



### Latin American Ethics

Journal:	<i>International Encyclopedia of Ethics</i>
Manuscript ID:	Ethics.4000.08-0648.R1
Wiley - Manuscript type:	4000 Words
Classification:	Ethics < Philosophy < Subject, Ethnicity and Culture < Subject, Globalization < Economics < Subject, rights < Key Topics
Keywords/Index Terms:	natural rights, Latin American Positivism, just wars, indigenous peoples, globalization, violence, ethnicity, Hispanic Identity, Lascasianism, Latin America, Bolivarism

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

view

## Latin American Ethics

Word Count: 4,010

## I. What is Latin American Ethics?

Latin American philosophers often express doubt about whether there is a characteristically Latin American philosophy at all. Yet the question itself has already led to philosophical work that now makes up a substantial corpus of original philosophical arguments that are topically related to Latin American history and culture. These criteria, then, together with that of being a view or argument on a substantial ethical question, demarcate Latin American ethics, a discipline closely connected to social and political philosophy. The focus in this article will be ethical issues about human rights and Hispanic identity raised within both academic and non-academic philosophy.

Academic philosophy, meaning the discipline as it is practiced today in the West, did not begin in Latin America until the first half of the twentieth century. When it did, it was mostly imitative of major Western traditions (see e.g., Pereda 2006). Non-academic philosophy comprises philosophical positions expressed in essay format, a hybrid genre cultivated by political leaders, scientists, and literary figures who, interested in the intersection of philosophy with literature and politics, have made contributions to the intellectual history of Latin America from the colonial period to the present.

## II. Human Rights

Two Western expansions, the so-called Iberian Conquest in the fifteenth and

sixteenth centuries and the current phenomenon of globalization (see GLOBALIZATION), have raised ethical questions about human rights in Latin America. The Conquest ignited a controversy about the nature of fundamental moral rights that could be claimed by indigenous peoples as well as by Spaniards. Scholastic thinkers on both sides of the Atlantic, encouraged by the Spanish Crown itself, addressed this question within the framework of Thomistic natural law theory (see AQUINAS, SAINT THOMAS; NATURAL LAW). At stake for Amerindians were their human or “natural” rights to life, liberty, and property (where ‘liberty’ included religious freedom), for Spaniards, their social rights to wage war, trade, travel, and preach their religion in what they perceived as a “New World.” The controversy’s principal contributions to the literature of philosophy were an absolutist theory of natural rights that had repercussions for modern natural rights theorists (see GROTIUS, HUGO); an original outline of a philosophy of international law; a pioneering polemic on the moral backwardness of Amerindian and African slavery; and an early doctrine of duties of reparation for past injustices (see COMPENSATORY JUSTICE).

All parties to the controversy agreed that

- (1) Standards for evaluative judgments are built into the order of nature itself,
- (2) To act rightly is to act in accordance with the true nature of things as we find them in the world,
- (3) People are treated justly when they are treated as they deserve in accordance with their nature, and
- (4) Humans are by nature rational beings with inalienable natural rights to life and freedom from gratuitous harm.

1  
2  
3 On one side were those who added thesis (5): that the Amerindians fit the Aristotelian  
4 description of natural slaves and could therefore neither govern themselves nor have  
5 other human rights. As “evidence” in support of (5), they invoked the Amerindian  
6 practices of idolatry, cannibalism and human sacrifice, which they thought betokened  
7 insufficient rationality.  
8  
9

10  
11 On the other side, however, we find more credible and influential arguments on  
12 the subject of who may plausibly claim human rights, especially in the works of two  
13 Spanish Dominican theologians, Bartolomé de las Casas (1474-1566), and Francisco de  
14 Vitoria (1486-1546).  
15  
16

