

# 소설을 통해 살펴본 남미 역사 이해

## Latin American history through the Novel

- ✓ **Instructor:** Prof. Lois Zamora
- ✓ **Institution:** LearnersTV
- ✓ **Dictated:** 김은비, 박원정, 한소영, 김보미

🔊 [02:00]

Okay, we're going to look at Octavio paz's essay today ... Mexico and the US just [?02:09] on your website.

But just so you know, it's anthologized now in this new addition of [?02:16] which is Octavio paz's very famous and very influential collection of essays published in 1950, the first version.

This is the [?02:27] and other essays are essay that we're reading today was published in New Yorker first in English in 1979.

And we're going to see some of the traces of 1979.

This is already an old essay if you want but what I want to do today is walk through it and really go very closely into the text read together some of the what I considered very beautiful passages very beautifully translated by Rachel Phelps if I'm not mistaken, I hope I am not

🔊 [03:00]

Yes, right she was Rachel Phelps then, she must've gotten married since she was Rachel Phelps [?03:06] and since nicely translated I think.

In there is a new addition in Spanish if any of you wants to read the essay in Spanish in the same format the [?03:16] and then extra essays that came abstruse.

Octavio paz died in something like 93, 94, 1994.

He won the Nobel prize as the addition I believe as this addition, no, it doesn't, I must've bought it before something like 1991 I should've looked that up to make sure ... a very influential writer.

Essays and poetry and plays and never novels, a few short stories but it says essays that have taught me a great deal about Mexican reality and about the relation of



Mexico to the US which as a US resident and US scholar I need to know about.

I'm in a in a row of my one second here to just wave next week's books at you.

I brought in my three copies of the trilogy you may be buying them in this form maybe buying them in the selected the collected trilogy.

All of this I hope it's clear on your syllabus.

What I want you to do for next week is read this volume, this is volume.

You're going to be presently surprised that there is quite a lot of blank space because as I've said there are very short passages at times that are ... nicely summarized events or people or situations.

This covers the first two centuries.

Well, it covers before time you'll see the early passages have no date no plays.

They're indigenous [04:53], they're are timeless if you want and then you'll get into the history that goes on for 30 pages also and then the dates start in 1492.

At the end of every passages you'll see I mark up my copy a lot I hope you do too.

There is a number or a series of numbers.

These numbers refer to a bibliography in the back of the book that says where he got the historical information that he has fictionalized, so pay attention to that those numbers of the bottom when you're interested in a topic go and see um, I wonder where he got this material.

Lots of is going to be in Spanish so those who aren't speak who don't speak Spanish will be inspired to learn it as quickly as possible.

But I'm not saying that you need to go [05:40] just that what he is saying to you is this is some my made up I have historical sources for this even as I'm fictionalizing or let's say poeticizing [05:53] the material.

So that I probably should've said before we start to talking about Octavio paz but I do want you to be aware of this book.

 **[06:02]**

How many people have the copy now have the genesis? Oh that's very reassuring so the book store did okay for us I think probably.

Good, and those of you who don't you have it on order or just you haven't gotten, gotten there yet, okay very good.



Alright, you know we could look at my blackboard for a minute here so that we can follow what I consider to be the nature of the argument.

We're going to ask first what Octavio paz defines his culture he tells us right to the outside he said something about civilization and he said something about culture.

So, we're going to look at that and then I take this essay to be and about 6 major points.

And I've outlined them and I hope sometimes when you're reading not so much fiction like Galliano or like Garcia Marquez.

But when you're reading about fiction you start to outline and this fashion ... bullet point if you want.

First, he is going to talk about the differences between Mexico and the US in terms of the indigenous peoples that occupy those territories.

We're going to hear what he has to say about the nomadic groups and the north versus the settled groups in Mexico.

Then we go to hit the imperial projects.

I should've said hear of Spain and of England the difference between the imperial projects what does he mean what do I mean by the imperial project.

