

THE HISTORY OF IDEAS IN LATIN AMERICA*

Harold Eugene Davis, The American University

INTEREST IN RESEARCH ON THE HISTORY OF IDEAS IN LATIN AMERICA IS INCREASING, but the product is spotty and uneven. As might be expected, much of the important work has been done by Spanish Americans and Brazilians. In 1950, in his *Social Science Trends in Latin America*,¹ the author pointed out the interest in intellectual history, especially in Mexico, Argentina, and Uruguay, and this interest has increased notably since that time.

Outside Latin America, this study of the history of ideas is still largely undeveloped, although a significant group of scholars in the United States, and a few in Spain, Italy, and elsewhere have made important contributions. International organizations and gatherings have stimulated an exchange of ideas and of publications. The most important among them has been the Committee on the History of Ideas, established by the Commission on History of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and headed by Leopoldo Zea. A seminar held by this committee in San Juan, Puerto Rico, in 1956, generated many ideas, and two provocative numbers of the committee-sponsored *Revista de Historia de las Ideas* were issued as a result. Meetings of the Inter-American Congress of Philosophy and of the Sociedad Interamericana de Filosofía, two meetings of United States and Mexican historians, increased scholarly travel, and increased publication in the United States, Latin America, and Spain have also furthered the development.

The Commission on History of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History sponsored the publication by the Fondo de Cultura Económica of a series of national volumes on the history of ideas in America, with emphasis on the contemporary, meaning in this case the twentieth century.² Two earlier series in Latin America should be noted. The Secretaría de Educación Pública of Mexico, when headed by Octavio Vejar Vázquez, published a series of volumes (*Serie del Pensamiento de América*) of selections from the writings of outstanding thinkers, with critical prologues by Mexican scholars.³

* The author uses the terms history of ideas and history of thought interchangeably, in a broad sense that embraces both formal and informal thought. The term philosophy is used to refer to the more formal or structured thought; but it is given a somewhat broader sense than is currently customary in the United States, a sense that includes social and legal thought or theory, as well as the philosophical bases of such subjects as anthropology, economics, literature, and art.

Editorial Losada of Buenos Aires, in a series of volumes entitled *Biblioteca del Pensamiento Vivo*, included studies of such outstanding Latin Americans as Andrés Bello, Simón Bolívar, Domingo Sarmiento, Mariano Moreno, and José Enrique Rodó. In contrast with the Mexican series, these were critical studies, rather than anthologies,⁴ of the thought of these authors by eminent scholars.

In recent years, university presses have issued an imposing number of English translations of important Spanish American and Brazilian classics. For the most part, they are books of authors whose thought is important to the historian of ideas. But they have also included an English version of Leopoldo Zea's *Dos etapas del pensamiento en Hispanoamérica*.⁵

Two Argentine professors, Guillermo A. Lousteau Heguy and Salvador María Lozada, of the Universidad de Buenos Aires, the Universidad del Salvador, and the Pontifical Catholic University "Santa María de Buenos Aires," are currently publishing an ambitious series of twenty-one volumes, to cover the thought of some forty-two important figures of Spain and Spanish America, "El pensamiento político hispanoamericano." Eleven volumes are to be devoted to thirty-two Spanish Americans. The volumes consist of extensive excerpts from the writings of these authors, but with little or no critical comment.⁶

The reader may detect in this series an over emphasis on Spanish thought, since it gives almost as much space to ten Spanish writers as to thirty-two Spanish Americans; but the series serves a useful purpose in bringing some of the relevant Spanish influences into the picture. It may seem captious to point out that Ortega and Unamuno are absent from the series, while Maeztu is included, and that such Spanish Americans as Bilbao of Chile and Ignacio Ramírez of Mexico, whom one would expect to find, are not there. Spanish traditionalism receives somewhat more than its share of attention. This is not entirely amiss, however, if one recalls the lack of attention elsewhere to this important stream of thought, if such a broad generalization may be used to embrace its diverse trends. But an entire volume (17) devoted to José Antonio Primo de Rivera raises some question as to the historical objectivity of the series.

Such series as the foregoing perform a valuable service in sifting out from the voluminous literature some of the writing which has been assumed to have historical importance. They must be used by the student with care, however, because the validity of the critical basis for the selection is not always objective; sometimes it is not even apparent. Their special importance lies in a widespread interest in the history of ideas; they have helped to lay the basis for the current interest in the history of Latin American thought.

Several works published by the Division of Philosophy and Letters of the Pan American Union have gone on to make something more like the kind

of analysis the historian looks for. Among these are volumes by Carlos Arturo Torres on Justo Sierra, by Emilio Abreu Gómez on Justo Arosemena, by Armando Correia Pacheco on Joaquim Nabuco, by Arturo Uslar Pietri on Juan Vicente González, and by Enrique Kempf Mercado on Gabriel René Moreno. Other significant publications of The Division of Philosophy and Letters include *Philosophy in Peru*, by Augusto Salazar Bundy; *Panorama de la filosofía cubana*, by Humberto Piñera Llera; *La filosofía en la Argentina*, by Juan Carlos Torchia Estrada; *Panorama: the History of Philosophy in Brazil*, by João Cruz Costa; and *La filosofía latinoamericana contemporánea*, by Aníbal Sánchez Reulet.

THE QUESTION OF A SYNTHESIS

As a whole, both among Latin American and non-Latin American scholars, the field still lacks clear definition and synthesis, particularly in the national era. Scholarly approaches to the subject vary greatly, and research tends to be in bits and pieces, consisting mostly in studies of individual writers. Leopoldo Zea in his *Dos etapas del pensamiento en Hispanoamérica*,⁷ has formulated a challenging synthesis that will be examined later. But his synthesis relates chiefly to the nineteenth century. The papers presented in the Puerto Rico seminar, and published in the *Revista de Historia de las Ideas*, though uneven in quality, are also suggestive of an emerging synthesis.⁸

Zea's book had been preceded by a notable series of articles published in *Cuadernos Americanos* by the Spanish philosopher, José Gaos, who had been engaged in studies of Spanish American Thought before becoming a resident of Mexico. In some respects these articles had prefigured the Zea synthesis.⁹ In the United States, the book of W. Rex Crawford¹⁰ also preceded the publication of Professor Zea's *Dos etapas*. But Professor Crawford did not develop an historical synthesis comparable to that of Zea, probably because his basic sociological approach precluded it. Crawford, however, made the observation that the most significant philosophy in Latin America was social philosophy, which he perhaps thought of as including the philosophy of law and of history. But his treatment was by individual authors, grouped largely by countries, which he treated as representative of their times and locale. He found "central themes running through Latin American thought . . . related to the historic situation of the Latin American countries after independence." The ideas, he assumed, were produced by the situation, so that Latin American philosophy "gets its new and urgent problems from the place and plight of the society in which it arises."¹¹

A few years earlier the Argentine sociologist, Alfredo Poviña, had covered much of the ground traversed by Zea and Crawford in a history of sociology

in Latin America.¹² As a sociologist, Poviña was chiefly interested in the history of sociological theory as such, and hence developed no particular concept of the historical process in its development; he was influenced by the historical conceptualism of Weber and reveals an inclination to historical sociology. The work of Carlos A. Echinove Trujillo, *La sociología en Hispanoamérica*,¹³ is less analytical and more descriptive. José Medina Echeverría also published a study of sociological theory in which he related sociology in Latin America to that elsewhere.¹⁴ Although, like Poviña, Medina reveals historical concepts in dealing with the sociological theories he finds, his work is not a history of ideas in the broader sense.