17  
18 Las Casas lived most of his life in Latin America and was passionately devoted to  
19 the reform of Spain’s policies toward Amerindians. His first-hand experience of native  
20 peoples gave him abundant evidence to support his rejection of (5). With the full  
21 rationality of Amerindians vindicated, las Casas appealed to his evidence together with  
22 thesis (3) to argue that the Amerindians were treated unfairly. On the same basis, he  
23 appealed to (4) to argue that they had natural rights. So effective were las Casas’s  
24 arguments that even Emperor Charles V was persuaded, and he granted many of the  
25 reforms las Casas requested.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43  
44 Las Casas left abundant textual evidence of his own moral evolution marked by  
45 two major changes of mind. The first came after witnessing the suffering and indignities  
46 endured by Amerindians in the abuse of their human rights, the second after learning of  
47 the unspeakable toll in human suffering endured by Africans as result of the Atlantic  
48 slave trade. Reflecting on his own complicity in these abhorrent institutions, he realized  
49 that his own status as a slave-holder in Cuba was morally untenable, leading him to return  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 his 'encomienda' -- his 'lease' on inherited slaves -- to local authorities (who technically  
4 owned them in the Spanish slavery system). Later, he withdrew his previous endorsement  
5 of a petition supporting the transportation of African slaves to America, publically  
6 renouncing that earlier position as a grave moral error (las Casas 1993: 85-87). This and  
7 other writings show the process by which las Casas's conscience evolved, manifesting a  
8 philosopher's commitment to finding a rational way through a moral minefield but  
9 always open to challenging received principles, where necessary, to accommodate the  
10 revised moral judgments he was inclined to make in light of new evidence.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 The outcome of this intellectual process was 'Lascasianism,' a doctrine quite  
23 radical at the time, that regards Amerindians as fully rational beings, bearers of natural  
24 rights to life, liberty, and property, which late Renaissance Thomism held to be absolute  
25 and inalienable rights. Correlative with the natives' rights were the Spaniards' duties of  
26 reparation for past injustices. And these las Casas construed as requiring the immediate  
27 manumission of enslaved Indians, restoration of their property, and Spanish withdrawal  
28 from tribal lands (las Casas 1993: 159-67; 169-73).  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 In arguing for this doctrine, las Casas often departed from traditional Scholastic  
40 strategies. Against those who took the practice of human sacrifice by some Amerindians  
41 to undermine their status as rational beings, he argued (conflating explanation with moral  
42 justification) that the practice was a natural result of their intense religiosity, which led  
43 them to offer to their gods the best they had (las Casas 1993: 162-167). Against the  
44 argument from idolatry, he devised the 'doctrine of probable error,' according to which  
45 the Indians, though *in error* because they held 'idolatrous' beliefs that were false, were  
46 nevertheless *justified* since they held those beliefs on the advice of their own wise men,  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 who were *usually not wrong*. Clearly, this argument might confer some degree of  
4  
5  
6 epistemic justification on the Indians' beliefs, even if it does in the end fall short of doing  
7  
8 the work las Casas needed it to do in order to give a sound rebuttal of the Spaniards'  
9  
10 charge.

11  
12 Like las Casas, Vitoria too held a realist conception of natural rights, but he  
13  
14 developed his own version of it in a series of lectures at the University of Salamanca. In  
15  
16 "On the American Indians" (1991: 231-92), based on notes from those lectures, he argued  
17  
18 that although the Spaniards had 'legitimate jurisdiction' in America, they had no right to  
19  
20 wage war against Amerindians, or to enslave them and take their lands and other  
21  
22 property. The principal reasons available at the time that appeared to support the  
23  
24 Spaniards' claim to such rights were carefully evaluated by Vitoria, who offered  
25  
26 counterarguments to each, mostly by appeal to canon law and definition. Following  
27  
28 standard Scholastic strategies, Vitoria developed significant philosophical views on the  
29  
30 way in which knowledge and volition may bear on moral obligation and the conditions  
31  
32 under which the use of coercive force against a people may be morally justified.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 For Vitoria too the question of whether Amerindians had natural rights turned  
40  
41 largely on the facts about their rationality. Reflecting the prevalent ethnocentrism of his  
42  
43 time, he regarded the natives as somewhat 'dull' and in needed tutelage, but in this he  
44  
45 saw no reason to judge them *irrational*. Moreover, he questioned the right of Spaniards to  
46  
47 wage war against them, on the grounds that 'slaughter of the innocent' is contrary to  
48  
49 natural law. In the absence of provocation – and lacking good moral reasons -- war  
50  
51 against other nations is morally wrong. From these principles he concluded that there  
52  
53 couldn't be a just war against the Amerindians, for no wrong had previously been done to  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Spain by these peoples. Spaniards therefore had the duty to abstain from harming them.  
4  
5 In “On the Law of War” (1991: 293-27), he argued that there may be legitimate reasons  
6  
7 for waging war against some local peoples when they violate some of the sociability  
8  
9 rights of citizens of a foreign nation, which included rights to travel freely in the local  
10  
11 people’s land, acquire citizenship, and practice their religion. Other legitimate reasons for  
12  
13 war included being attacked by another nation (in which case the war is always defensive  
14  
15 and should end with the aggressor’s withdrawal), and where there is a need to interfere  
16  
17 with customs such as cannibalism and human sacrifice. But, for Vitoria, that Amerindians  
18  
19 rejected of the Gospel, a common reason invoked at the time to justify war against them,  
20  
21 was not a sufficient reason (see JUST WAR THEORY, HISTORY OF).