I mean and he doesn't use the phrase exactly but he certainly use the empire and imperialist.

What he means is intention of England with the [?07:39] who came in 1620 as we know from [?07:42] sheet of last time.

As opposed to Spanish catholic intentions when they came, say ... let's take Columbus [?07:52] when [?07:53] in 1521 99 years before the program is ended.

The Spain years won of one thing and the English won another is very clear on that we're going to see it.

I've got my sub points under there the catholic, the Protestants are pluralists.

He says Mexico was a state before it was a nation and vice versa he said it of all whole series about possessions.

We can question those wait a minute not that black and white and we're going to do that.

But let's follow he's argument first.



Okay so that's the different imperial project which of everything to do with religion catholic and Protestant I should've put that probably before anything under point too.

Catholic versus Protestant he is fighting them very different as indeed they are in terms of a facting behavior of the colonizing process.

Then number three idols versus images we're going to look at Catholic practice versus Protestant practice one more time.

🔊 **[09:00]**

You can't understand the Americas if you don't understand religion and the per religion play both and the North and the South and in the middle.

So idols is one thing an images another we're going to check out what he says page on 368.

Then I can ask some page number here well it's not so important but let's go ahead racialism versus dogmatism happens to be 369 ... past versus future 370.

It's all very clearly lay out this was a New Yorker article a magazine article this wasn't something that wasn't intend for general audience.

And the finally the question were all we're going to ask of authors what his history for these authors what is the past how do we know it? How do we write about it? How can we speak consensually.

Because I can tell you whatever I want about my own past and you can say that your own past and you know that better than I.

But when I say art past when I say the past of the America's of land and America then I've got to be depending on agreement on consensus.

And there is always going to be disagreement but my example on this issue of consensual history is the holocaust.

There are people who deny the holocaust existed.

Now if we were to say well you know history, how he is told that's all it is, how he is told so few tell it the holocaust doesn't exist for you well it must not exist no.

We have to say most people agree that the holocaust existed and why people deny that well that's whole another course whole another question.

Um obviously there is million reading of the past but the ones that ten to be ... important let's say are those [?10:56] a number of people can agree.



So, this issue of consensual history the history of a community agreed upon by a community is what I'm asking about past here at the end.

What is he ... How does he take our definition history how does he arrive it he is and so for it.

Oaky, let's start a point number one and please do interrupt ask questions are there concerns of questions at this point.

Please feel free and yes would you push your button, thank you.

[Student Speaking]

um ... what was number six?

[Professor Speaking]

Oh, sorry we got number six is conclusion, thank you.

Would you tell me your name? Amanda, I'm sorry to try to learn a name.

Um ... thank you, conclusion to ... exclamation points because I think you're going to see this that is very polemical essay.

The past is something very specific in mind and it's to call the readers of the New Yorker in 1979 to attention.

 **[12:03]**

To say something about Mexico's disregard for American policy for American blind [?12:10] others.

So, what we're going to see in the end is the past version of history in part, past version of history.

We may not want to agree with that what we're going to see is his position.

Okay, number one the nature indigene's groups let's just... identity mark the pages but it's really very early.

Well, first definition of culture he starts on 257 and as you know the first page of the essay to say that we are two distinct versions of Western culture or Western civilization as he puts it.

So, he has in a way and he write [?12:49] to have to say little bit more when you make a decoration like that you're going to have to define what you mean of little bit more if you go to bottom of the 358.



Let's start at that essay that paragraph of other of course differences between Mexico and United State that's not imaginary projection but objective is reality there are very well differences.

Some [13:10] can be explained but the social economic and historical development of the two countries.

Are you there? Everybody there? If you didn't bring the essay please look on.

We're going to read from a quite a lot.

It is the second page 258, do you have page numbers? Yap

But there are different, as everybody else is pages different or just this ... do people's text have a 258? Yes.

Okay so yours is something else, okay just figure it's the second page all try the give you indication it's about the 4 paragraph of essay piece?

