

# LATIN AMERICAN APPLIED PHILOSOPHY

*Antón Donoso*  
*University of Detroit*

- PANORAMA DE LA PHILOSOPHIE IBERO-AMERICAINE: DU XVI<sup>e</sup> SIECLE A NOS JOURS.* By Alain Guy. (Geneva: Editions Patiño, 1989. Pp. 285.)
- EL KRAUSISMO Y SU INFLUENCIA EN AMERICA LATINA.* By José Prat et al. (Madrid: Fundación Friedrich Ebert and Instituto Fe y Secularidad, 1989. Pp. 287.)
- LATIN AMERICAN PHILOSOPHY IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY: MAN, VALUE, AND THE SEARCH FOR PHILOSOPHICAL IDENTITY.* Edited by Jorge J. E. Gracia. (Buffalo, N.Y.: Prometheus Books, 1986. Pp. 269. \$17.95 paper.)
- THE PHILOSOPHICAL FORUM, A QUARTERLY.* Edited by Jorge J. E. Gracia. Special issue, "Latin American Philosophy Today." Volume 20, numbers 1-2 (Fall-Winter 1988-89. Pp. 158. \$7.50.)
- PHILOSOPHY AND LITERATURE IN LATIN AMERICA: A CRITICAL ASSESSMENT OF THE CURRENT SITUATION.* Edited by Jorge J. E. Gracia and Mireya Camurati. (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989. Pp. 279. \$49.50 cloth, \$16.95 paper.)
- PROBLEMAS ACTUALES DE LA FILOSOFIA EN LATINOAMERICA.* By Raúl Fonet Betancourt. (Buenos Aires: Ediciones REPAL, 1985. Pp. 171.)
- ACADEMIC REBELS IN CHILE: THE ROLE OF PHILOSOPHY IN HIGHER EDUCATION AND POLITICS.* By Iván Jaksic. (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989. Pp. 259. \$39.50 cloth, \$12.95 paper.)
- FEMMES-PHILOSOPHES EN ESPAGNE ET EN AMERIQUE LATINE.* (Paris: Editions de Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1989. Pp. 149.)
- LEOPOLDO ZEA: UNA FILOSOFIA DE LA HISTORIA.* By Francisco Lizcano. (Madrid: Ediciones Cultura Hispánica, Instituto de Cooperación Iberoamericana, 1986. Pp. 150.)
- ANUARIO BIBLIOGRAFICO: HISTORIA DEL PENSAMIENTO IBERO E IBERO-AMERICANO.* Number 2 (1987). Edited by José Luis Gómez-Martínez. (Athens: University of Georgia, Georgia Series on Hispanic Thought, 1990. Pp. 268.)

A rich and diversified philosophy exists in Latin America that is also a Latin American philosophy in the sense of what has been termed in the last decade "applied philosophy," or a philosophical examination of

specific themes and problems connected with individual and collective human living. Each of the ten publications under review highlights some aspect of either “theoretical philosophy” in Latin America or Latin American “applied philosophy.”

In the late 1950s, I became interested in the history of philosophy in Latin America, curious to learn how Latin Americans, in contrast with North Americans, have adopted and adapted philosophies originating in Europe. At that time, I found almost no one else in professional philosophy in the United States and Canada with the same interest.<sup>1</sup> Fortunately, I discovered colleagues in other disciplines, especially in history, literature, and political science, who shared this interest. The meetings of the Latin American Studies Association became the forum where we would gather to present papers and exchange ideas. It was at these meetings that we eventually founded the Society for Iberian and Latin American Thought (SILAT) in 1976.<sup>2</sup>

More professional philosophers in North America have gradually become interested in philosophy in Latin America, but usually in what I call theoretical or general philosophy.<sup>3</sup> Some, however, have also taken an interest in applied philosophy. A younger generation of professional philosophers, most of them born in Cuba and educated in North American universities, have become very active in this area, injecting new life into SILAT. Several of them have prepared some of the publications under review (Jorge Gracia, Oscar Martí, and Ofelia Schutte).<sup>4</sup>

1. What sparked my curiosity were my background readings on the history of philosophy in the United States, undertaken for a dissertation at the University of Toronto on John Dewey's conception of the relation between the practical method of common sense and the scientific method. Dewey's long life (1859–1952) coincided with the professionalization of philosophy in the United States, and as I discovered, he dealt with the same European influences that affected philosophers in Latin America (even if under different names). Of my teachers, only Thomist Etienne Gilson, eminent historian of medieval Christian philosophy, had some notion of what was occurring in philosophy in Latin America. He directed me to Cornelius Krusé, who had attended the first Inter-American Conference of Philosophy in the early 1940s. See Antón Donoso, “Philosophy in Latin America: A Bibliographical Introduction to Works in English,” *Philosophy Today* 17, nos. 3–4 (Fall 1973):229, n. 1.

2. The founding of SILAT was the idea of the late Harold E. Davis, Professor of Latin American Studies at American University, Washington, D.C., who became its first honorary president. In 1972 Davis brought together about forty people interested in Latin American thought, ten of them professional philosophers. The papers from this conference can be found in *Conference on Developing Teaching Materials on Latin American Thought for College-Level Courses*, edited by Harold E. Davis (Washington, D.C.: American University, 1972). For more on SILAT's founding, early activities, and aspirations, see Antón Donoso, “The Society for Iberian and Latin American Thought (SILAT): An Interdisciplinary Project,” *Los Ensayistas: Boletín Informativo*, nos. 1–2 (Mar.–Oct. 1976):38–42.

3. On this topic, see the *Boletín Informativo* of the Sociedad Filosófica Ibero Americana (SOFIA) of Mexico. This group regularly sponsors conferences that attract leading foreign philosophers, including some from the United States and Canada.

4. SILAT has nurtured an interest among North Americans in Latin American philosophy during its three stages to date. Leading in the first stage was SILAT's first president, William Kilgore of Baylor University, a longtime participant in inter-American philosophy confer-

Paradoxically, it was the movement known as analytic philosophy, or linguistic analysis, that mainly spearheaded applying the methods of analysis and conceptual elucidation to specific themes and problems—in contrast to system-building and making broad generalizations. Analytic philosophy, which dominated the Anglo-American world from the end of World War II until recent times, dismissed almost all the history of philosophy as not really philosophy because it was concerned with the nature of reality rather than with conceptualizing and articulating that same reality.<sup>5</sup> Analytic philosophy had made only slight inroads in Latin America at that time, but its influence has grown steadily over the years, as Gracia shows.<sup>6</sup>

After the analytic movement's initial years of "reformation," when traditional philosophy and its themes were cavalierly dismissed as "non-sense," individual philosophers educated in analysis began to reach out to other movements and systems, both past and contemporary, and to apply the methods of analysis and conceptual elucidation to traditional themes as well as to new ones. Perhaps in imitation of some phenomenol