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 Vitoria’s views on just wars and natural rights have had an influence on doctrines  
28  
29 of human rights in contemporary international law. By contrast, Lascasianism has been  
30  
31 an ongoing populist phenomenon that continues to be a moral force behind movements  
32  
33 for political and economic reform in Latin America. Gustavo Gutiérrez (Peruvian, b.  
34  
35 1928), a Lascasian thinker, is the founder of ‘liberation theology’ (see LIBERATION  
36  
37 THEOLOGY AND ETHICS), a vastly influential philosophical movement within Latin  
38  
39 American Catholicism. The influence of Lascasianism can be seen in Gutiérrez’s (2008)  
40  
41 version of Roman Catholic ethics, a kind of perfectionism holding that some ways of life  
42  
43 should be promoted since they lead to human flourishing, while other less worthy ways  
44  
45 of life should be avoided (see PERFECTIONISM). In Gutiérrez’s own words, some  
46  
47 ways of life make people *more human*, while others make us *less human*. The sense of  
48  
49 ‘human’ at work here is the same one invoked by las Casas in his vindication of the  
50  
51 *humanity* of Amerindians (i.e., their personhood). Sensitive to the familiar Marxist  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 criticism of religion as focused solely on the afterlife, Gutiérrez argues that a crucial  
4 value Christians must seek is sympathy to the needs of the poor, which in Latin America  
5 entails a struggle for actual liberation from political and economic oppression. For  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

criticism of religion as focused solely on the afterlife, Gutiérrez argues that a crucial value Christians must seek is sympathy to the needs of the poor, which in Latin America entails a struggle for actual liberation from political and economic oppression. For Gutiérrez, political oppression and poverty are ways of life that dehumanize those who suffer them; thus an actual *this-world* liberation presents itself as an imperative for Christians: they must, he thinks, devote themselves to the elimination of injustice and poverty in the world.

For all their influence on the progressive ideology of the Latin American left, however, Lascasian theses about the morality of the Conquest are often qualified by thinkers from the same end of the political spectrum. For example, the Cuban Marxist Roberto Fernández Retamar (b. 1930) warns against the folly of complicity with the ‘Black Legend,’ a spurious sixteenth-century account of abuses in the Conquest actually made up by Spain’s rivals to smear Spain while disguising their own imperialist motives. On his view, Latin Americans should embrace their Spanish roots, since Spain brought to Latin America something often overlooked by critics: a valuable mix of races, cultures, and religions. Berbers, Moors, Muslims and Jews all contributed to the enrichment of traditional Spanish culture in the Middle Ages – and, together with Catholic Christians, left their imprint in the Hispanic New World. Furthermore, no other power in the sixteenth century showed Spain’s openness and moral honesty in permitting public debate over the morality of the European expansion. Arguably, however, neither the blessing of that mixed heritage nor the alleged sinister motives of proponents of a ‘Black Legend’ have the power to settle the larger question of the moral backwardness of the Conquest itself.