Of course the differences you see it okay.


Of course, the differences between Mexico and the United State is not all imaginary projection but projections of objective is reality.

But some [14:09] can be explained by the social economic and historical development but other two counties so far you could say that about any two counties oaky there different.

The more permanent one is although also the results of history are not easily definable or measureable the more permanent differences.

I pointed out to that belong to that to the [14:32] of civilization that [14:35] of imprecise contour in which are fused and confused ideas believes technology, styles, morale, fashions, church.

The material culture and the evasive reality which we rather inaccurately call [14:52] they pub a French phrase from 19 century history and meaning [14:59] character or cultural character.

 **[15:00]**

So, what his think he already is not get so much into the dates and the times and the places and the leadership and constitutions and revolutions let's talk about the way people live.

He is not, he is going to get back to the [15:16] I put it um ... page 366 to 369.



He is going to talk about the attitude toward death toward festivals, toward the human body.

We weren't going to go there right yet but I want you to I want you to know how he isn't forgetting his promise to the reader you shouldn't when you write essay either.

If you bring something up you're going to have ... don't bring it up if you are not going to get into it, so first bring up civilization then he gives his whole laundry list what he means by that?

It's the way people live a character of a community.

I mean all the French always like that the Americans the Mexicans.

It's the very for statement of course there are every sort of French men we are sort of French women and German and so forth.

It's a very false statement, of course there are every sort of French men and every sort of French women and German and so forth.

But nonetheless if I said, you know, something about Germany, something about France, something about the US, we might sort of agree.

And that's what he's going to start doing, now he's going to start giving us generalizations about Mexico, both of its past and its present.

But here he really wants to say, it's about the people that I want to talk.

And about how they live and how they die.

So, he does that, but we get into the mid of his argument which is historical, on page 359 which is next page along, and 60.

It's the paragraph that begins, "Clearly the opposition to Mexico in the US belongs to the north, south duality." Do you find that paragraph? Good.

Go down a couple sentences and we're going to get his first distinction.

The US is based in an indigenous culture that is nomadic. It's not agriculture.

Already we can say he's talking about Massachusetts. He's talking about the eastern seaboard, the north-eastern seaboard.

He's talking about the plains. He's talking about the north Texas, the Comanches, the



Kiowas, and so forth.

He's not talking about the south-east, where the Cherokees were settled in group, the Caddos, he's not talking about the Pueblo Indians, he's talking about the early settlement.

And therefore the politicization, if you want, or the establishment of the polity of the US.

And he says, you know, the settlers, the colonizers, the conquerors, and then the colonizers found two different things, nomadic, look at the very bottom sentence of 359.

I will read it. Why should I paraphrase it.

The northern part of the continent was settled by nomadic warrior nations.

Mesoamerica, on the other hand, was the home of an agricultural civilization.

🔊 **[18:00]**

With complex social and political institutions dominated by warlike theocracies that invented refined and cruel rituals.

We'll see about the practice of sacrifice when we get to Carlos Fuentes's book, <The Buried Mirror.

The invented refined and cruel rituals, great art, and vast cosmogonies (cosmic theories, there were huge astronomers, the Aztecs, the Mayas, the calendars, the calculations) inspired by a very original vision of time.

The great opposition a pre-Columbian America - all that now includes United States and Mexico - was between different ways of life: nomads and settled peoples, hunters and farmers.

This division greatly influenced the later development of United States and Mexico.

And the US are indigenous past as fair unless you come from New Mexico, unless you're special case.

It's quite invisible in Mexico. It's absolutely invisible.





So this division greatly influenced the later development of United States and Mexico.

The policies of the English and the Spanish toward the Indians were in large part determined by this division.

It was not insignificant that the former, the English, established themselves in the territory of the nomads and the latter, the Spanish, in the area of settled peoples.

I'm going to just go to.. what I want you to look one more page where he's talking about this difference of indigenous groups.