---

ences. During this time, meetings were held in conjunction with LASA meetings. In the second phase, under the vice presidency and presidency of Oscar Martí (now at UCLA), meetings were held during the national meetings of the American Philosophical Association (APA), especially the eastern division. In the third period, under the vice presidency and presidency of Jorge Gracia of SUNY Buffalo, SILAT has been reinvigorated over the last decade. Gracia, more than any other professional philosopher in North America, has contributed greatly to disseminating knowledge of the history of philosophy in Latin America. Among his other publications is *Repertorio de filósofos latinoamericanos/Directory of Latin American Philosophers* (Amherst, N.Y.: Council on International Studies and Programs, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1988). Published in association with SILAT, it lists philosophers in Latin America as well as philosophers of Latin American origin living in the United States, their backgrounds, present positions, publications, and other information. Only a few of them are interested in the history of philosophy in Latin America or in Latin American philosophy, however. More information on philosophers and philosophy programs in Latin America can be found in the *International Directory of Philosophy and Philosophers, 1990–1992*, 7th ed., edited by Ramona Cormier and Richard H. Linebach in cooperation with Mary M. Shurts (Bowling Green, Ohio: Philosophy Documentation Center, Bowling Green State University, 1990).

5. For the history of the recent emergence of "applied philosophy," see Richard T. DeGeorge's foreword to *Philosophers at Work: An Introduction to the Issues and Practical Uses of Philosophy*, edited by Elliot D. Cohen (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1989). See also Cohen's introduction on the interdependence of "pure" and "applied philosophy." For many years, the American Philosophical Association was controlled by analytic philosophers, who decided which papers were accepted and rejected papers critical of analysis or coming from nonanalytic perspectives. Only the various small independent societies that met under the umbrella of the APA (including SILAT) were open to multiple philosophical perspectives, depending on each group's purpose. During the last decade, many nonanalytic members have staged a revolt in favor of pluralism and have elected many of their candidates to offices, making the APA now more representative of philosophy in the United States.

6. See *Philosophical Analysis in Latin America*, edited by Jorge J. E. Gracia, Eduardo Rabossi, Enrique Villanueva, and Marcelo Dascal (Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Reidel, 1984). The Spanish edition was published as *El análisis filosófico en América Latina* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1985). See also Jorge J. E. Gracia, "Philosophical Analysis in Latin America," *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 1, no. 1 (Jan. 1984):111–12.

ogists, and certainly following the lead of the scientists, philosophical analysts focused on specific issues and avoided the overall picture. The day of applied philosophy appears to be here to stay for various reasons, including students' heightened interest in issues they can perceive as pertinent to their own lives and the ability of philosophy instructors to illustrate more strikingly the methods of philosophy to their students. As I view the situation, philosophers in North America should be able at long last to understand more readily the interest of some of their colleagues in Latin America in such themes as regional and national identity and to acknowledge such interest as legitimate philosophy.

The masterful history of philosophy, *Panorama de la philosophie ibéro-américaine: Du XVI<sup>e</sup> Siècle à nos jours* by Alain Guy of the University of Toulouse–Le Mirail, provides the larger context for the other publications under review. As founder of the Center of Iberian and Ibero-American Philosophy at Toulouse–Le Mirail, Guy is the best-known non-Iberian European student of Spanish- and Portuguese-language philosophy. He has attended many conferences in Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking countries and has hosted a number of philosophers from these countries at Toulouse–Le Mirail.<sup>7</sup>

*Panorama de la philosophie ibéro-américaine* consists of seventeen chapters divided into three parts, followed by an extended bibliography of selected works (general histories, anthologies, and country-by-country studies). The first part covers the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries but also treats the early nineteenth century. This part includes the introduction of scholasticism in its various forms, nominalism, humanism, and modern philosophy in its rationalist and empiricist forms. Guy takes the reader from the first philosophical work published in America (in 1554) through the first Creole's entrance into professional philosophy (by Chilean Alfonso Briceño, 1590–1667), to the eve of independence. During the colonial period, there was virtually no time lag between what was being taught in universities in Spain and Portugal and those in the colonies. The one name that stands out is that of Venezuelan Andrés Bello (1781–1865), who might have become a universally recognized thinker had he been Scottish or French.

The second part of Guy's *Panorama* is devoted to the nineteenth century and deals with Latin American acceptance of romanticism, eclecticism, spiritualism, positivism, and Krausism. It is clear that after independence, Latin Americans began to look for philosophic ideas toward non-Iberian Europe—to England, Germany, and especially France. Positivism in particular, hailing partly from England but mostly from France,

7. The author of numerous studies on Luis de León, Luis Vives, Miguel de Unamuno, José Ortega y Gasset, José Vasconcelos, and Samuel Ramos, Guy is noted especially for his two-volume *Les Philosophes espagnols d'hier et d'aujourd'hui* (Toulouse: Editeur Privat, 1956).

left its imprint on Spanish and Portuguese America well into the first quarter of the twentieth century. Latin American thinkers inspired by positivism repudiated as nonscientific not only scholasticism and romantic spiritualism but also the empiricist ideology of the Enlightenment in their efforts to begin anew and bring their respective nations into the modern technological world. In truth, Latin America became the Canaan of European positivism. Soon, however, positivism was challenged or modified by the moral idealist movement known as "harmonious rationalism" or Krausism. Coming directly from Belgium and France or indirectly from Spain, Krausism and its scientific emphasis tried to work within the tenets of the prevailing religion, presenting itself as a "rational Christianity" and aiming at reform in the areas of education, public morals, and government.

The third and last part of Guy's history deals with the twentieth century, its twelve chapters accounting for some two-thirds of the book. The chapters are devoted to a variety of subjects: the anti-positivist movement at the turn of the century; the influences of various philosophers (Kant, Bergson, and Ortega); the movements known as historicism, phenomenology, existentialism, Marxism, logical empiricism, Thomism, and Augustinianism; and to the movement I consider the example par excellence of Latin American applied philosophy, liberation philosophy. Among the various factors that coalesced to stem the tide of positivism and the other scientifically based philosophies were a renewed philosophic examination of the Latin American situation (which included what Guy terms a certain "mysticism of the land") and the Latin American tendency to rebel against the cultural imperialism of Europe and the United States (the latter being viewed as the most typically positivistic country).

The third part of the *Panorama* consists of short sections on the founders of professional philosophy in Latin America and many current leading figures. A number of less-known philosophers and their works are also identified briefly, making Guy's *Panorama* the most up-to-date history of philosophy in Latin America in any language. The work reads exceptionally well, even for those who rarely read French, and the material quoted from Spanish and Portuguese has been translated into French. This work thus makes knowledge of philosophy in Latin America available to readers of French worldwide.