Two Latin American philosophers, Francisco Larroyo of Mexico and Manfredo Kempf Mercado of Bolivia, examining the question of Americanism in the Philosophy of Latin America, published their studies in the same year, 1958.¹⁵ Kempf Mercado, concerned with the relationship culture-philosophy, discovered in his review of Latin American philosophy from the colonial period to the present the existence of a Latin American pattern of thought and culture distinct from that of Anglo-America, although like the latter it was a product of American experience. The book of Larroyo is not a history, but it is a very perceptive inquiry into the problems involved in such a history. His "Quadruple concept and form of an American philosophy," together with his chapters on "American Historiography" and "Philosophy of the History of America," are rewarding to any serious student who wishes to immerse himself in the stream of Latin American thought, whether or not he subscribes to Larroyo's neo-Kantian existentialism.¹⁶

Finally, among the efforts to structure the history of Latin American Thought, we have the recent work of a Spanish scholar, O. Carlos Stoetzer, *El pensamiento político en la América española durante el período de la emancipación 1789–1825*.¹⁷ Concentrating on the period immediately previous to that which Zea studied with most care, Stoetzer concludes that while Rousseau and other French writers exercised considerable influence, in various ways, upon leaders of independence, the major influence was not French but that of the Spanish Liberal movement as expressed in the Constitution of 1812.¹⁸

The writings on Latin American intellectual history, even those which have come to this author's attention in recent years, are much too numerous to be mentioned here. Nor is this the place to enumerate them. The reader will find a selected list in a bibliography recently published by the Division of Philosophy and Letters of the Pan American Union.¹⁹ Writers from Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, and the United States predominate in numbers. A simple count of the author's card file of the writing in this field which has come to his attention during the past three decades (the number increasing notably in recent years) produced the names of seventeen from Argentina, nine from

Brazil, sixteen from Mexico, twenty-seven from the United States, seven from Chile, five from Uruguay, five from Spain, four from Venezuela, three each from Ecuador and Peru, two each from Bolivia, Colombia and Cuba, and one from each of the other Hispanic nations, except Paraguay, and from the USSR. The total numbers are doubtless considerably greater than those which this author has happened to notice. They constitute an impressive indication of the increased interest in studies of this kind. How much of this writing is a significant contribution to our understanding of the history of ideas in Latin America is another question. Much of it treats the ideas of individuals; while useful in filling out the picture, it lacks any general concept, either of national intellectual history or of that of Latin America as a whole.

EARLIER DEVELOPMENTS

It would be a mistake to assume that this interest in the history of ideas is all new. The seventeenth century *Epítome* of Antonio de León Pinelo, the first comprehensive bibliography of the New World, was a major contribution to the history of ideas in Latin America.²⁰ The nineteenth century Chilean historian, Diego Barros Arana, laid important bases for intellectual history in his works on printing in the various countries and on the Inquisition in America, in a study of the papers of Ercilla, the author of *La Araucana*, in a history of women writers in Chile, and in a bio-bibliographical study of Antonio de León Pinelo's *Discourse* on the *Recopilación* of the laws of the Indies.²¹

In the nineteenth century, we also have the work of Vicente G. Quesada of Argentina on *La vida intelectual en la América española durante los siglos xvi, xvii, y xviii*²² and José Ingenieros' *La evolución de las ideas Argentinas*.²³ Almost a century ago, Silvio Romero wrote a history of Brazilian philosophy.²⁴ The work of the Peruvian Víctor Andrés Belaúnde, *Bolívar and the Political Thought of the Spanish-American Revolution*,²⁵ though more recent, reveals a long standing interest among Peruvian historians.

Harry Bernstein has written that Benjamin Franklin was "the first eminent American to develop an interest in Spanish thought."²⁶ The interest of United States scholars increased notably in the nineteenth century; the scope and variety of the Spanish, Portuguese, and Latin American works accumulating in the libraries in Cambridge, New Haven, New York, Princeton, Philadelphia, and elsewhere bespoke a lively interest in Spanish and Spanish American ideas. One cannot read the two volumes of William H. Prescott's *Mexico and the Life of the Conqueror, Fernando Cortes* without noting his interest in the sixteenth century ideas the conquistadores brought to the conquest of New Spain.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries Bernard Moses pioneered in developing an interest in the United States in the history of Latin

Latin American Research Review

American ideas with his classic work on the intellectual backgrounds of the independence movement.²⁷ More recently Harry Bernstein, in his *Origins of Inter-American Interest*²⁸ and his *Making of an Inter-American Mind*,²⁹ Irving Leonard, in his *Books of the Brave*³⁰ and his *Don Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora: A Mexican Savant of the Seventeenth Century*,³¹ John Tate Lanning in three major works, *The University in the Kingdom of Guatemala*, *Academic Culture in the Spanish Colonies*, and *The Eighteenth Century Enlightenment in the University of Guatemala*, made major specialized contributions to the literature on the history of ideas in Latin America, in works of broader purpose and scope.³² Arthur P. Whitaker helped to direct the attention of historians to the subject by organizing a symposium on the Enlightenment in Latin America at the meeting of the American Historical Association in 1940.³³

The work of two United States sociologists deserves special mention at this point. In his early approaches to a general understanding of the subject, the author found the article of L. L. Bernard in the *Encyclopedia of Social Sciences*³⁴ an invaluable and reliable guide to the trends in social thought. In his previously mentioned *A Century of Latin American Thought*, W. Rex Crawford had provided a series of illuminating essays on the outstanding intellectual figures since independence; this work was long the only useful guide in English for the student of the thought of this period.