If you just turn the page to 362, it's the paragraph that begins "In the united states the Indian element did not appear." The middle of 362.

This, in my opinion.... let's start it again.

In the United States, the Indian element does not appear.

Again, we can say, wait a minute... You haven't been to Santa Fe lately. Or wait a minute. In South Dakota, where my dad and I began to grow up, there was a rose bud, reservation right there, in Iowa, the Tama reservation, I'm began in the middle-west, there was certainly reservations we go and buy beaded things, you know.

But only proving past as point, I'm afraid.

Though he's freely still remembers thinking about the eastern US, at the time of the settlement, of the time of the invention of the US, really.

In the United States, and of course partly that is because, obviously, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, were still Mexican until 1848.

So he's talking about that earlier period.

In the US, in the United States, the Indian element does not appear. This, in my opinion, is the major difference between our two countries. He says it twice.

 [20:58]



The Indians who were not exterminated in the US, were corralled in "reservations."

The Christian horror of "fallen nature" extended to the natives of America: the US was founded on a land without a past.

The historical memory of Americans, meaning of the US, is European, not American.

For this reason, one of the most powerful and the most persistent themes in American literature from Whitman to William Carlos Williams and from Melville to Faulkner, has been the search for (or invention of) American roots.

And so forth.

Keep going, I just want to come to one very beautiful sentence I think, and very true sentence at the bottom of page 362, but start the next paragraph.

We'll start it and get to that sentence.

Exactly the opposite is true in Mexico, land of superimposed pasts.

Mexico City was built on the ruins of Tenochtitlan, the Aztec city that was built in the likeness of Tula, the Toltec city that was built in the likeness of Teotihuacan, the first great city on the American continent.

Pre-Hispanic, of course, indigenous huge ceremonial centers.

If you've been to Chichen Itza, or Uxmal or Teotihuacan, outside of Mexico City, you'll know.

Then the sentence I've been headed for.

Every Mexican bears within him this continuity which goes back two thousand years.

It doesn't matter that this presence is almost always unconscious and assumes the naive forms of legend and even superstition.

It is not something known but something lived.

That's the sentence I love it. It's not something known but something lived.

That's... we can say that about culture generally. I mean, our own culture.



We live it, we don't stop and think that I get to wear pants in front of a class, I remember.

First of all, when there weren't many women t-shirts and secondly when we weren't supposed to wear pants except when we wear out on the plain field, that shows how old I am.

But we take some of these things for granted.

So I love that sentence not something known but something lived. We can say that about a great number of things with respect to our own cultures. Yeah.

Tell me your name again please. Jully.

[Student Speaking] I was wondering this sentence, is he speaking about the past? It's not something...

No, he's speaking, the question is, "Is he speaking about the past, it's not known." The answer is no, he's speaking about the indigenous heritage. He's saying that if you go to a Mexican on the street in Mexico City and say, "Are you related to Mock the Zuma?"

I think this is changed since 1979. I think the huge awareness now in Mexico of indigenous past.

There's been an enormous recovery of indigenous sights, the anthropology and archaeology in Mexico can't be bid.

If anybody wants to be an anthropologist or archaeologist go straight to Mexico, it's beautiful, beautifully developed disciplines because of the richness of the territory.

 **[24:07]**

Thank you for asking. I hope that's clear.

The Indian, maybe cause we stopped there, one more sentence or two.

The Indian presence means that one of the facets of Mexican culture is not Western.



Is there anything like this in the United States? Each of the ethnic groups makes up the multiracial democracy that is the United, that is the United States.... Sorry. Start it again.

Each of the ethnic groups making up the multiracial democracy that is the United States has its own culture and tradition, and some of them - the Chinese and Japanese, for example - are not Western.

These traditions exist alongside the dominant American tradition without becoming one with it.

That's the pluralist culture we're going to get to in a minute.

They are foreign bodies within American culture.

Again, I think, this is changed since 1979. I think we're much more multi-cultural in a sense of the mainstream.