The collective volume *El krausismo y su influencia en América Latina* presents the proceedings of a symposium held in Madrid in 1988 under the auspices of the Fundación Friedrich Ebert and the Instituto Fe y Secularidad. The majority of the thirty-five participants were Spaniards, along with one each from Brazil, Cuba, Mexico, Puerto Rico, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Six of the seven papers presented were published and three additional ones were commissioned on Costa Rica,

Ecuador, and Spain to round out the treatments of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Cuba, and Mexico.

The first two essays provide a general context. "El Krausismo y Latinoamérica," by Teresa Rodríguez de Lecea of the Instituto Fe y Secularidad, states the aim of the symposium: to study the influence of Krausism during the last century and a half in all Portuguese- and Spanish-speaking countries on both sides of the Atlantic. Her study outlines the three stages of Krausism in Spain: from 1843 when Julián Sanz del Río (1814–1869) adopted the moral idealist and pro-scientific philosophy of Christian Friedrich Krause (1781–1832) during his study trip to Heidelberg (1834–1844) and adapted it to Spanish circumstances; the second period beginning in 1875, when Francisco Giner de los Ríos (1840–1915) led the Spanish Krausists in founding the Instituto Libre de Enseñanza;<sup>8</sup> and the third, from the 1907 educational innovations of the Junta para Amplificación de Estudios until the 1936 exodus of intellectuals due to the Spanish Civil War.<sup>9</sup> This especially informative section shows how Krausist-inspired educators continued their work in Mexico and Argentina.

The second essay by José Luis Gómez-Martínez of the University of Georgia, "Krausismo en Ibero América," provides an overview of the development of philosophy in Latin America in five sections: the development of Ibero-American thought during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when it was generally attempting to distinguish itself from "imported" thought; the arrival of Krausist thought via the philosophy of law of Henri Aherns, a Belgian disciple of Krause; the role of Krausism in the Andean countries (including a segment on Bolivia);<sup>10</sup> the influence of Krausism on interpretations of the Ibero-American situation at the beginning of the twentieth century (with its renewal of the search for identity, an example of Latin American applied philosophy); and critiques of Krausism in Ibero-America, from both spiritualism (that Krausism was too scientific and insufficiently attuned to the spiritual) and positivism (that Krausism was insufficiently scientific and too spiritualistic).

Antonio Ferrera Paim's essay on Brazil reveals links between Krausism and masonry, especially in regard to Krause's panentheism, which viewed humanity as the harmonious union of spirit and nature. Eduardo Ortiz's contribution on Argentina discusses Krausism's modernizing influence on general education by introducing science into the curriculum

8. Also participating was Antonio Jiménez García of the Universidad Complutense, author of *El krausismo y la Institución Libre de Enseñanza* (Madrid: Editorial Cincel, 1985).

9. The Junta's innovations are treated in more detail in an essay by Eduardo Ortiz of London's Imperial College in *La Junta y la nueva ciencia en España*.

10. See José Luis Gómez-Martínez, *Bolivia, un pueblo en busca de su identidad* (La Paz and Cochabamba: Los Amigos del Libro, 1988). Also see José Luis Gómez-Martínez, "Bolivia después de 1952: un ensayo de interpretación," *Los Ensayistas: Bolivia*, nos. 21–22 (Summer 1986):9–50.

(thus allying itself with positivism) and legal studies as well. I was disappointed, however, that this contribution did not mention the work in the history and philosophy of education in Argentina of Spanish exile Lorenzo Luzuriaga. The essay on Cuba presents the influence of Krause on José Martí, while the one on Mexico explains the conflict between Krausism as interpreted by Guillaume Tiberghien (a Belgian disciple of Aherns) and positivism, which ultimately prevailed. This essay also discusses Krausist pedagogues among the Spanish exiles of 1939. The study on Costa Rica focuses on the pedagogical work of brothers Valeriano and Juan Fernández Ferraz, who were born in the Canary Islands. Finally, the essay on Ecuador treats of the role of Krausism as part of the syncretic thought of various French philosophers that contributed to secularizing state and society.

The last two chapters of *El krausismo* contain the concluding roundtable discussion and a summary by Roberto Albares of the University of Salamanca, who reduced the conclusions of the symposium to two. The first was the possible resurgence of an interest in Krausism as a mediating approach between the “extremes” of spiritualism and materialism (as an alternative to liberation philosophies and Marxism?) and hence the danger of Krausism becoming a political ideology again. The second conclusion cited the applicability of the cultural category “Krausopositivism” in understanding the history of Latin American thought. This volume is an excellent first step in collective research on the rich history of this little-known philosophic movement, which has been overshadowed elsewhere by Hegelian thought.

*Latin American Philosophy in the Twentieth Century*, edited by Jorge Gracia of SUNY Buffalo, represents the first anthology on this topic in English in more than thirty years.<sup>11</sup> Its translated readings are divided into three sections focusing on man, values, and the search for philosophical identity. Each section begins with an informative introduction discussing the general theme as well as the historical context of each philosopher, and every excerpt is preceded by a biographical sketch of the philosopher.

The section on the human being illustrates how the vitalistic anthropology of Mexicans Antonio Caso (1883–1946) and José Vasconcelos (1882–1959), largely inspired by Henri Bergson, rebelled against the pre-

11. The earlier work is *Contemporary Latin American Philosophy: A Selection*, with an introduction and notes by Aníbal Sánchez Reulet, translated by Willard R. Trask (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1954). A more specialized anthology was printed privately in 1961 and published two years later. See Harold E. Davis, *Latin American Social Thought: The History of Its Development since Independence, with Selected Readings* (Washington, D.C., 1963). Later Davis contributed a general history of Latin American thought entitled *Latin American Thought: A Historical Introduction* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1972), paperback edition (New York: Free Press, 1974).

vailing positivism. This part also focuses on the influence of Spaniard José Ortega y Gasset and German thinkers on the anthropology of the spirit of Mexican Samuel Ramos (1897–1959), Argentines Francisco Romero (1891–1962) and Risieri Frondizi (1910–1983), and Peruvian Francisco Miró Quesada (b. 1918). This section also covers the existential and Marxist anthropology of Argentine Carlos Astrada (1894–1970).

The section on values, featuring an especially informative introduction, contains excerpts from Argentine Alejandro Korn (1860–1936), Peruvian Alejandro Deústua (1849–1945), Uruguayan Carlos Vaz Ferreira (1872–1958), and Brazilian Miguel Reale (b. 1910). The section on the search for philosophical identity includes Mexican Leopoldo Zea (b. 1912), Peruvian Augusto Salazar Bondy (1927–1974), and Argentine Arturo Andrés Roig (b. 1922). This section is the most interesting from my perspective as it deals with the historical development of the search for philosophical identity, which I consider to be Latin American applied philosophy. Gracia's anthology is a major contribution for those of us who teach courses on philosophic thought in Latin America. My experience has already proven that this anthology is easy for students to follow because of its clear introductions.

