own, the objective body of his subjectivity — appears to be mediated by means of a grant [Ablassen] from the total unity to the individual through the intermediary of the particular community. The despot here appears as the father of all the numerous lesser communities, thus realising the common unity of all.²⁴

One conclusion is that the Asian form of production combines a class society with strong family-based ties of blood. This form of production is seen as a transition phase between purely archaic and modern forms of society. Thus, if the social structure of 15th century Mexico can be conceived of as a version of the Asian form of production, the Mexican collectivist ontology and its significance to the European development of ideas can be substantiated. My conclusion thus is, that Marx' description is correct, and that the experience of the "Asian" form of production in Mexico influenced Europe already as from the 16th century.

The Colonisation, a constant source of guilt and shame

The Spanish and the Portuguese Empires have had a fairly liberal attitude when it comes to transcultural sexual relationships. The separation of Indians, Blacks and Europeans in the Ibero-American cultural sphere has never been as significant as it has been in Anglo-Saxon America. Behind this reality lay religious and economic motives that also separate Spanish America from Portuguese America.

Perhaps it is appropriate to point out the risk of putting an equality sign between the Spanish and the Portuguese colonial politics. Actually, there are significant differences between the two. Whilst the Spaniards considered the colonies to be part of the Spanish Empire, and from the first moment made significant efforts to civilise these through

evangelisation and education, the Portuguese handled Brazil as typical colony of raw material, not unlike the ones Portugal had in Africa and Asia. No universities were founded in Brazil during the entire colonial period, no significant Church, or the like, was built (still in 1676 there was only one bishop, in the city Salvador, and he stayed most of the time in Portugal. No monasteries were built in Brazil before 1677, while there were hundreds in Spanish America) and the work of the Jesuits concerning the Guarani Indians in the southern part of the colony developed under a constant struggle against the colonialists.²⁵

Discrimination in Spanish America thus assumed different forms. It was tangible in public contexts but very dampened in the private life. The result was the development of a half-Indian and half-African European culture, which in the literature is referred to as the *cultura criolla*. Since the conquest the number of Indians in the Ibero-American world continuously decreased, while the number of Criollos increased. Regarding this Amanda Peralta writes:

The fact that the evangelisation was a conscious aim for Spain (one spoke of “the spiritual conquest”) also always, in one way or another, put the native population, regarding which it was decided that it consisted of men with immortal souls, at the centre of the conflicts between the Church and the State. As the Cuban author Roberto Fernandez Retamar rightly points out, the only crucial difference between the Spanish colonial model in America and the Anglo-Saxon, French, Belgian and so on, lays not so much in the objective factors but in the subjective. The Anglo-Saxons considered the Indians to be a part of the nature they were destined to conquer and exploit. With a good conscience they successfully pursued this and enjoyed the fruits of it. No collectivist ambivalent emotions, no agony disturbed their conviction that they acted in the right way. To the Spaniards, on the other hand, the colonisation was a constant source of guilt and shame. Their ruthless way of treating the Indians and their acknowledgement of the Indians as Christian fellow beings did not fit together. The Spaniards knew that their actions were unjustified. They engaged in excuses and thousands of reforms to set things right. This is the reason that persons like Las Casas and other champions of Indian rights were able to gain support and sympathy from a significant part of the Spanish society and even from the king. This constant bad conscience today is the only conciliating feature of the Spanish colonisation, according to Fernandez Retamar.²⁶

The Social Development, 1492-1810

In 1492 the number of Indians in America was estimated to be 11,3 millions. In 1570 it had decreased to 9 millions.²⁷ As it is made clear in the following tables, the genetic association had already at that time been strongly initiated. Pre-Columbian America presented three distinct social and cultural civilisations. The most complex ranged over the highlands from Mexico to Perú. Here the Aztec, Maya, Chibcha and Inca cultures developed. The economic basis of such societies was agriculture put into practice with a high technological proficiency. Here corn and potatoes were the main crops. The other civilisation was less densely populated and ranged from the south-east of North America, over Venezuela and the Antilles, to the Paraguay-river in South America. Here we find a less developed form of agriculture that presupposed a less densely populated area. The third zone included the rest of the continent and was populated by hunters and collectors-cultures. It also ought to be established that large areas were practically unpopulated. The most complex societies were organised on the basis of a mixture between well-developed classes and relations of ties of blood, and a very differentiated aristocracy that governed both the political and the religious life. Farmers and slaves made up the rest of society. The archaic legacy had already been subordinated to the class structure in these societies. The ties of blood still exerted control within each class but ceased to do this in the relation to other classes. There were no class societies in the other areas of civilisation in America. These were firmly grounded in the archaic clan organisation, in which political government still is subordinated to the relations based on ties of blood. Let us have a look upon some estimated population statistics:²⁸

1570	
White	20 000
African, Mestizo, Mulatto	230 000
Indian	8 950 000
Total	9 200 000

In the 1650s the number of Indians had decreased to 8 400 000. The Mestizo and Mulatto population was estimated to half a million.

1650	
White	655 000
African	715 000
Mestizo	350 000
Mulatto	240 000
Indian	8 400 000
Total	10 360 000

In the 1810s there were approximately 7 millions of Indians on the continent. In the period 1650-1810 the number of Mestizos increased from 350 000 to 4 millions. The number of African descendants was in 1810 estimated to one million. The total number of persons that populated Spanish America in the 1810s was 15 250 000. This is to be compared to the 10,750 millions in the United States and the 4,5 millions in Brazil.²⁹

In the 16th century differences between white Spaniards and white Americans, also known as *Criollos*, started to emerge. The denomination “Criollos” was first used to designate Africans that were born in America, but in time it also came to include white Americans. Also, Spaniards were named *Chapetones*, meaning the “newly arrived”. The oppositions between these two groups grew stronger and exploded in the 1810s. During this period the Spanish Crown always favoured their own and time after time offered striking evidence of a lack of understanding regarding the political processes that started with the American, the Haitian and the French revolutions.

1810	
White: Spanish Europeans	150 000
White: Spanish America	2 900 000
Africans	1 200 000

Mestizos	4 000 000
Indians	7 000 000
Total	15 250 000

A tie between the Criollos and Indian blood was frequently manifested and therefore a certain anthropological difference between white Europeans and white Americans was predominant. White Criollos were, on the other hand, at least cultural Mestizos and the differences were also found on the cultural level. It is informing to study the way the colonial society looked upon itself with respect to racial mixtures. The denominations were many and often very humorous. They were based on skin colour, the shape and thickness of the mouth, the width of the face, bodily structure, etc. One finds, for example, *Moriscos*, *Albinos*, *Coyotes*, *Chamizos*, *Cambujos*, *Albarazados*, *Toma-atrás*, *Abi-te-estás*. There are Mulattos that are *Prietos*, *Pardos*, *Anegrados*, *Chapurrados* or *Amarillitos*. There are Mestizos that are *Prietos*, *Pardos*, *Negros Retintos*, *Amembrillados* and among the last, one can register *Cafés de Pasa* and *Merinos*. And what can be said of the following racial denominations from the 17th century: “tente en el aire” (moves in the air) and “no te entiendo” (I don’t understand you).³⁰

Among these 15 millions of persons the work was divided in this way: 160 000 were soldiers, 30 000 were priests, 20 000 worked within administration, 4 millions in agriculture, 180 000 in the mines, 700 000 were craftsmen, 20 000 worked in various industries, 30 000 in trade. The number of women and children was estimated to be 7,5 millions. Also, the number of social outcasts living in the periphery of society reached 1,5 million.³¹

The colonial society followed the structural course developed by the earlier Indian culture. The colonial society assimilated the Indian cultural legacy by adapting to the various Indian milieus and geographies. What was new was that the European culture was mercantilist and followed the path of the precious metals, and since these metals primarily were located in the highly developed Indian societies of the highlands, the Spanish colonial enterprise focused on these areas. It was in Mexico and Perú that the civilisations that since ancient days made use of the precious metals for the manufacture of both religious and profane artefacts could be found. In these societies the Spanish colonisers led a luxurious life among glitter and wealth. Here one quite possibly

also finds the best of the Spanish cultural architectonic legacy. Outside of these privileged areas the colonial life was more or less Spartan. On the grand prairies of the *pampas* of La Plata the economic life was based on cattle breeding and the hacienda structure. It is in these areas that Spanish resistance to independence became the greatest and it is therefore not surprising that the great liberation forces have their centre in, on the one hand, Venezuela (Miranda and Bolivar) and, on the other hand, the La Plata-region and Chile with leaders such as José de San Martín, Bernardo O'Higgins and José Artigas.

The advancement of mercantilism at length set the traditional colonial order of society aside. This order categorised persons on the basis of their origin or merit prior to the colonial enterprise. The situation changed as from the 17th century, as it became possible for rich merchants to buy the title of the nobleman and other positions of influence.

The economic unit of the colonial society was the *hacienda*. There were many forms of haciendas depending upon the area in which it had developed and the social composition in that area. Common to all was the economic independence with respect to self-sufficiency. Besides the main production they engaged in various activities on the side that guaranteed economic independence. The sugar hacienda, for example, also engaged in cattle breeding, for the purpose of both food and transport, and in craftsmanship for the production and repair of tools and so on. The farmers who engaged in sheep farming frequently had contact with the *obrajes*, or small weaving industries to which raw materials were supplied. The hacienda economy cannot be explained without a very important social institution, the *mayorazgo*, a form of landlord status assigned to certain families, with the purpose of guaranteeing their property to posterior generations. A *mayorazgo* presupposed a royal decision that was announced in a solemn ceremony. The chosen had to pledge to fulfil various demands and to make sure that these passed on to posterity. The inherited property was in this way owned by the individual, but also belonging to the family or the line. Thus, this *hacendado* (hacienda owner) never was an individual owner of the capitalist sort. "He was *pater familias*, with support from the family, friends and servants. The real owner of the estate was the line as a diachronic social reality."³²

The University in Spanish America

In the classical Spanish vocabulary, what belongs to America is referred to as “Indian” (*indiano*), i.e., the Indies (*Las Indias*). In this way the universities in America were referred to as *universidades Indias*. (It has already been pointed out that no universities were founded during the colonial period in Brazil).³³

The first university was founded in 1538 in Santo Domingo and named *Santo Tomás de Aquino*. The university was created by means of an extension of a Dominican school that was founded in 1505. Another followed in 1556, this one also in Santo Domingo, that got the name *Santiago de la Paz*. The University in Mexico was founded in 1551. Yet another university was founded in the 16th century: the university of San Marco in Lima in 1551. Several universities are founded in the 17th century, the Guatemalan university *San Carlos Borromeo* in 1676, the Jesuit university *San Gregorio Magno* in Quito in 1620, *San Francisco Javier de Chuquisaca* in Charcas (present Bolivia) in 1624, The Cordoba (present Argentina) University in 1613 and the *Universidad de Santo Tomás* in Santiago de Chile in 1617. In the 1720s *San Jerónimo* in Havana, *San Francisco Javier* in Panama (1749), *Universidad Real y Pontificia* in Caracas (1721) and *Universidad de San Felipe* in Santiago de Chile (1738) followed.

As the result of a papal charter from 1619 and 1634 the Dominicans and the Jesuits got the right to teach in “greater questions” in their schools, under the condition that those schools laid at a safe distance from Mexico and Lima. In time these schools gained university status.

In principle, the American universities adapted the university model of Salamanca, which in turn was inspired by the University of Bologna, the world’s first university. The University of Bologna was founded by students and not by masters, as it was in the Parisian model. The model gave to the students a great power with respect to the organisation and administration of the university. At length the influence of the Salamanca-Bologna model decreased and instead the university in Alcalá was adapted as a model, a university that specialised in educating leaders of colonial enterprises.³⁴ From here the missions in America were modelled.

The Indian universities were organised in four faculties. The faculties granted all of the classical degrees (bachelor, master, license, and doctorate). A doctorate could be attained in theology, medicine and

law. In philosophy the highest degree granted was the master. Philosophical studies were a prerequisite of all other studies and included Latin grammar and rhetoric, logic, ethics, physics, metaphysics and Euclidean mathematics.

Colonial Libraries and Printing Houses

Also initially a great amount of reading was being done in the New World. Pedro de Mendoza brought books by Petrarch and Erasmus to America in 1536. As early as in the 16th century there were great private libraries in Asunción and Buenos Aires. In 1583 a stock of books belonging to Juan Jiménez del Río was found. It proves that the same books were read here as in Europe. As from 1630 a *Catalogue of books for all faculties* was produced in Spain, for the purpose of selling books in America. In this catalogue classical authors such as Ovid, Virgil and Cicero were listed, together with Spanish classics such as Calderón de la Barca, Cervantes, Quevedo, Lope de Vega and Góngora. Also the most well known scientific books of the time could be found in the catalogue.

The first printing house in Mexico was built in 1533 and the first printer seems to have been Master Esteban Martín from Granada. The Spanish Crown, with the support of the Inquisition, strictly regulated what books could be exported to America. On the 4th of April, 1531, regulations for the export of books to the *Indias* – regulations that banned stories of chivalry and other forms of obscene literature that could have a harmful effect on the education of the Indians – were instituted. In addition, other instituted regulations demanded that printings of Indian dictionaries and translations of religious texts into Indian language were to be inspected by the government. Businessmen who wanted to export books to the New World thus turned to a churchly clerk or a censor that reviewed the list of books and approved of the export. The lists that have been spared reveal that the rules of discrimination were not followed and that all of the books that the Spaniards read in Spain, without exception, including stories of chivalry, also were exported to America. For instance, Cervantes' *Don Quixote* was one of the most exported books and remained a best-seller in America during the entire 17th and 18th century.

The export of books was more or less tax free in Spain and this

furthered the printing industry in the metropolis; it flourished during the entire colonial period. This was, on the other hand, disastrous to the printing houses in the New World, which had a hard time competing with respect to both price and quality. For this reason the printing houses in America specialised in the publication of books in and on Indian languages, a line of business that couldn't be conducted more perfectly in any other place.³⁵

The Spanish missionaries were the first Europeans to study Indian languages. The motive was the need to spread the Christian message. Vicente D. Sierra's work *Así se hizo América* (1955) offers a complete account of the linguistic efforts of these missionaries.³⁶ Sierra's purpose is to justify the actions of Spain in America. He is, despite of grave historical simplifications, sometimes right, as, for instance, when he points out that the linguistic achievements of the missionaries in the 16th and 17th century are among the greatest linguistic achievements of all time, and that this singular effort deserves to be more widely recognised and studied.

Already in the first half of the 16th century the first grammatical study of the Aztec language, by Francisco Jiménez, is published. It is soon to be followed by Alonso de Molina's *Arte de la lengua náhuatl* and a dictionary of 29 000 words. In 1547 the research of Andrés de Olmo and Juan Bautista de la Laguna, concerning Huasteco and Tarasco, is published and three years later also Olmo's studies on Totanesco. In 1576 Fray Melchor de Vargas compiled a grammar and dictionary on the Otomi language. The grammar and dictionary of the Mixteco language by Domingo de Santa Maria was published in 1560. Studies on Zapateco by Pedro de Feria were finished in 1567 and studies on Chontal by Diego Carranza were available in 1580. In the same year studies on Matlatzingo by Andrés de Castro and studies on Chuchón by Bartolomé Roldans were published. The different Guatemalan languages – Utlateca, Chiapaneco, Zoque, Tzendal, Quiché, Cahchiquel, Tztuhil, Name and Chiamenteco – were studied in 1560 by Francisco de Cepeda, Juan de Torres, Pedro de Bantazos and Francisco Parra. The Caribbean languages – Saliva, Chiricoa, Betoya, Ayrica, Chayma, Jirara, Achagua and Serusa among others – were studied in 1550 by Juan Azpilcueta Navarro and in 1595 by José Anchieta. Ludovico Bertonio spent 40 years studying the Aymará language. Torres Rubio i Ore and Domingo de Santo Tomás studied Quichua in 1560, and more extensive research was finished in 1584 by Alonso de Barzana and in 1590 by Diego Ortiz.

The first Mexican printing house was built in the 1520s and about a hundred texts in the Indian languages were published in the period 1524-1572, most of them were orations, biographies or translations of the gospel into various Indian languages.

Linguistic studies in 16th century Spain were of the highest quality. The investigations of the American languages quite possibly make up the most extensive study of non-European languages that has ever been conducted. The pioneer work of Antonio de Nebrijas, the first grammar of a Romanic language, was published in 1492 and marked the advancement of the vulgar tongue in the Latin European world. J. B. Scott writes:

The most inconspicuous of the events of the *annus mirabilis* of 1492 was the appearance – of all things! – of a grammar. But it was a grammar of the Castilian language. Printing had come to Spain with the accession of Isabella to the throne of Castile. It was probably introduced into Salamanca by one Antonio de Lebrija, also known as Nebrija, the author of the grammar in question – the first grammar of the Spanish language; the first grammar of a vulgar tongue to be published by any humanist, and the first scientific grammar in any modern language.³⁷

The Lund linguist Bertil Malmberg considers the grammar of Nebrija to represent a new era of scientific linguistics.³⁸

The First Writers of Ibero-America

A periodization of the Latin American history of ideas can be carried out in many ways, and in each period locate the main theme, the main set of problems. One of the most important *pensadores* of our time, Leopoldo Zea, proceeds in exactly in this way.³⁹ If the starting point is said to be the Spanish colonial enterprise the main set of problems can be characterised by the opposition between Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda (1490-1573) and Bartolomé de Las Casas. The debate concerned the rights of the Indians and their human status. This phase ends, after some centuries, with the forming of a *Criollo* intelligentsia, conscious of its peripheral status. Sepúlveda justified the colonial enterprise by emphasising the primitivism of the Indians and the importance of the Spanish civilising deed. To him, the Spanish conquest was a mandate of heaven. In opposition to Sepúlveda, Las Casas put the Spanish Christian humanism, which, aside from Las Casas himself, was represented by

men such as Luis Vives (1492-1540) and Francisco Vitoria (1486-1546). According to the humanist argument each man has a value as an individual and thus the right to a decent life. Las Casas' and Vitoria's views on rights anticipated many of the liberal principles that form the basis of the modern view of man, and of modern international rights, which were to be formulated later. Their humanist principles were, however, not liberal principles. The right to a decent life did not equal the right to an individualistic independent life. To Las Casas, and to the Spanish legacy in America, freedom always meant collectivist freedom, i.e., independence as a group; as a category of men and "Indians" to Las Casas and Vitoria, and to Vitoria also of "women" and "children". To understand the Latin American development it is essential to keep separate two different notions of freedom – collectivist freedom against other groups and nations, and individual freedom, a conception later imported from the Anglo-Saxon world under neo-colonial conditions. Thus, the main paradox of Latin America: the fact that liberalism arrives together with neo-colonialism and that the freedom fighters unconsciously introduce a new form of colonial submission. Economic and political independence works against individual freedom and individual freedom presumes submission to the neo-colonial projects. The situation is intricate to the point that it, even today, becomes difficult to make a decision on the many historical confrontations that under the years characterised the disunited intelligentsia.

Unlike the Spanish colonial project, which was a project of the state, the Anglo-American project was born out of a group of religious dissidents that, after years of prosecution, relocates to the New World in the hope of finding a more liberal and just world. On the 11th of November, 1620, the first generation of poor puritans arrived in North America on the ship the *Mayflower*. Thus, while the first colonisers in North America aimed to pursue private interests, the Spanish conquest was the result of a colossal project of the state. Hence, the colonisation that followed upon the arrival of the *Mayflower* is different. The ideological foundations of the intelligentsia are, even afterwards as the enterprise is taken over by the English Crown for the purpose of gaining advantage in the international trade in competition with Spain and France, very different. From the beginning the North American consciousness assumed liberal and individualistic outlines. Years of religious prosecution turned this new society into a stronghold of individualistic freedom. At the same time their ideals are identified as being in line with

the modernist project, which had the reformation as its starting point. The ideology of the reformers characterises Anglo-America, and among these primarily the puritan ideals.

However, if the puritan world was a world that put the freedom of the individual at the centre, it was also a world of profound sectarianism. Those individuals that, for one reason or another, could not adapt to this new enterprise were ostracised and subordinated. This is particularly true of the Indians who faced a noticeably different destiny than their kinsmen in Spain. Instead of forced acculturation and “mestizofication”, which was the Spanish way of conquest, the Indians are either exterminated or segregated. The Africans faced the same destiny – here slavery left traces that weren’t dissolved until the 1960s. Liberalism was born in Anglo-America as freedom to white puritans. While in Spanish America there were two traditional organisational structures that represented the sword and the Bible, the Anglo-American coloniser was both priest and warrior. He was judge and executioner at the same time. Also, private life in Anglo-America would support the equation of individual rights with individual property, property that would be defended even outside of Anglo-America. While the Catholic missionaries forced the doctrines of Christianity upon the Indians, the puritan shepherds weren’t interested in the evangelisation of the Indians. On can, in principle, sympathise with the more modern conception of the individual right to autonomy of the puritans, but one also ought to keep in mind that the alternative to evangelisation was extermination and, as a best case scenario, apartheid.

Traditionally, historiographers have divided the colonial historical development of ideas into three periods. The first period includes the “discovery” and features texts written by persons such as Columbus and Vespucci. The second period includes the “conquest” and “colonisation” and features texts written by, among others, Cortés, Valdivia and Bernal Díaz del Castillo. The last period is constituted by the colonial days and features texts such as the one by the Inca Garcilaso de la Vega.⁴⁰ The first impressions of American geography, flora and fauna, together with a report of the first contacts with the Indians, are to be found already in the first accounts of Columbus (1451-1506) – two examples are his notes collected in the *Diario del Descubrimiento* and the letters to the kings of Spain. The letter known as *Diario del Descubrimiento* was published in Spanish in 1493, and immediately translated into Latin. The theme in Columbus’ letters brings medieval texts to mind, particu-

larly in the depiction of an idealised nature. The conception of the Indians is a taste of what's to come – an idealisation of the Indians by the Americans that in time will give rise to the conception of the “noble savage”.⁴¹ In the writings of Columbus the first registered Indian words are to be found.

The writings of the discoverers are characterised as *chronicles*. The process is recounted in a chronological order, often with perfect exactness approaching pedantry. The historical awareness is significant and the author knows that he is breaking new ground. Common historical accounts, letters of an administrative type and the stories of the missionaries – all these texts are surveys from the point of view of the experiences of the author. The roots of the chronicle are medieval, and this is clearly reflected in the genre of chivalry stories.

The letters of Amerigo Vespucci (1451-1512) are to be categorised together with the chronicles of Columbus. Those were letters that, to begin with, were written in Italian and then immediately translated into Latin and other languages. Vespucci was the first to speak of the *New World* in a letter from 1505, titled *Mundus novus*. In 1507, influenced by the letters of Vespucci, the cartographer Waldseemüller printed a *mapamundi* (map of the world) that used the designation “America” for the New World.

The group of “conquerors” unites the authors that, after some years of discovering, also need to engage in the first more serious attempts at colonisation. The first one of these men is Hernán Cortés (1485-1547), the conqueror of Mexico. Between 1519 and 1526 Cortés wrote five letters to Charles V. The letters are known as the *Cartas de relación sobre el descubrimiento y conquista de Nueva España*. The letters are summaries of the discovery and conquest of the mighty Aztec Empire. Cortés, a student of the humanities in Salamanca, comes through as being completely aware of the value of the Indian culture. Bernal Díaz del Castillo (1495-1564) is another important chronicler. Díaz del Castillo was a soldier and recounted the events from his own perspective. His *Historia Verdadera de la Conquista de Nueva España* wasn't published until 1632. Lots of other examples of this kind can be found. The conqueror of Chile, Pedro de Valdivia (1500-1553), also wrote some letters to Charles V.

An important and well-known chronicle was *La relación que dio Alvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca de lo acaecido en las Indias en la armada donde iba por Gobernador Pánfilo de Narváez*, from 1542,

known to posterity under the title *Naufragios de Alvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca*. Alvar Nuñez Cabeza De Vaca (1507-1559) took part in the conquest of Florida but was captured by the Indians and lived, from 1527 to 1537, under their conditions.

Among the chroniclers there were those who had never been to America. One of those was Francisco López de Gómara (1511-1566), the author of the book *Hispania Vtrix*, which was divided into two parts – *Historia General de las Indias* (1552) and *Conquista de México* (1553).⁴² In Italy López de Gómara became acquainted with the Swede Olaus Magnus, together with whom he discussed the possibility of the existence of a connection with the mainland between Scandinavia and the Labrador province in North America.

In 1553 Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo (1478-1557) published a *Historia General y Natural de las Indias*. His classical style is Aristotelian, recounting and classifying according to the model of Pliny. In Perú Pedro Cieza de León (1518-1560) can be found with his *Crónica del Perú* from 1554. In the región of Río de la Plata (present Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay and southern Brazil) one finds Martín del Barco Centenera and his historical poetry *Argentina y la Conquista del Río de la Plata* from 1602 and Ruy Diaz de Guzman (1554-1629) and his *Historia del descubrimiento, conquista y población del Río de la Plata* from 1612. A chronicle of great importance from the 17th century is the *Historia de la Conquista de México* (1684) by Antonio de Solís y Rivadeneyras (1610-1686).

There are numerous chroniclers also among the missionaries. This group, however, perceived the events from different point of view. The missionaries penetrated more deeply into the language, culture and religion of the Indians. The need to colonise the Indians manifests itself to the missionaries in other ways than it did to the captains of the Crown. The missionary role was more delicate and required greater insight and power of persuasion. The missionaries needed to presuppose the concession of the Indians and they had to succeed in their mission to transform their identity. The Indians had to cease being Indians to accept the Spanish Crown and the Christian faith. A great number of the missionaries were serious about Indian rights and stood for one of the first important power struggles regarding human equal rights of the modern age. The most important of the missionaries was Bartolomé de Las Casas (1474-1566). He arrived from Seville in Mexico in 1502, assigned to work on the indoctrination of the Indians. In 1512 he became a priest and immediately started to side with the Indians. Las

Casas became bishop of Chiapas in 1544. His most well known work is the *Brevísima historia de la destrucción de las Indias*, a short passionately written text that sternly condemns the Spanish dominion in America. The text became very famous and for years it fuelled the so-called “leyenda negra” (the black legend), which lent to the Spanish Empire the reputation of being inhuman. Las Casas also wrote a *Historia de las Indias*, which wasn’t published until 1876-77. From Las Casas we know of the travelling documents of Columbus, which were studied and carefully copied by Las Casas, since the originals haven’t survived. Although Las Casas’ position in the Latin American world is unique his strict siding with the Indians turns him into a controversial character in Spain. His achievements are perceived as irrelevant and biased, he was sometimes also accused of having betrayed Spanish interests, since his writings served the interests of England and France in America.

Politically and culturally Las Casas was much closer to the Indians than was the Spanish *conquistador*. For this reason Las Casas might be seen as *the first great American thinker*. Las Casas influenced the formulation of a new legislation that was meant to prioritise the indoctrination of the Indians instead of the immediate economic interests in the colonies. These *Leyes Nuevas*, from 1542-43, transformed the *encomienda* system (*encomendar=transfer*). The *encomienda* system was both an economical-administrative and political-administrative form of organisation that was in force during the first 50 years of Spanish dominion in America. It lent to the individual coloniser the capability of directing the process of colonisation himself. The colonisers were in power over a number of Indians who were forced to work within the *encomienda*. In return the coloniser had to see to the well being and Christian indoctrination of those Indians. However, the direct interests of the *encomenderos* more heavily influenced their actions than those of the distant Spanish Crown. The Indians were more or less treated like slaves and a confrontation with the Church became a fact. After the *Leyes Nuevas* the *encomienda* system remained, but it lost its grip on the Indians.⁴³

Thanks to the efforts of the missionaries much of the Indian culture could be saved. Works that are worth mentioning here are the *Chilam-Balam* and the *Popol-Vuh*, two collections of traditional Maya myths and prophecies. In this context Fray Toribio de Benavente (-1565) – by the Indians referred to as “the poor one” (in the language of the Indians: “*motolinía*”) – also ought to be mentioned. He adopted the

denomination as a pseudonym and in 1536 “Motolinía” began writing *Historia de los Indios de Nueva España*.

Another missionary of great importance was Bernardino de Sahagún (1499-1590) who became one of the first to study the Aztec language: Nahuatl. Sahagún wrote *Historia General de las cosas de Nueva España* and *Islas de Tierra Firme*, which was finished in 1569. The writings present the Indian religious concepts in a skilful and respectful way. This was the reason that the work was prohibited and confiscated by the orders of Philip II in 1578. This extremely important work tells the history of the Aztecs before the arrival of Columbus and is based on the testimony of the Indians themselves. The text was written in both Spanish and Nahuatl and featured illustrations made by the Indians.

The efforts of the Jesuits concerning this cultural indoctrination became increasingly tangible as from 1572. Among these José de Acosta (1539-1600) stands out. His *Historia natural y moral de las Indias* was published in 1590 and influenced a great number of influential European thinkers in the 17th and 18th century. The experience he drew on he attained in Perú, where he lived from 1570 to 1587. Father Acosta might be the first to have formulated the theory that suggests that the American man wandered into the continent from Asia through the north of America.

In Chile the chronicler's name was Alonso de Ovalle (1601-1651). He was a Jesuit and the writer of *Histórica relación del reino de Chile*, published in 1646. The story of Nueva Granada, present Colombia, was told by the Mestizo Lucas Fernández de Piedrahita (1600-1688), the author of *Historia de las conquistas del Nuevo Reino de Granada*, published in 1666.

The most well known of the native American chroniclers was the Mestizo Garcilaso de la Vega (1539-1616). He was born in Cuzco, Perú, the son of a Spanish captain and an Inca princess. At the age of twenty he travelled to Spain and stayed there for the rest of his life. His most important work is *Comentarios Reales*, which includes *Historia General del Perú*. The work was published in 1590 in Madrid. The *Comentarios Reales* presents the history of the Inca Empire in an epic language and places the Inca civilisation on an equal footing with the Spanish.

The true period of colonisation was initiated in the 17th century. During this period a series of historical texts with nationalistic qualities were written. The former model of the chronicle is abandoned in favour of texts that are more characterised by the subject. This period marks

the peak of the Spanish Empire, the so-called *Siglo de Oro*, which included a significant number of great literary masterworks. Here we find Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora. He was born in Mexico in 1645 and died in the same city in 1700. He is a contemporary of the nun Juana Inés de la Cruz. He joined the Jesuit order in 1645 but left it in 1667. Soon afterwards he took up studies in law, theology and Indian languages at the universities. In 1662 he published the *Oriental planeta evangélica* and *Primavera indiana*. Mexican nationalism is founded in his *Teatro de virtudes políticas que constituyen a un Príncipe* from 1680. *Glorias de Querétaro* is published in the same year and *Parayso Occidental* in 1684. It is followed by *Relación de lo sucedido a la armada de Barlovento* from 1691 and *Mercurio Volante* from 1693.