We really can't, I think so much speak of an American mainstream meaning, Anglo-American, Protestant mainstream.

But I think in 79 that was less clear than it is now.

In any case, his argument is that Mexico is a mixed culture, and the US isn't. OK?

Now why is that? He's going to go straight now to religion. And let's go to that. It's the really the second point, we're only there.

Would you go back to page 360? It's going to be about the forth page of the essay. It's the ...

He's taken us from the Indian... the difference of nomadic and settled, that I wanted to look at that more, I wanted to look at his final assertion that every Mexico knows, doesn't necessarily know but lives the indigenous past.

Now there's a tradition for you. That's going to be different from what..

I mean, if we were writing a history of US republic, we start with 1776, so if we are colonialist, we'll start with the pilgrims.

There's a course, there are studies of indigenous cultures.



But it's not exactly what we would, most of us would begin.

So Octavio Paz is making his own point here by saying, look.

We live the indigenous tradition in Mexico. And if you've been to Mexico, or if you are Mexican, or Mexican decent, you know, that's the case.

Ok, now he's going to say why... he's asserted for example that the English did well to choose the Nomadic populations and the Spaniers wanted...

I wonder why that would be ... well, he tells us.

Look at the middle of page 360, the middle paragraph.

It ends with his assertion, "In England the Reformation triumphed, whereas Spain was the champion of the Counter-Reformation."

 **[26:57]**

Now we talked about that yesterday or day before in class, then we talked about Henry VIII, and why England became then protestant and what that meant in the mean time of the South of Europe, Spain leading the way is champion catholic church as the one true church, fighting religious war against the protestant.

Ultimately saying, the world will be divided, but only after battles on the Turkish front, and so forth, not only the America.

So let's think about the difference then he's going to give it to us very clearly.

I think if we go to 363 where best off, that's the middle of the page, it's the paragraph that begins, "If the different attitudes of Hispanic Catholicism and English Protestantism could be summed up in two words," do you find it? 363, everybody there?

I would say, and this I want you to think about, if the differences could be summed up, it is, I would say that the Spanish attitude is inclusive and the English attitude is exclusive.

In the former, the Spanish, the notions of conquest and domination are bound up with ideas of conversion and assimilation; in the latter, the protestant, conquest and

domination imply not the conversion of the conquered but their segregation.

Why is that? Anybody want to think about that out loud?

Why would the protestants not be interested in converting, indigenous peoples?

Why would they just say, you know, they're kind of out of sight, out of mind until we want their land and they will put them on reservations and will keep pushing them west until pretty soon?

Everybody's on reservation. Why would the protestants have no interest in converting?

Yeah, would you press the button? Remind me your name please.

[Student Speaking]

It's supposed to, yeah, move, it has no green light. [laughing]

[Student Speaking] My name is Karsna. And I was just.

Maybe they thought they were so far gone in the beginning that they didn't even want to convert them because it's like, you know, by who was saying indigenous people were the Indians and America will.. nature was everything and they knew it but protestants are not so much like that. So maybe they thought that they were inconvertible, like they couldn't be convertive so we would just push them.

Yes. Your name please.

[Student Speaking] Jenny.

I'm asking you several times. Thank you, Jenny. I forget immediately.

[Student Speaking] I would think that it would have to do with the fact that when they came here, they were fleeing from [29:49] prosecution and maybe they were just like, we have our religion, and you have your religion, and we don't need to convert you, because that's what we're trying to get away from.

 **[30:00]**

It's called pluralism.



Yeah, yeah.

I don't know much about Protestantism, but I don't know if they believe in predestination or not because if they do, then that would mean that you know, the Protestants are the saved and chosen and predestined people, you know, that conversion isn't possible, you are just born a person of god or you are not.

Right. Predestination is as you know, a part of especially Calvinism, not all Protestantism.