Gracia edited two other collections that between them bring the study of the history of philosophy in Latin America up to date. The first collection is thematic- or movement-oriented. It appeared as a special double issue, entitled "Latin American Philosophy Today," of the *Philosophical Forum* (volume 20, numbers 1–2, Fall–Winter 1988–89). Being a professional philosophy journal, it may not have been noticed by Latin Americanists outside the field of philosophy. The special issue contains a general introduction by Gracia and seven studies.

The introductory essay is intended for professional philosophers in the English-speaking world, almost none of whom are familiar with philosophy in Latin America. The first part discusses the general development of philosophy in Latin America in the twentieth century from its foundational stage (1910–1940) through its "normalcy" or self-critical stage (1940–1960) to its mature stage (1960–1980). Part Two summarizes the general level of philosophic activity, various philosophic perspectives, and current problems of philosophy in Latin America. Ample footnotes direct interested readers to additional sources. Gracia's concluding remarks convey his sense of the future of the field:

[The] main problem that Latin American philosophers have is lack of a solid philosophic tradition. A clear indication of this situation is that to this day Latin America has not produced philosophic figures of first order. . . . Philosophy, as any other human enterprise, is the product of collaborative and sustained effort. In countries like those of Latin America, where there is no tradition of collaboration and sustained effort, it is very difficult for the discipline to reach a high level of achievement and sophistication. . . . In spite of these problems I feel optimistic



about the future of philosophy in Latin America. Much has been accomplished in this century so far. Besides, Latin Americans have close linguistic and cultural ties that facilitate communication and exchange. And doubtlessly the importance of Latin America is growing in the world. Hopefully, all of this will help Latin America reach its philosophic destiny.

This special issue features Leopoldo Zea on identity, Horacio Ceruti Gulberg on liberation philosophy, Ofelia Schutte on feminism and gender identity, David Sobrevilla on phenomenology and existentialism, Adolfo Sánchez Vázquez on Marxism, and Gracia on philosophic analysis. It ends with a bibliographical essay by Iván Jaksić entitled “The Sources of Latin American Philosophy.” Although all the essays contribute to the history of philosophical ideas and to philosophy itself, only two will be examined briefly here, those by Zea and Schutte. Zea, whose title at the Universidad Autónoma de México is Profesor de Tiempo Completo, is the best-known of the contributors. His philosophy of history is the focus of another publication under review here (by Francisco Lizcano) and a major feature in yet another (by Fernet Betancourt). This essay, “Identity, A Latin American Philosophical Problem,” represents one of Zea’s most forthright statements and is also his clearest example of Latin American applied philosophy.<sup>12</sup> He begins with these pointed observations.

In the history of philosophy, strictly speaking, there seems to be no room for problems about identity, as raised by Latin American philosophy—more so when they also fall within areas that seem not to be strictly philosophical, like the political and the social. Apparently, philosophy raises only problems considered universal, and because they are universal and abstract, they are beyond what is everyday to man, his world, and his society. . . . Within this philosophizing, problems like the ones Latin American philosophy raises about its identity, seem to be only parochial, that is regional, and because of that, limited to a relative point of view proper to a concrete man, and thus, alien to what is truly universal. (P. 33)

From here, Zea tries to demonstrate that philosophy need not choose between universal knowledge and knowledge that allows humans to change their particular sociopolitical circumstances, between knowledge of being in general and the particular being of a specific flesh-and-blood human (yet one not so particular that he or she ceases to be appropriately human). Zea points out in his concluding statement, “Through

12. See Jorge J. E. Gracia and Iván Jaksić, “The Problem of Philosophical Identity in Latin America,” *Inter-American Review of Bibliography* 34 (1984):53–71. Although philosophers have long been concerned with the concepts of “self” and its “identity” in the history of Western philosophy, these same philosophers have manifested no such concern for either national or ethnic identity. It seems to me that professional philosophers have something essential to contribute to these discussions—clarification of concepts and systematization of the elements of the concepts. Currently, the peoples of Canada and the former Soviet Union, to name only two political entities, have engaged in discussions and activities that have led to the dissolution of one of these nations as we have known it. It would be unfortunate if philosophers thought of themselves as being above discussing such issues.

these particular problems [of whether Latin Americans are inferior to Europeans and North Americans or to any other human beings], and precisely because they are particular, other men can be acknowledged in a search for a horizontal relation of solidarity of peers among peers and not the vertical one of [cultural, political, and economic] dependency which had originated that unique problem of philosophy in Latin America" (p. 42).

The second essay from this issue to be discussed here is "Philosophy and Feminism in Latin America: Perspectives on Gender Identity and Culture," by Ofelia Schutte of the University of Florida.<sup>13</sup> She immediately reminds readers that "Of the growing number of Latin Americans committed to study women's issues or who consider themselves feminist, few are philosophers. Likewise, of the set of individuals who are philosophers, very few are actively teaching or doing research on feminism." Her aim is to identify some of the cultural contexts out of which Latin American consciousness of gender is developing. Her essay is subdivided into four parts: the historical and contemporary precedents of philosophy and feminism; feminist research strategies; the specific Latin American situation in the context of worldwide gender issues, with sections on violence against women, women and development, and women and domestic work; and the search for conceptual models that deal appropriately with Latin American women's specific situation of oppression, with sections on gender identity and public participation and on gender liberation and the abolition of exploited labor (a Marxist model of evaluation). Schutte concludes that Latin American women seem to be finding a unique solution to their problem: they are redefining their gender identity in both the public and private spheres without giving up their family identities, unlike North American feminists, who seem to be rejecting the private sphere for equality in the public sphere. She concludes, "The ideology of individualism that pervades North American society has had a profound impact on Anglo-American feminist theory. Latin Americans are trying to seek equality without losing community. As I see it, this is the symbolic value that the domestic maternal identity still holds for them" (p. 81).

The second collection edited by Gracia consists of five country-focused studies and constitutes the first half of the volume entitled *Philosophy and Literature in Latin America: A Critical Assessment of the Current Situation*. Coeditor Mireya Camurati edited the second part, which deals with literature.

The essays on philosophy update the history of philosophy in Latin America in the last few years. Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico are examined in detail while the remaining countries are treated collectively in the last chapter by Gracia (who also wrote the introduction). He cites

13. See Ofelia Schutte, "Toward an Understanding of Latin American Philosophy: Reflections on the Formation of a Cultural Identity," *Philosophy Today* 31 (Spring 1987):21-34.

an observation made by Risieri Frondizi in 1940 as still valid: “[T]here has not been in Latin America any original philosophy which may be the genuine expression of Latin Americans” (p. 1). Argentina, specifically Buenos Aires, remains the most important philosophical center in Latin America, with Brazil and Mexico not far behind. Indeed, Mexico has become a haven for philosophers from all over Latin America who have left their own countries because of political persecution.