COLONIAL THOUGHT

The rigorous revisionism which characterizes studies of colonial thought during the past two or three decades is part of the more general trend to modify or correct the Black Legend. The works of Lewis Hanke on Las Casas and the debate which centered around the latter's efforts to reform Indian policy have called attention to the persistent humanism of Spanish thought in the sixteenth century, centering in the University of Salamanca.³⁵ Silvio Zavala of Mexico has also directed attention to the humanist thought animating the Conquest, particularly among the missionaries.³⁶ The research of the scholars in the American Academy of Franciscan History has also made significant contributions, as for example in translating and publishing *Motolinia's History of the Indians of New Spain*.³⁷

Luis Nicolau d'Olivera's study of Bernardino de Sahagún as a historian not only demonstrated the Franciscan missionary's contribution to the cultural anthropology of America, but also threw light on the attitude of the Inquisition toward humanistic studies such as those of Sahagún, as well as on the methodology and theory he employed.³⁸ Mauricio Magdaleno combines the gifts of a playwright with those of an intellectual historian. In preparing a volume of

selections from Sahagún for the series *Biblioteca del Estudiante Universitario* he revealed his own anthropological contributions; but his work is even more important as an indication of Mexican interest in Sahagún's ideas and in those of the Indian civilization he wrote about.³⁹

The work of Spanish scholars is also part of this revisionism of colonial intellectual history. Bernardo G. Monsegu, C.P., among others, has resuscitated Juan Luis Vives as a Christian humanist showing that his thought was reconciled to that of Aquinas and Aristotle, although exhibiting much of the character of Erasmus.⁴⁰ This interest in intellectual history has long characterized Spanish scholarship; but the present century has found additional stimulus in the so-called "institutional" historians, led by Rafael Altamira y Crevea. In this connection the studies of the history of law, particularly the studies of the laws of the Indies by Altamira, are a major contribution to the history of ideas in the colonial epoch.⁴¹ The recent work of Francisco Puy on traditional thought in eighteenth century Spain is another good example of this Spanish interest.⁴²

While the work of Portuguese scholars is somewhat less imposing, Antonio José Saraiva, among others, has studied Portuguese humanism.⁴³ Vieira de Almeida has written *A dispersão do pensamento português*.⁴⁴

Revisionism in respect to the late colonial period has centered around questions of the penetration of Newtonian scientific thought and European rationalist ideas. Lanning used the theses presented by students in the University of San Carlos of Guatemala in the eighteenth century to show that the sensationalist-rationalist ideas had permeated widely, while analyzing the controversy over the teaching of these ideas in the university.⁴⁵ Incidentally, he showed that colonial society exhibited more flexibility than is often assumed in respect to this debate over the scholastic philosophy. Humberto Piñera Llera, in his study of José Manuel Mestre's *De la filosofía en la Habana*⁴⁶ does something similar for the University of Habana, but in a more limited way which lacks the significant attention to theses which Lanning gave to his research.

Many other Latin American scholars have studied the ideas taught in colonial universities. Guillermo Furlong, S.J., in his *Nacimiento y desarrollo de la filosofía en el Río de la Plata, 1536-1810*,⁴⁷ emphasizes the influence of Jesuit rational thought, particularly the influence of the legal thought and theories of Francisco Suárez. Other scholars such as Enrique de Gandía, writing on the thought of the independence period, have also examined Spanish colonial influences. But no other study of a university community known to this author rivals that of Professor Lanning. To borrow his own phraseology, Lanning has shown that "the mere shaking of an angry finger in the hoary argument about Spanish civilization is no longer rewarding."⁴⁸ Furlong comes close in his study of the colonial treatises written in the University of Córdoba.

THE INDEPENDENCE MOVEMENT

Much remains to be done in the study of the history of ideas in the colonial era, but the emphasis in recent years has shifted to the national period, including the epoch of independence. This latter area of study also provides one of the major current controversies of interpretation, a controversy which takes various forms. Venezuelan scholars, led by Vicente Lecuna and Pedro de Grases, and stimulated by the Comité de Orígenes de la Emancipación, established in Caracas by The Commission on History of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History, have focused attention upon the thinking of independence leaders. They have published the papers of Símon Rodríguez and Germán Roscio and the documents of the Gual and España uprising, directed attention to the liberal Christian ideas of Fermín Toro, and continued the debate upon the political philosophy of Símon Bolívar.

Economic determinists of various varieties have tended to interpret the independence thought as ideologies, as expressions of the interests of the land-owning criollo elite of leadership, or as the rationale of actions dictated by the conditions of the times. Thus José Luis Romero has written:

Entendía bien . . . el criollo campesino . . . los postulados de la política económica liberal, porque esos se relacionaban con problemas cuya gravedad había experimentado en carne propia, y en ese campo, como en el remoto anhelo de autodeterminación, coincidía con los otros grupos criollos.⁴⁹

Víctor Alba sees the basis of the independence thought in Mexico in "la situación social del Virreinato."⁵⁰ Jesús Silva Herzog, Mexican historian and long-time editor of *Cuadernos Americanos*, with obvious inclination toward marxist socialist thought (though not doctrinaire) and apparently attributing a certain autonomy to thought, in his discussion of the enlightened Bishop Abad y Queipo, seemingly views the independence movement in Mexico as a conflict within the inherited colonial tradition. He presents it as a conflict of both interests and ideas, a conflict to be understood in terms of the white conquerors and the conquered Indians, in which the white interests and outlook conquered, only to be challenged throughout the ensuing national history.⁵¹

Scholars who assume more autonomy in the history of ideas are of three kinds. Some emphasize the influence of the French writers, Voltaire, Montesquieu, Raynal, and Rousseau.⁵² A second group stress the influence of British political theory and the (North) American Revolutionary documents.⁵³ The third group, including such scholars as Guillermo Furlong of Argentina, direct attention to the influence of Hispanic natural law theories, especially as found in Francisco Vitoria and Francisco Suárez.⁵⁴ O. Carlos Stoetzer of Spain stresses the pre-eminent influence of Spanish liberalism.⁵⁵

Augusto Mijares of Venezuela emphasizes the influence of the Spanish

political tradition, especially that of the *cabildo*.⁵⁶ The Argentines Zorraquín Becú, Carlos Mouchet, and Ricardo Levene, their master, stress the Argentine origins of Argentine legal institutions.⁵⁷

The significance of this debate does not lie particularly in the various interpretations proposed, often in too doctrinaire fashion. Rather, its importance is twofold. First, it is broadening the scope of the historical inquiry, giving it wider perspective. Second, it is leading, at last, to much more fundamental and sophisticated research. No scholar can afford to disregard the controversy.

STUDIES OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

The increased interest in the history of ideas since independence is even more significant than the revisionist activity on the thought of the independence movements. A few studies of the history of thought (or philosophy) in individual countries had appeared prior to World War II,⁵⁸ but until the past two decades the post-independence era was relatively neglected. The pioneering work of Silvio Romero in Brazil is an exception, although Spanish American scholars often displayed an interest in the ideas of leaders and parties in their treatment of history. Moreover, the general practice of publishing the collected works of great writers, usually with government sponsorship, expressed a deep interest in their ideas; editors and compilers sometimes gave them an historical character.

The publication of Leopoldo Zea's *Dos etapas del pensamiento en hispanoamérica: del romanticismo al positivismo*, was a major turning point.⁵⁹ A number of the works of other scholars noted earlier, including those studying the history of individual countries, had sketched out the lines of interpretation; but no other scholar had done what Zea did. Zea had published two volumes (1943–1944) on the history of positivist thought in Mexico,⁶⁰ before he received financial support from the Colegio de Mexico and the Rockefeller Foundation for the study which produced this book. He had developed his ideas in contact with the group of Mexican scholars that had gathered around José Gaos and the Colegio de México, and was moved by the sense of cultural and spiritual unity which animates Spanish America. Thus he stated that his objective was "to bring out a series of ideas which call attention to the unity of spirit expressed in a uniformity of problems and of efforts to solve them."⁶¹ The resulting synthesis has been the guidance or point of departure for much subsequent research.