The *Libra Astronómica y Filosófica* was written at the beginning of the 1680s but not printed until 1690. This work was a response that was triggered by some criticism launched at Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora and his work *Manifiesto filosófico contra los cometas*, written in 1681 and in connection with the comet from the year before. In this text he argues against the superstition that was fuelled by the presence of the comets. This work from 1681 provoked a number of erudite men and thus made it necessary for Sigüenza y Góngora to produce a more well articulated argumentation in his work *Belerofonte matemático contra la quimera astrológica* and later in *Libra Astronómica y Filosófica* written at the beginning of the 1680s but not printed until 1690. *Libra Astronómica* was polemically written as a response to the Jesuit priest and teacher of mathematics Eusebio Francisco Kino, later known as the man who was in command of the evangelisation of Sonora and Arizona. Kino arrived in Mexico in 1681 and was received by Sigüenza y Góngora with a great amount of hospitality. He introduced him to Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz. Soon after his arrival Kino wrote *Exposición astronómica del Cometa*, in which he criticises Sigüenza y Góngora without even mentioning his name. *Libra Astronómica* is at the centre of the Mexican history of ideas, since it is a manifestation of the transition from an archaic “astrological” conception of the comets to the “astronomical” conception of modernity.⁴⁴

The Jesuit Missions in Paraguay and Uruguay

The missionary activity in Spanish America was a phenomenon that was typical of the continent and at length became a global model. It

could be said that this activity, already from the beginning, adapted to the prevailing circumstances in order to become one of the most credible attempts at perceiving the events from an Indian perspective. Even though one mustn't forget that the main objective was acculturation of the Indians, the approach of the missionaries has been described as American Indian-centred in opposition to other forms of attempt at acculturation that didn't hesitate regarding a total extermination of the Indians.

When it comes to the *La Plata* region the foundations of this activity were established primarily by the Jesuit missions in Paraguay and Uruguay. The guiding principles of the missionary activity in the *Indias* were formulated in the third council of Lima 1582-83. This council adjusted the conclusions established by the Catholic Church in Europe in Trento 1545-47 and 1562-63. It could be said that the newly formed ideology of the Counter-Reformation permeated the missionary activity in America. Also, regarding the missionary activity of the Jesuits in America their guiding principles derived from the guidelines settled by Pope Paul IV in 1540. According to these guidelines the missionary activity, in addition, was supposed to aim at guaranteeing Indian social and economic development. This prosperity was supposed to support the Indians in gaining the inner strength needed for the spiritual conversion.

Primarily, the Jesuit activity was aiming at an all-level education. Monks were recruited from all occupational categories and from different countries. Among the Jesuit monks one could find physicians and architects, artists and pharmacists, engineers and craftsmen, administrators and pedagogues. Besides Spaniards and Portuguese people, there were Frenchmen, Englishmen, Italians and Germans. In 1748 there were 1913 individuals, consisting of monks and associate staff, taking part in the Jesuit missions.

The missionary activity of the Jesuits began in India (1541), in Japan (1546), in Congo (1547) and in Brazil (1549). Six monks arrived in Spanish America (Lima) in 1574, seeking to found a school and start working on the evangelisation of the Indians of the region. Among the modernist qualities demonstrated by the Jesuit activity was the strategy of initiating work by means of pilot projects that later were evaluated with the intention of applying them in larger contexts. In Perú they settled in the area of the Titica Lake at a *Reducción* (Indian reservation). The knowledge gained by the Jesuits during this period was to be ap-

plied to the rest of the continent. Already in 1609 Jesuit activity in Asuncion del Paraguay was initiated. They worked on the *Guaycurú* Indians, the *Guayrá* Indians and the *Guarani* Indians. It is interesting to observe that the Indians themselves often entered the reservations, in the hope of finding a place of refuge. The Indians in the area were frequently attacked by Brazilian slave-traders or *bandeirantes*. In order to defend themselves against the *bandeirantes* the Jesuits were allowed to build a defence army of their own. Within a short period of time they had set up an effective military machine that was created by some of the most prominent specialists. The *bandeirantes* were defeated and the military capacity and discipline that now was a part of the Indian society transformed the missionaries into a problem to the great powers in the region. In 1650 there were 50 000 Indians and in 1750 there were 150 000 Indians living in the Jesuit missions. As from the 18th century the first printing house of the Jesuits starts to work.

Agricultural production laid at the foundation of the economy. The land was divided according to three criteria of property: *Abámbaé* (*abá*: “Indian”, *mbaé*: “thing that belongs to”, in other words: “a thing belonging to the Indian or the family”), *Tupámbaé* (*Tupá*: “God”, in other words: “a thing belonging to God”) and *Tavámbaé* (*Tavá*: “the people”, in other words: “a thing belonging to the people”). *Abámbaé* was made up of a bit of land that the family cultivated on their own.⁴⁵ Here work lasted for five days a week and everything that was produced was consumed at home. On the land of *Tupámbaé* all Indians worked collectively and the products were divided among the whole population. This production also paid for religious activity, including the building of churches, schools and workshops of various kinds. The agricultural production of the *Tupámbaé* also financed the more profane public expenses, together with those that didn't stand in a direct relationship to religious activities, such as support to other villages, to widows, to orphans and to the diseased.

To a large extent one also engaged in cattle breeding. A high level of protein consumption was predominant. For instance, in the village of *Yapeyú*, which had a population of about 1700 inhabitants, 10 000 cattle were, according to testimony, consumed a year. To private property belonged such things as agricultural tools, hunting weapons, etc. Since the Indians, to a certain extent, kept their own forms of organisation, the local laws were followed in parallel to the ones that regulated the activity of the missionaries. This meant that Indian chiefs

and other important persons were favoured in the form of small privileges such as the quality and colourfulness of the clothes.

Because of the ideology that characterised the Jesuits the political and economic organisation became central to religious activity. The political ideology of the Jesuits had been formulated earlier in classical works such as Plato's *Republic*, Thomas More's *Utopia* and Tommaso Campanella's *The City of the Sun*. Also the 16th century visions of Bartolomé de Las Casas were realised in the "Jesuit republics". Thus, one could say that the missions in Paraguay and Uruguay were the closest thing that had been achieved with respect to the realisation of one of the classical political visions of the western world. In this organisation the monks were assigned to the activities that Plato assigned to the philosophers. The government and economy was collectively organised and didn't follow the mercantilist principles of those days.

The importance of Indian slave labour to the Brazilian *fazendas* (estates) was the reason for the hostility of the Portuguese nobility towards the Jesuit order. The Jesuit experiment ended with their expulsion from America in 1767. The expulsion of the Jesuits from America was an enormous cultural catastrophe and it took the continent a hundred years to regain the lost cultural level.



The missions in South America during the 17th and 18th century

Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora and Olof Rudbeck

In his *Libra astronómica* Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora cited a contribution made by Olof Rudbeck to a work with the title *Theatrum cometicum* by Stanislaus Lubienietzki from 1665. Since Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora wrote the *Libra astronómica* at the beginning of the 1680s, one can assume that he had knowledge of this text by Olof Rudbeck from 1665. Here is the passage in which Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora quotes Olof Rudbeck:

Against the anonymous authority from Madrid I oppose the following. Firstly, a statement made by Olof Rudbeck, excerpted from *Theatrum cometicum* [...].⁴⁶

Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora got in contact with Olof Rudbeck through the *Theatrum cometicum* by Stanislaus Lubienietzki (1623-1675), a work from which he frequently makes citations. *Theatrum cometicum, duabus partibus constans, quarum altera...cometas anni 1664 1665* was written by Stanislaus Lubienietzki, a erudite Polish nobleman, a resident of Hamburg who corresponded with a great number of Swedish scientists – in addition to Olof Rudbeck, men such as Olof Heinsius, Jonas Fornelius, Petrus Fontelius and Magnus Celsius.⁴⁷

The contribution made by Olof Rudbeck to the *Theatrum cometicum* was published under the heading of *Communicatio Ubsaliensis* and included eight copperplate engravings based on sketches by Rudbeck and thirteen figures made by engravers who were active in Amsterdam. Rudbeck's paper on comets was written in the form of a letter to Heinsius. Nordström writes:

Rudbeck writes, to begin with, that an excellent opportunity to study the problem of the comets has arisen to him in the form of a series of abundant observations, from the whole of Europe, of the comet of 1664, which he through the gracious participation of Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie [...]. In the latter part of the letter (pp. 355-359) Rudbeck communicates his fixings of the positions of the comets during the period 7th of December 1664 –10th of February 1665, established together with Petrus Fontelius, Jonas Fornelius and Magnus Celsius.⁴⁸

Rudbeck's observations were widely known and discussed by his contemporaries, among others by Hevelius in Gdańsk, Bullialdus in Paris, Riccioli in Bologna and Kirchner in Rome. Carlos De Sigüenza y Góngora mentions all of these astronomers in the *Libra astronómica*. The modernism of Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora was paradoxical. Concerning this I agree with Octavio Paz, who writes the following:

In New Spain neither the intellectuals nor the society surrounding them were prepared to make the move towards modern thought. In Sigüenza, the most enlightened person in New Spain during the period, two epochs struggled for dominion. I have already mentioned his irresolution and I will give yet another example. Two years after the essay against astrology he refers to “the evil in those heavenly bodies that renders the earth infertile” and laments the fact that there are certain “years that are governed by

an evil star". Such contradictions followed him until the moment of his death.⁴⁹

Contradictions such as these are tangible with respect to all thinkers of this period. This situation is not, however, unique to New Spain, on the contrary it applies to the entire erudite cultural world, including Europe. Thus, I must object to the following remark by Paz:

This irresolution, in this case exemplified by Sigüenza, is repeated throughout our history and not only within the field of thought, but also within society and politics. In many fundamental respects Mexico still is a society that hasn't made it to the new age, and the same can be said of most other parts of South America.⁵⁰

It is, in principle, impossible to find any European thinker who, in the 17th century, didn't exhibit the same irresolution regarding the relation between modern and "occult" science. Another problem, that concerns the responsibility of contemporary scholars with respect to old texts, lies hidden in the statement of Octavio Paz. Paz doesn't relate Sigüenza to his own time, but to the development that was to follow. And this is, more specifically, done with the support of an ideology that attributes a peripheral location to Mexico. Paz puts judgement on Sigüenza (and Mexico) from the point of view of what he thinks has happened in the historical development up until the days of Paz. Historical significance is produced in a reversed direction. With respect to this, Paz' studies are nothing more than yet another example of Latin American modernist ambitions to gain a position in the Eurocentric world-order.

A comparison between Sigüenza and Rudbeck might, from this point of view, be of great interest because of a similar irresolution regarding modern and archaic thought. One finds, for instance, the same nationalistic striving, that can be found in the works of Sigüenza, also in the works of Rudbeck. Both of them cherish ambitions to create a "national" history.

As "astronomers" both Rudbeck and Sigüenza represent the "modern" views of their time. Their points of departure in the history of philosophy are, on the other hand, characterised by early ideological nationalism.

Francisco de Vitoria, the School of Salamanca and Indian rights

In 1507 the Dominican Francisco de Vitoria (1483/86-1546) met Erasmus in Paris. The encounter was a shocking experience to Vitoria and even though he remained a critic of Erasmus, he was inspired to a renewal of the scholastic thought. As the *catedrático de Prima* at the university in Salamanca, Francisco de Vitoria held lectures between the years of 1526 and 1540. Some of his most important lectures have been preserved in the notes of his students. These lectures, which are collected under the titles *Relecciones* or *Repeticiones*, make Vitoria one of the great renewers of the scholastic philosophy. Perhaps the most significant of these *Relecciones* were *De indis*, *De jure belli* and *De potestate civili*; they can be seen as a first effort towards an international law and the modern discussion concerning human rights. The concept of property is central to Vitoria's philosophy of law, which doesn't only deal with barbarian rights to property, freedom and autonomy, but also defends the right to property of women, children and the mentally ill.

In the text *De indis* Vitoria discusses whether it is correct to baptise the children of the unbelievers against the will of the parents or not. Regarding Indian rights to property Vitoria establishes that before the arrival of the Spaniards the Indians were the owners in both a public and private sense, and that they thus ought to retain the same rights in their relation to the Spanish Crown. The deadly sin isn't, according to Vitoria, an impediment to property rights and his argumentation for the fact that the unbelievers don't lose their property rights is based on the canon law. The unbelievers might also donate their possessions to others or inherit them as long as they cannot be associated with crime.

The Indians in the New World are free men who enjoy full rights to their country, their land and to other possessions, and no prince in world might deprive the Indians of these rights. Not even the Pope can decide over the Indians. The Indians have, according to Vitoria, the right to decide whether they want to accept the will of the Pope or not. And if not, the Pope hasn't got the right to declare war upon the Indians or in any other way force his will upon them. Vitoria makes it clear that religious motives aren't a legitimate reason for a declaration of war. The Indians were, according to Vitoria, not only "unbelievers" but also "maiden" and thus any violence against them was unjustifiable. On women, Vitoria has established that: "Women might inherit and enjoy their own property against the will of their lawful

husbands and thus women are not slaves.” Also minors have property rights and also the retarded who are free of guilt and thus cannot be the subject of harm. Vitoria also made statements against torture: “If a judge manages to attain a confession by means of torture, it cannot be used for a verdict, because the one who acts in this manner isn’t a judge.” Finally, on international law Vitoria, in his *De potestate civili*, wrote: “The world in its entirety, which is like a republic, has the power to legislate to the advantage of everyone. In the same way as the majority of the citizens of a country can make someone a common King – even against the will of the minority – a majority of Christians could, against the will of a minority, create a kingdom that all princes and nations had to obey.”

Women and Marriage during the Colonial Age

The situation of women during the first years of the colonial age can be studied first and foremost in the legislature. To the Spanish King the Spaniards in America weren’t any different than the Spaniards in Castile. The same laws applied to everyone but when it came to marriage the situation was affected by the principally low proportion of Spanish women in the New World.⁵¹ At the time of the voyage of Columbus women in Castile were subordinated to their father, an older brother or some other male relative. Marriage was the only means of emancipation from fatherly control but to the woman only meant to become subordinated to her lawful husband. It was not until she was a widow that she had the right to make free decisions and to, under strict circumstances, exert her civil rights. For instance, an adult married woman weren’t allowed to make decisions concerning her possessions or to travel on her own will to the Indies. Women and the marital law weren’t a part of the canon law, but fell under the power of the king with respect to the wellbeing of the state. Thus, it was regulated more by pragmatic criteria than by ethical or religious standpoints.

No women were brought on Columbus’ first voyage, but on his second journey 30% of the 330 emigrants were women. This was occasioned by a royal decision that also reserved 64 800 *maravedies* to pay for the sustenance of the women. During the first years, and in an increasing pace, women started to travel to the Indies to unite with their lawful husbands. This uniting took a long time but was encouraged by the

states and by the Church. Also, unmarried women took up travelling, encouraged by the fact that it was much easier to find a husband in the New World – here the economic, social and cultural status of the woman was less important. Unmarried women could apply for a travel permission at *Casa de Contratación* in Seville. This authority issued emigration permissions to both men and women, but this was based on a set of specific criteria. Women suspected of prostitution were, for example, not allowed to travel, and travel permissions weren't issued to gypsy women. Daughters of viceroys and other high officials were, in order to avoid nepotism, not allowed to travel.

The lack of Spanish women justified the sexual relations between the *conquistadors* and Indian women, a relationship that assumed very liberal forms and in which women lacked even the most fundamental rights. This was a source of concern to the Church and of motivation to Bartolomé de Las Casas with respect to his engagement regarding the issue concerning the uniting of wedded couples pulled apart by the conquest of the New World. In 1535 the viceroy of *Nueva España* wrote that there were 472 men waiting to unite with their women. Against this background the situation of the marriage was so regulated that married men residing in the Indies risked prison if they stayed away from their women for more than three years.

Among the women travelling to the Indies those that travelled together with their lawful husbands belonged to that group which rightfully might be classified as “colonisers”. Most of these women got married, sold all of their belongings and emigrated with great expectations of a better life. The wedded couples were often motivated to travel alone by the expenses and risks of the enterprise, and thus left children and older relatives behind. These persons stayed behind in Spain, waiting to travel to Spain at a later time. Emigration to the Indies always constituted an irrevocable decision. Thus, the first to make such a decision were among the most exposed in Spain. Women of a higher stand weren't positively disposed towards a risky adventure in the Indies and by every means tried to delay, if not hinder, a uniting with their husbands.

Chapter 4: The Pre-Revolutionary Period

The Enlightenment in Ibero-America

The Enlightenment, with its focus on the importance of reason, propels the modernist process yet another step forwards. The process of modernisation that was initiated by the Greeks and Romans, and that, after the Middle Ages, was obviously accelerated by the Renaissance, further obstructs the archaic legacy of society. The Enlightenment further develops the mechanical features that govern the organisation of society, a process brought about by Machiavelli and Hobbes, and that peaked in the works by Rousseau, Montesquieu and Locke. The power is regulated in constitutions that separate legislative, executive and juridical actions.⁵² Philosophers of the Enlightenment accept that different peoples should be allowed to live according to different principles and rules, depending upon physical, climatological and historical conditions. Enlightenment philosophers are, according to themselves, philosophers of progress, they propel society forwards, towards a better and more secure life, since it is constructed under controlled forms. They put their trust in the possibility of affecting and transforming inherited properties through education. Against this the Romantics eventually would take a stand. The Enlightenment philosophers would engage in severe criticism of the Spanish and Portuguese treatment of the Indians and Africans in America, a criticism that was based on the writings of Las Casas. Voltaire, Montesquieu, Marmontel, Raynal and Diderot would condemn Iberian colonialism and against this background speak of human rights and the rights of the people.⁵³

Conservatives against Reformers: “Civilisation or Barbarism”

In the process of enlightenment, and challenged with the task of liberating themselves from Spanish colonial dominion, the *Criollo* leaders start to profile themselves with respect to the new political reality. Some found a position by means of a new cultural identity – a *Criollo* identity or a *Mestizo* identity – which looks upon any foreign

influence with suspicion. Others chose to substitute a French or Anglo-Saxon identity for the Spanish identity. The different solutions caused a confrontation between cultural conservatives and cultural reformers, a fact that is mirrored in the entire ideological production of the 19th century. The confrontation was generated out of older oppositions such as the confrontation between an urban culture and a provincial culture; between, on the one hand, intellectuals, most often raised in Europe, in direct contact with new intellectual streams in England and France, and, on the other hand, *gauchos*, *llaneros*, Indians, Africans and Mestizos who couldn't read or write. To many of these intellectuals the liberation war concerned the ending of Spanish dominion, not because it was European, but because it was conceived of as archaic.

The new Criollo intelligentsia in the Ibero-American world struggled against Spain with different starting-points and different aims. The common starting-point is the Enlightenment. But apart from this the variations were significant, particularly with respect to conceptions of liberalism. They were all proponents of Ibero-American progress, but not all of them were equally influenced by European thought. Some took the ideals of the Enlightenment as their point of departure, then moved on into the realm of the romantic worldview and then also followed the principles of liberalism. Some of them, for instance Domingo Sarmiento and Juan Bautista Alberdi, were extremely sensitive to European influence. This was not the case when it came to the real gaucho or llanero leaders, who were conservatives with respect to the organisation of society. Thus, the new Criollo establishment was divided into two main groups, the enlightened conservatives, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the romantic and liberal.

For a long time the liberals in Spanish America lacked political power. The power was in the hands of the conservatives and it was the conservatives that spoke in the language of the great masses, and this language couldn't be appeased by European concepts of freedom that were an expression of the new individualistic liberalism. To the *gauchos*, *llaneros*, Africans and Indians freedom meant the exercise of an individual undisciplined life, a life without slavery, conceived of in a collectivist, never in an individualistic, way. Let us state more precisely that we differentiate between an *individually undisciplined* life and a *collectivist disciplined* life. Here we have in mind a life based on nature, which provides all necessities of life in an age of non-protected land. Their conception of society was collectivist, they followed a leader, a *caudillo*, with whom

one identified, and in whom one's own identity was perceived in perfection. The masses who defeated the Spanish dominion in Spanish America – and in some regions also the English and French attempts at conquest – were prepared to die for a feeling of group affiliation that didn't have anything to do with modern European thought. It was this kind of freedom, based on *the lack of individual discipline*, that Hobbes and Locke discovered in the Indian society in America, and that was perceived as a threat to civilisation. The arising reality in America was, from a modernist point of view, an obvious failure and this was also the way that most liberals perceived this reality. Andrés Bello writes that the Spanish-American revolution is characterised by two realities. On the one hand that of national liberation, on the other hand that of civil freedom. In our revolution, Bello writes, the “striving for freedom” was an ideological ally to the foreigners, who fought hidden under the flag of liberation. After the liberation the freedom fighters were prepared to continue the struggle against the conservatives in order to remain. This opposition was, according to Bello, the cause of the numerous civil wars that came to dominate the Latin American political arena after the liberation. According to Bello, freedom confronted liberation, with the aim of defeating it. Liberalism confronted conservatism in order to prevent it from gaining power in the new states after Spain was defeated.⁵⁴ Bello discerns the Spanish legacy in the conservative attitudes of Spanish America, a legacy that must be transformed by means of legislation and education. Thus, the main ideological dichotomy of the 19th century – that between *progression* and *retrogradation* – is to be found already in the works of Bello. This is the opposition that Sarmiento would immortalise in the slogan: *either civilisation or barbarism*. The new project of freedom, which was formulated by men such as Andrés Bello and Victorino Lastarria, was meant to transform the human soul and to implant a new civilised mentality that could replace the old Spanish-Indian “primitive” one.

The Ideological Roots of the Revolution: Benito Jerónimo Feijóo

During the 18th century Spain witnessed a wave of great pessimism that primarily was articulated by the Galician Benedictine monk Benito Jerónimo Feijóo (1676-1764). Feijóo is seen as the founder of philosophy in the Spanish language. Prior to him, Iberian philosophical authors – from Seneca in Roman Spain to the Mexican Alonso de la

Vera Cruz – had written in Latin.⁵⁵ French had, by then, become the European cultural language.

Feijóo writes during the first half of the 18th century. He is one of the precursors of the European Enlightenment and his texts are widely spread in the Spanish world during the period. His work aims to put an end to the scholastic hegemony in the Spanish culture, and to introduce the study of the classics of the new sciences. His two primary works are *Teatro Crítico* and *Cartas Eruditas*, two works in thirteen volumes that were published between 1726 and 1760. In his texts Feijóo deals with subjects of all kinds with the intention of combating prejudices and superstitions. Through the works of Feijóo modernist cultural models reach into core of the American thought of the *Criollos*, brought about by the new sciences. The resistance of the Catholic Church to the ideas of Galilei and Newton, and its identification with the Spanish Crown and Spanish culture in general, resulted in the perceived identity between the new ideas and the nationalistic emotions of the *Criollos*. In connection with this situation, and as a reaction to the Catholic worldview, a pronounced *deism*, i.e., a religion based on reason,⁵⁶ together with a new bourgeois ideology that put free enterprise before the traditional aristocratic view of economic values, spread in the American cultural elite.

With the Enlightenment an ideological process, that during the entire 19th century will assign central importance to concepts such as freedom, reason, science and nationalism, is initiated. The expression of these ideals would change, but not their content. First romanticism, and then positivism and Krausism, would reformulate the striving for freedom and modernisation that was expounded by the Enlightenment. There are other names that could be worth mentioning – such as J.F. de Isla, Antonio de Capmany, L. Fernandez de Moratín, Gaspar M. de Jovellanos y Jose Cadalso and Conde de Campomanes⁵⁷ – but Feijóo is the great figure of the period. In his writings Feijóo avoids confronting the spokesmen of the *Antiguo Régimen*. In a concise and obliging style he strives towards a renewal of Spanish thought. With respect to this Feijóo stands out against the background of the encyclopedists. His style, which was close to the spoken language and had clear pedagogical ambitions, became the model in the Spanish world without renouncing the scholastic tradition. For this reason he ought to be considered a renewer of Spanish scholasticism, rather than the founder of a new philosophy. The critical rationalism delivered by Feijóo's generation

penetrated deep into the entire Spanish world. One finds, in this movement, the source of the liberalism that later would characterise the Ibero-American generation of liberty.

In the 18th century Spanish America depended upon a well-developed communication system, including a well-working postal system and a widely encompassing system of high-quality printing houses. These mechanisms of communication entailed a fast spreading of critical rationalism in the entire Spanish world. At a rapid pace the profound pessimism was transformed into a revolutionary ideology that targeted the *Antiguo Régimen*. These revolutionary ideas are finally cast in the mould of the ideological material that is brought in from the North American, the Haitian and the French Revolution. For instance, it might be pointed out that 38 000 books were delivered in Mexico at one single moment of transport in 1785, among which works by Voltaire, Bacon, Descartes, Copernicus, Gassendi, Bayle, Leibniz, Locke, Condillac, Montesquieu, Lavoisier and Rousseau, together with some volumes of the famous encyclopaedia, could be found. It is worth mentioning that these books were forbidden.

During this period the cultivated section of Spanish America began to read and speak in other languages than Spanish or Latin. French became the standard international language, but also English and Italian was studied and often applied.

The period is also characterised by an interest in the study of the natural sciences. In connection with this it is worth citing among others Francisco José de Caldas (1770?-1816) with works on physics, astronomy, cartography and botany; and Celestino Mutis (1732-1808) with works on medicine and botany (they were both active in Nueva Granada); and José Mariano Mociño (1757-1820), the author of *Flora Mexicana* and active in Nueva España. In 1797, hardly a year since the discovery of the vaccine against chickenpox, vaccination had been carried out on the entire population of Nueva España. For example, the entire population in Caracas was vaccinated – a collective effort based on military and civil co-ordinated resources.

Economic and Political Ideologies

The influence of modern philosophy on the Spanish world is, as we have seen, very limited. The new philosophical spirit, that has its

origin in the works of Descartes, Locke and Spinoza, was, upon arrival in the Spanish world, filtered through a renewed scholastic thought. On the philosophical level the scholastic tradition continued to be the predominant philosophy, and traces of it can be found during the entire 19th century. More particularly, a new form of scholastic juridical thought inspired the American revolutionary ideology through the works of the Spanish philosopher Francisco Suárez (1548-1617).

However, if the influence of philosophical thought was limited, the influence of the French political ideologists and English economic thought was more tangible. The new political thought was represented by the works of Montesquieu (1689-1755). The reason for Montesquieu's success might be found in his moderate attitude to the new ideas. His ideas concerning the status of slave labour were flexible enough to be appropriate to most situations. But it was first and foremost Rousseau who influenced Spanish American political thought in the 18th century. Among his most influential ideas were the ones concerning "the noble savage" and the "natural goodness of humanity".

Rousseau's philosophy comes to America through Spain. His ideas are introduced in Spain by a network, the *Sociedades Economicas de Amigos del País*, interested in new political and economic thought. Manuel Ignacio de Altuna, a Spanish friend of Rousseau's, founded the network in the Basque Country in 1764. Rousseau's thought, which was in the style of the essay, worked against the scholastic tradition, which was advocated by the church and the state. The new period was in need of a way to communicate with the uneducated majority of the people, and thus an expression that could create visions and transfer new ideological concepts with political consequences. In the works of Rousseau there was also a humanism that in a profound sense criticised Christianity. He saw in the Christian doctrines a resignation that led to submission. That kind of humanism came in handy in the ideological confrontation with the Church and the scholastic philosophy.

Another important thinker, who had a significant influence on the Ibero-American world during this period, was François-Marie Arouet Voltaire (1694-1778). He was a merchant and held shares in a Spanish merchant vessel that, among other things, in 1756 was used to transport Spanish soldiers to the war against the Indians in the Jesuit *Misiones* (today, Paraguay). The letters of Voltaire reveal that he, between the years of 1756 and 1767, when the Jesuits were expelled from America, had contact with a correspondent in Buenos Aires. His character

Candide travels through Paraguay and at length reaches *El Dorado*. The style of the writings of Voltaire is also appropriate to a confrontation with the scholastic legacy in the Ibero-American world. His humour and his irony gave rise to an intellectual school that, by literary means, formulated a social criticism.

More important than both Rousseau and Voltaire to the Ibero-American ideological development was an author, in our days practically unknown, by the name of Guillermo Tomas Raynal (1713-1796). His *Historia Filosófica y Política de los Establecimientos y del Comercio de los Europeos en las Dos Indias* presents a bewildering amount of information concerning America, which the author had attained from various sources. In his work the European colonial powers are accused of various crimes against the Americans. Raynal defended a radical liberalism and found in the agricultural production the key to welfare.

Concerning economic thought, one can draw the conclusion that the physiocrats and the liberals, particularly Smith, deeply penetrated into the Spanish world. The English economic ideas came to America through commerce. Obviously the ideas of the physiocrats appealed to the American landowners, who for that matter dominated the American economic production, and who limited the role of the state to mere administration, the so-called “Laissez-faire, laissez-passer” state (the let do, let pass state):

Physiocrats (from the Greek *fysis*, nature, and *kratein*, rule): Some political and economic writers, who in the late 18th century fought against the, in most European countries predominant and in France realised, mercantilist politics. It was Quesnay, the physician in ordinary to Louis XV, who first expressed the ideas of physiocratism. He developed these in the *Tableau économique* (1758) and shortly gained a following. The content of the doctrines of the system of physiocratism mainly is this: the society is, just as the physical world, subject to constant laws. Thus, there is a natural order to economic conditions as well, and in the state it ought to be brought to bear. The study of this natural order teaches that the land (and the water) is the only source of wealth and, accordingly, that the agriculture and its related domains are the sole branches of commerce that in a real sense are capable of generating wealth. Neither industry nor trade are able to increase the wealth of the world. The agriculture generates a product, which not only compensates for the expenses, but also generates a surplus (“produit net”), which is pure profit to society. This profit is the only source of the taxation of

the state. As the “produit net” accrues to the landowner, the class of landowners is the only class in society that will pay taxes. Thus, the state should not impose other taxes than base taxes, proportionally related to the “produit net”. From this it follows that the state ought to reject any measure that might lessen the “produit net” of the agriculture. All measures that aim to stimulate other branches of commerce at the expense of the agriculture are unjustifiable. On the whole the natural order dictates a maximum, if not a totality, of individual freedom when it comes to choosing ones profession and to make use of ones possessions.⁵⁸

Adam Smith (1723-1790) inherited the ideas of physiocratism and created the modern liberal economic ideas. Work, not land, is, according to Smith, what generates wealth. The self-interest of the individual motivates the production of goods, which attains a value in the exchange with other goods on the market. The process is regulated by supply and demand, a process that is considered to be a natural law. The competition and the division of labour will create a harmonic and just state. The state must make sure that the laws are respected and that the state is well protected against external aggressors, without interfering when it comes to economic issues. His work *An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations* (1776) was translated into all European languages and was considered to be the fundamental work of modern economics.