The study of philosophy in Argentina, by Argentine Hugo Biagini of the Universidad de Belgrano, includes valuable sections on the philosophy of liberation. Argentina also produced the first significant philosophical examination of analytic philosophy in Latin America, demonstrating an early interest in this movement. Yet phenomenology, Marxism, and scholasticism were treated only summarily. Clearly, philosophy in Argentina in recent decades has become increasingly professional, with Argentine philosophers (especially those in exile) appearing regularly in the most prestigious circles and publications. What is still needed, Biagini emphasizes, is a careful plan to eliminate the essential causes of philosophical underdevelopment and dependency and to bring philosophy to bear in assisting incipient democracy in Argentina.<sup>14</sup>

The first of the two essays on Brazil is by Onésimo Teotónio Almeida, a Portuguese scholar teaching at Brown University. It deals with the diversity of philosophical expression in Brazil, emphasizing thinkers rather than movements. Almeida concludes that philosophy is alive and well in Brazil and that many of its practitioners have made more impact on Brazilian society than contemporary U.S. philosophers can claim regarding U.S. society. The reason in his view is that a few Brazilian philosophers, although still looking toward Europe and North America, “are decidedly thinking by themselves and about themselves.”

In the second essay on Brazil, Fred Sturm of the University of New Mexico offers an overview of philosophy today in Brazil. He concentrates on the great interest taken by Brazilians in philosophical ideas, even though graduate studies in philosophy were not introduced until 1971, at the Universidade de São Paulo (thirteen universities now have such programs). The vitality of philosophical activity is especially evident in the areas of symbolic logic, the foundations of mathematics, and the philosophy of science (apparently the legacy of W. O. Quine’s visiting lectureship in São Paulo in 1942). Forms of neo-Thomism, Marxism, and phenomenology are also still being discussed in Brazil.

Oscar Martí’s “Mexican Philosophy in the 1980s: Possibilities and Limits” provides a firsthand view of the practice of philosophy in Mex-

14. See also Leiser Madanes, “Filosofía y democracia en Argentina (1983–1989),” and Celia A. Lertora Mendoza, “Panorama del pensamiento argentino actual,” both in *Los Ensayistas: Argentina, 1955–1989*, nos. 26–27 (1989):105–16 and 117–60.

ico. Following his brief summary of the historical background or what he calls “possibilities,” Martí concentrates on philosophy as an academic vocation and the various “expressions” of that vocation. Philosophy in Mexico has been enriched by various exiled philosophers from Europe and other countries of Latin America as well as by philosophy studies conducted in foreign countries by Mexicans. The result is that philosophers in Mexico stay abreast of philosophical movements in the rest of the world and are fostering various philosophic movements, with no single movement predominating. Despite economic and political limitations, Martí concludes, philosophy in Mexico is as close to normal as can be desired. He cites a “multifaceted and active profession with sufficient means for diffusion, and an interested public, and a government that continually reasserts the importance of education in the development of the nation” (p. 47).<sup>15</sup>

Gracia presents an overview of recent philosophic developments in other Latin American countries, specifically Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Venezuela, Costa Rica, Cuba, Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic, and Uruguay. He reaches three main conclusions. First, continental European philosophies have been the main ones adopted by Latin Americans, especially Karl Marx, Henri Bergson, Max Scheler, and José Ortega y Gasset. Second, philosophy is practiced professionally by individuals whose aim is to keep current with developments outside their countries. Third, the main obstacles to further development of philosophy in Latin America are political, from the both the left and the right.

The second half of *Philosophy and Literature in Latin America* consists of an introduction and sections on poetry, narrative, drama, literary competitions for those writing in Spanish in the United States, Hispanic books in the Library of Congress (1815–1965), and the growing professionalism of journals devoted to Latin America (including *LARR* and the *Afro-Hispanic Review*). Regrettably, however, no effort was made to coordinate the two parts, thus missing an excellent opportunity for an essay integrating the two disciplines by emphasizing the literature of ideas, to which Latin Americans have contributed greatly. Nevertheless, the half on literature is innovative, especially in its coverage of the literary activities of Latin Americans living in the United States.

*Problemas actuales de la filosofía en Hispanoamérica* is the work of Raúl Fornet Betancourt, a Cuban trained at the Universidad de Salamanca who is now teaching at the Catholic University of Eichstatt in Germany. Using his own definition of philosophy as the search for the “essential,” he attempts to redefine the “essence” (meaning, character, function, and vocation) of philosophy in Latin America, whether it be a critique of or

15. See also Oscar Martí, “Is There a Latin American Philosophy?” *Metaphilosophy* 14 (1983).

a dialogue with traditional Western philosophy. The monograph's five chapters are followed by a sizable selected bibliography on general studies, country-by-country studies, representative thinkers, and current specific problems.

The first chapter discusses the existence or nonexistence of a Hispanic American philosophy and assesses the positions adopted by various thinkers: Argentines Angel Cappelletti and Jean Bautista Alberdi, who was the first to speak of "una filosofía americana"; Mexicans José Vasconcelos, who originated the idea of aspiring to a "raza cósmica," Agustín Basave Fernández del Valle, and Leopoldo Zea; Peruvian Francisco Miró Quesada; and Uruguayan Arturo Ardao. In his conclusion, Fernet Betancourt presents his own observations. Philosophizing, being an essentially human activity, is not only self-reflection but a way of living humanly, a way of anticipating and realizing the "essential" truth about human life (presumably meaning that philosophizing is a way of attaining authentic human life). This philosophizing always occurs in a particular historico-social situation but cannot be reduced to a specific situation (presumably because all situations involve the universal human situation). Otherwise, the essentially human would become confused with its circumstance. Thus according to Fernet Betancourt, philosophy in Hispanic America, to be true to itself and its fundamental human function, should cease searching for specific Latin American traits and seek what is characteristic of all times and places. In this way, philosophy in Hispanic America will be simply philosophy, which he considers the best way of being "Hispanic American philosophy."

My reaction to Fernet Betancourt's observations is that "theoretical philosophy," although it grows out of particular circumstances, is universal (insofar as it is theoretical), but "applied philosophy" is the return of theoretical philosophy to the particular circumstances in order to give them meaning and even modify them to help attain authentic human life. In other words, if a Latin American philosophy is "applied philosophy," then it is not incompatible with universal philosophy but is rather the necessary complement.