Zea approached the broader question of Hispanic American thought against the background of his analysis of that of Mexico. Social thought was his major concern, and the question was whether, or in what respects, the currents of thought were like or unlike those in Mexico where, despite the influence of

the ideas of Andrés Molina Enríquez,⁶² the attack on positivism had been a major element in the ideology of the Revolution. He found both similarities and differences in the thought of the other Spanish American countries; but his Mexican model may partially explain why, despite his obvious sophistication and objectivity, Zea's analysis tends to reduce the thought of the national period so generally to certain types of positivist thought. This author has some reservations about the Zea synthesis which will be discussed in the following pages, but these reservations do not, in any sense, minimize the catalytic effect of Zea's work. No other scholar has exercised a comparable influence in giving direction to research in this field. In a more general sense, Zea's work is also evidence of a kind of vitality and predominance of contemporary Mexican philosophical studies in the Spanish language world.

THE ZEA SYNTHESIS

One of Zea's basic concepts is that social thought is an expression of a search for American intellectual independence. As Americans first faced this question of independence, in confronting the evolving European philosophy of history, the theories of Herder, Hegel, Ranke, and Savigny presented them with a dilemma. Should they accept the authority of the European historical tradition, as determining their course of development, following the path of Spanish and Church oriented traditionalism? Or should they embrace a concept of history which gave them more freedom to determine their course of action? As Zea interpreted the thought of Sarmiento, Lastarria, José María Luis Mora, and José Antonio Saco, he saw Spanish Americans in the post-independence epoch resolving this dilemma of historical interpretation by rejecting the authority of historical tradition while accepting the general current of historical thought; they did this even as they sought the historical basis of Spanish American national destinies in American experience and American historical realities. They were influenced in this direction, he concludes, by their having accepted the ideas of the French ideologues, of the utilitarians, and of the Scottish "common sense" philosophy. Such a formulation, despite its many different expressions, prepared the way for the general acceptance of positivism by mid-century. In fact, Zea insists, this process had gone on by mid-century to the extent that much of the early nineteenth century Spanish American thought could best be called pre-positivist. Hispanic Americans "saw in positivism the philosophy which they had been forced to achieve by their own means."⁶³

The meaning of positivism for Brazil was quite distinct from that for Spanish America, however. Because Spanish Americans "acted always as revolutionaries," whether reacting against anarchy or against dictatorships, trying to

change the mentality, the habits and the customs inherited from Spain," they made of positivism a utopia. The Brazilians, on the other hand, because they were able to build their nation on the colonial past, saw positivism as "the most apt doctrine with which to bring into focus the new realities which appeared in their natural social evolution."⁶⁴

To understand the full significance of Zea's work it is necessary to note the importance of the immigration of Spanish intellectuals to Spanish America, particularly Mexico, shortly before World War II. Their presence seems to have incited some, though not all by any means, of this sudden spurt in the Latin American interest in the history of ideas. José Gaos gave an impetus to this interest by a series of articles in *Cuadernos Americanos*.⁶⁵ This Spanish American interest penetrated scholarship in the United States, during and immediately following the war, through the writing and/or presence of such philosophers as the Argentines Risieri Frondizi and Francisco Romero, the Peruvian Luis Alberto Sánchez, the Dominican-Mexican Pedro Henríquez Ureña, as well as Leopoldo Zea, Silvio Zavala, and other Mexicans. The significance of the publication of W. Rex Crawford's *A Century of Latin American Thought* (1944) in developing interest in the subject among United States students has been noted earlier.⁶⁶ Meanwhile, works of Latin American scholars began to appear in increasing number.⁶⁷

Zea saw enough similarities in the positivist thought in the various countries to justify speaking of an Hispanic-American positivism, although he also pointed out a diversity in the various national expressions. This interest in distinguishing the personalities of the different nations led him to categorize the positivist trends by countries. Thus all of the second "Part" of *Dos etapas*, a little over half of the book, is a series of thirteen chapters on positivism in Chile, Peru, Bolivia, Argentina, Uruguay, Cuba, and Mexico, in that order. These were the nations, he concludes, in which positivist thought had the greatest influence. Throughout these national chapters the author elaborates his thesis of the revolutionary or utopian character of positivist thought (despite its scientific sociology), while distinguishing the divergent patterns and emphases. His study was based upon first-hand examination of the writing of many authors, as evidenced by frequent quotations, although he also refers frequently to the national studies by historians. He has subsequently restated his thesis, with little fundamental change, in his *El pensamiento latino-americano*, previously cited, and in an article in *Cuadernos Americanos*.⁶⁸

In the article in *Cuadernos Americanos*, Zea formulated his synthesis in the recognizably Ortegaian terms of the Hegelian dialectic and the Ortega paradox of *yo y mi circunstancia* that he employed in *Dos etapas*. Apparently accepting the Toynbee interpretation of Herodotus, he opens his discussion of

westernization as an ideal with the perplexing remark that the Occidental and Oriental worlds seem to have met in the American continent. No paraphrase would do justice to Zea's limpid language.

El mundo occidental y el mundo oriental parecen haberse dado cita en este Continente. Es aquí donde muchos de los grandes problemas que ya se planteaban en el Viejo Mundo se replantean dejando su marca en los pueblos que los forman. Por un lado está la llamada América latina, ibera o hispana. Una América en la que se mezclan razas y culturas, al parecer tan diversas como de la raíz indígena de naturaleza oriental por sus lejanos orígenes y la raíz ibera o latina transterrada a esta América; raíz que es, a su vez, expresión de la Europa cristiana, católica, en pugna ya, desde el mismo momento del descubrimiento y conquista de América, con la otra Europa, la Europa moderna, la Europa llamada occidental, que sostiene otros ideales y mantiene otra configuración cultural.⁶⁹

One peculiar aspect of this encounter, which gives a new emphasis in Zea's over-all interpretation, was an immoral union (*contubernio*) between the conservative forces of Latin American society and the progressive forces of the occidental powers. This immoral union blocked the struggle for freedom and progress. "Fue en Latinoamerica el primer lugar en donde las fuerzas conservadoras nativas se unieron a las fuerzas progresistas del mundo occidental para resistir los esfuerzos de occidentalización que hacían las fuerzas progresistas nativas."⁷⁰ The paradox of this *contubernio* leads him to a restatement of the dilemma as expressed in *Dos etapas*. This phenomenon, he writes, found expression in such diverse early romantic liberals as Francisco Bilbao of Chile and José Luis Mora of Mexico, who posed the choice between Catholicism and Liberalism, or between retrogression and progress. It was a conflict between two utopias, as he describes it in the article in *Cuadernos Americanos*. It was the same dilemma which led Bilbao and Lastarria in somewhat different ways to reject the historical determinism they saw in Hegel and Herder, while holding to a "scientific" concept of history which centered around exercise of a free will.