The influence of the physiocrats in the whole of Ibero-America, particularly in the region of Rio de la Plata, is obvious. The entire criticism, that was formulated in those days, of the Spanish economic monopoly, rested upon physiocratic grounds. In this region the works of Manuel Belgrano had a significant importance. He was the son of an Italian dealer of chips and originally raised in the mercantilist tradition. In 1794 he was appointed secretary of the Spanish consulate in Buenos Aires. With time he became the indispensable point of reference to all the Criollos in the region who discussed the new economic ideas. In 1810 he founded the magazine *Correo de Comercio*, in which the new economic reform could be discussed.

After the French Revolution the economic liberalism became the predominant ideology in the Ibero-American world. It can be argued that the French Revolution consolidates the English Industrial Revolution and its influence in America. The French Revolution was the political expression of a process of modernisation, that had begun

during the Renaissance and particularly with the discovery and conquest of the American continent, and which was characterised by an increased rejection of scholastic thought. The intellectual mainstream reoriented its centre, from the strict collectivist Christian worldview to a secularised, empiricist and individualistic ideology. The new ideological winds favour the private life over the public life and lay the foundations of an entirely new form of society and organisation based on the industrial production.

However, the process also has other roots and one of those is the English Revolution of 1688. This revolution created a new political order in England, based on principles of reason. It established the democratic ideal as the natural social order, at the expense of the traditional monarchist view.

Another important source of inspiration to the Ibero-American world is the Anglo-American revolution (1763-1776). As from the year of 1778, Spain assisted in the uprisings in the English colonies. This facilitated the spreading of the revolutionary ideology in the Ibero-American world. This ideology was mediated through two very important texts: *The Declaration of Independence* (4th of July, 1776) and the *Bill of Rights* (1789). In these texts traces of Hobbes' conception of man can be found, according to which man is governed by selfish interests. Locke's thought (1632-1704) can also be found. His thought belongs to the revolutionary cultural milieu of the English revolution, but this did not impede the use of it to inspire and justify the new revolution.

Among all the religious ideologies, the Anglo-American revolution is characterised by Calvinistic notions, which separate their ideological material from other similar messages in, for example, the French-American and the Ibero-American revolution.⁵⁹

The Anglo-American revolution proclaimed the equal value of every human being. This equality was guaranteed by the individual freedom and this freedom then guaranteed a happy and meaningful life. The revolution was an expression of a new form of optimism and creativity, with which the Criollo immediately could identify. The hindrance that stood in the way of this bright future was said to be the Spanish hegemony.

A third important source of inspiration was the revolution in Haiti. It developed as a natural consequence of the French Revolution, which many black slaves had knowledge of through travels to France with their masters. The island of Santo Domingo was the first area in

the New World to be discovered by Columbus. For some years it was also the main region of the colonial mission, but it was later replaced by the continent. The island was abandoned and became a natural place of refuge to black slaves on the run, pirates and other lawless people. The eastern part of the island was later taken over by French interests and as from 1697 a third of the island would belong to the French Crown.

Santo Domingo was then divided into a Spanish and a French part: Saint Domingue. After the French Revolution the Spanish Criollos came into conflict with French interests. Also, Spanish and English forces would get involved in that conflict. On August 22nd, 1793, after a voodoo-ceremony, the black slaves rebelled under the leadership of Toussaint (1743-1803), an educated Christian leader. The blacks put the plantations on fire and killed all whites that could be found. After many battles the French army managed to suppress the revolutionaries, but the price was high. In the conflicts 10 000 blacks and 2000 whites were killed. On the 1st of July, 1801, the black population, under the leadership of Toussaint (who now changes his name to Louverture), takes power and proclaims Saint-Dominique a part of France but with a significant autonomy. A year later, in 1802, an army of 25 000 soldiers, which Napoleon sent to suppress the rebellion, arrives. Toussaint-Louverture is arrested and dies a year later in France. However, an epidemic of yellow fever reduces the potential of the French troops significantly, and they cannot stop the new republic from proclaiming its independence from France. The chosen name of the new country is Haiti, which means “the high country”.

The revolutionary ideas were transplanted to Ibero-American soil on other routes than the most obvious. Among the hidden enemies of the Spanish Crown one ought to count the Jews. The Jewish Spanish elite, that in 1492 was banished from the Iberian Peninsula, also consisted of Spaniards who expressed themselves in Spanish and had thousand-years old ties to the culture. When they were driven out of the Iberian Peninsula they settled in Africa, Syria, Italy, Palestine and Flanders. From there the resistance against the Spanish Crown was organised through a support of the Reformation and the Enlightenment. In 1777 the bishop of Cuba wrote to the Inquisition: “Every day new works arrive here, vomited from the mouths of Amsterdam, Leiden, London and the like [...]”⁶⁰

Another important group that was active in Ibero-America, and as from the 19th century worked to promote the revolutionary ideas,

were the freemasons. The Masonic orders were inspired by the medieval trade unions. The first Masonic order was founded in 1717.

The Masonic order is a world-wide society or brotherhood, whose fellows, the freemasons, use symbols and similes from the craft of masonry as designations of the activities within the Freemasonry and pledge to keep their signs and cult ceremonies a secret. Freemasonry, “the royal art”, is a way of living that aims towards a spiritual perfection of the self and of humanity. [...] The origin of the Masonic orders is to be found in the English medieval guilds of masonry, an alliance of masons, their assistants and apprentices, which aimed to promote the craft of masonry and to unify its practitioners. By the name of freemasons the guilds began to give admittance to non-professional members (“accepted masons”).⁶¹

In the Ibero-American world the Masonic order is known as *the masons*. The freemasons were organised in three groups: the master, the brothers and the apprentices. The operation called for secrecy and loyalty. The masons penetrated Spain and Madrid in 1728 by the help of Duke Felipe de Wharton.

A third group that was important to the spreading of the revolutionary ideas was the Jesuits. When the Jesuits were expelled from the Spanish colonies in 1767, and then later dissolved by the pope in 1773, they turned to an active resistance against the Spanish Crown. The ideological instrument of the Jesuits was to be the teachings of the Spanish neo-scholastic Francisco Suárez concerning “the sovereignty of the people”. A vast amount of the banished Jesuits moved to England to actively serve the English Crown.

The Rebellion of Tupac Amaru

The crisis of the *Ancien Régime* was also manifested in the 18th century, in a series of social rebellions that anticipated the war of liberation. Many of these pre-revolutionary movements, which deeply shook the *Regimen Indiano*, were acted out by Criollos in open conflict with the Spanish Crown. One of the most important rebellions was the one conducted by the *comuneros* in Paraguay. The rebellion began in 1721 – when some *encomenderos*⁶² wanted to expand the labour on the *yerba mate*⁶³

plantations by using the Indians of the Jesuit districts – and lasted until 1735.

Other rebellions that involved the Jesuits took place in Venezuela in 1749. This time the conflict concerned the trade monopoly of the Jesuits, against which the Criollos rebelled. In 1780 the Criollos also rebelled against the tax policies of the Crown in *Nueva Granada* (the Colombia of our days).

But the most important of all of the social rebellions was the one lead by José Gabriel Condorcanqui, to posterity known as *Tupac Amaru*.



Tupac Amaru

Tupac Amaru was born in Tungasuca, the Tinta province, in 1738. He was the son of an Indian chief and studied with the Jesuits in Cuzco. He had his own company that transported goods to Potosi and Lima. He spoke Quechua, Spanish and Latin. The exploitation of Indian labour reached new inhuman levels and in 1780, under the leadership of Tupac Amaru, a rebellion started that soon spread throughout the entire country. He adopted his warrior name from another Indian who was slaughtered in Cuzco by the orders of the viceroy Francisco de Toledo. “Tupac Amaru” in Quechua means “shining snake”. The rebellion lasted for two years and ended with the death of Tupac Amaru and all of his friends. The death sentence took place on the 15th of Mars, 1781, and the form itself says everything of the then present conditions: first he had to watch the execution of his wife, children and friends. Then his limbs were tied to four horses that pulled in different directions. After some failed attempts to kill him, he was finally beheaded.

Chapter 5: The Liberation

The Political and Ideological Enterprise

The liberation period in the Ibero-American world is characterised by the ideals of the Enlightenment. Revolutionaries organise to conquer the *Old Regime* and put a *New Regime* in its place. This *New Regime* was to be based on the ideals of equality and freedom, and also to be supported by a new enlightened constitution rooted in reason. Contrary to romantic ideals, which soon after the revolution would dominate the Ibero-American world, the age of liberation is internationalist rather than nationalist. It is optimistic with respect to the future of education and its capability to enhance human potential. The constructive generation (which was dominated by romantic ideals) is, on the contrary, characterised by pessimism, Eurocentrism and its firm belief in innate traits.

In general, the generation of liberation had a hostile outlook on Spain and Portugal, but at the same time it sympathised with the rest of Europe and European culture in general. It could be argued that the generation of liberation, with some exceptions, was very influenced by French and English culture, and by the North American Revolution. In spite of this, most political leaders from the early years of the liberation war had a fairly positive attitude to their own culture, which, at this point, had begun to be appreciated and respected. Men like Simón Bolívar and José de San Martín had learned to appreciate the Mestizo society that formed the basis of their armies and their political platform. After one or two generations of Latin American romanticism we will see that Eurocentrism gains even more momentum and, with ideologues like Sarmiento, renounces popular culture, firmly convinced of its inferiority.

Spanish Political Thought in the 17th and 18th Century

Spanish political thought was influenced by the prosperity of scholasticism on the Iberian Peninsula during the 17th and 18th century. At a time when scholasticism lost ground in other parts of Europe an original and powerful new interpretation of scholastic premises developed in Spain. The man responsible for this new development was the Jesuit Francisco Suárez (1548-1617). Suarez' political ideas were presented mainly in two of his works, *De Legibus* and *Defenso Fidei*, in which he advocated the thesis of the subordination of the state to the Church. The works linked up with the classical attempts made in *De Regno ad Regem Cypri* and the *Summa Theologica* by Thomas Aquinas (1224-1274). During the prosperity of the new scholasticism the Spanish intellectual elite engaged in the scientific debate that was going on in the rest of Europe, but at the same time an ideological wall was raised against the new revolutionary ideas. This ideological wall was characterised on the one hand by a strict renunciation of all forms of Machiavellism (Machiavelli's ideas were seen as non-Christian) and on the other hand by a pure ascetic and mystical interpretation of the world, that penetrated deep into the many class strata of the Spanish society. 17th Century political thought in Spain thus lacks an individualistic perspective.

The core of Suárez' thought, and, for that matter, of the scholastic tradition, is the belief that the authority of the prince is given to him by God, but only as long as he subordinates his will to the collective. The final power is always to be found in this collective; a political interpretation that definitely guided the various social experiments of the Jesuits in the world and that at length lead to their expulsion from America.

Francisco Suárez' thought was brought to Perú at the end of the 16th century by one of his disciples, the Jesuit Juan de Atienza. Juan de Atienza later led the founding of the Jesuit missions in Paraguay. Suárez' thought also influenced the foundation of the Jesuit school in Cordoba (present Argentina) in 1612.

This situation partly changed in the 18th century, a period that has been described as the period of the "two Spains"; on the one hand a conformist and conservative Spain that recruited followers from all layers of society, and on the other hand another Spain that was lead by thinkers and artists that opened up for the new ideological streams. These intellectual forces were to engage in the spreading of the new

ideas in Spanish America. The Spanish Enlightenment can be divided into two periods. The first was dominated by Benito Jerónimo Feijóo (1676-1764) and the second, i.e., as from 1750, was dominated by Gaspar Melchor de Jovellanos (1744-1811).

Liberal Currents: the Enlightened Despotism

According to Stoetzer,⁶⁴ the modern state is different from the medieval *civitas terrena* in that it has a broadened concept of the state as a collective of individuals. After the renaissance, and through the works of Machiavelli and Bodin, the *res publica christiana* gradually disappears and is replaced by a new theoretical reflection that considers the rights of the Prince to be absolute. The Prince and the state become one and the same, and the power and rights of the people are lessened. This new form of *despotism*⁶⁵ was combined with the ideal of the Enlightenment. The nation was raised by a cultural elite that at the same time fought old-fashioned traditions and superstitions through massive social reforms. The enlightened despotism called for the strictest form of administrative centralism. This was the form of government that was put in practice in Spain and in the Spanish colonies in the 18th and 19th century.

In Spanish America enlightened despotism can be found in the earliest years of the republic Paraguay – in the government of José Gaspar Rodríguez de Francia – that lasts from 1811 to 1840. Francia was an enlightened leader who subordinated the freedom of the people to the security of the country. Traits of the ideal of enlightened despotism can be found also in Nueva Granada (nowadays, Colombia), in general Francisco de Paula Santander, a fiduciary of Bolívar who in time parted with the federative ideas of Bolívar. He governed from 1819 to 1828. The Argentinian Bernardino Rivadavia, who was the first president of the country (1826-1827), can also be counted to the ideal of enlightened despotism. Both Santander and Rivadavia represented the white and enlightened elite of the city culture that opposed the provincial culture of the Mestizos and their political interests. Very briefly, one might – to cite Sarmiento – describe the centralism of the enlightened despotism as a representation of the ideal of “civilisation”, against the provincial conservatives and their federative ideas of “barbarism”.

José Artigas and Samuel Pufendorf

One can always, according to Stoetzer, include the ideas in the philosophy of law that Samuel Pufendorf (1632-1694) had among the ones that had a great influence on Spanish America. He was among those who, during the Enlightenment, developed the ideas of natural rights against positive rights.⁶⁶ Other famous names are John Locke (1632-1704) and Hugo Grotius (1585-1645). With its roots in the Spanish juridical philosophy of the 16th and 17th century, the main ideas of natural rights would be developed further by Rousseau and by the French Revolution.⁶⁷ The theory of natural rights was built upon the regulating mechanisms of reason, and not upon historical assumptions. To ground natural rights it was necessary to know what was genuinely human. In the 16th century, under the influence of the contacts with the American peoples, a concept of the “pure” man as the “primitive” man (later corrupted by History) was developed. In opposition to the realism of the classical antiquity and the Middle Ages, an idealised conception of pre-historical man was introduced.⁶⁸

The political reality is, to all the theories of natural rights, a consequence of a synthesis of many individual actions. But in other respects there are many differences. The rights of the individual were emphasised by both Locke and Rousseau, and also functioned as ideological goals for the North American and the French Revolution. The rights of the individual were, however, not that important to Hobbes and Pufendorf. Pufendorf's ideas are located somewhere in between the ideas of Hobbes and Locke. They were introduced in Latin in America as early as 1672, together with the works of Grotius. But his ideas later circulated thanks to a translation into French by Johannes Barbeyrac (1674-1729).⁶⁹

The ideas of Pufendorf influenced Spanish America mainly with respect to two issues: *federalism* as an ideal and the view of the state as a *social contract*. Both of these traits can be found in the most important revolutionary ideologue of Rio de la Plata: José Artigas. In his thought the ideal of the social contract, which says that if a state cannot satisfy the needs of its citizens, it leaves it open to the citizens to make up their minds concerning a new social contract that fulfils the new demands, can be found. The federalism of Artigas was also inspired by Pufendorf. The ideal of the social contract can also be found in Mariano Moreno, the ideologue behind Buenos Aires' *Revolución de Mayo* of 1810.

In Mariano Moreno's thought the ideas of the contract can be found, since the state is seen as an agreement among free individuals.

Locke, Montesquieu and the Latin American Constitutions

John Locke's thought confirmed with a new way of looking at natural rights that opposed the versions formulated by both Hobbes and Spinoza. In the writings of Locke the individual rights are firmly grounded. He supports the bourgeois and colonial interests, which predominated in the Anglo-Saxon world after the revolution in 1688. He develops a new way of thinking that rests on the importance of the contract, in which the legislative power is the most important. With Locke the idea was born of an organisation of the state with a separation of powers, so that different centres could complement each other and balance the result.

Locke's thought was completed by Montesquieu, who accepted the republican form with the people at the centre. His constitution assumes a dividing of the state into an executive, a legislative and a judiciary power.

Locke was known in Argentina already in 1701 through the Jesuits in Cordoba. His influence is clearly perceivable in the government of Rivadavia and in its legislation during the period 1819-1827. In Chile the ideas of constitutionalism, in the form of an explicit acceptance of the separation of powers, can be seen in the treaty of 1823. In Perú this influence can be perceived in the various regulations (*reglamentos*) of San Martín from 1821. The same can be said of the federative constitution of *Alto Perú* (today, Bolivia) from 1826. Both Miranda and Bolívar read Locke and Montesquieu and because of this they had their greatest influence on Venezuela and *Nueva Granada* (present Colombia) and their different constitutions. The first Mexican constitution (New Spain) was dictated on the 22nd of October, 1814, by an assembly led by José María Morelos. Here one finds a synthesis of both scholastic and constitutional ideas, in which the separation of the power of the state always is the main issue.

Rousseau, the French Revolution, Napoleon and the Democratic Ideas

The core of the modern republican democratic ideas was born in the works of Rousseau and the ideology of the French Revolution. Even though Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) was a man of the Enlightenment, he can also be perceived as a predecessor of the romantic ideals of the 19th century. The French Revolution both signifies the peak and the end of the Enlightenment, and at the same time the definitive breakthrough of Rousseau's thought.

The influence of Rousseau is particularly significant within three domains: education, political science, and philosophy. As a political thinker he builds upon the works of Machiavelli, Hobbes and Montesquieu, but he develops their theses to a deeper and more radical form of individualism. The way Rousseau sees it, man was born free, but everywhere is in chains. The strong individualism was compensated by a mystic collectivism, which Rousseau found in the form of a social contract developed in *Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité parmi les hommes* (Paris, 1753); and *Du contrat social, ou principes du droit publique* (Amsterdam, 1762)

The influence of Rousseau on Spanish America is significant. He was read by Francisco de Miranda and Simón Bolívar in Venezuela, by Antonio Nariño in Nueva Granada, by Antonio Rojas in Chile, by José Baquijano in Perú. Traces of Rousseau's thought can easily be found in the writings of Mariano Moreno from the revolution in Rio de la Plata in 1810. Moreno is the first to publish a translation into Spanish of the works by Rousseau as early as in 1810.⁷⁰

The French Revolution of 1789 at the same time constitutes both the peak and the negation of the Enlightenment. It can be seen as a failure of the ideas of reason and idealism. The demand for freedom, equality, and brotherhood reveals a radical individualism as the basis for a strong unity or collectivism. The French Revolution opens the door to the lower classes of society and thus to the first socialist advances. The French Revolution combined the ideas of Rousseau and the constitutionalism and the doctrine of the separation of power by Montesquieu, the utilitarianism of Condorcet and the declaration of human and civil rights by Lafayette. The ideological material of the French Revolution is rationalistic, materialistic and mechanical, and in an obvious opposition to preceding political realities.

The influence of Napoleon on the liberation war of Spanish America during the 19th century is significant. Particularly noticeable is Napoleon's influence on the aesthetical and ethical aspects of the revolution. The point concerns a superstructure that is combined with traditional Spanish attitudes to create a counterfeit of the Spanish American political self-image. This is obvious when it comes to the great military leaders, in particular those who were born to wealthy families and got a European education, for example Simón Bolívar in Venezuela, José de San Martín in Argentina, José de la Riva in Perú and Bernardo O'Higgins in Chile. The model can be simplified in a formula: "brilliant military hero and original political creator". This formula is often referred to as "the democratic Caesarism". The model survives in the continent into our days as a deviation from the traditional Spanish legacy.

The Utilitarianism of Bentham in Spanish America

Apart from enlightened despotism, constitutionalism and democracy, a fourth ideological stream of ideas can be found, this time originating in England: utilitarianism. The philosophy of Jeremy Bentham assumes as a premise the fact that every human being acts in self-interest. This egoism should be regulated by indirect mechanisms, guaranteeing the happiness of most people. Bentham's philosophy ought to be included among the ideas of the Enlightenment. His political ideas advocated a republican form of government, the parliament and universal suffrage. When it comes to the colonial enterprise, Bentham took up the influential views of Malthus and Smith concerning population growth to justify the social and economic advantages that the populating of the desert regions of the world would bring about. In this way some of his followers took part in the colonisation of Australia. The immigration of Europeans in desert areas became a key project to various Argentinean leaders, such as Bernardino Rivadavia (1780-1845), the first president of the country.

The generation preceding Alberdi and Sarmiento had plans of populating the grand desert fields in Argentina. Bernardino Rivadavia had contact with Bentham already in 1815 during a visit to England. Rivadavia was a monarchist and Bentham tried to convince him of the advantages of republicanism to a country like Argentina. In Nueva

Granada (today, Colombia) Francisco Santander ruled during the period 1819-1828. In 1825 legal decisions were made concerning the educational system, which was to be founded on the philosophical principles of Jeremy Bentham. Moreover, the personal contacts between Bentham and the Venezuelan leaders Francisco de Miranda, Andrés Bello and Simón Bolívar, are well known and well documented.

The Constitution of Cádiz from 1812, and Its Importance to the American Revolution

On the 2nd of May, 1808, Spanish resistance to the occupying powers of Napoleon was initiated. This occupation had weakened the Spanish powers in America and opened the doors to various liberation movements. In the opposition there was a dominant group of intellectuals who wanted to transform the Spanish Empire in modernist ways. The resistance was organised in the *Cortes* (a political form of organisation that is similar to the parliament) in Seville and culminated in the constitution of 1812, which is Spain's most liberal constitution of the 19th century. In the constitution the equality between those Spaniards who are born in Spain and those who are born in America is acknowledged. The relationship between the Church and the state was transformed, partly due to the dissolution of the Inquisition. The attempt is made to unify the Empire under the king and to recreate a unified Empire through a series of measures of modernisation. The political initiative for the constitution had not, however, appreciated the extent to which the different American regions had developed intense nationalistic emotions and the fact that Spanish privileges in America no longer were tolerated.

Even though the reorganisation of the Spanish Empire failed, and many parts of the American continent sealed independence already in the 1820s, the constitution of Cadiz became a model to the first constitutions of the new nations. The constitution of Cadiz reflected the influence of Rousseau, Locke and Montesquieu, and so this influence also made its way to the first American national constitutions through it. The constitution kept some of the features of traditional Spanish thought. The most typical of these is the connection to the catholic ideological tradition.

José de San Martín and José Artigas: the Conditions of the History of Ideas

The discipline “History of Ideas” has, the way I see it, many points of contact with other historical disciplines. But let us now consider some of its distinguishing features. The classical discipline “History”, which today rather would be referred to as “Political History” (with modern variants such as “Economic History” and “Social History”), is different from the “History of Ideas”, among other things because of the relation between the time of the subject and its degree of publicity.

The pertinence of history, moreover, is founded upon *mechanical* facts, events that can be dated chronologically and be related to persons, places, meetings and battlefields. A political event is never of a “potential” but always of a “factual” kind. “The History of Ideas”, on the other hand, is able to study that which never reached the public sphere, that which remained a tendency, a sketch of a possible development. Here the pertinence is confirmed through the rhetoric of argumentation and through estimations of probability. Also, the “History of Ideas” is always, to varying degrees, *personal*. At the one end it is biographical, and at the other end it is a history of mentalities. But in both cases it is always the *private* sphere of life that controls the reflection.

Because of the arguments presented above, a perspective on the events of Latin America, within the history of ideas, cannot be the same as that in a pure political or economic history. The case of José de San Martín might serve as a good example. From a military and a political perspective, San Martín is a crucial actor in the liberation struggle of Spanish America. He organised and led the armies that defeated the Spanish forces through half of the continent. With respect to this, he can only be compared to Simón Bolívar. The importance of San Martín is, however, close to “mechanical”. He “created” and put into practice the military machinery that transformed the liberation from a theoretical to a practical issue. From an ideological perspective, however, his significance is less important.

The matter is quite the opposite when it comes to José Gervasio Artigas. Artigas is the sole great leader from the age of liberation who was not born within the Spanish oligarchy, but to a *family of Criollos* in Montevideo, a less significant provincial city. He fought against Spain, but also against the Portuguese on the one hand, and the centralism of

Buenos Aires on the other. Because of the complexity of the situation – it partly anticipated the conflicts that in time would dissolve the entire continent – his ideological programs were defeated and his ideas banished. It is not until the end of the 19th century that people take up the study of his thought again, and now he was referred to as the “liberator of Uruguay”, a role he never actively sought and a role that is completely alien to his ideas. The total ideological legacy of Artigas makes him a unique unparalleled character. He was the first to formulate a *social program* to the new Latin American societies. He was the first to adopt the *modern principles of the court martial* in a world of brutality and recklessness. Artigas was just like the North Americans a federalist and republican, in contrast to the men of Buenos Aires, who were centralists and monarchists. He repudiated *all* of the European political powers and had sympathy only for the North American revolution. He lived in harmony with the *gauchos*, the Indians and the Blacks and died of age in 1850 during his exile in Paraguay, after a voluntary ostracism that lasted for 30 years. Without being alien to the new revolutionary ideas, irrespective of their origin, Artigas understood the codes of his own culture and lived in perfect harmony with the social and natural environment. From a perspective in the history of ideas, the system of Artigas deserves to – I think – be noticed and analysed closer, even though its political importance was less far-reaching than the others.

Andres Bello

Andres Bello was born in Caracas in 1781 and died in Santiago de Chile in 1865. He was a companion to Bolivar in London in 1810 and moved to Chile in 1827, where he wrote his most important works. He became headmaster of the university in Santiago de Chile and the author of the national Civil Code. In addition to this he also wrote a philosophical tractate in the Lockean tradition with the name *Filosofia del entendimiento*, together with some books on Spanish grammar. As a thinker, Bello belongs to two periods, the Enlightenment and the Romantic Age, but his personality is complex enough to allow him to transcend these limits. Bello belongs to the group of revolutionaries that were responsible for the development of the ideological principles that made the revolution possible, but also to the group of *pensadores* that mark the beginning of the new nationalism. In 1848 he wrote an article for the journal *El Araucano* in Santiago de Chile with the title *The way to*

write history. In this article the new nationalistic ideas are made clear:

We do not want to see the French chronicles be rewritten. [...] Are we to derive our history from Froissart, Comines, Mizeray, or Sismondi? The true process of regression would be to start off from where the Europeans ended. This doesn't mean that we think one should close ones eyes regarding what comes from Europe. Let us read and study European history, let us accept their examples and lessons. Let us use them as models for own historiography. Could Chile, with its qualities and character, be found in the European history? Because it is those qualities and that character that historians in Chile must account for, regardless of the method chosen. (*El Araucano*, Santiago de Chile, 1848).⁷¹

The Initial Strides of the Revolution on the Continent: Miguel Hidalgo and José María Morelos

After the Anglo-American and the Haitian revolutions, the revolution spread to the Spanish world. The first signs of it are to be found in Mexico. This initial revolutionary movement was to fail and its leader was to be shot in order to make an example. It was, however, to express the new political interests of the new social groups made up by the Mestizos. The first leader of the revolution was the priest Miguel Hidalgo y Castilla. Hidalgo was born in Guanajuato, on the 8th of May, 1753, to a family of poor farmers. He got a priestly education but was influenced by the philosophy of the Enlightenment, particularly by Rousseau. As a consequence of this he was accused of defending the French Revolution, of speaking disparagingly about the Pope, of denying the existence of the holy Mary and of himself having two daughters, which he raised according to modern ideas. In 1800 he was found guilty of having "dangerous ideas" by the Inquisition and as punishment he was relocated as a priest to a small village called *Dolores*. Here Hidalgo found the social foundation that in 1810 made the first Spanish-American rebellion possible. On the 15th of December, 1810, it was proclaimed:

Let us build a congress of representatives from every town and village, which may construct advantageous laws that are suited to the reality of all societies. These representatives are to rule with a fatherly love, to treat us all as brothers, to eliminate poverty and dampen the consequences of the disastrous situation of the country... The agricul-

ture and the industry are to be stimulated, and soon afterwards all residents of the country are to enjoy national wealth.⁷²

Hidalgo was captured, tortured and finally executed. Hidalgo's head, together with the heads of his companions, were exhibited for many years. One of the followers of Hidalgo was the Mestizo José María Morelos y Pavón, who also was ordained. He was born in Morelia, on the 30th of September, 1765. He was a Vaquero⁷³, carrying Indian, African and European blood. Also José María Morelos y Pavón was defeated and executed.

Francisco de Miranda: *El Precursor*

The first great leader of the Spanish American time of liberation was called Francisco de Miranda. He was born in Venezuela, in 1730, and died imprisoned in Cadiz, 1816.

Miranda was a true revolutionary, deeply engaged in the political events of his days, but with ideas that were not entirely suited to the Spanish American reality of those days. Miranda's real political scenario was Europe, and the enlightened ideas of Europe formed him. He was a real *precursor*. He participated in the American Revolution in 1780 and in the French army in 1792. During all these years he developed an intense diplomatic activity in both the United States and Europe to gain support for his plans of liberation. Miranda represented Venezuelan commercial interests, which strove to implement economic liberalism in Spanish America. In both England and the United States he saw the model of this future development. Miranda gained the North American support for an invasion of Venezuela in 1806. The invasion ended in a catastrophe. He returns to Venezuela together with Simón Bolívar to execute a new military action in 1810. This enterprise lasted for another two years and ended in a new disaster. He fell out with Bolívar and was surrendered to the Spanish authorities by him. He is moved to Cadiz, where he also dies in 1816.

The relations between Miranda and his disciples are illustrated by the following story. Bernardo O'Higgins (1776-1842), partner to San Martín in the liberation of Chile, tells that when he once listened to the political visions of Miranda, he "threw himself into the arms of Miranda and asked for permission to kiss his hands."⁷⁴

Even though Miranda was the revolutionary ideal that, among others, Simón Bolívar and Bernardo O'Higgins used, the leaders of the

second generation were more conscious of the real conditions of the American continent and thus able to adapt the European ideologies with greater care.