The problem of the existence of a distinctive Latin American philosophy leads directly to the second problem, that of the authenticity of philosophy in Latin America, the subject of the second chapter. The three main contributors to this topic are considered. The position adopted by Peruvian Augusto Salazar Bondy is that Latin American philosophy is unauthentic because it is grounded in an underdeveloped society (supposedly economically and politically underdeveloped). Trying to avoid a deterministic stance, Salazar Bondy hastened to add that Latin American philosophy can gain authenticity by recognizing this sociocultural underdevelopment and converting itself into a philosophy of liberation (the subject of the last chapter). Fernet Betancourt interprets this determinism-indeterminism argument as a sign of ambivalence on Salazar Bondy's part.

Mexican Leopoldo Zea joined this debate by criticizing Salazar Bondy's views, arguing that some philosophy in Latin America was already authentic insofar as it had become conscious of the need to search for Latin American identity. According to Zea, unauthentic philosophy resulted when European modes of philosophy, omitting reference to particular circumstances, were taken as paradigmatic and adopted mechanically. Zea and Salazar Bondy nevertheless concur in refusing to accept Latin America's underdevelopment as a defect of the Latin American mode of being or reality.

Argentine Enrique Dussel entered the debate by asserting that it is possible to develop authentic philosophy now if philosophy is linked to the liberating movement of oppressed peoples.<sup>16</sup> Dussel considers it necessary to ignore all previous philosophy in Latin America insofar as it has reflected European and U.S. dominating forces. He views liberation philosophy as the beginning of a postmodern stage in philosophy in which the discipline of philosophy will assist the downtrodden in transcending their situation to become fully human, while they convince their former oppressors of the mutual benefits of this step for all humankind, rather than liquidate them. Fernet Betancourt disagrees with Dussel because he considers European philosophy to be fully human also, despite the fact that it has not encouraged Latin Americans to devote attention to their own circumstantial reality.

The third and fourth chapters deal with Americans' mode of being according to various philosophers (including Zea and Dussel) and with the subject of values. Fernet Betancourt concludes that the American is a human being, nothing more or less, with the same great yet dangerous task of becoming authentically human in solidarity with every other human being in every region of the world. According to Fernet Betancourt, the relation between philosophy and liberation is the burning issue (*el problema más candente*) in all of Latin America. His critique of liberation philosophy as a whole, conditioned by his view of philosophy as the search for the Essential, is that the subject of philosophy is not "the people." If it were, philosophy would be subservient to national politics.<sup>17</sup>

I agree with Fernet Betancourt that philosophy must not become the tool of politics. But his criticism would have been clearer had he introduced a distinction in the concept of "philosophy" between the "theoretical" and the "applied" and another distinction in the concept of "people" between "the social" and "the political" or "the state." To me, the subject of philosophy is reality as it becomes conscious of itself in the

16. For a critical study of the theological complement to the philosophy of liberation, see Arthur F. McGovern, *Liberation Theology and Its Critics* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1989).

17. See Raúl Fernet Betancourt, "La pregunta por la 'filosofía latinoamericana' como problem filosófico," *Revista de Filosofía* 22, no. 1 (May–Aug. 1989): 166–88 (published in Mexico City).

individual human reality, which is circumstantial in the sense of including other human realities and the sum total of historical, geographical, and natural realities. The enlightening knowledge gained from the reflections of individual philosophers should be shared with their fellow humans and placed at the service of “the people” in the sense of “the social.” This knowledge may or may not be utilized by “the people” in the sense of “the political,” but if it is, the risk is ever present that it will be employed to justify the political status quo or past or future political decisions. Philosophy harnessed in this manner is no longer at liberty to go where experience and logic take it, to express freely and authentically the truths it perceives. Of course, individual philosophers may legitimately disagree among themselves. As Ortega once said, for philosophy to be philosophy all it needs from “the state” is to be let alone to do its task freely and faithfully.

The relation of philosophy to politics is discussed in *Academic Rebels in Chile: The Role of Philosophy in Higher Education and Politics*, by Iván Jaksic of the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee. He covers the development of philosophy in Chile in six chapters: the role of philosophy in secularizing thought (1810–1870); the eclipse of philosophy as philosophy under positivism (1870–1920); the “spiritual” revolt against positivism by the founders of Chilean philosophy (1920–1950); the institutionalization and professionalization of philosophy (1950–1968); the role of philosophy in the university reform movement (1960–1973); and philosophy under military rule (1973–1989). The thoughts of a number of philosophers are examined for their educational and political implications: Venezuelan Andrés Bello (1781–1865), Spaniard José Joaquín de Mora (1783–1864), and Chileans José Victorino Lastarria (1817–1888), Francisco Bilbao (1832–1868), Valentín Letelier (1852–1919), Enrique Molina (1871–1964), Jorge Millas (1917–1982), Juan Rivano (b. 1926), and others.

*Academic Rebels in Chile* presents a view from within Chile, as Jaksic taught philosophy in a Chilean secondary school and studied in the philosophy department at the Universidad de Chile. His students taught him how military rule was subverting normal life, while Rivano, his teacher, showed how standing up for one’s convictions—rather than remaining silent or becoming an “official philosopher”—led to imprisonment and exile. Jaksic’s well-researched study is a warning to every nation of the consequences of statism, under which an authoritarian government forbids liberty of thought and tries to pervert philosophy into catering to its ideological defense.<sup>18</sup>

The collective volume *Femmes-philosophes en Espagne et en Amérique Latine* also originates from the University of Toulouse–Le Mirail. Of the seven essays, the first two deal with Spain. One examines the small

18. For more on this topic, see my review of this book in *Hispania* 74, no. 1 (Mar. 1991):81–82.

number of Spanish women who advanced their education beyond the knowledge of domestic duties. Among them was the Countess of Montijo, grandmother of the Spanish-born Empress of Napoleon III, Marie Eugénie de Montijo de Guzmán. The other study deals with María Zambrano, a student at the Universidad de Madrid under Ortega and a teacher before going into exile near the end of the Spanish Civil War. The study considers her writings during the 1940s on Seneca's theory of resignation.<sup>19</sup> Of the remaining essays, one deals with the birth of feminism in the work of Argentine writer Victoria Ocampo, comparing her with Simone de Beauvoir. The other four deal with women who currently teach philosophy in Latin America.

Alain Guy contributes two of these studies, one on the "progressism" of Peruvian María Luisa Rivara de Tuesta, the other on the philosophy of psychology, medicine, and technology of Puerto Rican Elena Lugo. Rivara, who teaches at the Universidad de San Marcos, considers herself a historian of philosophy in Latin America and especially her native Peru. She is convinced that the most original contribution of Latin America to philosophy is liberation philosophy. In her view, an authentic Latin American philosophy (what I call applied philosophy) must be bipolar. It must simultaneously contribute to the development of Western philosophy and to the "popular" aspect of Latin American reality, thus manifesting the tension between speculation and action (a requisite of philosophy in its complete sense, in my view). Lugo teaches philosophy at the Universidad de Puerto Rico in Mayagüez, specializing in the epistemology of the sciences and ethical issues dealing with medical engineering technologies. She emphasizes the obligation of philosophers to consider the social and common good in these matters. I view this obligation as part of applied philosophy.