Thus, in the name of history, these early nineteenth century Spanish Americans rejected the Hispanic historical tradition in favor of the American history they believed they were engaged in making. At the same time they elected a secular utopia, rejecting that of traditional Christianity. Thus, as Zea now sees it even more clearly, America has not yet made the history that these earlier writers thought was to occur. The cardinal error of the Spanish Americans, whether they were liberals, conservatives, positivists, or revolutionaries, has been to reject this past negatively, that is to say logically, rather than according to the Hegelian dialectic of assimilation. Hence, while denying their past logically, Spanish Americans continued to *be* their past of the conquest and colonialism throughout the nineteenth century.

In the introduction to his *Dos etapas*, Zea quotes Ortega's well known (neo-Hegelian) view of European history, that "European man has been democratic, liberal, absolutist, feudal, but he is no longer any of these things."⁷¹ By this Ortega meant that these were completed historical experiences which the European had denied, thus making them a part of his history. The nineteenth century Hispanic American, Zea feels, did not succeed in this dialectical denial. His rejection of the past was merely logical, while he continued to live a life of colonialism, even in the sense of adopting European patterns of thought that were anachronistic because alien to his condition. The Hispanic American continues to criticize this past, but it is still a part of him.⁷²

Interpreting the Romantic era in this Orteguian fashion, Zea sees it dialectically as the gradual experience of the Hispanic American historical reality. Romantic liberalism failed, as the Enlightenment idealism of the independence leaders had failed, because Hispanic Americans were still living this experience of Hispanic colonialism, strengthened by the new nineteenth century forms of British, French, and North American colonialism. Their comprehension of this historical reality prepared the Liberals for positivism as the philosophy of a new order. As they experienced this Hispanic American reality, the nineteenth century positivists had to resign their earlier idealistic utopias replacing them by the end of the century with a philosophy reflecting the authoritarianism, despotism, and defense of the established order which dominated their society. The problem seemed unsolvable.

El problema parece insoluble: Hispanoamérica se vuelve a presentar, como en el pasado, dividida en dos grandes partes, una con la cabeza aún vuelta hacia un pasado colonial y otra con la cabeza orientada hacia un futuro sin realidad aún.⁷³

Zea has not really applied his synthesis to the twentieth century in very specific terms, but he would appear to be at the point of developing an interpretation of twentieth century revolutionary thought in his 1965 essay in *Cuadernos Americanos*. There he suggests that only in the twentieth century did Hispanic American thought begin to reveal the kind of Orteguian denial of the experience of Spanish-European colonialism that could provide the basis for a dialectical synthesis of the American historical experience.⁷⁴

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE ZEA SYNTHESIS

A number of North American scholars, consciously or unconsciously, were inspired to write on Latin American positivism in Zea's terms.⁷⁵ But there has been little or no critical consideration of the conceptual orientation of Zea's interpretation. In general, the author of this article sees much validity in Professor Zea's interpretation and is convinced that it is one with which any scholar

in the field must come to terms. He admits a large debt to Zea for his interpretation of the nineteenth century,⁷⁶ even while not accepting all of Zea's dialectic.

This is not the place for an extended evaluation and criticism of Zea's brilliant and provocative conceptualization. It would seem appropriate, however, to point out certain questions that it poses to scholars. Is Zea's philosophical assumption of the autonomy of thought, within what may be called a neo-Hegelian and Orteguian dialectic, valid?⁷⁷ United States historians of ideas who tend to see ideas in more empirical terms, coming more directly from the social environment, may encounter difficulty with this assumption; those employing a materialist dialectic will have even more difficulty. The smaller group of those who accept a certain autonomy of thought may find the Zea concept more congenial,⁷⁸ but may still be puzzled by the Orteguian dialectic.

Does Zea give enough attention to currents of conservative thought?⁷⁹ Does he neglect the influence of such nineteenth century currents of Catholic radical liberal thought as that of Lammenais and of the more moderate end-of-the-century *Rerum Novarum*?⁸⁰ Does he distinguish sufficiently between philosophical concepts and political or social ideologies? Are the implications of the synthesis for the colonial era and for the twentieth century sufficiently clear? In respect to the twentieth century, the suggestion of an answer appears in his 1965 article in *Cuadernos Americanos*; but this beginning of a synthesis is not based upon historical research at all comparable to his nineteenth century studies. It has the virtue, however, of tying twentieth century Latin American thought to its earlier revolutionary manifestations.

MARXIST INTERPRETATIONS

Marxist interpretations of Latin American intellectual history are not as noticeable as one might expect from the spread of marxist ideologies in the present century. Yet, they are important enough to engage the attention of the historical scholar, if one gives a broad interpretation, as he should, to marxist thought. In a broad sense, the writing of Jesús Silva Herzog should be cited, although he is far from orthodox in his marxism.⁸¹ Víctor Alba is even farther from the path of orthodoxy,⁸² as is the Aprista, Luis Alberto Sánchez.⁸³ Julio Cesar Jobet of Chile has called for a materialistic Chilean historiography, and a general marxism permeates his incisive criticism of Francisco A. Encina's history of Chile.⁸⁴ Carlos Lombardi of Argentina has made one of the most clearly marxist dialectical materialist interpretations of intellectual history.⁸⁵

The recently increased interest in Latin America displayed by Soviet historians has brought at least one essay into the history of ideas, as Edward B. Richards shows in his recent survey, "Marxism and Marxist Movements in Latin America in Recent Soviet Historical Writing."⁸⁶ Richards reports that Soviet

historians have studied the influence of Marxist ideas in the Latin American labor movement prior to the Russian Revolution of 1917, and have examined the ideas of such Latin American writers as Mariátegui and da Cunha. In 1960 A. F. Shul'govski criticized in *Vestnik Istorie: Mirovi Kul'tury* an article by Leopoldo Zea published the same year, in which, according to Richards, Shul'govski stood Zea on his dialectical head much as Marx did to Hegel.

AREAS FOR RESEARCH

This largely undeveloped field of the history of Latin American thought presents many challenging questions for study, questions ranging from the most general problems to those of micro-research, and from the pre-Conquest thought to the twentieth century. The burden of this article has been to present some of the problems involved in achieving an acceptable synthesis or alternative syntheses. These problems involve the relationship of various aspects of social thought, since pre-Conquest days, to the more general philosophical trends of the various eras as well as the question of the autonomy of Latin American thought—more precisely defined as the relationship of Latin American ideas to those of Europe and the United States. In this respect the Zea synthesis has probably raised more questions than it has answered. Nor is it to be expected that other scholars will agree in their theoretical approach. The important thing is some kind of consensus upon what the problems for investigation are, and in this respect the Zea synthesis provides an invaluable point of departure.