Simón Bolívar: *El Libertador*

Simón José Antonio de la Santísima Trinidad Bolívar was born in Caracas on the 24th of July, 1783, to an oligarchic and wealthy family. Later he became the second of the two most successful military leaders in the Spanish American liberation war (another is José de San Martín⁷⁵ who was a great military strategist but who lacked political and ideological ambitions). He was raised according to the ideals of the Enlightenment and at the age of thirteen he commenced on a military career. He completed his education in the divisions of *Voluntarios Blancos de los Valles de Aragua* and becomes a lieutenant in 1798. Later he travelled to Madrid and other European cities. At the beginning of the new century he married and travelled back to Europe, where his wife unexpectedly died. On the 2nd of December, 1804, Bolívar attends the crowning of Napoleon.

In 1810, when the troops of Napoleon were in Andalusia, Bolívar travelled to England to negotiate for support to the revolution. He travelled as an official representative of the revolutionaries of the newly formed *Junta de Gobierno*. Among others, Andrés Bello was in his delegation. In London they met Francisco de Miranda – at the time 60 years old – and agreed to meet again in Venezuela to start the military rebellion against Spain.

On the 4th of April, 1812, Miranda was appointed military leader of the rebellion and the war was initiated. But in time the enterprise ended in a disaster. Bolívar and Miranda fell out with each other and Miranda was captured (and he later died in prison, on the 14th of July, 1816).

The revolution that Miranda, Bolívar and other leaders visualised during this initial phase was a revolution without enough of a social fundament. All these leaders belonged to the oligarchy, a social class in conflict with the Spanish Crown, which, totally independent from other social classes, strove to separate their interests from the Spanish Crown. This social and political isolation made sure that every attempt at rebellion was doomed to fail. But after the fall of Miranda, and under the

leadership of Bolivar, the situation was about to change. Bolivar belonged to the oligarchic group that during and after this period understood that Ibero-America was made up of a poor and uneducated people, in a mixture of races and cultures, who lived on the countryside and with whom one cannot communicate in the language and taste of the elegant auditoriums.

Bolivar begins to realise the need for some necessary strategic changes when he turns to the Black republic of Haiti for help. At the time the republic was ruled by Alejandro Petion who accepted the defeated Bolivar with solidarity and understanding. Here Bolivar got the support he needed to once again organise the struggle for liberation against Spain. In exchange for the promised support, Petion wanted some guaranties. According to an agreement signed in 1816, Bolivar pledged to proclaim the end of slavery as soon as he and his troops had returned to the continent.

However, this new expedition also ends in a disaster because of the already mentioned social and political isolation. Bolivar is forced to return to Haiti on the 22nd of August, 1816, to ask for more support to the revolutionary enterprise. A new invasion, now on the 31st of December, 1816, changes the outcome. Bolivar begins to look for support among the circles outside of the oligarchy and finds it in the *barbaric* masses from the vast pastures. It was the support of the *llaneros* (the Venezuelan counterpart of the South American *gauchos*) that was the crucial factor that changed the outcome of history. The llanero-leader, and the most important partner of Bolivar, was called José Antonio Páez (1790-1873). As from now, and in only a couple of years, Bolivar's army liberated Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador and parts of Perú.

At the Angostura-congress, on the 30th of January, 1819, Bolivar formulated some of his most memorable words. From these I have chosen to translate the following:

Let me point out to this congress a question that I consider to be one of the most important. Let us establish that our people is neither European nor North American; rather it is a combination of Africa and America, because even Spain itself falls outside of Europe because of its African blood, institutions and temperament. It is as a matter of principle impossible to decide to which family we belong. The greatest part of the Indian population has been exterminated, the European has been mixed with the American and the African, and the latter with the Indian and the

European. Born out of the same womb, all of our fathers are of different origins, and all of those have different skin colours, a difference of uttermost importance. Our separate origin calls for a firm leadership and a very sensitive way of dealing with things. If we are to succeed, we ought to carefully handle this heterogeneous society, which might fall into pieces by even the slightest form of change.⁷⁶

In a revealing letter, known as the *Carta de Jamaica* from the 6th of September, 1815, Bolivar gives proof of how well-read he was, of his realism and of his deep understanding of the issues and the spirit of the time in the continent of the Mestizos. Here follows some excerpts from this letter:

I hasten to answer your letter from the 29th [...]. You write that 300 years have passed since the Spanish horrors began at Columbus' continent. Horrors in which our age refuse to believe because of their perversity. Las Casas, the philanthropic bishop of Chiapas, left a short enumeration of some of them, collected from the accounts given by the conquerors in Seville, to posterity. All neutral observers have done justice to this friend of humanity, who with such great passion and conviction exposed the most horrifying of the actions to his government and time.⁷⁷

The letter continues with a comparison between the way Napoleon and the Spaniards treated their enemies.

In your letter you mention the treacherous methods employed by Bonaparte to capture Charles IV and Ferdinand VII, kings of a nation that during three centuries employed treacherous methods to imprison two monarchs of America. In this you see a divine retribution and a proof of the fact that God supports the American striving towards liberation. If I understand you correctly, you refer to Montezuma, who was captured and murdered by Cortés [...] and the Inca-king Atahualpa of Perú, who was captured and murdered by Pizarro and Almagro. But let me tell you, there is an obvious difference between the two cases. While the Spanish kings are treated with respect until they get their freedom back, the American kings are humiliated and tortured to death.⁷⁸

In the elusive identity of Ibero-America, Bolivar saw a political problem with respect to its future existence.

I consider the present American condition to be similar to the situation in Europe by the time of the fall of the Roman Empire. Then, as now, every dissolution created a new political order, dependent upon the particular interests of the leaders, the prominent families and the corporations. There is, however, a significant difference. These new constituents of the old order rebuilt with the necessary changes their own nations. But we, who hardly carry the traits of what we once were, who are neither Indians nor Europeans but a form of hybrid of the true owners of the country and of the Spanish usurpers; in other words, as we are Americans from birth, but with European rights, we ought to stay in this continent against the interests of all natives and at the same time defend it against all intruders. In this way we are in a very difficult and curious situation.⁷⁹

As early as this he gave expression to the existence of the inferiority complex that prevailed in Ibero-America with respect to the North American revolution. This complex of ideas would also be predominant in the Ibero-American ideological future.

[...] As long as our fellow countrymen do not develop the skills that characterise our northern friends, the populist systems might, far from being advantageous, cause our ruin. Unfortunately, the acquisition of these skills seems to reside in a distant future. We are, on the contrary, dominated by a series of bad habits, inherited from a nation like Spain, distinguished only by ambition, desire for vengeance and greed.⁸⁰

Reading between the lines, one finds both a realistic and pessimistic stance toward the Spanish political project:

I wish that I could see America become the greatest nation in the world, not so much for its greatness and wealth, but for its freedom and blessedness. However, even if I wish for a perfect government to rule my native country, I cannot imagine the New World being governed by a single grand republic. Because such a republic cannot be realised, I do not wish for such things. Even less, I would like to see a universal monarchy in America, and this is because such a project, without being useful, also is impossible to realise. We would not be able to avoid the excesses existing today and all regeneration would be impossible. The American states are in need of paternalistic states that heal the wounds of war and despotism. Mexico might, because of its powerfulness,

be the metropolis. [...] For one single government to be able to give life, to start the public mechanisms of success, for one government to be able to correct old errors, enlighten and improve the New World, one would have to rely on divine intervention or at least all of human intelligence and virtue.⁸¹

Mariano Moreno and the May Revolution of 1810

Mariano Moreno (1779-1811) was the ideologue behind the revolutionary junta in Buenos Aires in 1810. He died early, in 1811, on his way to London. Moreno published a journal, *La Gaceta de Buenos Aires*, which was the natural mouthpiece of the revolution. The ideas of Jean Jacques Rousseau, concerning *the general will* and *the sovereignty of the people*, were, together with other ideas, spread through this journal. In 1810, Moreno wrote for *La Gaceta*:

The authority cannot justify itself, [...] the sovereignty of the people is nothing but its own general will, since the right to sovereignty is collectivist and cannot become individual property.⁸²

Mariano Moreno was the first to publish a translation into Spanish of the *Contrat Social*, from 1762, by Rousseau. His ideology is similar to that of the Jacobins and his efforts are to be counted among the most honourable of the revolutionary forces during the period. He was a true republican in opposition to the rest of the revolutionary elite in Buenos Aires, which, after the fall of the Spanish king, as a consequence of the advance of Napoleon, strove for a new monarchist solution.

José Artigas: “The Most Miserable Are To Become the Most Privileged”

The Latin American historiography has not only been Eurocentric and androcentric, it has also been written from the perspective of the large countries and big cities. It is, for this reason, hard to find any comprehensive historical writing that search deep into the Haitian Revolution and its importance to the enterprise of Bolivar, or into the ideological importance of José Artigas and Banda Oriental to the American legacy of ideas. Artigas importance wasn't primarily military,

at least not if it is compared to that of men such as San Martín, but he was an ideologue and politician of much greater measures.

José Artigas was born on the eastern beach of Río de la Plata (known as *Banda Oriental*, present Uruguay) on the 19th of June, 1764, and died in exile in Paraguay in 1850. Among the great Ibero-American *caudillos* from the age of liberation he is one of the less known, particularly in Sweden. This might be because of his resistance to the centralism of Buenos Aires, which, after the foundation of Argentina, excluded Artigas from among its great sons (in the next chapter will consider what Sarmiento had to say about Artigas). He was the son of a landowner without much of a fortune, who became captain of the *Blandengues*-regiment, a military unit with customs assignments that was active on the border to the Portuguese Empire (present Brazil). Artigas was, in contrast to Bolívar and San Martín who were educated oligarchs, a more or less self-taught politician sprung from the deep American roots of the gaucho society (he got his basic education at *San Bernardino*, the school of the Franciscan monks in Montevideo). Artigas was a true *Criollo*, in the sense that to him no other reality was more paramount than the American reality. We will find traces of his origins in the subsequent literature as we are to study the ideology of Sarmiento, in his work *Facundo*, in which Artigas is presented as a true *gaucho*.

Artigas supported the May Revolution of 1810 in Argentina and later, in 1811, defeated the Spanish army in *Las Piedras*, outside of *Montevideo*. In 1813 he confirmed his greatness as a statesman in his famous *Instructions*, in which he laid out a federalist project for the region, which he opposes to the centralism of Buenos Aires. In 1815 he publishes his second, and perhaps most important, document, the *Reglamento de Tierras*, in which he presents an advanced program of land reforms that guarantees land property rights to the poorest and weakest. Here follows an excerpt from the document:

Article 6: For the present time being the mayors and their subordinates are to engage in the preparation of useful frames for farm labour. To this end he is to make an inventory of the available land and a list of the men who might use this land. Among these men, the most miserable are to be the most privileged. Thus, all free Blacks, free *Zambos*, Indians and poor *Criollos* are to be the potential receivers of an *estancia*, if they, through their work, partake in their own bliss, and in the bliss of the province.

Article 7: Poor widows are, in the same way, to be treated with

special favour if they have children, and married Americans are to be favoured before unmarried Americans, and these are to be favoured before non-Americans.⁸³

As from 1815, Artigas, as *Protector*, led the Banda Oriental-government. In 1820, faced with a new Portuguese advance, he retired to Paraguay where he stayed until his death in 1850. Concerning Indian rights, Artigas wrote the following in 1815:

I wish that the Indians would rule themselves in their villages, so that they might answer for their own interests, in the same way as we manage our own. In this way they will experience the joy that practical tasks bring and abandon the miserable present condition. Let us keep in mind that they have all the rights to the best treatment, and that it would be unworthy of us to prolong the present situation. Let us help them recover and to yet again possess the noble character that it has been their unfortunate destiny to degenerate from. To this end, let us give first priority to their affairs. Those who do not fulfil their duties ought to be punished, so that the action serves the love for the native country, for its people and its fellow beings.⁸⁴

The social ideas that are manifest here – among the texts of the *Reglamento de Tierras* from 1815 – speak their own clear language against the supposed American ideological dependence upon European sources of ideas.

Chapter 6: Liberalism, Romanticism and the Construction of the New Nations

The civilisation enterprise, the origins of which are to be found in France and England, found in the intellectuals that were friendly disposed towards Europe a channel through which it could influence the course of events in the new Spanish American nations. At the same time those countries supported the remaining liberation struggles against the lingering Spanish power bins. Also, Spain had to direct its forces towards another liberation struggle, this time in the homeland, against the occupational forces of Napoleon.

The romantic generation of intellectuals in Spanish America can be divided into two more or less separate groups: the *nationalists* and the *liberals*. It is sometimes the case that some of the historical actors in either of the groups act in a contradictory manner.

One group of intellectuals found, in nationalistic emotions, material for a strengthening of the conditions and potential of the continent. This group of *pensadores* worked in an understanding with the caudillo leaders and is opposed to the other group of romantics that are dominated by the ideology of liberalism.

The liberals, on the other hand, are characterised by their Eurocentrism and their pessimistic attitude towards the Latin American capacity for development. Men such as José Luis Mora (1794-1850) in Mexico, José Victorino Lastarria (1817-1888) in Chile, Francisco Bilbao (1823-1865) also in Chile and Juan Montalvo (1832-1889) in Ecuador fought against the conservatism of the Criollo leaders. Two Argentines do, however, stand out among these: Juan Bautista Alberdi (1810-1884) and Domingo Faustino Sarmiento (1811-1888). Their main antagonist was the gaucho leader Juan Manuel De Rosas, the man who personified the conservative Spanish legacy, but also the primitive ideologies of the Mestizos. Alberdi and Sarmiento were enemies in practice, but agreed on the need to transform the mentalities of the new countries. While Sarmiento saw the future in the importance of the cities, based on trade, industry and culture, Alberdi put his faith in the economic importance of the countryside.

Both Alberdi and Sarmiento considered immigration to be the main solution to the mentality problems of the new countries. Basing their arguments on racist ground, they wished to initiate an immigration of people with German blood, a people they considered to be superior to all others. This model had proved to be successful in North America and was, according to them, worth trying out also in Spanish America. Leopoldo Zea writes that such a project could only have originated in individuals that were alien to the actual reality, a reality that they wished to replace instead of transform.⁸⁵

The liberal racist project assumed different forms in different countries. Justo Sierra wrote, in Mexico, that the mixing of blood was the only reasonable solution available to the country. Hidden behind this is the thought that the more white blood that can be put into circulation in the country, the better with respect to social quality. Sarmiento is clear on this: the intelligence of the Spaniards was atrophied after centuries of inquisitorial dominance. He sees the brain as a muscle that is atrophied if it isn't used. Further, Sarmiento believed that as the descendants of Spaniards, Americans had a just as small, if not smaller, brain, because of the mixing with Indian blood. "As it is known – Sarmiento writes – the size of the Indian brain is even smaller".⁸⁶ According to Sarmiento, "*Indians do not think, they feel*".

Indeed, a Spaniard or an American from the 16th century ought to have said: I exist, therefore I do not think! Thus, she wouldn't have existed if she, unfortunately enough, had thought.⁸⁷

The civilisation enterprise had three goals: to substitute the blood, the mentality and the European reference and the economic and cultural dependence upon Spain, England, the United States and France.⁸⁸

Literary Americanism and Nationalism: the Birth of Latin America

The liberation war, which had begun circa 1810, continued for two or three decades. The Spanish Empire had, soon after 1830, fallen into a series of new political pieces. The dreams of Bolivar, San Martin and Artigas, concerning the founding of greater nations, fell into pieces because of the varying interests of the various regions and the old Empire was "balkanised". Political chaos was predominant and this instability was favourable to the great powers that intervened in the

formation of the new nations. The old viceroyalty of Rio de la Plata was divided according to the influence of the various regions and Uruguay was separated from it as a result of an English intervention in 1828. Venezuela and Ecuador are separated from *Gran Colombia* in 1830. This new scene is dominated by new ideas that, in part, will replace the Enlightenment legacy. A new romantic philosophy arrives from Europe to enrich the new nationalistic winds. Nationalism in Spanish America is constructed from an older regionalism, i.e., from the economic interests of specific groups, rather than from various cultural or ethnical oppositions.

Romanticism in Spanish America is predominant until the 1870s when positivism replaces it. Among the romantic qualities that at an early stage is mirrored on the continent, the primary one is the focus on inherited ethnical traits. The Mestizo culture gives rise to two opposite attitudes. On the one hand the liberals that compare the new growing nations to those in North America and Europe are worried. On the other hand nationalistic emotions are born, which eulogise Latin American reality. It is obvious that the new generations of intellectuals suffer from an identity crisis, and that the distance between the intellectual elite of the cities and the political leaders of the countryside increases and is turned into an open confrontation. The *caudillos* of the liberation war are most often in perfect agreement with the people of the countryside, but they do not understand the liberal demand for modernisation and vice versa. The Eurocentric norms of the intellectuals are perceived by the public to be unrealistic and alien.

The new nationalism will be expressed first and foremost in the literature and is, in specialised circles, known as *the literary Americanism*. The phenomenon first appears with one of the ideological characters of the revolution, Andres Bello; one of the most complex personalities of the period. In 1823, in London, Bello wrote *Alocución a la poesía* (*Allocution to poetry*) in which the first lines urged:

it is time for you to leave effete Europe,
no lover of your native rustic charms,
and fly to where Columbus's world
opens its great scene before your eyes.⁸⁹

The process had, however, begun earlier, during the first days of the revolution and through the politically loaded words found in the

papers of the barricades. During the first years of the 19th century a new political terminology, which is capable of expressing the new arising reality, is developed. One of the first problems that had to be solved was the finding of new denominations for the old Spanish viceroyalties. The first suggestion was Miranda's *Magna Colombia* and its qualities were called "Colombian". America (Amerigo Vespucci) was contrasted to Columbus. Francisco Miranda printed the paper *El Colombiano* in London in the 1810s. It was the first patriot paper that addressed the entire continent but it was to be followed by many others.

Juan García del Río (1794-1856) was born in New Granada (Colombia) and started off as a journalist in Santiago, in 1818. He was one of the men who were closest to San Martín and O'Higgins. Here he published *El sol de Chile* (1818-19) and *El Telégrafo* (1819-1920). They were informative papers that intended to inform on the advancement of the revolution. In these papers he spoke of a "Colombian Revolution" and the term "Colombian" was meant to refer to Latin America.

Juan García del Río followed San Martín to Perú, where he, in 1821, founded *The Colombian Library* (Biblioteca Colombiana). The word "library" meant "archive" or "inventory". This journal was followed by a new one, which he published together with Andres Bello and which was printed in London, in 1823, and titled *The American Library*. During the first years the literary Americanism was continental and it was born *prior to* the construction of the new nations.

After 1830 the situation changed and the romantic ideals made a definite entry into the conceptual schemes of the intellectuals. During this process the various national literatures developed. It was Esteban Echeverría (1805-1851) who as from 1832 introduced the romantic concepts in both Spanish America and Spain (as from this period America frequently influenced Spain). Echeverría was one of the most important dedicated persons in a group of young Argentinean intellectuals that in 1837 formed the "Literary Salon" and in 1838 the "Association of the Young Argentine Generation" also known as the "May Association". As a result of a conflict with the caudillo Juan Manuel de Rosas these young intellectuals fled to Montevideo where they, together with the Uruguayan Alfredo Lamas, founded the journal *El Iniciador*. On the other side of the continent, in Mexico, the first literary association was formed, the *Letrán Academy* (Academia de Letrán), which, just like the Argentinean intellectuals, strove for a "Mexicanisation" of the literature. Finally, Juan María Gutierrez (1809-1878) published *América Poética* in

Valparaiso between 1846 and 1847, a work that consists of 816 pages and also is the first Spanish American anthology.⁹⁰ The anthology included 53 poets from 11 countries.

In this romantic spirit the name “Latin America” was born. It was the Colombian José María Torres Caicedo (1830-1889) who first made use of this denomination. Caicedo started using it as early as in the 1850s. Several years afterwards, in 1875, he wrote that the term “Latin America” was an expression that referred to the Spanish, Portuguese and French America. In 1855 he published a series of biographical and critical studies in Paris, for the Spanish American journal *El Correo de Ultramar*. After some years of work, he collected all of these articles in a book that was published in 1863. The book was divided into three volumes and consisted of a total of 1417 pages. It included accounts and critical studies by 56 authors from the entire continent.

Juan Bautista Alberdi

Juan Bautista Alberdi (1810-1884), an Argentinean *pensador*, was one of the romantics who fought against the dictatorship of Juan Manuel de Rosas. He and Domingo Faustino Sarmiento were in agreement when it came to the colonial mentality that lingered in the mentality of the new nation and that thus had to be driven away by means of an intellectual revolution. His worldview was Eurocentric and he was, just like Sarmiento, a great admirer of the North American revolution. Alberdi put forth his philosophical points of departure in a curriculum with the title *Ideas pertaining to a course in contemporary philosophy*. In the text a quality that, since the days of Las Casas, characterises Latin American thought becomes manifest, the anthropological reflection:⁹¹

In this way our studies will engage in applied philosophy, in the positive and realistic philosophy, in philosophy as it is applied to the social, political, religious and moral interests of our countries. We will work on the favourite philosophical paths of our century: that is, the social and political philosophy. Such was the conception of philosophy of Damiron, Lamennais, Lerminier, Tocqueville, Jouffroy, and so on. Day after day, the philosophical activity is transformed, becomes one with political science, with finance, with history, with industry, with literature, instead of being identified with logic and psychology. Philosophy has, by a famous new thinker, been defined as the science of

generality.⁹²

Domingo Faustino Sarmiento

Domingo Faustino Sarmiento was born in San Juan, present Argentina, in 1811 and died in Asunción del Paraguay in 1888. He is the author of one of the Latin American classical works in the history of ideas, *Facundo, Civilisation and Barbarism*, from 1845. He belonged to the generation of romantic liberals that stood outside of the new growing reality and that by all means strove to transform it according to European and North American models. Particularly romantic was his conviction that the qualities of a people were innate and couldn't be affected by means of education. Despite of being a schoolteacher and devoting a significant part of his life to questions pertaining to education, Sarmiento had less faith in the importance of education than he had in innate inherited qualities. Regarding this, Sarmiento stands out in the crowd of thinkers that were influenced by the Enlightenment, i.e., thinkers like Andres Bello before him and the positivists and Krausists after him. His conception of the *gaucho*, the soldier of the liberation war and the new cultural soul of the republics, is summarised in the following:

The gaucho do not work; he finds his food and clothing served in his house; he gets other necessities from the cattle that either is his own, belongs to a family or the employer he works for. The attention that the cattle calls for consists of some scattered horse runs that he carries out for his own sweet pleasure. The branding of the cattle is conceived of as a celebration – exactly like the wine harvest is conceived of by the winegrower. On this occasion they all gather to show off their lasso proficiencies.⁹³

Particularly revealing is his description of José Artigas, whom he considers to be a primitive gaucho leader. In the middle of the liberation struggle that was carried out against Spain, a more or less open confrontation took place between the “conservative” gaucho leaders and the liberal, “towards civilisation friendly disposed”, forces that were supported by England, France and after some time also by the United States. An early example of this confrontation took place in the region of Rio de la Plata, between Buenos Aires and the other provinces, with Artigas as its greatest leader. He writes:

General Rondeau besieged Montevideo with a disciplined army. To this siege Artigas, a famous caudillo, came with a couple of thousand of his gauchos. Artigas was until 1804 a horrifying smuggler, whom the authorities in Buenos Aires managed to win over to the side of the liberation struggle, as a commander. [...] One day Artigas broke with Rondeau and started to make war against him. [...] Artigas, at that time, fought against both realists and republicans.⁹⁴

The Unitarians, to which Sarmiento refers, are represented by the troops of Rondeaus from Buenos Aires. Artigas represented federalists, i.e., those who wished to substitute a federation of provinces or states for the Spanish dominion, instead of an unitary republic with Buenos Aires as its centre. Sarmiento continues to describe the *gaucho*:

The gaucho was the element that Artigas put in motion; a blind instrument, albeit full of life, with violent instincts against the European civilisation, just as reluctant towards the monarchy as towards the republic, since they were both born in *the city* and signified order and authority. This spontaneous movement was provincial and genial, it was so original that is hard to understand how the political parties in the cities were able to incorporate it in its political spectrum. The forces that supported Artigas in Entre Ríos were the same that supported López in Santa Fé, Ibarra in Santiago and Facundo in los Llanos. Individualism was their essence, the horse their exclusive weapon, the vast Pampa their scene.⁹⁵

Much can be criticised in this text because it isn't based upon reality. Sarmiento looks upon Artigas and the gaucho in the same way as once Vespucci looked upon the Indians or Schefferus upon the Sami people. One doesn't look, but applies ones own concepts to what one sees. In reality, the gaucho was far from being an "individualist". The term is, on the contrary, quite easily applied to Sarmiento himself. The conception of freedom of the gauchos reminds of that of the Indians and has a collectivist foundation. The freedom of the gaucho is limited by his subordination to the group and its leader. His actions might be perceived as chaotic, as long as they act out within the framework of the collective. Discipline, to the gaucho, means to learn to obey the group. The liberal individualistic conception of freedom, on the other hand, presumes the questioning of the authority of the group.

Part III: Modernity

Chapter 7: Positivism and Krausism in Latin America

Positivism

Of all the Latin American streams of ideas the most well known in Europe is *positivism*. Much has been written on the influence of the positivist ideas on political and pedagogical thought in Latin America. It is true that positivism more or less dominated Latin American thought during the last 25 years of the 19th century, but its influence has an earlier beginning and it lasts longer, by finding a common platform in the practical, non-metaphysical way of considering reality that characterises the ideological activity of the area.

Many European Americanists find it difficult to demarcate the limits of the positivist era against the romantics before, and against the *Krausists* and other spiritualists afterwards. The reason for this difficulty might be found in the fact that Latin American periodization cannot be equated with European periodizations. We have seen how the American basic philosophical attitude has been characterised by issues of action, particularly influenced by anthropological reflections. Adjacent fields of action – like the pedagogical and political ones – were also affected by the colonial-anti-colonial dispute. The Latin American anthropological philosophy has been directed by conflicts of identity, by oppositions for and against the European legacy, something that was mirrored in the conservative and liberal ideologies which, in a paradoxical way, strove towards independence. Positivism was merely a stage in this process, a stage that dominated the ideological arena during 30 years, but the consequences of which can be found everywhere in the social structures of these countries even today. The advancement of positivism in Latin America relied upon native conditions. It fitted the ongoing development perfectly, it even offered a new excuse for secularising society and for once again renouncing Catholic scholasticism. Also, the content of the positivist thoughts varied from nation to nation. We must remember that, until the beginning of the 20th century, communications between the intelligentsia of the various countries were sparse and most fre-

quently occurred through European contacts.

Since European positivism is represented by several varieties, it is appropriate to begin by briefly introducing it. Concerning this, Arturo Ardao writes:

In France there have been many interpretations of positivism, from that of its creator Comte, to that of Taine, and many others, such as Littré, Laffitte, Renan etc. In England, positivism varied from John Stuart Mill to Spencer. And might add Darwin, Bain, Huxley. It would be easy to enumerate many others listed in most histories of philosophy.⁹⁶

It was Auguste Comte who baptised a philosophical standpoint that for a long time had been predominant in scientific circles and that can be seen as a natural consequence of the increasing importance of science within society and culture. In Brazil, Comte's positivism was predominant and the national flag still today displays the positivist motto: "Order and Progress". In Brazil, positivism became the political ideology that in 1899 proclaimed the republic. It entered the political intelligentsia through *the positivist society* in Rio de Janeiro. This association was founded in 1876 by Benjamin Constant Botelho de Magalhaes. After Benjamin Constant Botelho de Magalhaes positivism was led by Demetrio Ribeiro who strove towards implanting Comte's idea of a "republican dictatorship" in the country. Comte's thought was far from being liberal and his positivism is characterised by an ideological and political intolerance. His teachings proclaimed a "scientific religion" and a "sociocracy". Brazilian positivism managed to implant the "pure teachings" of Comte in the southern provinces of the country:

In spite of being a Republican, in politics Comte was against democratic liberalism. Between aristocracy and democracy, he visualized "sociocracy" based on what he called "Republican dictatorship". It was for this Republican dictatorship that the Brazilian positivists fought in the middle of the Constituency. They failed, but one of its delegates, Julio de Castilhos, implanted it in his state, Rio Grande do Sul. This was the only time in the history of the world that the constitutional ideas of Comte triumphed. Without going that far, Comte's positivism as a political doctrine was widespread in the whole country before and after the fall of the Empire.⁹⁷

Positivism in Brazil also influenced religious thought. In a nation characterised by rich religiosity it isn't surprising to learn that even

positivism managed to introduce new elements to it. Comte had proclaimed a “religion of humanism” and this proclamation was realised in Rio de Janeiro in the *Apostolado* of the positivist Church, by Miguel Lemos and Raimundo Teixeira Mendes. In this city the *Temple of Humanism* was consecrated in 1897.

Positivism in Argentina followed another path. Here political positivism didn't have much of an influence. Its consequences were, compared to those of positivism in Brazil and Mexico, never that significant. Positivism in Argentina was of an Anglo-Saxon variant and the evolutionist ideas of Spencer became particularly important. In this spirit a pedagogical science, planned according to the standards of natural science, developed. In the region of Rio de la Plata the Argentinean-Uruguayan Francisco Berra was active. His theories had a great impact even upon the Europe of those days.

In Mexico positivism followed on the path of Comte. To start off, new pedagogical criteria were derived from these ideas, but later they extended their influence to cover also political life. The leading positivist thinker in Mexico was Gabino Barreda. At length Spencer's Anglo-Saxon positivism grew in importance without completely replacing the ideas of Comte. These two forms of positivism together partly made up the ideology that characterised *the scientist party*, a political party founded in the 1890s that was immensely important to the political development of the country.

In Brazil official positivism, although important was accidental; in Argentina positivism was official only to the extent that it influenced the political leaders of the time; on the other hand, in Mexico it became the official line during the long dictatorship of Porfirio Diaz. The party of the Scientists, from the very beginning stronger than the Conservative Liberal parties and inspired by the great intellectual Justo Sierra, adopted the positivist ideology as its political creed. Thus resorting to Comte, they found a justification for the dictatorship as a means of maintaining order based on scientific principles. They also invoked the ideal of liberty borrowed from Mill and Spencer but applied it only in economic matters.⁹⁸

Positivist ideas in Mexico were identified with the government of Porfirism, which was conquered during the revolution of 1910. This great revolution of 1910 was also the end of the glorious days of positivism in Mexico.

Positivism in Europe developed as a consequence of the advancement of the natural sciences. Such advancement within the scientific domain cannot, however, exist in Latin America. The conclusion might even be drawn that the conditions for scientific activity heavily deteriorated after the liberation from Spain. The knowledge and the proficiencies required for such activity were in the hands of the religious orders. In contrast to Europe, secularisation in the beginning of the 19th century changed the conditions for scientific activity for the worse. This situation was improved by positivism, actively seeking to change these conditions for the better.