Zdenek Kourim contributed an essay on Chilean philosopher Carla Cordua. As a student at the Universidad de Chile, she received a scholarship to study in Germany for two years. Afterward she presented her doctoral dissertation on Hegel, who inspired her conception of philosophy, at the Universidad Complutense in Madrid. Cordua now teaches at the Universidad de Puerto Rico in Río Piedras (along with fellow Chileans Roberto Torretti and José Echeverría). She considers one of her specialties to be "practical philosophy," maintaining that the Latin American situation calls for an "application" of philosophy. In my view, such application is required by all situations at all times.<sup>20</sup>

19. See the March–April 1987 issue of *Anthropos: Revista Documentación Científica de la Cultura*, dedicated to María Zambrano as "Pensadora de la Aurora." This journal is published in Barcelona and Madrid. See also the interview with Zambrano when she became the first woman to receive the Premio Cervantes: *Prólogo: Revista del Lector*, no. 3 (May–June 1989): 16–22 (published in Madrid).

20. Cordua presented a paper, "The Dissolving Power of Intelligence according to Hegel,"



Finally, Reine Guy contributed a study of Brazilian Constança Marcondes César, who teaches at the Universidad Pontificia Católica de Campinas (in São Paulo). Her interest in various French philosophers has made her a frequent visitor to the Sorbonne's Institute of Advanced Studies on Latin America and the University of Toulouse–Le Mirail. She too considers herself a historian of philosophy and has demonstrated the influence of the pre-Socratics on contemporary Brazilian philosophy. Her book *Filosofía na América Latina* (1988) envisions the philosophical path of Zea as leading from the Mexican to the Latin American to the human (and thus avoiding parochialism).

Francisco Lizcano, a Spaniard who studied in both Spain and Mexico, has written *Leopoldo Zea: una filosofía de la historia*. Six chapters are devoted to European and Latin American philosophy; consciousness, being conscious, and historical assimilation; commitment and responsibility; originality and authenticity; domination and dependency; and the theme and reality of independence. The last chapter evaluates some major aspects of Zea's thought. Zea has been acknowledged as the main disciple of Spanish exile José Gaos, the last rector of the Universidad de Madrid and a philosopher greatly influenced by his teacher, Ortega y Gasset. When Gaos arrived in Mexico in 1939, he began a long and distinguished career that touched the academic lives of many younger Mexicans, Zea above all. Through Gaos's teaching, Zea adopted Ortega's intuition that each life also includes its circumstances, one of which is an individual's national identity. Zea has devoted his long life to applying this intuition to the history of Mexico and the rest of Latin America.

Lizcano's stated objective is to offer a global interpretation of the work of Zea that systematically interrelates his most important themes. The study is presented on two levels: it undertakes an analysis of Zea's main concepts and also presents the historical reality that Zea is attempting to clarify. The union of the two features is found in Zea's philosophy of history, which seems to me an effort to write a philosophy of the history of Latin America. Zea's concerns with the human individual, society, and the state are all incorporated into his philosophy of history, as is his conception of philosophy as an attempt by humans to understand the specific problems of their respective realities and to resolve them. Thus Zea's thinking encompasses both general or theoretical philosophy and applied philosophy.

Zea's central effort is to make the citizens of nations that are economically, politically, and culturally dependent conscious of their de-

---

to the conference "Skepticism in the History of Philosophy: A Pan-American Dialogue," University of California, Riverside, 15–17 Feb. 1991. See also Cecilia Sánchez, "La búsqueda de un nuevo lugar teórico para la filosofía en Chile," *Los Ensayistas, Chile: 1968–1988*, nos. 22–25 (1987–88):167–90.

pendency, to bring them to realize that the same Western nations that proclaim the universality of freedom in seeking their own interests deny this freedom to other nations. Only at the beginning of the twentieth century did Latin Americans consciously begin to accept their own reality for what it is, rather than try to imitate other people. Only then did they start to adapt ideas of European origin to the American reality rather than simply adopt them uncritically. According to Zea, it is the first obligation of a responsible individual to become conscious of his or her reality and perhaps commit himself or herself to transforming that reality into one more conducive to attaining human authenticity. It is also the first obligation of a responsible people. In taking the lead in transforming their reality, Latin Americans are pointing the way for other inhabitants of the Third World to do the same for their respective realities. This approach is needed because each human and each society are necessarily "original" and only sink into inauthenticity by uncritically imitating others—even in the discipline of philosophy.

The Latin American peoples were first dominated by the Iberians and after independence by other Europeans and finally by the United States. Each of these nations has denied liberty to Latin Americans in their various efforts to control and manipulate Latin America for their own interests. Worst of all, in an attempt to justify their domination, these countries have denied that Latin Americans are fully human. Rather, they have forged the model of a human in their own image and likeness, leaving out non-Western peoples as "infrahuman." According to Zea, this ultimate act of imperialism has classified non-Western peoples as part of the fauna and flora of the land. But liberty is the patrimony of all peoples, and history is moving toward liberty as its goal, without dominator or dominated. No definitive model of liberty can be formulated beforehand and imposed because each people must formulate its own particular model. In other words, liberty is a specific condition that each people must obtain for itself according to its own distinctive reality. Yet Zea maintains that Christianity has pointed the way by revealing the dignity of the human.

Lizcano's final chapter evaluates the key aspects of Zea's thought. His assessment hinges on three related criteria. The first is Zea's capacity to explain certain facets of reality (such as the meaning of the future of humanity and the goal of history as the progressive elimination of dominator and dominated by various means) more precisely than other philosophic traditions—like liberalism and Marxism, which present certain already existing nations as the only models for the future of all of humanity. The second criterion is the fecundity of Zea's thought on dependency (including more than the ideological and economic aspects) as possibly applicable to other areas that require theory (for example, the social sciences). The third criterion that Lizcano considers is the efficacy of Zea's

ideas in transforming reality, which has introduced the imperative as a complement to a philosophy of history, as seen in the concepts of commitment and responsibility.

According to these criteria, Lizcano finds Zea's philosophy of history to have made a significant contribution, especially his position that relations of dependency constitute the present basis of the unity of humanity. Lizcano's only minor criticism is epistemological and is offered in a helpful spirit. For Lizcano, knowing or theorizing about reality is always an approximation of reality, never a total apprehension (as it seems to be for Zea).