1  
2  
3 Issues of human rights have also attracted the attention of contemporary analytic  
4 philosophers such as the Argentine Eduardo Rabossi (1930-2005). On his account, it  
5 makes no sense now to ask “foundationalist” questions concerning the existence,  
6 analysis, and classification of human rights. What matters is that “after the creation of the  
7 United Nations and the sanctioning of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights...”  
8 (2004: 146) there came to be international and regional consensus about the existence of  
9 human rights. The failure of the United States and Britain to persuade the United Nations  
10 to declare war on Iraq suggests precisely that “the phenomenon of human rights...is  
11 taking its place in the culture of humanity” (2004: 148). From this premise, Rabossi  
12 concludes that the only fruitful theorizing in political philosophy will be that concerned  
13 with the legal and political issues raised in the adjudication and enforcement of human  
14 rights.

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32 But if Rabossi’s ban on philosophical theorizing about human rights is to avoid  
33 dogmatism, something more than an appeal to the international legality of those rights is  
34 needed. In fact, Rabossi indulges in some theorizing himself in accounting for the  
35 relation of human rights to globalization and violence (see VIOLENCE). One of the  
36 virtuous consequences of the type of globalization that arose after World War II is that it  
37 has enabled a *global* civil society to be created -- one rooted in political values  
38 acknowledged by organizations such as the United Nations and the Organization of  
39 American States. Moreover, the fundamental rights underwritten by these basic political  
40 values are now generally accepted (at least as worthy goals) even when they limit state  
41 sovereignty (Rabossi 2004: 147).

42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

But globalization also has vices such as violence. Although the supranational

1  
2  
3 legality of our current “global civil society” provides a means to exert some control over  
4  
5 violence as standardly construed, it has, Rabossi maintains, so far failed to control  
6  
7 another, more subtle form of violence: the prevalence of poverty and malnutrition, which  
8  
9 Rabossi considers “indirect violence.” Expressing a view not uncommon among Latin  
10  
11 American theorists, he holds that the global society has the moral duty to control indirect  
12  
13 violence. “What good is liberty,” asks Rabossi (2004: 150), “if I’m dying from  
14  
15 starvation?” Consistent with his rejection of foundationalism, however, he doesn’t  
16  
17 elaborate on whether there is a human right to health or nutrition. Of course, neither of  
18  
19 these rights is yet fully acknowledged by the international community, but on Rabossi’s  
20  
21 view, that is to be lamented.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

### 30 III. Hispanic identity

31  
32 From the Wars of Independence (roughly, 1810 - 1829) to the present day, a  
33  
34 distinctive set of ethical issues have been raised by Latin Americans in connection with  
35  
36 concerns about their own collective identity, which for them means establishing *who they*  
37  
38 *are as a people* – and to some extent also *what they should* culturally and ethnically or  
39  
40 racially. Similar questions have been asked more recently regarding a broader category,  
41  
42 that of Latin Americans and their descendants abroad.  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 Establishing who Latin Americans actually were as a people was particularly  
48  
49 pressing during the Wars of Independence. The Venezuelan Simón Bolívar (1783-1830),  
50  
51 called *el Libertador* for his military leadership in defeating Spanish royalist forces in the  
52  
53 northern and western regions of South America, seems to have realized that Latin  
54  
55 Americans, as they struggled to free themselves from their colonial masters, needed a  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 new identity. His ‘Jamaica Letter’ (1815) is one of many writings where he maintains  
4 that Latin Americans are not exclusively European, or Amerindian, or Black. Rather, they  
5 are a people somewhere between these three identities, many of whom have a “mestizo”  
6 (mixed) cultural, ethnic and racial heritage. Bolívar thus offered the first version of a  
7 view that was to become popular a century later: the *mestizaje* view according to which  
8 Hispanics are a new ethnic group with some aspects of Europeans, Amerindians, and  
9 Africans.

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20 Given this new identity, Bolívar thought, Latin Americans should devise political  
21 institutions suited to their own cultural and national characters, not necessarily following  
22 the North American model. Liberal democracy, he believed, was justly praised for its  
23 success in the English-speaking world, but not self-evidently best for Latin American  
24 societies. This idea is part of what we might call “Bolívarism,” a larger doctrine that is  
25 perhaps Bolívar’s most distinctive contribution to political theory. It holds that there is no  
26 single universally valid polity for all peoples; rather, each nation must take into account  
27 the distinctive characteristics of its own people, as well as their unique historical  
28 circumstances and the physical geography of their country, to find the form of political  
29 arrangement that works best for it. Clearly, Bolívarism is a form of social and  
30 geographical determinism, since it holds that a people’s history, culture, and  
31 environmental conditions affect their national character.