In Europe positivism evolved as a philosophy of scientism developed as a reaction against philosophy, as a consequence of the historical victory of the natural positive sciences. [...] In Latin America the process was just the reverse. Scientific positivism did not originate from science; it was science that evolved from scientific experience. Thus furnishing us a model from which we could draw when attempting to establish science in Latin America with the help of positivism as an ideological tool. When positivist doctrines started to reach Latin America, early in the second half of the XIXth century, there was almost a complete lack of scientific culture in our countries, in the sense of experimental physical-mathematical knowledge. Therefore, positivist doctrines went beyond mere acquisition of new knowledge; they involved the adoption of a new methodology, that of the natural sciences.⁹⁹

Thus, positivism in Latin America had to work to *create* scientific conditions, rather than merely being a *consequence* of these.

Krausism

Karl Christian Friedrich Krause (1781-1832), practically unknown to his contemporaries in Germany and hardly to be found in any philosophical encyclopaedia outside of the Latin world, made a synthesis of the philosophy of Schelling and Hegel. He advocated a form of liberalism that built upon a “harmonic reason” and pantheism. Krause considered the conception of reason of the Enlightenment to be destructive. Instead he suggested a new conception of reason that would “unite” reality in syntheses instead of “discriminating” it. Concerning this, he thinks of himself as the true follower of Kant.

Krause considered Christianity to be an original and positive re-

ligion, which, however, was loaded with negative elements of non-Christian ethics. Krause turned to the ideology of the freemasons and wrote several books on their history (1810). In connection with his concept of freedom, Krause introduced the concept “pantheism” to describe his view of the world as “identical to the divine”. Krause’s pantheism was meant to confront the deism of the Enlightenment. His perhaps most famous and important work is *Das Urbild der Menschheit* (The ideal of Humanity) from 1810. This work was translated into Spanish, by the Spaniard Sanz del Río, in 1860. Krause was a romantic and a Christian liberal, whose picture of the ideal state was inspired by the constitution of the United States, but also by the harsh mechanistic message of utilitarianism. This is why Krause – as a representative of an alternative model to utilitarianism and positivism – could achieve such a breakthrough, that didn’t come off in his own country or, for that matter, in the German world, in the Spanish world. The influence of Krausism, even though not as revolutionary as that of positivism, lasted just as long. It is also, like positivism, still today an unseparable constituent of the ideological material of the Latin American countries.

The Krausist conception of the state presumes a coordinated free standpoint where all social actors act freely and independent of the state. He continues on the path of Montesquieu and accepts the importance of the mechanisms of modern democracy. The most original political thoughts of Krause concerned the United States. With respect to this he follows a vision, stretching way back in time to men such as Pierre Dubois (1306), Eméric Cracé (1623), Sully (1640), Leibniz (1670), William Penn (1693), Alberoni (1736), Rousseau (1761), Bentham and Kant (1795).

Krause is introduced in Latin America through two of his students, who in turn were translated by some Spaniards. The most important of his students were Heinrich Ahrens (1808-) and Guillaume Tiberghien (1819-). In Spain Krausism became very important. Its most important exponent was Julián Sanz del Río (1814-1869).

The influence of Krausism in Latin America, as an ideological alternative to positivism, has been significant. But the consequences of its influence have been greater in some countries than in others. For instance, in Argentina, during the reign of Hipólito Yrigoyen (president between 1916-1922), Krausism became the main ideology of the political program of the UCR (Unión Cívica Radical), together with *Peronism* the most important political movement in the 20th century. In Uruguay

Krausism became the main ideology of the political reform that was implemented by the president José Batlle y Ordoñez during the period 1903-1907. The government of Batlle y Ordoñez transformed the country into the first Latin American welfare state. Finally, it ought to be mentioned that also José Martí (1853-1895) was deeply affected by Krausism; he refers to its philosophical message in many of his writings.

Chapter 8: The Reaction against Neo-Colonialism, Latin–Americanism

At the turn of the century the ideological climate changes towards its opposite. The attack of the United States on Mexico in 1847 and later the French attack upon the same country in 1861, transformed the political attitude of the public towards these countries and their ideological message. The foreign politics of the United States is primarily characterised by the new aggressive expansion that forces the Latin American countries to reconsider their ideological points of departure. The new intellectual generation instead turns its attention towards its own history to find political and cultural inspiration. The new project renounces the earlier attempts at acculturation. In this group some persons stand out: the Uruguayan José Enrique Rodó (1871-1917), the Mexican José Vasconcelos (1882-1959), the Venezuelan César Zumeta (1864-1955), the Peruvian Manuel González Prada (1848-1918), the Mexican Alfonso Reyes (1889-1959), the Argentinean Manuel Ugarte (1878-1951) and the Cuban José Martí (1853-1895). This generation will find the roots for a promising and original future in the Mestizo culture.

When it comes to the ideological spirit that characterises this generation a splendid picture is available in the *modernist* literary projects. In his foreword to the journal *Revista de América*, printed in Buenos Aires in 1893, the Nicaraguan poet Ruben Darío (1867-1916) sketches some points for a modernist manifesto:

[...] we ought to be the link that connects and enhances the American idea in the universal artistic community. [...] We ought to fight against the fetishists and the iconoclasts. [...] Keep both the principle of innovation and the care for our traditions and the teachings of our masters. [...] Strive for the perfection of the Spanish language and at the same time guard its ancient abundant vocabulary, rhythm and plasticity. [...] Work for the love of the eternal beauty that today is threatened by utilitarian streams. [...] Serve the New World in the greatest cities of Latin America, the intellectual aristocracy in the Spanish-speaking republics.¹⁰⁰

José Enrique Rodó

The Uruguayan José Enrique Rodó (1871-1917) is one of the great Latin American enigmas. His main work *Ariel* (1900) is a critical idealistic book that became one of the most widely read books of his time. His sources of inspiration were Greek and Christian, rather than American. Rodó's primary message is to emphasise humanistic values over materialistic ones, and the Latin culture over the Anglo-Saxon positivist and utilitarian one. Among his other works are *Liberalismo y jacobinismo* (1906), *Motivos de Proteo* (1909) and *El Mirador de Próspero* (1913).

The enormous success of Rodó has to be seen as a reaction against positivism and as a consequence of the politics of expansion of the United States in Mexico and Central America. In their book *Latin American Political Thought and Ideology*, Miguel Jorrín and John D. Martz cite one of his most popular observations; when he establishes that the Latin America of those days suffered from an obsession with North America:

The utilitarian conception as the idea of human destiny, and equality at the mediocre level as the norm of social proportion, make up the formula, which in Europe they call the spirit of Americanism. It is impossible to think of either of these as inspirations for human conduct or society...without at once conjuring up by association a vision of that formidable and fruitful democracy there in the North, with its manifestations of prosperity and power, as a dazzling example in favour of the efficacy of democratic institutions and the correct aim of its ideas. ... The vision of a voluntarily *delatinized* America, without compulsion or conquest, and regenerate in the manner of its Northern archetype, floats already through the dreams of many who are sincerely interested in our future, satisfies them with suggestive parallels they find at every step, and appears in constant movement for reform or innovation. We have our *mania for the North*. It is necessary to oppose to it those bounds, which both sentiment and reason indicate.¹⁰¹

José Martí

In the writings of the Cuban José Martí one finds a recapitula-

tion of the 19th century Latin American struggle for political independence and cultural identity in the new arising world. Cuba was still, in 1898, under Spanish dominion. In the process that brings liberation to Cuba, the United States actively took part and had obvious neo-colonial intentions. This complex situation is treated in the texts by Martí, in which he develops his own political project. He encourages the Latin Americans to look to their own reality, no matter how unpleasant it might be. He urges them to confront the existing problems with the intention of finding their own solutions. In a clear reference to Sarmiento, Martí writes:

There is no prevailing confrontation between civilisation and barbarism, but one between the falsely erudite and nature. [...] The native *Mestizo* has defeated the exotic Criollo. [...] The imported book has been defeated by the natural man. [...] The natural man is humble and subordinates to a superior intelligence if this intelligence does not wish to exploit the advantage by suppressing.¹⁰²

The Philosophy of Bergson in Latin America

Henri Bergson (1859-1941) might be seen as one of those thinkers who, without having much originality, fit the needs of their time but also offer ideological material that soon gets outdated and vanishes from the daily debate. He grew up in France and was raised in the positivist tradition but reacted against it and created an intuitionist and vitalistic philosophy that often approaches mysticism. Undoubtedly, his thoughts had their greatest influence in Latin America, but in contrast to Krause and Krausism, his ideas were successful also in Europe. He advocated the use of reason against reason, a thought that anticipated the present postmodern “deconstruction” a la Derrida.

As we have seen earlier, positivism in Latin America was the creation of a generation that underwent a deep identity crisis and wished to transform the nature of the continent, by more or less replacing it with a reality imported from the European world. Positivism in Latin America was an applied ideology without the foundations in natural science that justified its existence in Europe. Bergson’s philosophy thus offered a methodology for the re-establishment of a connection with the real problems and with the ideological forms that were closer to the

cognitive experiences of the great masses. Bergson influenced some of the most important Latin American thinkers, among these were the Mexicans José Vasconcelos (1882-1959) and Antonio Caso (1883-1946); the Argentines Alejandro Korn (1860-1936), Alberto Rougés (1880-1945) and Coriolano Alberini (1886-1960); the Peruvian Alejandro Deustua (1849-1945); the Chilean Enrique Molina (1871-1964); the Uruguayan Carlos Vaz Ferreira (1872-1958) and the Brazilian Raimundo de Farias Brito (1862-1917). The philosophy of Bergson was central to the Mexican Revolution of 1910. This revolution ended a 30-year old period of positivism in the service of Porfirism (i.e. the positivist government of Porfirio Díaz).

José Ortega y Gasset and *perspectivism*

José Ortega y Gasset (1883-1955) was a Spanish philosopher that had a deep impact upon the Latin American world of ideas. He is most famous for his doctrine concerning historical *perspectivism*. According to this doctrine truth always depends on perspective, i.e., the point of view from which one observes the course of events. This was an old theory of cultural relativism in a new form that was particularly suitable to a Latin America deeply in conflict with positivism. The thoughts of José Ortega y Gasset were also influenced by Krausism and this made the reception of his works in Latin America easier. The influence of José Ortega y Gasset in Latin America transcends the philosophical sphere. He did important work also as a publisher of the most important journal of those days, *Revista de Occidente*. He was also a book-publisher for one of the largest publishing houses of our days: Espasa-Calpe. Through these institutions he introduced works by Dilthey, Husserl, Hartmann, Heidegger and so on, in Latin America.

He got two important followers in Mexico, Samuel Ramos (1897-1959) and his older student from Spain, José Gaos. Other important followers were Edmundo O'Gorman, Justino Fernández and Leopoldo Zea. The last one is perhaps the most influential philosopher and historian of ideas that has been active in Latin America during the last 50 years. Through the epistemology of José Ortega y Gasset a philosophical school that attempts to develop a national philosophy is launched, and this is the set of problems that has been predominant in Latin American thought since the 1950s.

Chapter 9: Philosophical and Scientific Thought in the 20th Century

The Generation of the Founders

In Latin America academic philosophy was born at the turn of the century and it can without a doubt be linked to the modernist (the Krausist, Bergsonist, Orteguist, etc.) reaction against positivism. It is only as from now that we can begin to speak of a Latin American academic (i.e., professional) philosophy. We have already observed how the modernist programme was an attempt at a reorientation towards ones roots and a repudiation of the positivist lack of Latin American identity. To the first generation, which also sets the academic agenda, belong, among others, the Mexicans José Vasconcelos (1882-1959) and Antonio Caso (1883-1946), Carlos Vaz Ferreira (1872-1958) in Uruguay, Alejandro Korn (1860-1936) in Argentina, Enrique Molina (1871-1964) in Chile, Octavio Deustua (1849-1945) in Perú and Raimundo de Farias Brito (1862-1917) in Brazil. Depending upon in which country these philosophers are active, the influence of this generation takes root some years earlier or some years later. The process first kicks-off in Argentina, Uruguay and Perú.¹⁰³

This generation aims to combine the philosophical and technical instruments of the contemporary European philosophical academies with a reflection of their own, more or less tied to the Latin American reality. The result was a technically competent production that was original enough to be domestically useful. This generation, just like the next one, worked to build a technical foundation that was to facilitate the professional philosophical activity of the succeeding generations.

To the second generation belong the Argentinean Francisco Romero, but also Emilio Oribe in Uruguay, Samuel Francisco Larroyo and Guillermo Héctor Rodríguez in Mexico, Victor Andrés Belaunde, Francisco García Calderon and Oscar Miro Quesada in Perú.

The third generation is dominated by the works of the Mexican Leopoldo Zea.

The Opposition Between Universalists and Regionalists: Is There a Latin American Philosophy?

After the Second World War, and in connection with the appearance of the third generation of academic philosophers, the original issues concerning identity once again are put at the centre of reflection. This occurs all over the continent but its most natural place is in Mexico, in the works of Leopoldo Zea and his students. The main issue now was whether one could or could not speak of a “Latin American way of doing philosophy”. The issue becomes clearer if we relocate the question to Sweden and ask ourselves if there is or isn’t a “Swedish way of doing philosophy”. The views fell into two camps. On the one hand there were the internationalists, who claimed that philosophy always is abstract and cannot be ethnically or culturally bound. On the other hand there were the regionalists, who claimed the opposite. Here we consider the rebirth of an old Latin American idea; that of ethno-philosophical ties to religion, history, language and race.

Even though this set of problems most certainly has troubled plenty of other thinkers in the history of philosophy, it has been a Latin American achievement to manage to convert it into a philosophical problem of an international character. In other words, it could be said that the opposition between internationalists and regionalists in the Latin American philosophy has led to the fact that the issue concerning the possibility of an “abstract” knowledge became an internationally recognised problem, and that this took place many years before the birth of *postmodernism*. The current debate between modernists and postmodernists has been a topical question in Latin America since the days of liberation. This opposition has assumed different forms and been the expression of various political rivalries between conservatives and liberals, and between positivists and Latin Americanists. The reason for this is that what in Europe is referred to as “modernism”, and is linked to the scientific revolution of the 17th century, never took place in Latin America. The scientific revolution comes to the continent as the main ideology of the colonial enterprise, and thus it became natural to question its universal significance. The colonial message of modernism is later amplified by the identity crisis of the romantics and the positivists.

Arturo Ardao has presented a fruitful model, which can be used to tackle this problem, in *La Inteligencia Latinoamericana* from 1987. He writes that the Latin American philosophy can be seen as Latin American with respect to its object of study – as when one is engaged in anthropological reflections – or to the ethnical and cultural affiliation of the reflecting subject – as when the person who is philosophising is doing this from the frame of reference of the Latin American culture. Ardao's presentation is fruitful because it shows how the issue can be approached from different and of each other complementing directions.

The ethno-philosophical debate has made it clear, among other things, that the roots of the philosophy of the classical period neither were abstract nor “international”. Without a doubt, the Greek philosophy was “ethnically situated”. The Greeks thought on the basis of their own problems and the Romans and the Christian scholastics acted in the same way. A real philosophy needs a firm foundation of issues to fall back upon in order to exist. Thus, the answer that this generation arrives at is that the path to a modern and original philosophy goes through an investigation into the deepest ethnical and cultural roots of ones own.

A Brief Summary of the Debate between Internationalists and Regionalists

In the book *Veinte Filósofos Venezolanos (1946-1976)*, printed in 1978 by Universidad de los Andes, the author Pompeyo Ramis collects and studies various answers within the Venezuelan philosophical tradition. According to Juan David García Bacca one cannot speak of a Latin American philosophy as long as “one do not avoid repeating all the conclusions that European thought reaches”. Here an obvious tendency within the Latin American intelligentsia is pointed out, the tendency to import everything that is produced in the European capitals. This attitude, very tangible when it comes to the positivists, lives on into our days and characterises the middle class culture of the big cities. García Bacca wants the philosophers to engage in scientific studies, for this is the only way to avoid futile repetitions. Here he points to the traditional lack of scientific studies on the continent. On the other hand, he draws the conclusion that if the Latin American philosophers engage in scientific studies with success, their results will be original but not “Latin

American”, since scientific results are “abstract” and thus ethnically and culturally independent. Let us note that García is referring to the philosophical reflection that takes Latin America as its object of study.

We have observed how the problem of a lack of original thought has bothered all of the generations since the liberation. On the other hand, there has not been a lack of voices pointing out that a copy never is a mirror image and that the Latin American *pensadores*, even when copying, have done this from their own perspective.

The author José R. Nuñez Tenorio thinks that a Latin American philosophy lacks significance because philosophical reflection, for natural reasons, is “universal”. If one, for example, studies the Latin American social conditions, what one achieves is a study that concerns the “socio-political modalities of the specific countries”, which in their turn is an expression of the “universal coordinates of the classes”.¹⁰⁴ Influenced by the assumptions of the internationalists, José R. Nuñez Tenorio does not seem to be willing to separate the different levels of abstraction of the reflection.

Ludovico Silva accepts the existence of a Latin American philosophical reflection, under the condition that it manages to produce “categories that might explain the underdevelopment of the continent”.¹⁰⁵ Now, all that has a Latin American object of study automatically is Latin American, but another condition is also posed: the reflection must be empirically justified, it must successfully make explicit how it produces a useful analysis.

Federico Riu does not think that philosophy can contribute in any meaningful way to solve the problems of Latin America. He does not put his faith in a Latin American philosophy because such a philosophy never is regional enough, but instead locked in a national perspective.¹⁰⁶ Here a “middle internationalism” is striven for.

To Juan Antonio Nuño it is impossible to speak of a Latin American philosophy, in the same way as it is impossible to speak of a “Danish or German physics”.¹⁰⁷ Here the positivist legacy that dominates the internationalists can be found once again. But he forgets that we might very well speak of the “school of Nils Bohr” or of “the Swedish botanical school after Linnaeus”.

Ernesto H Battistella Sacchi thinks that “we are the followers of existentialism, phenomenology, Thomism, Hegelianism and Marxism, but we lack those who cultivate analytic philosophy.”¹⁰⁸ In other words,

Battistella Sacchi finds a solution in a new ideological “import” of the new philosophical positivism: analytic philosophy.

This brief overview makes it clear that the debate concerning the Latin American philosophical identity follows classical patterns, which as from the liberation have put liberals and conservatives in opposition to each other, for once to produce a new synthesis of the anthropological search for an ideological identity.

Arturo Rosenblueth, Humberto Maturana and Francisco Varela: Philosophy of Science and Postmodern Information Society

Latin American history of science does not merely consist of parallel peripheral imports from Europe and the United States. In certain contexts Latin American thought has been included as an important ingredient in the ultra modern processes that have a European or North American origin. To understand this one ought to keep in mind that Latin America, since the end of the 19th century, has achieved a very high academic quality in the biological disciplines and particularly in medicine and other related domains and technologies. It is the sciences of life that introduce Latin America to modernity.

In the 20th century, and as a consequence of the rapid technical development that just after the Second World War produced the first computer and the first computer programs, a crucial investigation into the “mechanisms” of life flourished in the top western centres of research. The problem was not a new one. It originated in the mechanistic philosophy of Descartes, in which the concept of a “robot” was actualised. During this period some important technical developments had been completed. One of those was the feedback mechanisms that at the same time triggered an important philosophical debate concerning the possibility of developing artificial life. Other key concepts to a philosophical understanding of the period are *entropy* and *information theory*. Two important participants in those early studies were the neurobiologists Arturo Rosenblueth from Mexico and Humberto Maturana from Chile. Arturo Rosenblueth cooperated with Norbert Wiener (1894-1964) in the development of cybernetics. In the book *The Human use of Human Beings, Cybernetics and Society* from 1950, Wiener writes:

I devoted the last chapter to the problem of the industrial and social impact of certain control mechanisms which are already be-

ginning to show important possibilities for the replacement of human labour. However, there are a variety of problems concerning automata which have nothing whatever to do with our factory system but serve either to illustrate and throw light on the possibilities of communicative mechanisms in general, or for semi-medical purposes for the prosthesis and replacement of human functions which have been lost or weakened in certain unfortunate individuals. The first machine which we shall discuss was designed for theoretical purposes as an illustration to an earlier piece of work which had been done by me on a paper some years ago, together with my colleagues Dr. Arturo Rosenblueth and Dr. Julian Bigelow.¹⁰⁹

Arturo Rosenblueth wrote, among other things, *Mente y Cerebro*¹¹⁰, *La Psicología y la Cibernética*¹¹¹ and *El Método Científico*¹¹². Together with Wiener and Bigelow, Rosenblueth published *Behaviour, purpose and teleology*¹¹³. The philosophy of Rosenblueth can be described as Cartesian, including a strict dualistic view of the relation between thought and the brain. However, Rosenblueth denies the possibility of any form of referential relation between the physical incitement and the neurophysiological reaction. Concerning this, his position might be described as a form of “parallelism” between physical and neurophysiological processes.

Humberto Maturana worked on exactly the same problem but found a totally different solution that he in time developed further with his younger fellow countryman, and also neurologist, Francisco Varela. Their ideas were presented in two great works, *Autopoiesis and Cognition* from 1980 and *The Tree of Knowledge* from 1987. Since then, both have pursued a direction of their own, but still remained faithful to the original programme. Worth mentioning are the books *The Embodied Mind* by Varela, Rosch and Thompson, from 1991 and *Science and Daily Life: the Ontology of Scientific Explanations*, by Maturana, from the same year.

The first works of Maturana treated the neurophysiology and phenomenology of vision. These pioneer works make him one of the prominent figures of cognitive science. But the originality of Maturana is not restricted to his scientific works, but can also be found in his philosophical achievement. The philosophy of Maturana locates the foundation of cultural and social life in the biological sphere of life. The key to this metaphysics is the conception of life as an *autopoietic* organisation.

The main issue for Maturana and Varela is how living creatures are organised. They hold that life cannot be explained by means of an abstraction of all of the common qualities of living creatures. The set of living creatures is not defined by some common essence but by a particular form of organisation. The phenomenon of life could be explained if the generative mechanism, which if it was actualised would have life as a consequence, was found. In other words, if one could specify a particular form of organisation that would be identical to the one that is being identified as the organisation of life, one would have found an explanation of “what life is”. But if such a mechanism is found, say, a computer program, should the generative mechanism, except from being an “explanation of life”, also be an example of life? In other words, would one be able to identify the copied phenomenon with the real? And if one succeeded in this, would artificial life be identical to life?

It can be said that Maturana and Varela follow a tradition that originates in the first years of technology during the 1950s and 1960s in the United States. This process became known under the name of cybernetics and was developed by, among others, von Neumann and Norbert Wiener. In the 1980s cybernetics was transformed into “cognitive science”, and here the research on artificial life still had a place. A very productive group of researchers who took up the ideas of Maturana and Varela was the “A-Life-Group”. Christopher Langton, one of the most eminent members of the group, spoke of the nature of life as “a property of the organisation of matter, rather than a property of the matter that is so organised.”¹⁴

According to Langton and the A-Life-Group, life might form from the combination of simple matter and “complexity”. The most important aspect of this suggestion is that life, despite of the fact that it is made up by matter, is not one of the properties of matter. Life is not a form or a colour, not a “life force” associated with certain tissues or certain chemical combinations, but a form of organisation.

Among the organisational aspects of life are the, according to Maturana and Varela essential, relations of vicinity. These relations work independently of each other within an organism. Thus, coordination is not global. An immediate consequence of Maturana’s and Varela’s philosophy of life is that a computer program such as a “computer virus” ought to be considered to be “alive”.

Rodolfo Kusch and America *Profunda*

Rodolfo Kusch was born in Buenos Aires on the 25th of June, 1922, and died in the same city in 1979.¹¹⁵ He studied philosophy and worked as a senior high school teacher. His works can be described as autobiographical since his entire philosophical reflection is built upon an analysis of and a discussion concerning what he referred to as “my village”. The works of Kusch reconnect to the classical debate concerning civilisation and barbarism, this time through a profound study of the Indian ideological legacy. He worked in the directions initiated by other original thinkers. Among these Bernardo de Canal Feijoó (dead, 1982) and Saúl Alejandro Taborda (dead, 1944) ought to be included. From Canal Feijoó, Kusch inherited the difference between “to be” and “to be in”, which in Spanish is formulated with the verbs “ser” and “estar”. According to these thinkers, the Spanish culture “is in”, rather than “is”. The idea has been attained from the fact that many Indian languages lack a term that could correspond to the verb “to be”.

Kusch’s reflection is without a doubt western in an anthropological-philosophical style of investigation. When Kusch describes his village, it is populated by citizens, Indians and Gods. His works aim to grasp Inca thought and its internal coherence. In the search for that thought he will describe the profound America (*America profunda*), traces of which he finds everywhere in both the city and the province. According to Kusch’s description, the Andian presumes to “be in” a change of direction towards a centre of archaic and magical forces, in which the individual identity is devoured by the collective legacy. On the other hand, the western “to be” presumes a will to fulfil an individual destiny, to be identified with an individual content.

Here are some of Kusch’s works: *La ciudad mestiza* from 1952; *Seducción de la Barbarie: Análisis herético de un continente mestizo* from 1953; *América profunda* from 1966 and *Indios, porteños y dioses* from 1966.

Enrique Dussel and the Philosophy of Liberation

Enrique Dussel (1934) was born in Mendoza (Argentina), but since 1975 he has lived in Mexico. Dussel has written more than 50

books, including *Para una ética de la liberación latinoamericana* from 1973-1989, and *Filosofía de la Liberación* from 1977.

The philosophy of Dussel can be described as an anthropological reflection with Marxist roots. In a lucid ethical and political framework, Dussel attempts to construct the identity of the Latin American man. He finds that this identity can be realised through the action and the engagement in a process of liberation that is both individual and collectivist. His philosophy is also constructed around a rejection of most of the streams of European and Anglo-Saxon philosophy, which are predominant in western thought in the 20th century. Dussel seeks a philosophy that has its roots in the political actions of the Latin American man. Thus, the purpose of philosophy becomes to treat the most urgent of all problems, like poverty, oppression and alienation.

Ubiratán D'Ambrosio and Ethnomathematics

Ubiratán D'Ambrosio, Professor Emeritus in mathematics, was born in Brazil in 1932. He is seen as the one who inspired the pedagogical-anthropological movement known as "ethnomathematics". The movement was initiated in Brazil in the 1970s as the study of the philosophical-historical roots of mathematics, in connection with the Latin American pedagogical problems. The main idea was to investigate other non-western mathematical methods of presentation and education, particularly in elementary school and in the province, where the presence of Indian and African cultures was predominant. In 1977, under the *American Association for the Advancement of Science*, a seminar on the theme *Native American Science* was organised in the United States. During this seminar it was agreed to define these studies as "ethnomathematics". A link between the ethnomathematical project of D'Ambrosio and Paulo Freire's *Pedagogia do oprimido* and the pedagogical-political movement that was predominant in Brazil in the 1960s, can without much effort be found.

Chapter 10: Latin American Political Thought in the 1950s and 1960s

The Latin American culture is, after the Second World War, almost exclusively dominated by the confrontation with the United States, now framed within the logic of the Cold War. The earlier dominating confrontation with Europe is now only of a secondary importance. The Cuban revolution is, against this background, the most important political event of the 20th century and nothing can be understood, if this revolution and its significance to the culture are neglected.

Because the Cuban revolution adopted the Marxist political and economic ideology, the doctrines of Marx and Engels, for the first time, were to dominate the ideological debate in Latin America during the period 1950-1990. It is therefore important first to study the way in which Marx and Engels have looked upon Latin America.

Marx, Engels and Latin America

During the period 1847-1862, Marx and Engels wrote a series of articles for Charles Anderson Dana (1819-1897), the managing editor of *The New York Daily Tribunes* and *The New American Cyclopaedia* during the period 1858-1863. On the 8th of January, 1958, Marx wrote a short political biography on Simón Bolívar. Marx' sources were the *Historie de Bolivar, par le Général Ducondray Holstein, continuée jusqu'a sa mort par Alphonse Violette*, Paris 1831, *Memoirs of General John Miller* (in the service of the Republic of Perú) and Col. Hippislay's *Account of his Journey of the Orinoco*, London, 1819.¹¹⁶

The biography follows the course of events quite closely and a modern reader will not find anything new in it. However, the interpretation of the course of events is very interesting today. In Marx' text we are faced with a very unusual picture of "El Libertador", a picture that is very different from the one you would expect to get from a man like Marx. The difference between the text and the expectations is very informative with respect to the worldview of Marx and Engels.

In a letter from Marx to Engels, written on the 14th of February, 1958, Marx writes:

Moreover, Dana questions my article concerning Bolivar, because he maintains that it is written in a partisan style. He wishes to learn what my sources are. Certainly, I can state my sources, but the demand seems odd. I must admit the he is right concerning the partisan style. I have put the encyclopaedic style to the side. It would have been to go too far to present the cowardly, cruel and miserable villain, as Napoleon I.¹¹⁷

Undoubtedly, it is hard to recognise both Bolivar and Marx in this text. In the confrontation between Bolivar and Miranda, a confrontation that later also cost the latter his freedom, Marx clearly takes Miranda's part and considers Bolivar to be a traitor. And what is more, Marx gets the opportunity to pass judgement on the Latin American man in general, and on the Latin American temperament in particular. He paints a picture of an inconsistent and lazy villain. Here follows a short excerpt from Marx' biography on Bolivar, where he presents his opinions concerning the Spanish American temperament.

When he finally had proclaimed himself "dictator" and "Liberator of the western provinces of Venezuela", he founded the Libertador-order, an elite army "Guardias de Corps" and a form of court. But like most of his fellow countrymen, he was incapable of any extended effort and his dictatorship soon was transformed into a military anarchy in which the most important commissions were placed in the hands of the favourites who in their turn undermined the public finances and later took to horrible measures to restore them.¹¹⁸

In another article, Engels writes about California and the confrontation concerning this region that made Mexico and the United States oppose each other. On the 15th of February, 1849, the following text was published in the Marxist newspaper *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* under the title of *The democratic pan-slavism*. The text had no signature, but it is known that the author was Engels. It was written as an answer to Mijail Bakunin's *An invitation to the slavish people*.