The relationship of the history of ideas in Latin America to that of Spain and Portugal is a closely related problem of interpretation. This is a controversial and on the whole little studied area. The relationship of philosophical and theoretical concepts to political ideologies, and the penetration of these ideologies into traditional attitudes is another question largely unexplored.

One of the more obvious general needs is for study of the currents of ideas expressed in the Latin American labor press during the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This is a subject in which Carlos Rama of Uruguay and Moisés Poblete Troncoso of Chile have ploughed significant ground with their writing, including Rama's important bibliography,⁸⁷ and which, as we have just seen, is engaging the interest of Soviet historians.

The influence of Spanish *krausismo* is another theme that has received little attention. The relationship of Unamuno's personalism and religious existentialism, Ortega's philosophy of law and history, and Altamira's historiography all invite further study.⁸⁸

Another major area calling for research is that of traditional and conservative political and social thought during and since independence. Colombians have done important work here, as in Carlos Valderrama's previously cited

study of Miguel Antonio Caro and Pablo González Casanova's treatment of efforts of the Inquisition to protect traditional thought against the innovation of the Enlightenment in the eighteenth century.⁸⁹ Studies of a sort have been made of such figures as Rosas, Portales, Alamán, and Bernardo de Pareira Vasconcellos; but in general we have only a vague concept of the nature of their ideas, of the relationship of their ideas to the problems of the eras in which they lived or acted, or of the connections of their ideas with contemporary trends in Europe, particularly with traditionalist thought in Spain and Portugal.

We also appear to know little of the relationship of nineteenth century liberal-radical thought in Latin America to the European radical Catholic trends represented in Lammenais, and this relationship invites research. The history of the penetration and spread of the concepts of social Christianity expressed in the *Rerum Novarum* (as well as those of Protestant missionary social Christianity) is largely untouched. The social and political ideas behind the important relationship of the military to politics is another such undeveloped area of study.⁹⁰ The history of legal thought is also largely uncultivated, except for the pioneering work of the Instituto de Historia del Derecho Ricardo Levene in Argentina. Nor have we much significant research on the history of economic thought in Latin America. Much the same may be said for the history of Latin American historiography, although the Commission on History of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History has sponsored a series of significant publications in this field.

First among the more specific areas calling for research is that of the thought of individual writers and political leaders. Pioneering work has been done by Latin American biographers, but critical studies which show the relationship of ideas of these individuals to the trends of thought and the problems of their times are rare. Beyond this initial need, the range of specific questions for research is virtually unlimited. Studies are needed of the thought involved in most of the important revolutions, events, and movements of change in Latin America since independence. Research has been done on a few such questions by both Latin American and United States historians, but the field is still wide open.

Finally, one of the least explored areas in that of the nature and influence of Aztec, Maya, and Inca thought in relation to the whole panorama of Latin American thought. Studies of pre-conquest culture are numerous, and Altamira's studies of the laws of the Indies posed some of the questions, but Miguel León Portilla's study of the Nahuatl Mind⁹¹ is a rare instance of an effort to view the ideas of an indigenous culture in a larger historical perspective.

NOTES

1. Washington, D.C.: The American University Press and Inter-American Bibliographical Association, 1950.

2. José Luis Romero, *Las ideas políticas en Argentina* (1946), Guillermo Francovich, *El pensamiento boliviano en el siglo xx* (1956), João Cruz Costa, *Esbozo de una historia de las ideas en el Brasil* (1957), Ricardo Donoso, *Las ideas políticas en Chile* (1946), Victor Alba, *Las ideas sociales contemporáneas en México* (1960), Jesús Silva Herzog, *El agrarismo Mexicano y la reforma agraria* (1959) and *El pensamiento económico en México* (1947), Arturo Ardao, *Espiritualismo y positivismo en el Uruguay* (1956) and *La filosofía en el Uruguay en el siglo xx* (1956), and Rafael Heliodoro Valle, *Historia de las ideas contemporáneas en Centro-América* (1960). This Mexican publishing house also brought out Antonio Gómez Robledo, *Idea y experiencia de América* (1958), a brilliant critique of the development of the ideas of inter-Americanism.
3. Valle, *prólogo de Rafael Heliodoro Valle* (1934). González Prada: *Prólogo y selección de Andrés Henestrosa* (1943), Montalvo, *prólogo y selección de Manuel Sánchez* (1942), Vasconcelos, *Prólogo de Genaro Fernández MacGregor* (1942), Varona. *Prólogo de José Antonio Fernández de Castro* (1943). Some publications of the National University in a sense form part of the series, e.g. Domingo Faustino Sarmiento, *Selección, notas biográficas y comentario de Pedro de Alba* (1944), the volume of José Luis Mora, *Ensayos, ideas y retratos*, edited with a prologue by Arturo Arnáiz y Freg (1941) and Justo Sierra. *Prosas: prólogo y selección de Antonio Caso* (1939).
4. An incomplete list includes: Emilio Oribe, *El pensamiento vivo de Rodó* (1944), Ricardo Rojas, *El pensamiento vivo de Sarmiento* (1941), R. Blanco-Fombona, *El pensamiento vivo de Bolívar* (1942), German Arciniegas, *El pensamiento vivo de Andrés Bello* (1946).
5. Leopoldo Zea, *The Latin American Mind*, translated by James H. Abbot and Lowell Dunham (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1963). Other translations of this character published in recent years include Mariano Picón Salas, *A Cultural History of Spanish America* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California, 1962); Samuel Ramos, *Profile of Man and Culture in Mexico*, trans. by Peter G. Earle (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1962); José Luis Romero, *A History of Argentine Political Thought*, trans. by Thomas F. McGann (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1963); José Vasconcelos, *A Mexican Ulysses, an Autobiography*, trans. by W. Rex Crawford (Bloomington: University of Indiana, 1963); João Cruz Costa, *A History of Ideas in Brazil*, trans. by Suzett Macedo (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1964); Miguel León Portilla, *Aztec Thought and Culture: A Study of the Ancient Nahuatl Mind*, trans. by Jack Emory Davis (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1963), Ángel del Rio, *The Clash and Attraction of Two Cultures: the Hispanic and the Anglo-Saxon Worlds in America*, trans. by James F. Shearer (Baton Rouge: State University of Louisiana, 1965), Robert Ricard, *The Spiritual Conquest of Mexico. An Essay on the Apostolate and the Evangelizing Methods of the Mendicant Orders of New Spain, 1523–1572*, trans. by Harold V. Livermore. 2 vols. (University of Texas Press, 1965).
6. Volumes published to the end of 1967 include: *Alberdi-Sarmiento* (6) 1964, *Donoso Cortés* (12) 1965, *Suárez* (1) 1966, *Vitoria* (2) 1967, and *Rodó-Zorilla de San Martín* (7) 1967. Other volumes are announced for Juan de Mariana, Jovellanos-Feijóo, San Martín-Bolívar-O'Higgins, Joaquín Costa-Angel Ganivet, José Manuel Estrada-José Hernández, Ramiro de Maeztu, Mariano Egaña-Andrés Bello, Bartolomé Herrera-Victor Andrés Belaúnde-Victoriano de Villava, Juan Vázquez de Mella, Justo Sierra-José Vasconcelos, Montalvo-Hostos-González Prada-Martí, José Antonio Primo de Rivera (17), Rafael Nuñez-Miguel Antonio Caro-José María Samper (18), José Gil Fortoul-Juan Francisco Quijano-José Cecilio del Valle (19). Volume 20 will include the thought of the "dictators" Rosas, García Moreno, Francia, Francisco Solano López, and Ramón Castillo.