32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48 Bolívarism, then, leaves open the possibility that autocratic governments might  
49 sometimes be morally justified. That would be so whenever such a government provides  
50 stability for a nation and enables its people to flourish. Thus Bolívarism denies the widely  
51 held thesis that liberal democracy is the best form of government for all nations.

1  
2  
3 Bolívar himself appears to have favored representative democracies with elected heads of  
4  
5 state who would have clearly limited terms of office. But he was unwilling to rule out  
6  
7 authoritarian government categorically and himself served for a time as dictator of  
8  
9 Venezuela.  
10

11  
12 The generation that followed Bolívar's also struggled with the problem of  
13  
14 identity, but did so in the process of laying down the philosophical foundation for  
15  
16 national unity (roughly, 1840-1880). Prominent among them are two Argentine thinkers,  
17  
18 the liberal statesman and educator Domingo Sarmiento (1811-1888), and the political  
19  
20 philosopher and diplomat Juan Bautista Alberdi (1810-1884). Rivals in public life,  
21  
22 Sarmiento (1998) and Alberdi (2004) would nevertheless agree in rejecting Bolívarism.  
23  
24 Liberal democracy, they maintained, is a paramount value; thus dictatorships are to be  
25  
26 resisted as a form of government in Latin America. Second, they held that the collective  
27  
28 identity of Latin Americans has nothing to do with racially mixed heritage, but rather  
29  
30 with being a European transplanted in the New World. Their proper ethnic category was  
31  
32 'criollo,' meaning *Latin-American-born white descendants of Spaniards*.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 Sarmiento and Alberdi both went beyond the question about the actual identity of  
40  
41 Latin Americans to ask what they should be. On this, according to Sarmiento, the  
42  
43 emerging nations faced a choice between civilization and barbarism, and national  
44  
45 development must be steered toward either the one or the other. 'Civilization' he thought,  
46  
47 was represented by only the criollos, barbarism mainly by Amerindians and mestizos,  
48  
49 such as the 'gauchos' of Argentina, the 'rotos' of Chile, and the 'llaneros' of Venezuela  
50  
51 (it is unclear where Latin American Blacks fit in this simple-minded picture). In fact, it  
52  
53 was a common view of liberals at the time that the civilized way of life should be  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 promoted and barbarism eradicated -- a view of collective identity that was shortly to  
4  
5 serve as the ideological foundation for late-nineteenth-century genocide campaigns  
6  
7 against Amerindians. That these people were too unruly for civil society, and therefore  
8  
9 candidates for elimination, both Sarmiento and Alberdi clearly agreed.  
10  
11

12  
13 About the prospects of mestizos in civil society, however, Sarmiento was  
14  
15 ambiguous. Given his social and geographical determinism, he seems committed to  
16  
17 holding that this group could be integrated through relocation and the fostering of  
18  
19 “enlightened urban habits” by education. Later political thinkers, in any case, took  
20  
21 mestizos to qualify for integration, but only if they could provide the needed labor force.  
22  
23 Harsh, discriminatory laws were adopted for the purpose. On the question of the means of  
24  
25 nation-building, Alberdi and Sarmiento disagreed, with Sarmiento holding that education  
26  
27 of the masses was crucial to this goal, and Alberdi maintaining that the promotion of  
28  
29 European and North American immigration was more important.  
30  
31  
32  
33

34  
35 In the late-nineteenth century, as the new nations of Latin America became more  
36  
37 stable politically, many thinkers began to reflect once again on the question of the  
38  
39 region’s ethnic and racial identity. They began to wonder if there was a causal connection  
40  
41 between underdevelopment in Latin America and the legacy of Iberian culture. Given the  
42  
43 apparent cultural and economic stagnation, they argued that a systematic change of  
44  
45 values, conducted through education, was critical to the flourishing of Latin American  
46  
47 nations. No longer content to ask simply ‘Who are we?’ they began to pose the larger  
48  
49 question, ‘Who should we be?’ The philosophical framework favored by thinkers who  
50  
51 raised that question was an autochthonous positivism influenced by both British and  
52  
53 French positivism. On the whole, it amounted to a communitarian form of perfectionism  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (see COMMUNITARIANISM). Autochthonous positivism was communitarian in that it  
4  
5 rejected the liberal principle of self-determination, holding that in Latin America that  
6  
7 principle conflicted with progress, and that progress was, after all, the highest value for  
8  
9 nation building. And it was also a form of perfectionism, because it held that ways of life  
10  
11 conducive to prosperity and social progress should be promoted, while those conducive  
12  
13 to stagnation should ultimately be eradicated.  
14  
15