Is Bakunin supposed to accuse the North Americans of a "war of conquest", which, for that matter, puts into question the theory of "justice and humanity", but, however, has been done in the service of humanity? Or is it perhaps an accident that magnificent California has been conquered from the lazy Mexicans who did

not know what could be done? Is it perhaps a misfortune that the energetic North Americans, with the rapid exploitation of the gold, add greater amounts of resources to the economic circulation? Is it a misfortune that they concentrate a larger population in the favourable coast of the Pacific Ocean, that they build cities, and steamship routes, and railroads that run from New York to San Francisco? Is it a misfortune that the North Americans for the first time open the coast of the Pacific Ocean to civilisation and that they for a third time give the international commerce a whole new direction? The “independence” of some Spaniards in California and Texas will, for this reason, suffer, “justice”, and other moral principles, might be sacrificed in some places, but what is the significance of this when it comes to such grand universal historical events?

The profound Marxist belief in progress and its inner *civilisation-centrism* become obvious in the texts presented above. It also becomes obvious why these ideas could not be accepted in Latin America. If these ideas are viewed from the total perspective of the Latin American historical process, their Marxist affinity to various Eurocentric and colonial enterprises becomes clear. It was those qualities that delayed the advancement of the Marxist ideology in Latin America before the time of the Cuban Revolution. Not even Lenin’s reformulation of the fundamental principles of Marxism could prepare the way for the Marxist doctrines in Latin America before the 1950s. It was first when the Marxist ideas were reformulated in practice, in Cuba, that Marx “made sense” to the new generations.

The Leninist doctrine of the imperialist phase of capitalism forced, during the first half of the 20th century, the Latin American communist parties into subordinated supporting activities. Their activity mainly consisted in supporting the Soviet Union. And this was a role that in many ways reminded of the various roles in which earlier historical situations had cast the continent.

The Populist Reform in Latin America

The term “populism” is used to refer to a political phenomenon that still is only vaguely known. There is, however, no other term that is as important to an understanding of contemporary Latin America. Both

the political phenomenon, and the term that refers to it, are characterised by multiple meanings. Before we venture into a discussion of its application to Latin America, it might therefore be a good idea to discuss the extension of the semantic term. The adjective “populist” is, without a doubt, charged with a *negative* value. To many scholars, but primarily to the media, “populism” is a degenerated form of democracy, and/or the beginning of dictatorship. Let us here point out that we reject this interpretation, as too simplistic and Sarmientist, i.e., inspired by Sarmiento’s hostility to the spontaneous thought of Latin America.



Evita and Domingo Perón

According to Viviani Trías, the term “populism” was used already in the 19th century to refer to the North American *farmers’* movement.¹¹⁹ Populism is, to most scholars, a political symptom, an emotional condition, rather than a political doctrine. Scholars practically agree not to attribute any ideological originality to populism. Its ideological agenda is perceived as a more or less heterogeneous conglomerate of plagiarised ideas. Personally, I find that it is precisely this eclecticism that confers originality and strength to populism. There have been examples of populism in every Latin American country, but the most

well known case is perhaps the *justicialismo* of Juan Domingo Peron in Argentina.

Another great example is Jorge Elicer Gaitán. Gaitán was born in Bogotá, Colombia, in a poor side of town. He commenced his formal education at the age of eleven and by the age of fifteen he had already made himself a pretty clear concept of the world in which he lived. At an early stage, his thinking included traces of French philosophy from the turn of the century. He was also inspired by art and the literary classics. But above all it was his mother who inspired him to become who he later became. At the age of twenty-one Gaitán embarked his political career, although he had been interested in politics for a long time. His doctoral thesis in Law and Political Science at the *Universidad Nacional* in Colombia was titled "The socialistic ideas in Colombia". He was seventeen years old when he finished the dissertation. In 1926 he travelled to Rome, where he studied at the *Real Universidad*. In Rome he completed a doctorate in jurisprudence with an award-winning dissertation. Back in Colombia he became a strong political figure, blaming the government for national poverty. In 1928, during an enormous strike by the United Fruit workers in Magdalena, the military opened fire on a crowd of strikers. Gaitán claimed that the army acted under instructions from the United Fruit Company and used his power as a congressman and a lawyer to defend the workers. As a consequence he received the nickname "the people's tribunal". In 1933 he founded the "Leftist Revolutionary Union" (Unir). The idea was to avoid the two traditional parties (the liberal and the conservative) and create an alternative. He wished to create class-consciousness among peasants and workers. He got involved in a very personal manner, by distributing soap and toothpaste in poor neighbourhoods. During all of his life he possessed a strong aversion against poverty and ignorance. He wished for the taxi drivers to wear uniforms and disliked rope-soled sandals, worn by the humbler part of the population. Gaitán became Education Minister (1940), Labour Minister (1943-44), mayor of Bogotá (1936) and chief of the Colombian Liberal Party (1947-48). In April 9, 1948, he was murdered by a young man called Juan Roa Sierra. The murder started of a massive national revolt against the conservative government and a riot (*the Bogotazo*) leading to ten more years of bloody civil war, a period in Colombian history called *la Violencia*.

Populism developed out of the deep economic crisis that, after 1929, imposed itself upon the world. This economic crisis was pro-

longed in Latin America until the Second World War and traces of it remain until the 1950s. The great power centres of the western world have during this period partly lost control over the world economy and we find ourselves in a time when colonialism comes to an end. A time of political initiative dawns upon the periphery of the world, and Latin America stands ready to seize it.

In the last years of the 19th century and the earliest years of the 20th century, Latin America accepted a great amount of European immigrants. The great immigration, both because of its size and its quality, changed the Latin American society at its roots. At the coast of the Atlantic Ocean, for example, the scene is dominated by the Italian and German immigration, that arrives in large groups to Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay. These groups bring a high technical competence and also new ideologies. With the Italians the movement of the trade unions was born, and with it the organisations of anarchism, socialism and, at length, communism developed. After 1930, and as a clear consequence of the international trade, the stream of immigration lessened. The governments were troubled by the economic consequences of the crisis, and limited the process of immigration.

In parallel to the phenomenon of immigration an inner migration was initiated. A massive migration from the countryside to the cities took place. Earlier modest cities were transformed into great cosmopolitan urban milieus in just a couple of years. It is precisely during this period that the new modern Latin America is born. The inner migration created the slum areas of the cities, with their special folk cultures and mentalities. This process is characterised by new folk cultural phenomena, particularly within music, singing and poetry, with phenomena such as tango music in Argentina and Uruguay.

One could say that the process of urbanisation in Latin America, from the 20th century and on, has proceeded at a higher speed than the process of industrialisation. This has brought a massive and chronic unemployment, which is the basis of the common scepticism and “political disdain” that characterise “populism”. The inner migration from the countryside to the unemployment of the cities created a social group that in the literature is described as *half-proletarian*. We are dealing with a social group that lacks the consciousness of the worker and keeps the values and ideas of the farmer. The new citizens are still appealed by a mentality that is characterised by the *caudillos* of the pampas and by the political forms of organisation of the *montoneros*. The mentality that, a

couple of years earlier, characterised the liberation movement is still alive.

Through the new populism the ideologies and political visions of the farmers of the 19th century were adapted to the new urban milieu. This process of transformation was, however, followed by a corresponding process within the social elite. The abrupt entry of the new proletariat into society divided the growing middle class into two groups. An important and influential part of this middle class – most often within the military and academic elite – rejected the populist phenomenon, and remained hostile to this proletariat and its political forms throughout the years. One could say that the 19th century urban distrust of the *gauchos* and their leaders – once personified by Sarmiento and the positivists – was reformulated as the *military modernism* of the 20th century. An attempt to – once again by means of violence – adapt the spontaneous development of Latin America to the predominant interests of the world. Most of the military coups that took place from the beginning of the 20th century to Pinochet and the continental massacre of the leftist activists during the 1970s and 1980s belong to this *contra reform*.¹²⁰

From the Utopian Socialists to the Russian Revolution

Socialist and anarchist ideas came to Latin America during the second half of the 19th century, but even before this the world of ideas of the utopians was well known in certain intellectual circles. Esteban Echeverría (1805-1851) was born in Buenos Aires. He studied at Buenos Aires' University between 1822 and 1825. In 1825 he travelled to Paris on a scholarship handed to him by the Argentinean government. There he got in contact with the ideas of Saint-Simon and the left wing of the Parisian student movement. Against the liberal individualism, Saint-Simon put the so-called dogmas of “collective objective truths”. Back in Buenos Aires, he in 1838 founded the May Association (*Asociación de Mayo*), also known as the young Argentina (*La Joven Argentina*), which armed fought the Argentinean dictator of those days, Juan Manuel de Rosas. The project was a failure and Echeverría was forced into exile. He escapes to Montevideo, where he in 1848 publishes *Dogma socialista de la Asociación de Mayo*. In it the following words can be read:

In order to exist, man needs to feel that she is surrounded by

other creatures that justify her existence [...] so that her self is embodied by the others.¹²¹

Echeverría belongs to the romantic generation of Latin Americans that, just like Argentines such as Alberdi and Sarmiento, look upon the revolutionaries of the generation of the 1810s as failed thinkers and politicians, all too dominated by Spanish “psychology”. The mistake of the conservatives was, according to Echeverría, to give the *Plebeys* (“el pueblo plebeyo”) access to the power, through democratic suffrage. A good democracy was, according to Saint-Simon, based on the use of the reason of the people, and the reason was embodied by the intellectuals of the society.

At the end of the 19th century and at the beginning of the 20th century a great amount of immigrants came from Europe to the region of Rio de la Plata. This group brings to the classical society a whole new class form and strengthens the cultural role of the city. At the same time the first signs of industrialism come to these big cities in the form of foreign capital investments. This immigration is particularly noticeable in Argentina, Chile, Uruguay and southern Brazil. An urban proletariat is formed and the first trade unions are founded. Until the Russian Revolution these trade unions are dominated by anarchist ideas.

The few socialist parties that are founded, at this early stage, have an insignificant political influence and consider it their task to work to increase the interests of the workers movement. The Argentinean Trade Union Confederation (Federación Obrera de la República Argentina) is formed in 1890 (the socialist party was formed in 1901) and the Chilean counterpart (Federación Obrera de Chile) was born in 1909, already under Marxist control.¹²² In Brazil the Federação Operária Regional Brasileira (FORB) was formed in 1906. In Mexico the anarchists were very active both before and after the revolution of 1910. In Uruguay the socialist party was formed in the 1910s.

After the death of Lenin the importance of the communist forces increases in the continent while the anarchist influence decreases. The main political task of the communists, during the Stalinist era, is to function as support parties to the regional interests of the Soviet Union. The socialist parties have, during the 20th century, a hard time finding a suitable model that is neither identified with communist strategies, nor with the ideology of the European social democracy parties. With the fall of the government of Salvador Allende in 1973 such a third path seemed impossible to build.

Feminism in Argentina, Chile and Uruguay 1890-1949

Latin American feminism follows the same patterns of development as European feminism. It is a natural consequence of the society that developed out of the industrial revolution. The modern industry was in need of young and inexpensive labour and thus both women and children found a new place in the order of society. On the other hand, women at length were needed as consumers, with their own demands and purchasing power.

The search for answers to problems raised by recognition of the new social, economic, and political dimensions of womanhood was aided by a new ideology taking shape in Europe by 1880: feminism. Its origins and meaning were not altogether clear when it first came to the attention of alert minds in some of the fastest-growing urban areas of Latin America.¹²³

That women assumed an active role in the new society also brought about a transformation of the public life in general. For example, the importance of women's literature increased, and the cultural presence of women in the daily papers and other public forums transformed the common cultural opinion. Naturally, at length, the female demand for equality followed within various areas. Quite possibly, the political demand was the most tangible. Women wanted the same political rights as men, and this demand was summed up in the female suffrage movement. Feminism was in Latin America to develop in the shadow of the positivist movement with deep roots in political and pedagogical ideologies. A good example of this phenomenon is what happened in southern Latin America.

Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay shared several key political and economic characteristics in addition to their geographical proximity. In the late 1870s a generation of statesmen nurtured in liberal and positivist thought attempted to bring their countries into the mainstream of European and North American "progress".¹²⁴

The positivist spirit and the modernist ideologies that followed in the first decades of the 20th century helped the feminist movement in its striving towards equality. The decades from 1890 to 1940 proved a receptive time for raising questions about women and about gender relations within the family. The social and political elites of the turn of the century lost ground to more people oriented, if not populist, regimes

in which the needs of workers, peasants, students and women were voiced, heard and to some extent heeded.¹²⁵

The early Latin American feminism was not a unified movement but reflected the entire political spectrum. In spite of this, one can discern two main ideologies: socialism and liberalism. The socialists, who had deep roots in the working class, first and foremost fought to attain equality with respect to wages and working conditions of women and children. The liberals, on the other hand, who had their base among middle class women, focused their actions on questions concerning civil rights, rights of possession, etc., of women and children.

Two main feminist interpretations were adopted before 1910. One was socialist oriented, finding its inspiration in the writings of August Bebel. This feminism was conscious of class issues and found a niche in the labour movements of the three nations, especially after 1905, when the plight of women workers was discussed alongside that of their male counterparts. The other feminism had closer ties to the mid-nineteenth-century liberal feminism of men such as John Stuart Mill. It reflected the aspirations of middle-class women and men who approached the gender issues with an emphasis on the natural rights of individuals and the need to establish in law the equality of women and men.¹²⁶

Early feminism in Argentina, Chile and Uruguay can be divided into two generations. The oldest group of “founders” was active between 1900 and 1930. The other group was active between 1930 and 1940. Among these Alicia Moreau and Paulina Luisi, the first female physician in Uruguay (1909) who worked for feminism until 1950, can be found. The Chilean Elena Caffarena and the Uruguayan Ofelia Machado Bonet also fought actively for feminism until the 1980s.

In spite of the different class associations and ideologies, the various feminist groups never got into open conflict with each other. Difficult questions, like individual freedom and equality, were dampened with that which is called “compensatory feminism”, which defended both equality with respect to men, and at the same time the specific attitude of women with respect to motherhood and the like.

Having been denied intellectual capacity and personal freedom of action for a long time, feminists wanted to assert their right to be considered as good as men, but not the same as men.¹²⁷

In early feminism motherhood was a central aspect of the new ideology. By emphasising the significance of motherhood to humanity,

feminism defended the equal value of women in all other issues. Motherhood as a political idea unified women from different classes and ideologies, and at the same time placed the movement outside the range of male criticism. Concepts such as *Supermadre* (super-mother) and *Marianismo* (the Cult of the Virgin Mary) were created in the debate, always with the intention of emphasising the female role of motherhood.

Motherhood was another powerful ingredient in building a special ideology of gender. Southern Cone feminists embraced it wholeheartedly as the highest signifier of womanhood. Women's rights as individuals were important, but they never lost sight of the fact that most women became mothers and that motherhood caused some of the most serious problems they faced. The toil and sacrifice of working mothers were only one side of the coin. Motherhood demanded respect as a practical service to the nation.¹²⁸

In this context the discussion concerning women's health both before, during and after pregnancy became a crucial issue to early feminism. As a consequence the health and education of children also became an important ideological issue. The importance of the female presence within health care and the school increased, and at length became the area that was most significantly affected by the political engagement of women. The new age brought better educational possibilities and women immediately began to make use of this.

No study of feminism in its social context can afford to ignore the special attention given to the "mother-child dyad" by early twentieth-century social reformers. Long before suffrage caught their eye, early feminists were attempting to channel their own and other women's energies into improving women's and children's health. If there was a social problem amenable to women's special understanding, it was child care. Frightening rates of child mortality demanded better-designed public policies. The figures culled from contemporary data are essential to understanding the dimensions of the problem and why feminists made child care a part of their mission.¹²⁹

Among the health concerns that directly affected the situation of women was abortion. The issue became very controversial because often the rhetoric of the debate was used against the women's trump: i.e., motherhood. Statistical numbers, presented by both feminists and anti-feminists, displayed very high abortion rates. The first challenge was to demonstrate that the high abortion rates were a consequence of the

irresponsible sexual behaviour of men and women's lack of authority with respect to their own body. The women's movement made visible the sexual double standard of society. The exposed situation of the single mother and the rights of their children to a normal life were pointed out. The issue concerning abortion was, however, also linked to another controversial issue, namely that concerning eugenics:

Feminism also had a furtive rendezvous with eugenics as a tool for sexual and social reform. Eugenics, as understood and promoted in the Southern Cone, focused on public health programs to combat diseases that weakened a significant portion of the population. Thus, many feminists of both genders supported eugenics policies because they promised better health for future generations through attention to mothers and children, the elimination of sexually transmitted diseases, and the hope that pre-nuptial certificates would detect such diseases before marriage. Such an attractive promise was difficult to ignore, and many outstanding female physicians, feminist or not, who advocated state programs for healthy mothers and babies also supported state policies that promised to change male sexual behaviour. It was all part of a broad change in gender relations.¹³⁰

Concerning the issue of women's position in the family the "declaration of majority" in general was imperative. Women of that time could not, for example, take an appointment without the consent of the father or the husband. In the same way the rights were limited with respect to inheritance of property. The right to divorce was also limited and always to the advantage of the husband.

Another challenge to family law, to traditional social mores, and to gender roles was the discussion of divorce. Outwardly this was a political question between church and state, but it also unveiled significant nuances of gender construction in the three nations under review. The impassioned parliamentary debate, legal analyses, and writings of its proponents and opponents provide a rich source for exploring the traditional as well as the reformist scripts of femininity and masculinity.¹³¹

It was, however, the issue concerning suffrage that provided the feminist movement with its profile. In Argentina, Chile and Uruguay it became a topical question in the 1920s, as men got the right to vote, something that increased the unequal position of women.

Women's participation in politics through suffrage is regarded as

the touchstone of feminism and social change. In the Southern Cone suffrage became a topic of debate in the second decade of the century. Male universal suffrage, in effect in the three nations in the early 1920s, began to change the physiognomy of the voting mass and gave male and female feminists the base they needed to argue for the inclusion of women.¹³²

The female political movement for universal suffrage practised peaceful argumentation. Universal suffrage for women was introduced in Argentina first under the government of Peron in 1951. Women in Chile attained the right to vote in municipal elections in 1934. Universal suffrage was later introduced in 1948. Women's right to vote was introduced in Uruguay 1932:

After two days of discussion the Chamber of Deputies approved female suffrage on 14 December 1932. The feminist leaders were ecstatic. Sofía Alvarez Vignoli, Clotilde C. De Pérez, Elola de Andreasen, Sara Alvarez Rey, Clotilde Luisi, and others made numerous statements to the press. Nothing short of a utopian future lay ahead for the thrilled feminists. People must have faith in women's work, stated Alvarez Vignoli. They have "intelligence, character and virtue," a trilogy of "eternal superiorities." Progress and the well-being of women and children would result from women's access to politics. She itemized vagrancy, alcoholism, prostitution, and gambling as "torturing problems" that only women, with their "love and maternal tenderness, could face and resolve with dignity."¹³³

During the first decades of the 20th century women conquered many of the new growing working milieus and affected the development of society like never before. Their engagement within industry labour ranged from textile industry to tobacco industry, from match industry to food industry. At length women also got a dominant position within the public sector, school and health care, but also within the administration of every economic line of business.

José Carlos Mariategui and Latin American Marxism

Few Marxist thinkers of the period show any sign of originality. One of the few who does is José Carlos Mariategui (1895-1930). His most important work is *Siete ensayos de interpretación de la realidad Peruana*

(*Seven Interpretative Essays on Peruvian Reality*) printed in Lima in 1928. In that book Mariategui attempts to apply the Marxist methodology in an analysis of the Peruvian reality. Like any true Latin American “product” the doctrines of Mariategui are too nationalistic to be accepted by orthodox Marxism, which always has been suspicious of his interpretation.¹³⁴ Mariategui’s main thought is that the classical proletariat lacked a clear counterpart in the Peruvian reality and that it is the situation of the Indian population, and its connection with the landed property, that is the social factor that is the key to the Peruvian reality.

The Cuban Revolution

The political and ideological significance of the Cuban revolution goes way beyond the bounds of Latin America. Without a doubt, this revolution belongs in the ranks of the most influential when it comes to the history of the western world after the Second World War. The revolution affected the Latin American relations with the United States, but also played a crucial role with respect to the Marxist ideology all over the world. Politically it was to play a vital role during many decades in the trial of strength between the Soviet Union and the United States.

The historical background to its political originality is to be found in the Cuban war of liberation against Spain (1868-1898). This process was lengthy and particularly bloody and ended with the intervention of the United States. The first attempt at liberation was led by Carlos Manuel de Céspedes and is known as “the great war” (la Guerra Grande). He proclaimed Cuba independent and abolished slavery in 1868. The struggle lasted until 1878 but ended in a defeat of the freedom fighters.

The struggle continued under the leadership of Jose Martí, Máximo Gómez and Antonio Maceos. In 1897 the United States declared war against Spain and soon the Spanish resistance fell. At that point Cuba became an independent country under the protection of the United States. The country was, after the liberation, occupied by the forces of the United States for four years. The Cuban republic was proclaimed first in 1902, almost 100 years after the first rebellions in Mexico, Venezuela and Rio de la Plata.

The sovereignty is reduced by the United States by means of the addition of a rider to the constitution, known as *enmienda Platt* (the Platt Amendment), after the originator's name, the senator Orville Hitchcock Platt (1827-1905). The inclusion of this amendment was the condition for the withdrawal of the American troops from the island. The limitations of the independence are many, but the most important are the ones found in article III and VII: the Cuban government agrees to allow the United States to keep the right to intervene to defend the independence of Cuba and to guarantee the existence of a government that respects life, property and individual freedom. In order to make the American obligations with respect to the Cuban defence easier to follow through, the Cuban government will sell or leave the requisite land, for the establishment of fuel and naval bases on certain specific locations, to the American government. The legacy of the Platt Amendment will weigh heavily on the island and the various North American interventions succeed each other: 1906-1909, 1912, 1917 and 1921-38. The Platt Amendment isn't abolished until 1934.¹³⁵

The strong dependence of Cuba upon the United States does not change during the entire 20th century. On the contrary, the economy of the country might very well be compared to that of a colony. In this sense, it is easy to understand how the dreams of liberation in the common consciousness only awaited an appropriate opportunity. The opportunity came as a consequence of the cruel and corrupt dictatorship of Fulgencio Batista.

On the 26th of July, 1953, a group of revolutionaries attacked the Moncada Barracks in Santiago. The leader was Fidel Castro. The attack was a military fiasco that manifested the determination, rather than the capability of organisation, of the revolutionaries. Fidel Castro was captured and sentenced by a court martial to 15 years in prison but was granted an amnesty in 1955. He defended himself in court and formulated the programmatic defence speech that became known as *History Will Absolve Me* (*La historia me absolverá*).

In reality, it isn't a defence speech but a speech of indictment. Castro, just like Zola in *J'accuse*, is the prosecutor of his society and his judges. The tone is characterised by a profound moral indignation and sadness, but also by pride. It expresses the conviction of having justice – true justice – on one's side. What takes place in the court is only a lamentable but not unexpected parody of justice. He knows that he and his surviving comrades will be sentenced, but nothing else is to be

expected in a country in which the unrighteous hold the power. The last words of the speech are: “*Condemn me. It does not matter. History will absolve me.*”¹³⁶

In general, this first phase of the revolution had a strong ideological and utopian character. In many ways it was an ideological phenomenon deeply rooted in the early history of Latin America, with which every man and woman on the continent could identify. This deep ideological anchoring was reflected in Castro’s defence speech in a masterly way. Castro speaks to the heart of every Latin American when he says:

I shall by no means accept such a gag, for in this trial there is much more than the freedom of a single individual at stake. Fundamental matters of principle are being debated here, the right of men to be free is on trial, the very foundations of our existence as a civilised and democratic nation are in the balance. When this trial is over, I do not want to have to reproach myself for any principle left undefended, for any truth left unsaid, for any crime not denounced.¹³⁷

After the amnesty of 1955 the resistance moved to Mexico where new revolutionary plans were prepared. They resulted in the landing from the yacht *Granma* in 1956 – a new military catastrophe that strengthens Castro’s main theory, i.e., that it is the moral power that in the end brings victory. The revolutionary process reaches its final victory in the taking of Havana on the 1st of January, 1959. On the 13th of October, 1960, the law that nationalised most of the large land properties and foreign businesses was instituted and a year later Castro began to describe the Cuban revolution as a socialistic one.

The particular Cuban history of ideas makes this country a representative of many of the traits that characterise the Latin American soul. Particularly interesting is to emphasise the importance of will and morals to political situations. An important trait also to remember, as we are to study the *pensamiento* of Che Guevara, is *the power of action over thought*.

Che Guevara and the New Man

Che Guevara’s thought cannot be comprehended without the Marxist background, against which the entire Latin American left was

set in the 1960s, in mind. An excellent introduction to this period is available in Swedish. It is Amanda Peralta's book from 1990: *...med andra medel. Från Clausewitz till Guevara- krig, revolution och politik i en marxistisk tradition*. Here we can read the following:

A paradigm shift in the Marxist revolutionary theory occurred in Latin America at the beginning of the 1960s. The new paradigm becomes the foco theory, or *foquism* (foquismo) as it is usually called. The name is derived from *focus*, meaning hotbed or hearth.¹³⁸

Revolutionary action is, according to this theory, what creates the subjective conditions of the revolution. It is not a matter of a naive form of "voluntarism" of the kind that earlier figured in the Marxist tradition. This theory presumes that the "objective" conditions, i.e., the historically necessary conditions that make the revolution possible, are fulfilled, while the subjective conditions aren't mature enough. According to the theory, the maturation of the subjective conditions can be sped up with the help of an adequate political resistance that puts into question the foundations of society and visualises alternative paths. This is expressed by Fidel Castro in the following:

The subjective conditions of a people, that is, its revolutionary consciousness, organisational capacity and leadership, can all according to its higher or lower level of maturation either speed up or delay the revolution; but sooner or later, as the objective conditions have matured, a revolutionary consciousness will see the day, the organisation will be realised, the leadership will step forward and the revolution will break out.¹³⁹

The task of the Left wing is, according to both Castro and Che, to initiate the subjective maturation. To force through an acceleration in the process that, the way they saw it, did not move in the pace of the objective conditions. The theory is a natural consequence of the events that characterised the Cuban revolution. We have seen how this revolution was characterised by an immense will, courage and optimism, while it at the same time was an example of improvisation and noticeable organisational flaws. According to the political doctrines of Fidel and Che, the Cuban revolution would have been impossible if it were not for the catastrophes of the Moncada Barracks and the Granma. It was in a confrontation with these catastrophes and with the destiny of the revolutionary heroes that the people of Cuba made up their minds to change their living conditions.

In the Marxist ideology that characterises the Cuban revolution and particularly Guevara's thought there are traits that are alien to classical "European" Marxism. The individual is, to begin with, as important as the "masses". Without the participation of the individual there is no "focus", no advance guard, no guerrilla resistance. The initiative of these individuals is not comparable to the leadership of the Marxist Communist Party. If one follows the relationship that the Latin American left had to the classical communist parties, it is noticeable how these relations have been very strained and seldom very useful. In contrast to classical Marxist thought, the Cuban revolution and the new leftist message was "voluntarian" or, in other words, the expression of a middle class elite that wanted to hasten a process that was not mature enough. Let us look at the critique as it is formulated by Che's own words:

And then came the stage of guerrilla warfare. It was developed in two different milieus: on the one hand the people, the still dormant masses that were to be awakened. On the other hand the avant-garde, the guerrilla, the driving motor, the creator of the revolutionary consciousness and the will to fight.¹⁴⁰

Foquism (eng. foquism) implied the equation: "the revolution generates revolution". Guevara himself lived according to these ethical principles, something that turned him into a unique combination of a political guerrilla leader and a "monk". The role of the individual put in contrast to traditional Marxist thought can be found also in other contemporaries of Che, for example among the French thinkers that followed Nietzsche and Sartre. However, in the case of Che the individualism has its basis in a Latin American tradition that meant the superiority of action over theoretical thought. As we have seen in the various chapters of this book, Latin American thought is characterised by an integration of theory and practise, something that has roots that go way back to, among other things, Las Casas engagement for the rights of the Indians. Against this background Che develops his theory of "the new man" (*el hombre nuevo*). Che describes the *new man* in the following way:

Now I would like to explain the role that personality plays, the individual that directs the masses as it makes history. [...] Let me tell you – running the risk of seeming ridiculous – that the true revolutionary is driven out of great emotions of love. It is impossible to imagine a true revolutionary without these qualities. That might be the grand dramatic destiny of the director. He must

combine an impassioned soul with a cold thinking and be able to make painful decisions without showing it. Our revolutionaries must idealise this love for the people and their holy destiny, turn it into a uniform and indivisible reality. [...] The directors of the revolution have children that cannot learn the name of their father. Women that must take part in the common sacrifice to realise the revolution. The circle of friends is reduced to the circle of comrades. There is no life outside of the revolution. Under these circumstances one must have a strong human empathy, a strong sense of justice, to avoid slipping into dogmatism, into speculative scholastic conclusions and to isolate oneself from the masses. One must fight every day to convert that love for humanity into positive actions, good examples and driving forces.¹⁴¹

Since his death, Che has been transformed into a global icon. Many of his ideas are as relevant today as they were in the 1960s. But the guerrilla war in Latin America is less relevant since the end of the Cold War. In his life it is primarily the combination of action and thought that has the strongest appeal. With respect to this, Che undoubtedly is a “true Latin American”. In his works roots that stretch way back into the Latin American history can be found.

In the opposition between Latin American Marxism and European Marxism traces can be found of many other earlier “adaptations” of European thought. In the same way Enlightenment thought was adapted to a reality in which there were no real “philosophers”, the romantic ideas to a region without any real nations, positivism to a reality without any natural scientific activity. The adaptation in every case rests on this combination of thought and action.

The Development of New Socio-Political Realities: the “Bassismo” of Paulo Freire

Paulo Freire was a professor of social work in Recife in northern Brazil and was hired by the local government to organise an educational campaign. In his collaboration with the Catholic Church he executed a large alphabetisation campaign that among other things made use of the radio. It was in this context that the word “base” was used. It means “grassroots” and it was the first application of the concept “grassroots organisation”.

The movement of basic education had at its disposal 53 radio stations and 7353 school radio stations. Already in the context of this project the concept *conscientização*, the promoting of consciousness, turned up. Lehmann points out that there are significant differences between Freire's concept of consciousness and the Marxist concept of class-consciousness, as between the Christian and the socialist view on solidarity. He gives an account of the various theoretical impulses that Freire got from Catholic and non-Catholic thinkers. Among these the modern sociological theory in the tradition from Weber to Durkheim seems to have been particularly important. The promotion of consciousness is originally seen as an effort by the people to create a political culture that contributes to the country's modernisation, democratisation and opposes "massification", that is, the transformation of the people into an irrational mass.¹⁴²

Freire's project became possible thanks to the populist government that abruptly had to step down with the military coup in 1964. Freire then moved to Chile where he cooperated with the Christian Democratic Chilean government. Like many other Christian products of that period Freire's thought later was transformed in Marxist directions. In 1970 he published in English *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (New York 1970). In this work Freire combined Marxist concepts with his original concepts from the period of alphabetisation.