I would add three other qualifications of Zea's very significant contribution to "applied" Latin American philosophy. First, Zea makes no effort to illustrate how European philosophy emerges from European cultural conditions, as he maintains Latin American philosophy must emerge from Latin American cultural conditions in order to be authentic. I have no doubt that it does—given human living, how could it be otherwise? But Zea's statement is nevertheless misleading. Those Europeans who delved deeply into themselves to reach the depths of their humanity, upon which the European version of human life is historically constructed, also revealed philosophically aspects of human life that all people in all times and places recognize as their own. Yet the shortsightedness of ethnocentrism caused Europeans to believe that the natives of the New World must be Europeanized to be civilized or, worse yet, to be humanized. In this misguided attitude, Europeans have shared the temptation of people all over the world. Unfortunately, they were continuing a policy going back as far as the Greek colonists, who thought they had to Hellenize before they could civilize, and then the Romans, who thought they had to Romanize before they could civilize, and worse still, the Romanized Christians who thought they had to Romanize before they could Christianize.

Second, Zea draws no distinction between European and U.S. philosophers, who recognize the universality of human rights (but perhaps have less political and economic clout than philosophers in Latin America), versus the politicians and business executives of these same countries, who refuse to extend these rights worldwide because they lack insight into the sameness of humanity the world over. Even Thomas Jefferson, a political leader with a philosophic mind who composed the initial U.S. expression of the conviction of the universality of human rights to justify the colonists' declaration of independence, was a slave holder (although he privately realized the incompatibility of his position). Moreover, he "purchased" the Louisiana Territory from France as if the sovereignty of American Indian nations did not exist.<sup>21</sup>

21. For a North American study of Zea, see Solomon Lipp, *Leopoldo Zea: From "Mexicanidad" to a Philosophy of History* (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1980). For

Third, Zea rarely mentions African Hispanics when he speaks of an authentic Latin American culture. He always cites the Amerindians as having to have their cultural aspirations recognized as equally human and says the same of the Creole cultures if an authentic Latin American culture is to come into being. But what of Europeans and Africans, both transplanted peoples (the former willingly, the latter unwillingly) who have intermarried with each other and the Amerindians? Even when these three peoples have not mixed blood, they have mixed their cultures to the point that the present Latin American culture represents a combination of three peoples. Any authentic applied Latin American philosophy must take this reality into account.

On this subject, Ian Smart of Howard University has written an essay of special interest on the *Afro-Hispanic Review* for the second part of the already reviewed volume, *Philosophy and Literature in Latin America*. An interdisciplinary journal originally published by Howard's Afro-Hispanic Institute, the *Afro-Hispanic Review* is now published by the Black Studies Program and the Department of Romance Languages of the University of Missouri-Columbia. Smart concurs with Richard Jackson, author of *Black Literature and Humanism in Latin America*, that the region's large African population is the key to the development of an authentic Latin American humanism (which would be an example of applied philosophy). Many of us forget that in Latin America, the large Amerindian and African populations are more integrated into the national cultures than they are in the United States and Canada. Hence if philosophy is to be applied to cultural themes and problems, African cultural roots and Afro-Latin contributions must be acknowledged and studied.

The *Anuario Bibliográfico de Historia del Pensamiento Ibero e Iberoamericano* provides a long-needed international bibliography on Ibero and Ibero-American philosophy. The first volume in 1989 contained items published in 1986. The second volume under review here appeared in 1990 and contains items appearing in 1987 along with those missed in the first volume. Entries are limited to studies of the history of Ibero and Ibero-American philosophy, broadly conceived.<sup>22</sup> Thus publications on

---

an early essay by Zea on culture in both Americas, see Leopoldo Zea, "The Interpretation of Ibero-American and North American Cultures," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 14 (Sept. 1948-June 1949):538-43. This essay demonstrates Zea's lifelong effort to comprehend the culture of Latin America, the main task of philosophy in his view. He expresses the hope that North American philosophers will do the same for their cultures and that the philosophers of both Americas will someday attain an understanding of the American culture that is common to both. I cannot recommend this essay too highly as a clear forestatement of Zea's lifelong vocation in philosophy. U.S. interest continues in Zea's philosophy of the history of Latin America. English readers can now consult Zea, *The Role of the Americas in History*, edited by Amy A. Oliver, translated by Sonja Karsen (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1991).

22. For information on all publications on philosophy in a number of journals and books

this theme that appeared outside the cultural geographical area are also included. This volume covers six more Ibero and Ibero-American countries than the first volume.

The collaborators on the *Anuario Bibliográfico* include some familiar names: Raúl Fornet Betancourt (on Austria and Germany), Alain Guy (on France), Horacio Cerutti Gulberg (on Mexico), and Jorge Gracia (on the United States). Each national listing is followed by an index of the journals consulted, and the volume ends with an index of names of philosophers. In all, 2,181 entries are listed.

This admirable facilitator of research was conceived and implemented by José Luis Gómez-Martínez. The project is being sponsored by the University of Georgia and cosponsored by the Asociación de Hispanismo Filosófico (AHF) of Spain, the Society for Iberian and Latin American Thought (SILAT)<sup>23</sup> of the United States, the Centro Interdisciplinario de Literatura Hispanoamericana (CILHA) of Argentina, the Fundación para el Estudio del Pensamiento Argentino e Iberoamericano (FEPAI) of Argentina, and the Instituto Peruano de Filosofía of Peru and the United States. This collective undertaking will save hours of searching, for which we owe a debt of gratitude to Gómez-Martínez.

Much has changed for the better in the three decades that I have been tracing the development of philosophy in Latin America. Philosophers in Latin America have forged closer ties with their colleagues in the rest of the world, and the converse is also true. Although philosophers interested in a Latin American philosophy have been sidelined by professional philosophical associations and publications, their focus should soon be recognized as legitimately philosophic, as a form of applied philosophy. The relatively recent immigration of Latin Americans to the United States and Canada has enriched North American professional philosophy with the perspective of Latin American philosophers interested in the history of philosophy in Latin America. All in all, this trend bodes well for fuller participation by Latin Americanist philosophers in Latin American programs of study and in meetings and publications of the Latin American Studies Association.

---

originating from Latin America, consult the quarterly listings (some with abstracts) in *The Philosopher's Index: An International Index to Philosophical Periodicals and Books*, which has been published for the last twenty-five years by the Philosophy Documentation Center of Bowling Green State University in Ohio.

23. SILAT continues to be active. Under President-elect Iván Jaksic, the Center for Latin America at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee sponsored a major conference entitled "Bridging the Atlantic: Iberian and Latin American Thought," 14–16 Mar. 1991. Four of the thirteen sessions were devoted to philosophic thought, with papers or commentaries by some of the authors under review (Gómez-Martínez, Gracia, Jaksic, and Schutte) that deal with some of the subjects covered in these publications (Zea, Krausism, feminism, liberation, and dependency).