16  
17 For the autochthonous positivists, promoting the right values required a drastic  
18  
19 change in the collective identity of Latin Americans, who should be induced to adopt the  
20  
21 ways of life of the French and the 'Anglo-Saxons' – which were believed to be  
22  
23 responsible, at least in part, for the achievements of those peoples in commerce, politics,  
24  
25 and technology. On the other hand, ways of life to be discouraged and eventually  
26  
27 eradicated were mainly those grounded in the traditionalist Iberian conception of social  
28  
29 order and in its related religious worldview, Catholicism.  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 Under the positivist influence, political leaders sought to transform Latin  
35  
36 American societies by making large-scale reforms aimed at remolding peoples' values as  
37  
38 well as political and social institutions. Prominent among those reforms were the  
39  
40 secularization of public education in nearly all countries and the separation of Church and  
41  
42 state, both mostly in place by 1900 (Ardao 1963). Together with their anticlericalism,  
43  
44 positivists offered a very unorthodox take on liberal democracy. In fact, they were by no  
45  
46 means in favor of democracy in the usual sense, favoring instead governments led by the  
47  
48 most learned in the positive sciences, where a strong leader might serve as executive with  
49  
50 the counsel of experts.  
51  
52  
53

54  
55 Widely accepted in Latin America, this model of government came to disastrous  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

fruition when it was implemented in Mexico. Although first influenced by Auguste Comte, Mexican positivists later followed J. S. Mill (see MILL, JOHN STUART), whose libertarian individualism seemed congenial to capitalism, and Herbert Spencer, whose attempt to graft a pseudo-Darwinian theory onto social philosophy served as a framework for their attempts to redirect the “evolution” of the Mexican people. From the highest positions in the Mexican government as well as popular publications such as the magazine *La Libertad*, Mexican positivists extolled the benefits of free-market capitalism as the true expression of ‘positive liberty’ while supporting General Porfirio Díaz’s iron-fisted rule to keep order in society. They saw in Díaz a possibility to foster progress in the long term by first establishing civil order, and these two values were held more important than individual liberty (Zea 1974). On the positivists’ view, the masses would have to be educated before they could be trusted with democracy -- thus introducing what would later become a persistent stereotype, the thesis that Latin Americans are “not ready for democracy.”

By the early 1900s, positivism had become untenable. Many objected to its rejection of the Iberian background of Hispanics and its single-minded vindication of progress as the preeminent social value. The *mestizaje* view was revisited and developed in directions that raised new ethical questions. The Cuban-American philosopher Jorge Gracia has recently put forward a version of it emphasizing the instrumental value for Hispanics of establishing their collective identity and giving it a name: viz., that it can empower them and be a source of pride and liberation from relations of dependence. On Gracia’s conception, Hispanics include not only Latin Americans and their descendants abroad but also Iberians. Like Fernández Retamar, Gracia too notes that in 1492 Iberians

1  
2  
3 were of mixed heritage (as were the Amerindians, and the mestizo people that resulted  
4 from their encounter). Such mestizaje, he thinks, is to be valued, for having a mestizo  
5 identity may provide protection against some forms of cultural, ethnic, and racial  
6 discrimination. But whether Latin Americans actually share a single collective identity  
7 with Iberians, as Gracia contends, and whether their mestizo identity can in fact afford  
8 them a defense against discrimination, remains an open question in the developing field  
9 of Latin American ethics.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

#### 20 21 22 23 24 Cross-references

25  
26 SEE ALSO: AUGUSTINE, SAINT; AQUINAS, SAINT THOMAS; COMPENSATORY  
27 JUSTICE; COMMUNITARIANISM; GLOBALIZATION; GROTIUS, HUGO; JUST  
28 WAR THEORY, HISTORY OF; IDENTITY, POLITICS OF; MILL, JOHN STUART;  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
NATURAL LAW; PERFECTIONISM; VIOLENCE

#### References

Alberdi, Juan Bautista 2004. "Bases and Starting Points for the Political Organization of the Argentine Republic," in Susana Nuccetelli and Gary Seay (eds.) *Latin American Philosophy: An Introduction with Readings*. Upper Saddle Brook, NJ: Prentice Hall, pp. 132-37.