Paulo Freire's *Pedagogia de oprimido* is a Latin American classic from this period and an ideological key to the period. Without a clear understanding of the particular combination of ideas from many different sources (Catholic praxis, Marxism, Weber and Durkheim, etc.) that Freire draws upon, it is difficult to understand the *concept of the base*, a typical Latin American socio-political construction that lives on.

Revolution within Theological Thought: the Liberation Theology

Latin American Catholic thought is noticeably different from European thought when it comes to one crucial point: the anthropological experience that was attained in the contact with the Indians and the Africans. This contact led many of the missionaries to the conclusion that the process of evangelisation was a part of the darkest aspects

of colonisation. In its relation to the native cultures Catholic thought was utterly transformed. This was a process that started with the missions of Bartolomé de Las Casas and the Jesuits, and that in the second half of the 20th century generated the movement known as *liberation theology*.

There developed in Catholic American circles, during the days of colonisation, an ambivalent attitude to the treatment of the Indians by the colonial powers, something that got many of the missionaries to question the compatibility between the colonial enterprise and the Christian message. Awareness grew that even though Indian confidence in the Catholic Church increased, the sermons of the church caused a reinforcement of the process of acculturation that made the colonial humiliating treatment of the Indians easier.

The defence of the interests of the Indians thus became a part of the Catholic missionary enterprise, particularly to the Jesuits who, up until their expulsion from the continent, had managed to develop a very original and coherent cultural hybridisation between European and American values. During the liberation war many priests participated in the battles against the colonial powers. From the first years of the revolution Miguel Hidalgo and José María Morelos from Mexico ought to be mentioned.

However, the dilemma of the evangelists isn't the only source of the liberation theology of our time. Another important source is to be found in traditional Catholic social engagement. In 1891 the Pope Leo XIII formulated the encyclical *Rerum Novarum* (On new things). This encyclical grounded the modern Catholic social and political engagement. It condemns socialism and the class struggle but at the same time stimulates "the inclination of the rich to pay decent wages out of pure decency."¹⁴³ In this encyclical the idea was put forward that the poor had the right to unite, not as a class, but as "poor", as a common group with common interests. The pope Pius XI took this development one step further with yet another encyclical, the "Quadragesimo anno" (the name means 'the fortieth year' and refers to the fact that it was published forty years after the *Rerum Novarum*)¹⁴⁴. In this encyclical the principle of subsidiarity is presented. Peralta summarises as follows:

In this encyclical the famous principle of subsidiarity is presented, at presently a burning topic of discussion in the European debate. The main idea is this: in the same way as it is wrong to deprive individuals of the right to own private companies and industries,

it is also wrong and unfair – a significant wrong and a disturbance of the right order – by the greater and higher unions to take over functions that very well might be upheld by smaller and lower associations. The aim of all true social activity should be to help the members of the social “body” (the Catholic Church of course has a very clearly articulated organic view of society), but never to destroy or devour them.¹⁴⁵

In the Latin American social reality of the 1950s *the principle of subsidiarity* was developed in the same way as the basismo-ideas of Paulo Freire, and accordingly, the social ground organisation developed into a new form of churchly activity that also became the part of a prototype for the political leftist organisations. In the 1950s and 1960s the grass-roots movement blossomed all over the continent and the Catholic Church to a large extent assisted in this through the so-called *Comunidades Eclesiales de Base* (CEB).

The social doctrine of the church got a spectacular continuation with John XXIII, who became known as the good Pope. He was the Pope between 1958 and 1963. In spite of his high age, he was born in 1881, and his short period at the churchly power, he irrevocably transformed the Catholic Church. He called the Second Vatican Council in 1962 but it was up to his successor Paul VI to end it in 1965.¹⁴⁶

Just like during the war of liberation in the 19th century some men and women of the church were engaged in the concrete rebellious political struggle on the side of the poor. One of the great names with respect to this was the Jesuit priest Camilo Torres, a sociologist and guerrilla fighter who died in the confrontation with the Colombian army in 1967.

The Christian liberation theology that aims to liberate the poor has not necessarily an ethical basis. The activity of the liberation theologians is not merely directed towards the reality of the Indians, but towards the situation of the poor in general. Since the Latin American poor to a large extent consists of a mass of Mestizos the activity was organised around this group. The priests of the 1950s and 1960s were, on the other hand, either of a European origin or educated along European guidelines at European universities. The situation gave rise to a new variant of the situation that was predominant during the period of colonisation.

Ernesto Laclau and Postmarxism

Ernesto Laclau was born in Argentina. He studied for, among others, Jorge Luis Borges, Gino Germani, José Luis Romero and Rodolfo Mondolfo. He became a member of the Argentinean socialist party. In 1969 he moved to Essex in England and at length became a Professor of sociology and history. Ernesto Laclau ought to be seen as one of the creators of Postmarxism. As it is made clear in the book *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy. Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*¹⁴⁷ from 1985, Ernesto Laclau has together with Chantal Mouffe left traditional Marxism behind with the Marxist intention of developing a science of the development of history. Instead, they have transformed some of the Marxist theses into an instrument of the hermeneutic analysis.¹⁴⁸ Ernesto Laclau's and Chantal Mouffe's critique of traditional Marxism is grounded in a clear conceptualist spirit, it is a critique of the *essentialist* aspect of classical Marxism, i.e., its abstraction from the concrete events or also its *realist* use of *universals*. One example is the concept of "class", which to traditional Marxism is a universal category – a category that is *abstracted* from each single class manifestation. This essentialism has, according to Laclau and Mouffe, led Marx and Marxists astray and into a positivist illusion. On the contrary, Laclau and Mouffe argue that the concept of class only can be understood in its particularity. Laclau and Mouffe replace the original realism of Marxism with a conceptualism that is inspired by Wittgenstein's *theory of family resemblance*. As is well known the later Wittgenstein developed a modern form of conceptualism that got the name *game theory*. There are, according to this theory, no universal concepts or *essences*, but only particular occurrences of facts that are *related*. The philosophical status of universals has its origin in the problem of finding a correlation between the semantic and the ontological sphere. Even though the reflecting subject is in contact with particular cases only, knowledge is built upon general conclusions and laws. One might think that Wittgenstein's theory of family resemblance solves the problem, since it replaces essences with general resemblances, but to what extent are those general resemblances different from the universals. One thing is, however, clear: besides Wittgenstein, Laclau and Mouffe follows the French philosopher Jacques Derrida, in the purpose of constructing a form of conceptualism in which the course of events is reduced to linguistic and/or communicative – the term used is

“the discourse” – relations. All that exists is difference within the discursive relations.

The concept “discourse” is of a central importance to Laclau. The social “discourse” is always, according to Laclau, *meaningful*. It consists of a linguistic and a “practical” component in this way:

Let us suppose that I am building a wall with another bricklayer. At a certain moment I ask my workmate to pass me a brick and then I add it to the wall. The first act, - asking for the brick – is linguistic; the second – adding the brick to the wall – is extralinguistic. Do I exhaust the reality of both acts by drawing the distinction between them in terms of the linguistic/extralinguistic opposition? Evidently not, because, despite their differentiation in those terms, the two actions share something that allows them to be compared, namely the fact that they are both part of a total operation which is the building of the wall. [...] This totality...is what we shall call discourse.¹⁴⁹

The Peruvian movement made a strong impression on Ernesto Laclau and affected his look upon the so-called “populist ideology”. He writes about the “populist reason” as a form of onto-logic rather than an ideological form. The way Laclau sees things, populism is a reasonable answer to misery and a natural consequence of a hopeless situation.

Literature

- Acevedo, Eduardo.** *Jose Artigas: Jefe de los orientales y protector de los pueblos libres.* Volume I and II. Montevideo, 1950. Ardao, Arturo. *La inteligencia Latinoamericana.* Fundación de Cultura Universitaria. Montevideo, 1987.
- Ardao, Arturo.** "Lo específico del hombre latinoamericano." *En América Latina, conciencia y nación.* Caracas, Universidad Simón Bolívar. Edit. Equinoccio, 1977.
- Ardao, Arturo.** *Filosofía de lengua española.* Montevideo: Alfa, 1963.
- Ardao, Maria Julia & Castellanos, Aurora C. de.** *Artigas.* Montevideo, 1951.
- Busaniche, José Luis.** *Rosas visto por sus contemporáneos.* Buenos Aires, 1976.
- Bosch, Juan.** *De Cristóbal Colón a Fidel Castro.* La Habana, 2003.
- Capdevila, Arturo.** *Meditación sobre Artigas.* Montevideo, 1948.
- Carranza, Jacinto.** *La Tricolor de Artigas.* Montevideo, 1950.
- Castellanos, Alfredo R.** *Vida de Artigas.* Medina Editor, 1954.
- Chasteen, John Charles.** *Latinamerikas historia.* Historiska media. Lund, 2003.
- Comision Nacional de Homenaje a Artigas.** *Artigas en la Historia y en el Arte* Catalogo de la exposicion realizada en el Teatro Solis. Montevideo, 1952.
- Crawford, W. R.** *A Century of Latin-American Thought.* Harvard University Press, 1945.
- Dussel, Enrique.** *Método para una filosofía de la Liberación.* Stromata. 1-2, 53-89. Salamanca, 1971.
- Estrada, José Manuel.** *La política liberal bajo la tiranía de Rosas.* Biblioteca argentina. 22. Buenos Aires, 1927.
- Flores Mora, Manuel & Maggi, Carlos.** *Jose Artigas.* Montevideo, 1950.

- Flores Morador, Fernando.** Mellan åsikt och vittnesbörd. Amerika och Västerlandets arkaiska rötter. Uggla 3. Lund 2001.
- Gandía, Enrique de.** Historia política argentina. Época de Rosas. Buenos Aires, 1994.
- Genta, Edgardo Ubaldo.** *Artigas: el heroe de la platania.* Montevideo, 1951.
- Hoekstra, Rik.** Two Worlds Merging. The Transformation of Society in the Valley of Puebla, 1570-1640. CEDLA. Latin America Studies 69, 1993.
- Jorrín, Miguel och Martz, John D.** Latin-American Political Thought and Ideology. The University of North Caroline Press. 1970.
- Kusch, Rodolfo.** *Aportes a una filosofía nacional.* Megafón 9-10. Centro de Estudios Latinoamericanos. Buenos Aires, 1980.
- Lakoff, G.** *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things.* Univesity of Chicago Press; 1987.
- Langton, C. G.** *Artificial Life.* K. Gerbel and P. Weibel (ed.) Genetic Art- Artificial Life. PVS Verlager; 1993.
- Lasplaces, Alberto.** *Jose Artigas.* Madrid, 1933.
- Malamud, Carlos. *Juan Manuel de Rosas.* Protagonistas de América. Madrid. Historia 16, 1987.
- Marichal, Juan.** *Cuatro fases de la Historia Intelectual Latinoamericana (1810-1970).* Fundación Juan March. Madrid, 1978.
- Maturana, H.R.** *Science and Daily Life: The Ontology of Scientific Explanation .* F. Steier (ed.) Research and Reflexivity, Sage, London; 1991.
- Maturana, H.R. y Varela, F.J.** *Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living.* D. Reidel, Boston.; 1980.
- Maturana, H.R. y Varela, F.J.** *The Tree of Knowledge: The Biological Roots of Human Understanding.* Shambala, Boston; 1987.

- Miranda, Francisco de.** *Miranda i Sverige och Norge 1787*. Stockholm. Nordiska Museet, 1950.
- Miró Quesada, Francisco.** *Despertar y proyecto del filosofar latinoamericano*. Colección Tierra Firme. Fondo de Cultura Económica. México, 1974.
- Mórner, Magnus.** *Latinamerikas historia*. Stockholm, 1965.
- Peralta, Amanda.** Teori och praktik i de fattigas universum. En idéhistorisk undersökning av latinamerikansk befrielseologi. Daidalos. 1995.
- Peralta, Amanda.** ... med andra medel. Från Clausewitz till Guevara- kig, revolution och politik i en marxistisk idé tradition. Daidalos. 1990.
- Ramis, Pompeyo.** *Veinte Filósofos Venezolanos (1946-1976)*. Universidad de los Andes. Mérida, 1965.
- Ramos Pérez, Demetrio.** *San Martín, el libertador del Sur*. Biblioteca iberoamericana, 35. Madrid, 1988.
- Reyes Abadie, Washington och Vázquez Romero, Andrés.** Crónica General del Uruguay. Banda Oriental; Montevideo, 1979-1980.
- Ribeiro, Darcy.** *Las Américas y la Civilización*. Centro Editor de América Latina. Buenos Aires, 1969.
- Rivoire, Mario.** Washington : hans liv och verk. Gestalter och óden ur världshistorien. Malmö, 1968.
- Rojas, Ricardo.** *El santo de la espada: [vida de San Martín]*. Buenos Aires. Losada,, 1940.
- Rossiello, Leonardo.** *Literatura Hispanoamericana. Época Colonial. La crónica y la prosa novelesca*. Institutionen för Romanska språk. Uppsala, 1992.
- Rumazo González, Alfonso.** *Ocho grandes biografías*. Caracas. Ediciones de la Presidencia de la República, 1993. Volume I, II and III.
- Sarmiento, Domingo Faustino.** Facundo. Civilización y Barbarie. Letras Hispánicas. Madrid, 1990.
- Sahlin, Gunnar.** *Miranda i Sverige 1787 : Miranda en Suecia 1787*. Latinamerika-institutet, Stockholm, 1946.

- Salazar Bondy, Augusto.** *¿Existe una filosofía de nuestra América?* Siglo XXI. México, 1969.
- Stoetzer, O. Carlos.** El Pensamiento político en la América española durante el período de la emancipación (1789-1825) (Las bases hispánicas y las corrientes europeas) Tomos I y II. Madrid, 1966.
- Street, John.** *Artigas and the Emancipation of Uruguay.* Cambridge, 1959.
- Trías, Vivión.** *La Rebelión de las orillas.* Obras Completas, Tomo 12. Montevideo, 1989.
- Weiss, Ignazio.** Carlo Alberto e Juan Manuel de Rosas : Contributo alla storia delle relazioni diplomatiche fra il regno di Sardegna e la confederazione Argentina. (Collezione storica del risorgimento italiano; 42). Modena, 1951.
- Varela F.J., Thompson E. and Rosch E.** *The Embodied Mind: Cognitive science and human experience.* MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass; 1991.
- Zea, Leopoldo.** La filosofía americana como filosofía sin más. Siglo XXI. México.
- Zea, Leopoldo.** (ed.). *América Latina en sus ideas.* Siglo XXI editores, UNESCO; 1986.
- Zea, Leopoldo** (Compilador). *Fuentes de la Cultura Latinoamericana.* Colección Tierra Firme. Fondo de Cultura Económica. México, 1993. Vol I, II y III.
- Zea, Leopoldo.** *Filosofía de la historia americana.* Colección Tierra Firme. Fondo de Cultura Económica. México, 1978.
- Zea, Leopoldo.** *El Positivismo en México. Nacimiento, apogeo y decadencia.* Fondo de Cultura Económica. México, 1990.
- Zorrilla de San Martín, Juan.** *La epopeya de Artigas.* Tomos I & II. Barcelona.

Vocabulary

Caudillo: Charismatic Mestizo leader.

Criollo: Spanish descendant, born in America. Might be a Mestizo, but this is not necessary.

Fazenda: Estate. Portuguese. In Spanish = *hacienda*.

Gaacho: The “cowboy” of Rio de la Plata.

Llanero: The “cowboy” of Venezuela and Colombia.

Montonera: A guerrilla group mounted on horses.

Pensador: Thinker, philosopher.

Poncho: Garment. An Indian blanket with a hole made for the head.

Nueva España: Present Mexico.

Nueva Granada: Present Colombia.

La Plata, Río de la Plata: Present Argentina, Paraguay, Bolivia and Uruguay.

Banda Oriental (del Plata): Present Uruguay.

Bandeirantes: Brazilian estate owners who engaged in the abduction and enslavement of Indians.

Index of Names and Subjects

- Alberdi...21, 31, 32, 74, 91, 105, 106, 109, 144
- Alvarez Rey, Sara..... 149
- Alvarez Vignoli, Sofia..... 149
- Ardao 163
- Ardao, Arturo 116, 129, 175
- Argentina...33, 38, 51, 58, 86, 89, 91, 102, 110, 117, 119, 127, 134, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 148, 149, 159, 166, 169
- Artigas 163, 164, 166
- Artigas, José 50, 88, 93, 94, 101, 102, 103, 106, 110, 111
- Bacon..... 77
- befrielseologi 165
- Belgrano, Manuel 80
- Bello, Andrés.. 31, 35, 75, 92, 94, 97, 107, 108, 110
- Bentham 91, 119
- Bergson, Henri..... 35, 123, 124
- Bolívar, Simón 36, 50, 85, 87, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 96, 97, 98, 99, 101, 102, 106, 137, 138
- Borges, Jorge Luis 17, 159
- Botelho de Magalhaes, Benjamin 116
- Brazil33, 46, 48, 51, 58, 62, 102, 116, 117, 127, 135, 142, 144, 155
- Caso, Antonio..... 22, 124, 127
- Castro, Fidel ... 36, 53, 151, 152, 153, 163
- caudillismo* 33
- Céspedes, Carlos Manuel de..... 150
- Che1, 4, 31, 152, 153, 154, 155
- Chile50, 51, 57, 60, 89, 90, 91, 94, 95, 96, 105, 108, 127, 131, 144, 145, 146, 148, 149, 156
- Cold War 137, 155
- Columbus ..33, 41, 42, 56, 57, 59, 60, 69, 82, 99, 107, 108
- Comte 116, 117
- Copernicus77
- Cuban revolution 36, 38, 137, 150, 152, 153, 154
- D’Ambrosio, Ubiratán 135
- de Farias Brito, Raimundo ... 124, 127
- de la Riva, José 91
- de Vitoria, Francisco 34, 68
- delay and retardation.....29
- Derrida, Jacques..... 123, 159
- Descartes..... 77, 78, 131
- Deustua, Octavio..... 124, 127
- Diderot 73
- Discrimination 46
- Dussel..... 163
- Echeverría, Esteban 108, 143, 144
- engagement as a worldview 29
- enlightened despotism..... 87, 91
- Enlightenment in Latin America...73, 74, 76, 82, 85, 87, 88, 90, 91, 94, 95, 97, 107, 110, 118, 119, 155
- enmienda Platt* 151
- Feijóo, Benito Jerónimo..... 75, 76, 87
- feminism 145, 146, 147, 149
- feminist movement 145, 148
- Foquism* 154
- Freire, Paulo..... 135, 155, 156, 158
- French Revolution. 77, 80, 81, 82, 88, 90, 95
- Gaitán, Jorge Elicer..... 141
- Gaos, José 35, 124, 175
- García del Río, Juan..... 108
- gaucho..... 74, 102, 105, 110, 111
- gauchos* 74, 94, 98, 111, 143
- Gómez, Máximo 150
- Gran Colombia* 107
- Granma* 152, 153
- Grotius 88
- Hobbes 73, 75, 81, 88, 89, 90
- immigration 17, 91, 106, 142, 144
- Indians, definition 41

Jesuits ..46, 51, 60, 62, 64, 78, 83, 84,
 86, 89, 157
 Korn, Alejandro..... 22, 124, 127
 Krause, Karl Christian Friedrich. 118,
 119, 123
 Krausism.76, 115, 118, 119, 123, 124
 Kusch, Rodolfo..... 134
 Laclau, Ernesto 159, 160
 Las Casas.1, 4, 21, 33, 34, 35, 41, 43,
 46, 54, 58, 59, 64, 70, 73, 99, 109,
 154, 157, 175
 Leibniz..... 77, 119
 Lenin 139, 144
liberation theology... 23, 31, 157, 158
 Lima 51, 62, 84, 150
llaneros..... 74, 98
 Locke....73, 75, 77, 78, 81, 88, 89, 92
 Luisi, Clotilde 146, 149
 Maceos, Antonio 150
 Mariategui, José Carlos . 31, 149, 150
 Martí, José 21, 31, 121, 122, 123, 150
 Marx, Karl 15, 24, 37, 44, 45, 137,
 138, 139, 159
 Marxism ..24, 31, 130, 139, 149, 150,
 154, 155, 156, 159
 Maturana, Humberto.... 131, 132, 133
 Mexico.43, 44, 45, 47, 49, 51, 52, 57,
 58, 61, 67, 77, 95, 100, 105, 106,
 108, 117, 121, 122, 124, 127, 128,
 131, 134, 138, 144, 150, 152, 157,
 169, 175
 Miguel Hidalgo y Castilla..... 95
 Miranda, Francisco de 50, 89, 90, 92,
 96, 97, 108, 138, 165
 modernity and archaicity 16
 Molina, Enrique..... 53, 124, 127
 Montesquieu... 73, 77, 78, 89, 90, 92,
 119
 Morelos y Pavón, José María..... 96
 Moreno, Mariano 88, 89, 90, 101
 Napoleon .82, 90, 91, 92, 97, 99, 101,
 105, 138
 Nueva España 60, 70, 77, 169
 Nueva Granada 60, 77, 84, 87, 89, 90,
 92, 169
 O’Higgins, Bernardo 91
 O’Higgins, Bernardo..... 50, 96
 Ortega y Gasset, José 124
 pantheism..... 118, 119
 Paraguay ... 47, 58, 61, 62, 63, 64, 78,
 83, 86, 87, 94, 102, 103, 110, 169
pensador 21, 22, 24, 109
 periodization 54
 Peron, Juan Domingo..... 38, 141, 149
 Perú..... 58, 60, 62, 91
 Physiocrats..... 79
 populism 33, 139, 140, 142, 143, 160
positivism 76, 107, 115, 116, 117,
 118, 119, 122, 123, 124, 127, 131,
 155
 Pufendorf 88
 Ramos, Samuel 31, 124, 165
 Rivadavia, Bernardino 87, 89, 91
 Rodó, José Enrique ..21, 31, 121, 122
 Rodríguez de Francia, José Gaspar 87
 Romanticism..... 105, 107
 Romero, José Luis..... 127, 159, 165
 Rosenblueth, Arturo..... 131, 132
 San Martín 50, 85, 89, 96, 97, 102,
 106, 165, 166
 San Martín, José de ..91, 93, 108, 165
 Santo Domingo 51, 81, 82
 Sarmiento .. 16, 17, 21, 31, 32, 35, 37,
 74, 75, 85, 87, 91, 102, 105, 106,
 109, 110, 111, 123, 140, 143, 144,
 165
 Sarmiento’s *Facundo* 35
 Simón Bolívar 163
 struggle between *civilisation* and
barbarism 16
 Suárez, Francisco 78, 83, 86
 The Masonic orders 83
the principle of subsidiarity . 157, 158
 Torres Caicedo, José María.... 34, 109
 Toussaint..... 82
 Trías, Vivión 140, 166
 Tupac Amaru 83, 84
 Universities in America 51
 urbanisation..... 142
 Vasconcelos, José 121, 124, 127
 Vaz Ferreira, Carlos..... 22, 124, 127
 Venezuela . 36, 47, 50, 84, 89, 90, 91,

96, 97, 98, 107, 138, 150, 169
Vespucci, Amerigo..... 41, 42, 56, 57,
108, 111, 175

Voltaire 73, 77, 78, 79
Zea 166

Notes

- ¹ Las Casas, Bartolomé de from 1552: *Brevísima Relación de la Destrucción de las Indias*.
- ² Michel Eyquen de Montaigne (1553-1592), the author of the *Essais*, which were published between 1580 and 1588.
- ³ On this, see José Gaos, *El pensamiento latinoamericano*, El Colegio de México, 1944.
- ⁴ Real de Azúa, Carlos (1964) *Antología del Ensayo Uruguayo Contemporáneo*. Universidad de la Republica Oriental del Uruguay. Departamento de Publicaciones. Montevideo.
- ⁵ Real de Azúa, Carlos, 1964, p. 16.
- ⁶ Op cit., p. 18.
- ⁷ Op cit., p. 21.
- ⁸ William Rex Crawford: *A Century of Latin-American Thought*. 1945, p. 4.
- ⁹ Zea, Leopoldo. *La filosofía emericana como filosofía sin más*. Siglo XXI Editores. México 1969. p. 73.
- ¹⁰ Darcy Ribeiro. *Las Americas y la civilizacion*. Buenos Aires, 1972.
- ¹¹ Ardao, Arturo. *La inteligencia Latinoamericana*. Fundación de Cultura Universitaria. Montevideo, 1987. p. 52.
- ¹² Adao, Arturo. Op. Cit., p. 86. José Gaos quoted by Ardao. My translation.
- ¹³ Flores Morador, Fernando. *Mellan åsikt och vittnesbörd. Amerika och Västerlandets arkaiska rötter*. Uggla 3. Lund 2001. p. 43.
- ¹⁴ Bosch, Juan. *La Habana*, 2003.
- ¹⁵ "The letter of Amerigo Vespucci and other documents illustrative of his career". Translated, with notes and an introduction by Clements R. Markham. Hakluyt Society, London. p. 76.
- ¹⁶ "Latinamerikansk idévärld – mellan institution och revolution". Björn Olsson. I Mohammad Fazlhashemi, Anders; Óckerman, Ronny; Ambjörnsson (ed.). *Globalt perspektiv på idéhistoria*. Studentlitteratur, 2000. p. 256. (My translation).
- ¹⁷ Flores, Fernando. *Mellan Åsikt och Vittnesbörd. Amerika och Västerlandets arkaiska rötter*. Uggla, Lund. 2001. p. 22.
- ¹⁸ The oldest of the three is the Maya culture. People of the Maya language

existed already 4000 years ago in the highlands of Central America, but a more consolidated Mayan civilisation formed during what is known as the pre-classical period, i.e. 1500 BC – 250 AD, with its centre moved to the jungle areas in present Guatemala, Honduras and Mexico. What earlier were villages in various locations grew into city-like ceremonial centres in which architecture, art and long-way trade developed. Temples, similar to the pyramids, were raised with great architectonic proficiency in some cities of the cult – the most well known of these are North Guatemalan *Tikal*, North Honduran *Copán* and South Mexican *Palenque*. It was during the following classical period (250-950 AD) that the Maya made their most significant intellectual achievements. Advanced astronomical and mathematical knowledge was achieved, and an advanced calendar system and chronology was established. Now the art of writing also appeared. [...] As the Maya Empire fell, another pre-Columbian high culture began to grow in importance further down south in Latin America. In South America, in an area of the Andes that today is delimited by northern Argentina and Chile in the south and Ecuador in the north, a Quechua-speaking people had, in a very brief time, built an advanced civilisation – the Inca Empire. During the 13th and 14th century the Incas merely had been one of many small, rivalling kingdoms that had grown out of the remnants of an earlier high culture, the *Huari* (600-1000 AD), but as from 1438 the Inca ruler Pachacuti Inka Yupanqui set off building an empire that “in less than hundred years would lead to the largest and most well-administrated state of the pre-Columbian America”. The Inca Empire had its centre in present Perú and has been described as an early communist society: food and other necessities were divided among the various groups of society, supplies were stored in great common depositories and the relation between ruler and servant was depicted as a reciprocal, mutually obligating exchange. There were no permanent private rights of possession with respect to the earth – it was officially administrated for the people by the emperor. The Inca Empire, or *Tawantinsuyu* as it is called in Quechua, is made up by four provinces that come together in the capital Cuzco, located at a height of almost 4000 metres.

The third high culture, that of the Aztecs, has some elements in common with the Inca Empire. It was a fast-expanding civilisation, well organised but with a more feudal form of government than the Incas, and in the rapid conquest the Spaniards were able to benefit from the domestic battles that were raging. The Aztec Empire lasted for about the same time as the Inca Empire and was just as spectacular. Originally the Aztecs were northern hunters and

warriors that in the 13th century reached the Anáhuac valley, today the location of Mexico City. As intruders they were faced with the resistance of the settled population and didn't manage to conquer the most attractive parts of the valley, but had to settle with more inhospitable areas, a swamp and sea area that included some habitable islands. In connection with the settlement they abandoned their own dialects and assimilated the predominant language in central Mexico, Nahuatl. "Latinamerikansk idévärld – mellan institution och revolution." (Björn Olsson. I Mohammad Fazlhashemi, Anders; Öckerman, Ronny; Ambjörnsson (ed.). *Globalt perspektiv på idéhistoria*. Studentlitteratur, 2000. (My translation)).

¹⁹ Op. Cit. pp. 256-257.

²⁰ Hoekstra, Rik (1993) *Two Worlds Merging. "The transformation of Society in the Valley of Puebla"*, 1570-1640. CEDLA (Center for Latin American Studies, Amsterdam). p. 24.

²¹ Karl Marx, "Om förkapitalistiska produktionssätt" (1970) Ett kommenterat texturval av Erik af Edholm. BOC-Universitetet, Bo Cavefors Bokförlag. p. 37.

²² On this, see Op cit., p. 38.

²³ Karl Marx, "Om förkapitalistiska produktionssätt" (1970), p. 36.

²⁴ Karl Marx, "Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations", translated by Jack Cohen, 1964, from:

<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1857/precapitalist/ch01.htm>.

²⁵ Peralta, Amanda. *Teori och praktik i de fattigas universum. En idéhistorisk undersökning av latinamerikansk befrielseologi*. Daidalos. 1995. p. 25. (My translation).

²⁶ Peralta, Amanda. Op.Cit., p. 24. (My translation).

²⁷ Reyes Abadie, Washington and Vázquez Romero, Andrés- *Crónica General del Uruguay*. Banda Oriental; Montevideo, 1979-1980. All numbers are from Jaime Vicens Vives Historia de España.

²⁸ Reyes Abadie, Washington and Vázquez Romero, Andrés. *Crónica General del Uruguay*. Banda Oriental; Montevideo, 1979-1980. All numbers are from Jaime Vicens Vives Historia de España.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Reyes Abadie, Washington and Vázquez Romero, Andrés. *Crónica General del Uruguay*. Banda Oriental; Montevideo, 1979-1980. All numbers are from Jaime Vicens Vives Historia de España.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Op. Cit., p. 170. My translation.

³³ Peralta, Amanda. *Teori och praktik i de fattigas universum. En idéhistorisk undersök-*

ning av latinamerikansk befrielseologi. Daidalos. 1995. p. 25.

³⁴ Reyes Abadie, Washington and Vázquez Romero, Andrés. *Crónica General del Uruguay*. Banda Oriental; Montevideo, 1979-1980.