But there is some idea that doesn't mean though the Protestants didn't some of them work with indigenous peoples and it doesn't mean that they were constantly examining their soul, cause they couldn't tell who was predestined to be saved and who was not.

But I think that we're getting close to when we remember that the Protestants are themselves persecuted people is not that they don't want to continue persecuting.

They are perfectly happy to be very cruel to indigenous peoples.

But it is that they believe that if you don't agree with them, you just go for another religion.

That's why we have so many Protestant groups.

Would you tell me your name?

[Student Speaking] Name's Anny.

Anny.

Thinking of one of the big reasons why a lot of them would not want to go about to task of converting whoever they ran into is a fear of like contamination, sort of speak.

If they don't want to be part of that, they don't want, you know their kids seeing something else and even contemplating that is another option not to say that for all of the [?31:43] and all the other partisan groups that came over that would be a reason.

But a lot of them would see it as a threaten and not want to entertain the idea of [?31:52] saying with that.

The communities were very close.

[?31:55] points out the Protestant communities.

But it is still theologically unnecessary to convert if you don't believe that there's one true church, that there are many ways to go about worshipping and indeed if you left



the church that's arguing that it's one true church, then you don't need to include everybody.

You can be exclusive and that's what Octavio Paz's says.

So pluralism, which we are very proud of, at least I am as a US citizen, I am very glad that I have the right to choose this church or that church or indeed this school or that school or indeed think about this way or that way.

And all I can say to a person who disagrees or chooses another option is well, that's you're right because we are pluralist culture.

I don't have to convince you, we don't have to call have it because we have lots of options.

So what happens when there's the first disagreement in the Northeast at least A disagreement with the Pilgrim who landed in 1620 as you remember on [?33:00] rock, with Rodger Williams, he doesn't agree with the leadership, he's just fine, I'll just go find right road island and he does.

### [33:09]

And then there are different colonies are...

Why is the opposite true?

Why does the catholic church have a great interest in conversion?

Because it's the one true church.

If you come as a catholic conqueror, you are [?33:23] to save souls.

I mean it says a pretty funny way to save souls working indigenous groups to death in mines doing terrible things including bringing small pokes and [?33:38].

If they really cared about those souls, maybe they no, no, they are [?33:42] we have to save them.

So, the Spanish conquest is based on and justified by the need to convert.

These people are waiting for god's word indeed there's agreed discussion about who these indigenous peoples could be, because they aren't [?33:59] in the bible.

There's the theory this quite important in the 16<sup>th</sup> century that this is the lost tribes of Israeli that are discussed in the Hebrew bible.

So, the catholic church had always to fit things into the dogma.





We talked about it with Galileo.

Galileo was in prison because what he has discovered doesn't fit in to the version and we talked about with the maps.

So the Catholics actually, Octavio Paz says it in another essay.

It says your laugh, he says, your laugh when I say this.

But in Mexico, we were better to our indigenous peoples than the English war in the North because we didn't kick them out of the cosmos.

That's another words we had to include them.

So that's the difference between exclusive and inclusive.

And it's the difference between central system and a plural system.

The catholic church had to get used in the 16<sup>th</sup> century to the Protestant reformation.

People were saying wait, we are not going to be a part of this church.

And they used to be a part.

So the whole examination of conscience and so forth comes in, the whole idea of questioning what church if you were a European you would belong to was new in the 16<sup>th</sup> century with Martin Luther with Calvin, and so forth.

So these very different ways of looking at indigenous peoples are theologically determined.


And every reason that you all of given I think are good ones that pierce one interested in mixing that [35:28] literature.

If they hear what they called indents, howling barbarians...

It's not pretty.

It's not pretty either the treatment of indigenous peoples in Latin America but the fact is they were great groups of catholic [35:47].

I think [35:52] who came later the karma like later the judge with all with this great interest and we can say well, it wasn't just their souls it was their labor, it was their eventually the power that they had over great groups of people these catholic orders.

 **[36:10]**

But the fact is there was also a very deep religious and theological basis.