Latin American Research Review

7. México: El Colegio de México, 1949. A revised and enlarged edition in two volumes, appeared in 1965, with the title *El pensamiento hispano-americano* (Mexico: Editorial Por-maca, copyright with The Macmillan Company, N.Y.).
8. See the two numbers of the *Revista*, Numbers 1 and 2, issued in Quito, Ecuador, 1959 and 1960. Unfortunately suspended, this journal was intended to be a forum for the exchange of ideas and knowledge on this subject.
9. "Localización histórica del pensamiento hispano-americano," in No. 4 (1942), pp. 63–86; "Caracterización formal y material del pensamiento hispano-americano," in No. 6 (1942) pp. 59–88; and "Significación filosófica del pensamiento hispano-americano" in Vol. II (1943) pp. 63–86.
10. *A Century of Latin American Thought* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1944; 2nd ed., 1961).
11. *Op. cit.*, pp. 4–5.
12. *Historia de la sociología en Latinoamérica* (México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1940).
13. La Habana: Imprenta Universitaria, 1953.
14. *Panorama de la sociología contemporánea* (México: Casa de España en México, 1940.)
15. Manfredo Kempf Mercado, *Historia de la filosofía en Latino-América* (Santiago, Chile: Zig-Zag, 1958; Francisco Larroyo, *La filosofía americana: su razón y su sinrazon de ser.* (México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1958).
16. *Op. cit.*, pp. 191–192.
17. 2 vols. (Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos, 1966).
18. Vol. II, pp. 38, 252.
19. *Fuentes de la filosofía latinoamericana* (Washington, D.C.: Unión Panamericana, 1967).
20. See the facsimile edition: *El Epítome de Pinelo, Primera Bibliografía del Nuevo Mundo*, with preliminary study by Augustín Millares Carlo (Washington, D.C.: Pan American Union, 1958).
21. Reprinted by the Fondo Histórico y Bibliográfico José Toribio Medina, with a prologue by Aniceto Almeyda (Santiago de Chile, 1956). On Medina see Maury A. Bromsen, ed., *José Toribio Medina: Humanist of the Americas*, (Washington, D.C.: Pan American Union, 1960); Sergio Villalobos, *Medina, su vida y sus obras, 1852–1930* (Santiago de Chile: Imp. Universitaria, 1952); and Armando Donoso, *José Toribio Medina, 1852–1930* (San-tiago de Chile: Imp. Universitaria, 1952).
22. Buenos Aires, 1910.
23. Buenos Aires: El Ateneo, 1951. 2 vols. First published 1918–20.
24. *A filosofia no Brasil* (Porto Alegre, 1878).
25. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1938.
26. *Origins of Inter-American Interest* (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1945), pp. 55–56.
27. *Intellectual Background of the Revolution in South America* (New York: 1926).
28. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1945.
29. Gainesville: University of Florida, 1961.

THE HISTORY OF IDEAS IN LATIN AMERICA

30. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949.
31. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1929.
32. *Academic Culture in the Spanish Colonies* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1940).
The other two works were published by the Cornell University Press in 1955 and 1956, respectively.
33. The papers were published as *Latin America and the Enlightenment*, Arthur Whitaker, ed. (New York: Appleton-Century, 1942).
34. Vol. I, 301–320.
35. *The Struggle for Justice in the Spanish Conquest of America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1949), *Aristotle and The American Indians* (London: Hollis Carter, 1959), *Bartolomé de las Casas: an Interpretation of his Life and Writings* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1951); with Manuel Giménez Fernández, *Bartolomé de las Casas* (Santiago de Chile: Fondo Histórico y Bibliográfico José Toribio Medina, 1954). See also his "The Dawn of Conscience in America: Spanish Experiments and Experiences with Indians in The New World," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 107 (April, 1963), No. 2, pp. 83–92. On sixteenth century humanism see Bernardo G. Monsegú, C.P., *Filosofía del humanismo de Juan Luis Vives* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1961).
36. *Filosofía de la conquista* (México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1947).
37. Washington, D.C.: Academy of American Franciscan History, 1951.
38. *Fray Bernardino de Sahagún (1499–1590)* (México: Instituto Panamericano de Geografía e Historia, 1952); Vol. IX in the series, *Historiadores de América*.
39. Fray Bernardino de Sahagún, *Suma Indiana*. Introducción y selección de Mauricio Magdaleno (México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma, 1943).
40. *Op. cit.*
41. See especially his "La legislación indiana como elemento de la historia de las ideas coloniales españolas," *Revista de Historia de América*, No. 1 (1937), 1–24.
42. *El pensamiento tradicional en la España del siglo xviii (1700–1760); introducción para un estudio de las ideas jurídico-políticas españolas en dicho periodo histórico* (Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos, 1966).
43. *Humanismo em Portugal* (Lisbon, 1956), cited in João Cruz Costa, *Panorama of the History of Philosophy in Brazil* (Washington: Pan American Union, 1962), p. 18.
44. Cited by Cruz Costa, *Op. cit.*, p. 16.
45. *The Eighteenth Century Enlightenment in the University of San Carlos de Guatemala* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1956). Cf. José Mata Gavidia, *Panorama filosófico de la universidad de San Carlos al final del siglo xviii* (Guatemala: Universidad de Guatemala, 1948) and Ramón A. Salazar, *Historia del desenvolvimiento intelectual de Guatemala*, t.1 (Guatemala: Tipografía Nacional, 1897).
46. La Habana: Publicaciones del Ministerio de Educación, 1952.
47. Buenos Aires: Guillermo Kraft, 1952.
48. See his previously cited *The Eighteenth Century Enlightenment in the University of San Carlos de Guatemala*, p. vi.
49. *Las ideas políticas en Argentina* (México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1946), p. 60.