³⁵ Op. Cit., No. 8.

³⁶ Sierra, Vicente D. (1955) *Así se hizo América*. See also, Fernando Flores, *Mellan Asikt och Vittnesbörd. Amerika och Västerlandets arkaiska rötter*. Uggla, Lund, 2001. pp. 237-239.

³⁷ Scott, J. B. (1934) *The Spanish Origin of International Law*, page 19.

³⁸ Malmberg, B. (1991), *Historie de la Linguistique. De Sumer a Saussure*. p. 153f., 157. The grammar of Nebrijas “[...] représente bien, et à plusieurs points de vue, les débuts d’une nouvelle époque en matière de linguistique scientifique et appliquée. L’importance de son auteur pour la grammaire latine ne doit pas être sous-estimée non plus. La Gramática Castellana implique une étape dans l’histoire de la linguistique. C’est une des premières grammaires –et parmi celles–ci sans doute la meilleure– d’une langue moderne.”

³⁹ Zea, Leopoldo. *Filosofía de la historia americana*. Colección Tierra Firme. Fondo de Cultura Económica. México, 1978. No. 8.

⁴⁰ Rossiello, Leonardo. *Literatura Hispanoamericana. Época Colonial. La crónica y la prosa novelesca*. Institutionen för romanska språk. Uppsala, 1992.

⁴¹ Op. Cit. p. 3.

⁴² Op.cit, p. 7.

⁴³ Hoekstra, Rik. *Two Worlds Merging. The Transformation of Society in the Valley of Puebla, 1570-1640*. CEDLA. Latin America Studies 69, 1993, sid. 50-51.

⁴⁴ José Gaos writes: “The polemics caused by the comet from 1680-81 [...] was a polemics caused by the transition from an archaic “astrological” – and the modern “astronomical” view of the comet. (“La polémica ocasionada por el cometa de 1680-81 [...] fue una polémica propia del tránsito histórico de la arcaica concepción “astrológica“ de los cometas a la moderna concepción “astronómica“ de ellos.”) Op. cit. XI-XII.

⁴⁵ Reyes Abadie, Washington and Vázquez Romero, Andrés. *Crónica General del Uruguay*. Banda Oriental; Montevideo, 1979-1980. No. 10.

⁴⁶ My translation. Rudbeck’s words were: “Si omnium temporum evolvamus historias, deprehendemus bella, pestem, et id genus saepissime [accidisse] nullo antecedente cometa. Sed et cometae visi aliquando, nulla sequente notabili mutatione rerum, nisi quis, quae sex, octo, decem, pluribusque annis post acciderunt, quam apparuit, ab ipso dixerit sigi- ficata, aut quae evenerunt ante,

cum nonnunquam in medium talium interveniat.” *Theatrum cometicum* (605).

Sigüenza’s words were: “A la autoridad del Anónimo de Madrid opongo las siguientes, no por otra cosa sino por ser modernas, que es la calidad con que propone y abona las tres de que forma su fundamento. Es la primera de Olao Rudbeck y se hallará en el *Teatro de los cometas*. “Si recorremos las historias de todos los tiempos, descubriremos que muchísimas veces hubo guerras, peste y cosas semejantes sin que antecediera. Ningún cometa. Pero además, algunas veces fue visto cometa, sin seguirse ninguna notable mutación de las cosas, a menos que alguien haya dicho que fueron significados por el hechos que acontecieron seis, ocho, diez y más años después que apareció, o cosas que sucedieron antes, cuando algunas veces se interpone en medio de tales sucesos.” *Libra Astronómica y Filosófica*. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1959. Sid 102.

⁴⁷ Johan Nordström’s bibliographical supplement to N.v.E. Nordenmark’s *Astronomins historia i Sverige intill år 1800*. Lychnos Bibliotek 17:2; Uppsala 1965.(My translation)

⁴⁸ Op. Cit. My translation.

⁴⁹ Paz, Octavio. *Sor Juana*. Stockholm, 1982. pp. 272-273 (My translation).

⁵⁰ Paz, Octavio. p. 273. (My translation)

⁵¹ Pareja Ortiz, María del Carmen. Un aspecto de la vida cotidiana: La mujer ante el matrimonio en la legislación de Indias. “Hoy es Historia”, Año X, No.60, 1993.

⁵² Montesquieu, Charles de Secondat, Baron de La Brède and de Montesquieu was a French social philosopher (1689-1755). He belonged to the official nobility and became a member of the parliament in Bordeaux in 1714. In 1748 the work that has made his name one of the greatest within political thought was published, “L’esprit des lois”. The main thought of this work is that the social institutions (the laws) ought to be adjusted and judged with respect to the varying conditions of life of various peoples, their varying geographical and economic conditions, their size, customs, religion, history and so on. Thus, Montesquieu acknowledged the justification of different forms of society, as long as they guaranteed the stability of society and, to certain extent, individual freedom. Montesquieu only considered a monarchy fully satisfying, if the executive power belonged to the monarch, the legislative power belonged to a national assembly made up by an aristocratic upper house and a popularly elected house of commons, and the juridical power belonged to independent judges. The idea of separation of powers, already sketched by others, was

carried through by Montesquieu to the extent that one possessor of power weren't allowed to partake in the exercise of another. The theory of separation of powers has been of the uttermost importance to the discussion on political constitutions and has served as a model to the elaboration of a great number of constitutions (including the Swedish constitution of 1809). Montesquieu's works were just as important in other areas. He was the most prominent founder of the generical view of history, because of a diversified emphasis on the importance of various historical-political and physical causes of development. His views, heavily inspired by the natural sciences, also generated a new conception of man, which was quite the opposite to that of classical literature. Instead of a stylised and ideal figure of man, a variety of various, by the climate, environment and so on affected, personalities of peoples was disclosed. Interest in these soon was to affect, rejuvenate and renew also the literature; the so-called climate theory is one of the most important ferments of thought, and it was to evoke the pre-Romantic movements. Nordisk familjebok. Förlagshuset Norden AB, Malmö; 1952. (My translation)

⁵³ Zea, Leopoldo. *Filosofía de la historia americana*. Colección Tierra Firme. Fondo de Cultura Económica. México, 1978. p. 162.

⁵⁴ Zea, Leopoldo. *Filosofía de la historia americana*. Colección Tierra Firme. Fondo de Cultura Económica. México, 1978. p. 201.

⁵⁵ Ardao, Arturo. *Filosofía de lengua española*. Montevideo: Alfa, 1963.

⁵⁶ Deism (Fr. déisme, Lat. deus 'God'), in part a denomination of a certain form of faith (God is conceptualised as distant from the world and non-intervening in the historical development, comp. God), in part a specific theological and philosophical school that peaked in the 18th century in Great Britain. The common denominator of all theologians and philosophers at that place referred to as deists was the attempt to unite faith and reason through a limiting of the importance of divine revelation in theology. Christianity is true to the extent that it harmonises with natural religion. [...] Anders Jeffner. Nationalencyklopedin.

http://www.ne.se/jsp/search/article.jsp?i_art_id=151635&i_word=deism

⁵⁷ Reyes Abadie, Washington and Vázquez Romero, Andrés. *Crónica General del Uruguay*. Banda Oriental; 17. Montevideo.

⁵⁸ Nordisk familjebok. Förlagshuset Norden AB, Malmö; 1952.

⁵⁹ Calvinism (kalyinism): the educational view and school of the church, which originates in Johannes Calvin and is led by his principles. The views of Calvin were directly inspired by Luther, and matured through the influence of Butzer.

Nordisk familjebok. Förlagshuset Norden AB, Malmö; 1952.

⁶⁰ Reyes Abadie, Washington and Vázquez Romero, Andrés. *Crónica General del Uruguay*. Banda Oriental; 17. Montevideo. My translation.

⁶¹ Nordisk familjebok. Förlagshuset Norden AB, Malmö; 1952.

⁶² An *encomendero* is a person who holds the responsibility of an *encomienda*, i.e., an Indian district that is administrated by a Spaniard who is also allowed to exploit the Indian labour.

⁶³ *Mate*: Paraguay tea, a drink common to most parts of South America, prepared from the dried twigs and leaves of various species of holly (first and foremost, *Ilex paraguariensis*), small trees that can be found in the woods of south-western Brazil and adjacent countries. The drink is served with a straw and has, if it is consumed without sugar, a bitter taste (*matte cimarrao*). Mate contains caffeine and like coffee it has stimulating qualities, without causing insomnia.

⁶⁴ Stoetzer, O. Carlos. *El Pensamiento político en la América española durante el período de la emancipación (1789-1825) (Las bases hispánicas y las corrientes europeas) Tomos I y II*. Madrid, 1966. pp. 185-187.

⁶⁵ *Despotism*: a form of government in which the will of the monarch is unbound by any law.

⁶⁶ Those ideas of rights that are developed together with the culture from an historical perspective are called “positive”.

⁶⁷ Stoetzer, O. Carlos. pp. 195-196.

⁶⁸ Stoetzer, O. Carlos. p. 197.

⁶⁹ S. Pufendorf. *Le droit de la nature des gens, ou système général des principes les plus importants de la morale, de la jurisprudence, et de la politique*. Amsterdam 1712. Stoetzer, O. Carlos. Sid. 200.

⁷⁰ Stoetzer, O. Carlos. Volume II, p. 9ss.

⁷¹ *Modo de escribir la historia*. [...] No pedimos que se escriban otra vez las crónicas de Francia: ¿qué retroceso cabe en hacer la historia de Chile, que no está hecha; para que ejecutado este trabajo venga la filosofía a darnos la idea de cada personaje y de cada hecho histórico (de los nuestros se entiende), andando con paso firme sobre un terreno conocido? ¿Hemos de ir a buscar nuestra historia en Froissart, o en Comines, o en Mizeray, o en Sismondi? El verdadero movimiento retrógrado consistiría en principiar por donde los europeos han acabado. Suponer que se quiere que cerremos los ojos a la luz que nos viene de Europa, es pura declamación. Nadie ha pensado en eso. Lo que se quiere es que abramos bien los ojos a ella, y que no imaginemos encontrar en ella lo que no hay, ni puede haber. Leamos, estudiemos

las historias europeas; contemplemos de hito en hito el espectáculo particular que cada una de ellas desenvuelve y resume; aceptemos los ejemplos, las lecciones que contienen, que es tal vez en lo que menos se piensa: sírvannos también de modelo y de guía para nuestros trabajos históricos. ¿Podemos hallar en ellas a Chile, con sus accidentes, su fisonomía característica? Pues esos accidentes, esa fisonomía es lo que debe retratar el historiador de Chile, cualquiera de los dos métodos que adopte. [...]. (*El Araucano*, Santiago de Chile, 1848).

⁷² Reyes Abadie, W. and Vázquez Romero, A. *Crónica General del Uruguay. La emancipación hispanoamericana*. Ediciones de la Banda Oriental; Montevideo, 1979-1980. My translation.

⁷³ “Cowboy”, the Mexican counterpart of the “Gaucho” of Rio de la Plata and the “llanero” of Venezuela.

⁷⁴ Ricardo Lorenzo Sanz. Simón Bolívar. Madrid. 1978. p. 48.

⁷⁵ José de San Martín (1778-1850) was born in Corrientes (Argentina). As a child he moved to Spain with his parents, where he went to school in Madrid at the so-called *Seminario de Nobles* (the Noble Seminar, a school that only accepted students with aristocratic roots). Since San Martín was not an aristocrat, one might postulate that the school made some exceptions. Here San Martín got to learn French, a language he spoke fluently, something that opened up the texts of the encyclopedists to him (which he continued to read throughout his life). San Martín got his military education in the Murcia-division (1789) and later participated in actions of war in Africa and in the war against Napoleon. In 1812, after a short time in London, he returned to Buenos Aires. Here he founded the Lautaro-lodge together with Carlos de Alvear (1789-1853); a secret network similar to that of the freemasons. Later he held the responsibility for the organisation of the cavalry divisions *Granaderos*, with which he in 1813 defeated the realists in San Lorenzo. A year later he can be found in Mendoza, where he formed the famous *Los Andes*-army, with which he liberated Chile in 1817. Only some years later, in 1821, he managed to defeat the last Spanish resistance in Lima. On the 25th of July, 1822, the historical confrontation with Bolívar took place in Guayaquil. He lived his last years in France, where he died in 1850.

⁷⁶ Reyes Abadie, Washington and Vázquez Romero, Andrés. *Crónica General del Uruguay*. Banda Oriental; 19. Montevideo. My translation.

⁷⁷ Me apresuro a contestar la carta del 29 del mes pasado que Vd. me hizo el honor de dirigirme, y que yo recibí con la mayor satisfacción.[...]. "Tres siglos ha —dice Vd.— que empezaron las barbaridades que los españoles cometieron en el

grande hemisferio de Colón." Barbaridades que la presente edad ha rechazado como fabulosas, porque parecen superiores a la perversidad humana; y jamás serían creídas por los críticos modernos, si constantes y repetidos documentos no testificasen estas infaustas verdades. El filantrópico obispo de Chiapas, el apóstol de la América, Las Casas, ha dejado a la posteridad una breve relación de ellas, extractadas de las sumarias que siguieron en Sevilla a los conquistadores, con el testimonio de cuantas personas respetables había entonces en el Nuevo Mundo, y con los procesos mismos que los tiranos se hicieron entre sí, como consta por los más sublimes historiadores de aquel tiempo. Todos los imparciales han hecho justicia al celo, verdad y virtudes de aquel amigo de la humanidad, que con tanto fervor y firmeza denunció ante su gobierno y contemporáneos los actos más horribles de un frenesí sanguinario. Simón Bolívar: *Contestación de un Americano Meridional a un caballero de esta isla*. Kingston, 6 de septiembre de 1815. My translation.

⁷⁸ "La felonía con que Bonaparte —dice Vd.— prendió a Carlos IV y a Fernando VII, reyes de esta nación, que tres siglos ha aprisionó con traición a dos monarcas de la América meridional, es un acto muy manifiesto de la retribución divina, y al mismo tiempo una prueba de que Dios sostiene la justa causa de los americanos y les concederá su independencia." Parece que Vd. quiere aludir al monarca de México Montezuma, preso por Cortés y muerto, según Herrera, por el mismo, aunque Solís dice que por el pueblo; y a Atahualpa, Inca del Perú, destruido por Francisco Pizarro y Diego de Almagro. Existe tal diferencia entre la suerte de los reyes españoles y de los reyes americanos, que no admite comparación; los primeros son tratados con dignidad, conservados, y al fin recobran su libertad y trono; mientras que los últimos sufren tormentos inauditos y los vilipendios más vergonzosos. Si a Guatimozín, sucesor de Montezuma, se le trata como emperador y le ponen la corona, fue por irrisión y no por respeto; para que experimentase este escarnio antes que las torturas. Iguales a la suerte de este monarca fueron las del rey de Michoacán, Catzontzín; el Zipa de Bogotá y cuantos toquis, imas, zipas, ulmenes, caciques y demás dignidades indianas sucumbieron al poder español." Simón Bolívar: *Contestación de un Americano Meridional a un caballero de esta isla*. Kingston, 6 de septiembre de 1815. My translation

⁷⁹ "[...]Yo considero el estado actual de la América, como cuando desplomado el Imperio Romano cada desmembración formó un sistema político, conforme a sus intereses y situación o siguiendo la ambición particular de algunos jefes, familias o corporaciones; con esta notable diferencia, que aquellos miembros dispersos volvían a restablecer sus antiguas naciones con las alteraciones que

exigían las cosas o los sucesos; mas nosotros, que apenas conservamos vestigios de lo que en otro tiempo fue, y que por otra parte no somos indios ni europeos, sino una especie media entre los legítimos propietarios del país y los usurpadores españoles: en suma, siendo nosotros americanos por nacimiento y nuestros derechos los de Europa, tenemos que disputar éstos a los del país y que mantenernos en él contra la invasión de los invasores; así nos hallamos en el caso más extraordinario y complicado; [...].” Simón Bolívar: *Contestación de un Americano Meridional a un caballero de esta isla*. Kingston, 6 de septiembre de 1815. My translation.

⁸⁰ “En tanto que nuestros compatriotas no adquieran los talentos y virtudes políticas que distinguen a nuestros hermanos del Norte, los sistemas enteramente populares, lejos de sernos favorables, temo mucho que vengan a ser nuestra ruina. Desgraciadamente estas cualidades parecen estar muy distantes de nosotros en el grado que se requiere; y por el contrario, estamos dominados de los vicios que se contraen bajo la dirección de una nación como la española, que sólo ha sobresalido en fiereza, ambición, venganza y codicia.” Simón Bolívar: *Contestación de un Americano Meridional a un caballero de esta isla*. Kingston, 6 de septiembre de 1815. My translation

⁸¹ “Yo deseo más que otro alguno ver formar en América la más grande nación del mundo, menos por su extensión y riquezas que por su libertad y gloria. Aunque aspiro a la perfección del gobierno de mi patria, no puedo persuadirme que el Nuevo Mundo sea por el momento regido por una gran república; como es imposible, no me atrevo a desearlo, y menos deseo una monarquía universal en América, porque este proyecto, sin ser útil, es también imposible. Los abusos que actualmente existen no se reformarían y nuestra regeneración sería infructuosa. Los estados americanos han menester de los cuidados de gobiernos paternos que curen las llagas y las heridas del despotismo y la guerra. La metrópoli, por ejemplo, sería México, que es la única que puede serlo por su poder intrínseco, sin el cual no hay metrópoli. Supongamos que fuese el istmo de Panamá, punto céntrico para todos los extremos de este vasto continente, ¿no continuarían éstos en la languidez y aun en el desorden actual? Para que un solo gobierno dé vida, anime, ponga en acción todos los resortes de la prosperidad pública, corrija, illustre y perfeccione al Nuevo Mundo, sería necesario que tuviese las facultades de un Dios, y cuando menos las luces y virtudes de todos los hombres.” Simón Bolívar: *Contestación de un Americano Meridional a un caballero de esta isla*. Kingston, 6 de septiembre de 1815. My translation.

⁸² Stoetzer, O. Carlos, p. 33. My translation

-
- ⁸³ Reyes Abadie, W., Bruschera, O.H. and Melongo, T. El ciclo artiguista. Volymen IV. Universidad de la República. 1969. José Artigas. *El Reglamento de Tierras de 1815*. Artículos 6 y 7. My translation.
- ⁸⁴ Reyes Abadie, W., Bruschera, O.H. and Melongo, T. El ciclo artiguista. Volymen IV, p. 60. Universidad de la República. 1969. José Artigas. My translation.
- ⁸⁵ Zea, Leopoldo. *Filosofía de la historia americana*. Colección Tierra Firme. Fondo de Cultura Económica. México, 1978. No. 8, p. 350.
- ⁸⁶ Zea, Leopoldo. *Filosofía de la historia americana*. Colección Tierra Firme. Fondo de Cultura Económica. México, 1978. No. 8, p. 356.
- ⁸⁷ Zea, Leopoldo. *Filosofía de la historia americana*. Colección Tierra Firme. Fondo de Cultura Económica. México, 1978. No. 8, p. 356. “Un español o un americano del siglo XVI debió decir con más verdad: Existo; luego no pienso! Pues que no existiera si hubiera tenido la desgracia de pensar.” (My translation.)
- ⁸⁸ Zea, Leopoldo. *Filosofía de la historia americana*. Colección Tierra Firme. Fondo de Cultura Económica. México, 1978. No. 8, p. 356.
- ⁸⁹ Tiempo es que dejes ya la culta Europa/ Que tu nativa rustiquez desama, / Y dirjas el vuelo a donde te abre / El mundo de Colón su grande escena. Ardao, Arturo. *La inteligencia latinoamericana*. Montevideo, 1987. Sid. 7. Andres Bello (ed. Ivan Jaksic), “Allocution to poetry”, in *Selected Writings of Andres Bello*, Oxford 2003, p. 7. Translation by Frances Lopez-Morillas.
- ⁹⁰ Ardao, Arturo. *La inteligencia latinoamericana*. Montevideo, 1987, p. 46.
- ⁹¹ Zea, Leopoldo (Compilador). *Fuentes de la Cultura Latinoamericana*. Colección Tierra Firme. Fondo de Cultura Económica. México, 1993. Vol I, p. 143.
- ⁹² Ideas para un curso de filosofía contemporánea para proceder a la confección del curso de la filosofía contemporánea en el Colegio de Humanidades.”[...] Así la discusión de nuestros estudios será mas que en el sentido de la filosofía especulativa de la filosofía en sí; en el de la filosofía de aplicación, de la filosofía positiva y real, de la filosofía aplicada a los intereses sociales, políticos, religiosos y morales de estos paises. En el terreno de la filosofía favorita de este siglo: la sociabilidad y la política. Tal ha sido la filosofía como lo ha notado Damiron en manos de Lamennais, Lerminier, Tocqueville, Jouffroy, etc. De día en día, la filosofía se hace estadista, positiva, financiera, histórica, industrial, literaria en vez de ideológica y psicológica: ha sido definida por una alta celebridad del pensamiento nuevo, la ciencia de las generalidades.” Zea, Leopoldo (Compilador). *Fuentes de la Cultura Latinoamericana*. Colección Tierra Firme. Fondo de Cultura Económica. México, 1993. Vol I, sid 143. (My translation.)

⁹³ “El gaucho no trabaja; el alimento y el vestido lo encuentra preparado en su casa; uno y otro se lo proporcionan sus ganados, si es propietario; la casa del patrón o pariente, si nada posee. Las atenciones que el ganado exige se reducen a correrías y partidas de placer; la hierra, que es como la vendimia de los agricultores, es una fiesta cuya llegada se recibe con transportes de júbilo: allí es el punto de reunión de todos los hombres de veinte leguas a la redonda, allí la ostentación de la increíble destreza en el lazo.” Sarmiento, Domingo Faustino. *Facundo. Civilización y Barbarie*. Letras Hispánicas. Madrid, 1990. Sid. 74.

⁹⁴ El general Rondeau puso sitio a Montevideo con un ejército disciplinado: concurría al sitio Artigas, caudillo célebre, con algunos millares de gauchos. Artigas había sido contrabandista temible hasta 1804, en que las autoridades civiles de Buenos Aires pudieron ganarlo, y hacerse servir en carácter de comandante de campana, en apoyo de esas mismas autoridades a quienes había hecho la guerra hasta entonces. [...] Un día Artigas con sus gauchos se separó del general Rondeau y empezó a hacerle la guerra. [...] La única diferencia consistía en que Artigas era enemigo de los patriotas y de los realistas a la vez. Sarmiento, Domingo Faustino. *Facundo. Civilización y Barbarie*. Letras Hispánicas. Madrid, 1990. Sid. 109. (My translation.)

⁹⁵ “Este era el elemento que el célebre Artigas ponía en movimiento; instrumento ciego, pero lleno de vida, de instintos hostiles a la civilización europea y a toda organización regular; adverso a la monarquía como a la república, porque ambas venían de la *ciudad*, y traían aparejado un orden y la consagración de la autoridad. [...] Este movimiento espontáneo de las campañas pastoriles fue tan ingenuo en sus primitivas manifestaciones, tan genial y tan expresivo de su espíritu y tendencias, que abisma hoy el candor de los partidos de las ciudades que lo asimilaron a su causa y lo bautizaron con los nombres políticos que a ellos los dividían. La fuerza que sostenía a Artigas en Entre Ríos era la misma que en Santa Fé, a López, en Santiago a Ibarra, en los Llanos a Facundo. El individualismo constituía su esencia, el caballo, su arma exclusiva, la Pampa inmensa su teatro.” Sarmiento, Domingo Faustino. *Facundo. Civilización y Barbarie*. Letras Hispánicas. Madrid, 1990. Sid. 110. (My translation.)

⁹⁶ Ardao, Arturo. *Assimilation and Transformation of positivism in Latin America*. Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol XXIV, No. 4, October-December, 1963, pp. 515-522. U.S.A.

⁹⁷ Ardao, Arturo. *Assimilation and Transformation of positivism in Latin America*. Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol XXIV, No. 4, October-December, 1963,

pp. 515-522. U.S.A.

⁹⁸ Ardao, Arturo. *Assimilation and Transformation of positivism in Latin America*. Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol XXIV, No. 4, October-December, 1963, pp. 515-522. U.S.A.

⁹⁹ Ardao, Arturo. *Assimilation and Transformation of positivism in Latin America*. Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol XXIV, No. 4, October-December, 1963, pp. 515-522. U.S.A.

¹⁰⁰ [...] ser el vínculo que haga una y fuerte la idea americana en la universal comunión artística. [...] Combatir contra los fetichistas y los iconoclastas. [...] Mantener al propio tiempo que el pensamiento de la innovación, el respeto a las tradiciones y la jerarquía de los Maestros. [...] Trabajar por el brillo de la lengua castellana en América, y, al par que por el tesoro de sus riquezas antiguas, por el engrandecimiento de esas mismas riquezas en vocabulario, rítmica, plasticidad y matiz. [...] Luchar porque prevalezca el amor a la divina belleza, tan combatida hoy por invasoras tendencias utilitarias. [...] Servir en el Nuevo Mundo y en la ciudad más grande y práctica de la América Latina a la aristocracia intelectual de las repúblicas de lengua españolas esos son nuestros propósitos. (My translation.)

¹⁰¹ Op.cit. p. 166. Jorrín, Miguel and Martz, John D. *Latin-American Political Thought and Ideology*. The University of North Carolina Press. 1970.

¹⁰² Zea, Leopoldo. *Filosofía de la historia americana*. Colección Tierra Firme. Fondo de Cultura Económica. México, 1978. p. 290. "No hay batalla entre la civilización y la barbarie, sino entre la falsa erudición y la naturaleza. [...] El mestizo autóctono ha vencido al criollo exótico. [...] Por eso el libro importado ha sido vencido en América por el hombre natural. [...] El hombre natural es bueno, acata y premia la inteligencia superior, mientras ésta no se vale de su sumisión para dañarle." (My translation.)

¹⁰³ Miró Quesada, Francisco. *Despertar y proyecto del filosofar latinoamericano*. Colección Tierra Firme. Fondo de Cultura Económica. México, 1974.

¹⁰⁴ Op cit. p. 106, 107.

¹⁰⁵ Op cit. p. 113.

¹⁰⁶ Op cit. p. 138.

¹⁰⁷ Op cit. p. 166, 167

¹⁰⁸ Op cit. p. 182, 183.

¹⁰⁹ Op.cit. 1967. Avon Books. New York, p. 223.

¹¹⁰ Siglo XXI, 1970

¹¹¹ UNAM, México 1987.

-
- ¹¹² Instituto Politécnico Nacional de México; 1971.
- ¹¹³ 1943.
- ¹¹⁴ Langton, C. G. *Artificial Life*. K. Gerbel and P. Weibel (ed.) *Genetic Art-Artificial Life*. PVS Verlager; 1993.
- ¹¹⁵ Alfredo Amando Aguirre, <http://www.discepolo.org.ar/kusch.htm>
- ¹¹⁶ The periodical *Cuadernos de Marcha*, number 13, May 1968 and number 14 from June 1968. Montevideo.
- ¹¹⁷ The periodical *Cuadernos de Marcha*, number 14 from June 1968. Montevideo. p. 20. My translation.
- ¹¹⁸ The periodical *Cuadernos de Marcha*, number 13, May 1968. Montevideo. p. 76. My translation.
- ¹¹⁹ Trías, Vivián. *La Rebelión de las orillas*. *Obras Completas*, Tomo 12. Montevideo, 1989. p. 197.
- ¹²⁰ The text about Jorge Elicer Gaitán belongs to Anna Cappi.
- ¹²¹ Marichal, Juan. *Cuatro fases de la Historia Intelectual Latinoamericana (1810-1970)*. Fundación Juan March. Madrid, 1978. Sid. 54.
- ¹²² Jorrín, Miguel and Martz, John D. *Latin-American Political Thought and Ideology*. The University of North Carolina Press. 1970. p. 273.
- ¹²³ *Op.cit.* p. 2.
- ¹²⁴ *Op.cit.* p. 2.
- ¹²⁵ *Op.cit.* p. 3.
- ¹²⁶ *Op.cit.* p. 16.
- ¹²⁷ *Op.cit.* p. 5.
- ¹²⁸ *Op.cit.* p. 7.
- ¹²⁹ *Op.cit.* p. 7.
- ¹³⁰ *Op.cit.* p. 10.
- ¹³¹ *Op.cit.* p. 11.
- ¹³² *Op.cit.* p. 11.
- ¹³³ *Op.cit.* p. 345.
- ¹³⁴ Jorrín, Miguel and Martz John D. *Latin-American Political Thought and Ideology*. The University of North Carolina Press. 1970. p. 279.
- ¹³⁵ Peralta, Amanda. ...med andra medel. Från Clausewitz till Guevara: krig, revolution och politik i en marxistisk idétradition. Daidalos. 1990., p. 159. (My translation)
- ¹³⁶ Peralta, Amanda. ...med andra medel. Från Clausewitz till Guevara: krig, revolution och politik i en marxistisk idétradition. Daidalos. 1990., p. 181. (My translation)

-
- ¹³⁷ Translated by Pedro Álvarez Tabío & Andrew Paul Booth, see <http://www.marxists.org/history/cuba/archive/castro/1953/10/16.htm>.
- ¹³⁸ Amanda Peralta. p. 128. (My translation)
- ¹³⁹ Amanda Peralta. pp. 121-122. (My translation)
- ¹⁴⁰ Zea, Leopoldo (Compilador). Fuentes de la Cultura Latinoamericana. Colección Tierra Firme. Fondo de Cultura Económica. México, 1993. Volume 1, p. 321.
- ¹⁴¹ Zea, Leopoldo (Compilador). Fuentes de la Cultura Latinoamericana. Colección Tierra Firme. Fondo de Cultura Económica. México, 1993. Volume 1, p. 321. (My translation.)
- ¹⁴² Amanda Peralta, pp. 63-64. (My translation)
- ¹⁴³ Peralta, Amanda. Teori och praktik i de fattigas universum. En idéhistorisk undersökning av latinamerikansk befrielsesteologi. Daidalos. 1995. p. 48. (My translation)
- ¹⁴⁴ Peralta, Amanda. p. 49. (My translation)
- ¹⁴⁵ Peralta, Amanda. p. Ibid. (My translation)
- ¹⁴⁶ Peralta, Amanda. p. 51. (My translation)
- ¹⁴⁷ Post-Marxism: A Reader. p. 2.
- ¹⁴⁸ Post-Marxism: A Reader. p. 7.
- ¹⁴⁹ Laclau, Ernesto. New Reflections on the Revolution of Our Time. London., 1990. p. 185.