Ardao, Arturo 1963. "Assimilation and Transformation of Positivism in Latin America." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 24: 515-22.

Bolívar, Simón 1951. "The Jamaica Letter," in Harold A. Bierck, Jr. (ed.) *Selected*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

*Writings of Bolivar*. New York: The Colonial Press, pp. 103-22.

Fernández Retamar, Roberto 1989. *Caliban and Other Essays*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gracia, Jorge J. E. 2000. *Hispanic-Latino Identity: A Philosophical Perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Gutiérrez, Gustavo 2008. "Toward a Theology of Liberation," in Iván. Márquez (ed.) *Contemporary Latin American Social and Political Thought: An Anthology*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 93-106.

Las Casas, Bartolomé de 1993. *Witness: Writings of Bartolomé de las Casas*. George Sanderlin (ed.), Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books.

Pereda, Carlos 2006. "Latin American Philosophy: Some Vices." *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 3, pp. 192-203.

Rabossi, Eduardo 2004. "Notes on Globalization, Human Rights, and Violence," in Ricardo J. Gómez (ed.) *The Impact of Globalized Neoliberalism in Latin America: Philosophical Perspectives*. Newbury Park, CA: Hansen House Publishing, pp. 139-55.

Sarmiento, Domingo F. 1998. *Facundo or, Civilization and Barbarism*. New York: Penguin.

Vitoria, Francisco de 1991. *Vitoria: Political Writings*. Anthony Pagden and Jeremy Lawrence (eds.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zea, Leopoldo 1974. *Positivism in Mexico*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

#### Suggested Readings

Marks, Greg. C. 1992. "Indigenous Peoples in International Law: The Significance of

1  
2  
3 Francisco de Vitoria and Bartolomé de las Casas.” *The Australian Yearbook of*  
4  
5  
6 *International Law*, pp. 131-51.

7  
8 Garrido, Manuel, Nelson R. Orringer, Luis M. Valdés and Margarita M. Valdés (eds)  
9  
10 2009. *El legado filosófico español e hispanoamericano del siglo XX*. Madrid: Cátedra.  
11  
12 Gutiérrez, Gustavo 1993. *Las Casas: In Search of The Poor Jesus Christ*. Maryknoll,  
13  
14 NY: Orbis.

15  
16  
17 Las Casas, Bartolomé de 1992. *Bartolome de las Casas: The Only Way*, H. Rand Parish  
18  
19 (ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

20  
21  
22 Nuccetelli, Susana 2009. “Latin American Philosophy,” in Nuccetelli, S., O. Schutte and  
23  
24 O. Bueno (eds.) *Blackwell Companion to Latin American Philosophy*. Oxford: Wiley-  
25  
26 Blackwell, pp. 343-56.

27  
28  
29 Nuccetelli, Susana 2002. *Latin American Thought: Philosophical Problems and*  
30  
31 *Arguments*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

32  
33  
34 Rabossi, Eduardo 1998. “On Being Sane in the Midst of Madmen: Some Reflections on  
35  
36 Civil Societies,” National Humanities Center.

37  
38  
39 <http://nationalhumanitiescenter.org/publications/civilsoc/rabossi.htm>

40  
41 Rodó, José Enrique 1988. *Ariel*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

42  
43  
44 Sierra, Justo 1969. *The Political Evolution of the Mexican People*. Austin: University of  
45  
46 Texas Press.

47  
48 Stavans, Ilan. 1997. *The Oxford Book of Latin American Essays*. New York and Oxford:  
49  
50 Oxford University Press.

51  
52  
53 Vasconcelos, José 1997. *The Cosmic Race: A Bilingual Edition*. Baltimore: The Johns  
54  
55 Hopkins University Press.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review