Latin American Research Review

50. *Las ideas sociales contemporáneas en México*, (México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1960), p. 18.
51. *El agrarismo mexicano y la reforma agraria* (México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1959), pp. 29–33.
52. Most United States scholars, including Crawford, have assumed the primacy of the influence of Rousseau as presented in Jefferson Rea Spell, *Rousseau in The Spanish World before 1833* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1938) and in José Manuel Restrepo, *Historia de la revolución de la República de Colombia en la América Meridional* (Bensanzon, 1858). Crawford writes (*Op. cit.*, p. 8) that Latin America had followed Rousseau and the ideals of the French Revolution.
53. See, among many who might be cited, Ariosto D. González, *Las primeras fórmulas constitucionales en los países del Plata* (Montevideo: Barreiro y Ramos, 1962).
54. *Nacimiento y desarrollo de la filosofía en el Río de la Plata* (Buenos Aires: Guillermo Kraft, 1952).
55. Carlos Stotzter, *El pensamiento político en la América Española durante el periodo de la emancipación (1789–1825); las bases hispánicas y las corrientes europeas* (Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos, 1966).
56. Augusto Mijares, *La interpretación pesimista de la sociología hispanoamericana*, 2d. ed. (Madrid: Afrodisio Aguado, 1952). *El Libertador*, 2d ed. (Caracas: Ed. Arte, 1965).
57. See *Revista del Instituto de Historia del Derecho Ricardo Levene* (18 numbers published to 1967).
58. For example, José Ingenieros, *La evolución de las argentinas* (Buenos Aires: Rosso, 1937); Mariano Ibérico y Rodríguez, "La filosofía en el Perú," *Mercurio Peruano*, Año IV, Vol. IV (Lima, 1921), Luis Alberto Sánchez, *La literatura peruana*, 3 vols. (Lima, 1928, 1929, Santiago, 1936) Alberto Zum Felde, *Proceso intelectual del Uruguay* (Montevideo; Claridad, 1941).
59. (Mexico: El Colegio de México, 1949) Hereinafter cited as *Dos etapas*. An English translation by James H. Abbott and Lowell Dunham appeared in 1963 (University of Oklahoma Press). The author has also produced a revised edition, *El pensamiento latinoamericano* (México: Pormaca, 1965), which contains some of the ideas he published in an article in *Cuadernos Americanos* referred to below. See note 68.
60. *El positivismo en México*, 2d. ed. (Mexico: Ed. Studium, 1953) was issued first in 1943; *Apogeo y decadencia del positivismo en México* (México: El Colegio de México, 1944).
61. *Dos etapas*, p. 12.
62. *Los grandes problemas nacionales* (México: Imp. de A. Carranza e Hijos, 1909) and *La revolución agraria de México* (México: Talleres Gráficos del Museo Nacional, 1934).
63. *Dos etapas*, pp. 34–43.
64. P. 45. Author's translation.
65. See especially "Localización histórica del pensamiento hispano-americano," in No. 4 (1942), pp. 63–86.
66. See footnote 10.
67. Guillermo Francovich, *Filósofos brasileños* (Buenos Aires: Ed. Losada, 1943); Antonio Gómez Robledo, *La filosofía en el Brasil* (Mexico: Imp. Universitaria, 1946); Nelson Wer-

THE HISTORY OF IDEAS IN LATIN AMERICA

- neck Sodré, *Orientações do pensamento brasileiro* (Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Vecchi, 1942); Guillermo Francovich, *La filosofía en Bolivia* (Buenos Aires: Losada, 1945); Medardo Vitier, *La filosofía en Cuba* (México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1948); Ricardo Donoso, *Las ideas políticas en Chile* (México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1946); Arturo Ardao, *La filosofía pre-universitaria en el Uruguay* (Montevideo: Ed. García, 1945).
68. "Latinoamérica en la formación de nuestro tiempo," No. 5 (Septiembre-Octubre, 1965) examined by the author in a *sobretiro* of 68 pages. An article by William D. Raat, "Leopoldo Zea and Mexican Positivism: A Reappraisal," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, Vol. XLVIII, No. 1 (February 1968), 1–18, appeared shortly after this article had been written. Chiefly a criticism of Zea's methodology, it serves to confirm the influence of the Orteguitan pattern on Zea's synthesis.
 69. *Op. cit.*, p. 10.
 70. P. 11.
 71. *Dos etapas*, p. 16: translated in *The Latin American Mind*, p. 4.
 72. *Dos etapas*, "Introducción," pp. 15–29.
 73. *Ibid.*, p. 54.
 74. "Latinoamérica en la formación de nuestro tiempo," loc. cit., pp. 15–16.
 75. See, for example, Karl M. Schmitt, "The Mexican Positivists and the Church State Question," *Church and State*, VIII, No. 1 (Spring, 1966), pp. 200–213.
 76. See the author's *Latin American Social Thought* (University Press of Washington, D.C., 1961), especially pp. 100–101. In addition, these statements were written before the appearance of Raat's article listed in note 68.
 77. Cf. Robert E. McNicoll, "Hegel and Latin America Today," *Journal of Inter-American Studies*, VI, No. 1 (January 1964) 129–131.
 78. See Allen Skotheim, *American Intellectual Histories and Historians* (Princeton University Press, 1966).
 79. See, for example, Carlos Valderrama Andrade, *El pensamiento filosófico de Miguel Antonio Caro* (Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuevo, 1961).
 80. On Lammenais see Volume 7 of the Lousteau-Heguy-Lozada series, devoted to Rodó and Juan Zorrilla de San Martín, which includes a significant lecture of the latter on the *Rerum Novarum*. For the probable influence of Lammenais on Juan Montalvo see Frank Mac D. Spindler, *The Political Thought of Juan Montalvo* (Ph.D. dissertation, The American University, 1966).
 81. See footnote 2.
 82. See *Las ideas sociales contemporáneas en México* (México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1960).
 83. Among many works, see *La literatura peruana*, 2v. (Lima, 1928–1929).
 84. See his "Notas sobre la historiografía chilena," in *Atenea* (Universidad de Concepción) Año XXXI, t.xcv, Nos. 291–292 (Sept.-Oct. 1949) 345–377. His study of Encina is in *Tres ensayos históricos* (Santiago: Instituto Nacional, 1950).
 85. *Las ideas sociales en la Argentina* (Buenos Aires: Ed. Platina and Ed. Stilcograf, 1965).
 86. *Hispanic American Historical Review*, XLV, No. 4 (Nov. 1965) 576–590.

Latin American Research Review

87. Carlos M. Rama, *Mouvements ouvriers et socialistes* (Paris: Ed. Ouvrières, 1950) and *Historia del movimiento obrero y social latinoamericano contemporáneo* (Buenos Aires: Ed. Palestra, 1967); Moises Poblete Troncoso, *El movimiento obrero latinoamericano* (México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1946); also M. Poblete Troncoso and Ben G. Burnet, *The Rise of the Latin American Labor Movement* (New York: Bookman Associates, 1960).
88. On *krausismo* see Juan López Morillas, *El krausismo español* (México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1956).
89. *El misoneísmo y la modernidad cristiana en el siglo xviii* (México: El Colegio de México, 1948).
90. But see John J. Kennedy, *Catholicism, Nationalism and Democracy in Argentina* (Notre Dame University Press, 1958).
91. *Aztec Thought and Culture: A Study of the Ancient Nahuatl Mind*, trans. by Jack Emory Davis (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1963).