You can feel it in Mexico today when you go to the difference.

I mean both cultures are [?36:19] the pluralist and the centralist.

They produced very different versions of Western culture as Paz start to by saying.

So this centralist versus pluralist which I wrote on a article blackboard is the one I want you to re-read when you have a chance with Octavio Paz page 363.

He defines him at the bottom.

Let's just review his version after I've gone through it.

It says same paragraph where we were at the middle of 363.

If the different attitudes of Hispanic catharsism and English Protestant could be summed up in two words, I would say that the Spanish attitude inclusive and the English is exclusive.

In the former, the Spanish, the notions of conquest and domination are bound up, justified by I would say.

These conquerors came over and they couldn't do what they did without saying but we're saving souls.

So, there's a phrase the spiritual conquest of Latin America which is useful here.

So what's bound up with ideas of conversion in the simulation.

The latter the English, conquest and domination imply not the conversion of a conqueror, but their segregation.

This is what I mean by imperial project.

The two imperial projects, or plans, or intentions, you could use the word you want are being compared here or I should say being contrasted here.

Okay, then he's going to give us his definition one after the other pluralists and the centralists which she's calling inclusive and exclusive.

I should do it the opposite way.

The inclusive is centralist, okay.

And inclusive society one that believes there's only one way to do things, you gotta include the other or others.

If you want everybody to agree with you, you have to find a way to make them fit, right?


And inclusive society, Spanish, founded on the double principle of domination and conversion, is bound to be hierarchical centralist and respectful of the individual characteristics of each group.

Well, if respectful is take... is little too celebratory.

But anyway, it believes in the strict vision of classes and groups each one governed by special laws and statutes but all embracing the same fate and obeying the same lord.

That's the catholic, Hispanic project.

Now, we are going to go to the Protestant English project.

 **[39:00]**

And in and exclusive society, is bound to cut its off from the natives either by physical exclusion or bi-extirpation.

At the same time, since its community of pure mind [39:13] is isolated from other communities, it tends to treat its members as equals and to assume autonomy and freedom of each group of believers.

So we can have the Luther and so we can have the ...

The origins of American democracy are religious and in the early communities of New England that dual-contradictory tension between freedom and equality which has been the light motive of history of the United States was already present.

Okay, so then he goes on to make the point that Anny was making about communion and purity, those would be, communion would be the centralist, inclusive model, purity would be the Protestant pluralist model.

And it wouldn't have to be purity cause it's just like I differ from you, I'm going to go start road island.

And we said what a great thing that is, that we can have different side by side, I mean, pluralism is [40:15], so is centralism, if not used indiscriminately.

Okay, we are going to move on to the next, state and nation issue.

Do you, somebody define for me what it means by state in by nation.

Would you ... page 367 and 368.



It's the very bottom of 367.

If you are looking for a different [?40:49] it's the paragraph, there's a typographic break.

If you find that, it's the next paragraph down pre-colombian Mexico was mosaic nation's tribes and languages.

Anybody dares to talk about that?

Let's read what he has to say and then let's somebody analyze it for us unless some have a volunteer.

Let's read what he saying.

Again, he's doing this dichotomy.

He's saying one is one way, the US is one way and Mexico is the opposite way.

And here's what he says.

It's three lines up from the bottom of 367.

The true effective unity of Mexican society was brought about what has been brought about slowly over several centuries but it's political and religious unity was decreed from above as the joint expression of the catholic monarchy and the catholic church.

Mexico had a state and a church before it was a nation.

In this respect also, Mexico's revolution has been very different from that of the United States where the small colonial communities have from their inception a clear cut and [?42:01] concept of their identity, as regards, the state.

For North Americans, the nation, anti-dated the state.

Would somebody explain that to us, please?

It's quite clear, don't you think?

What's nation for him?

Nation doesn't it mean an agreed upon community?

And doesn't state mean the state [?42:31] who governs the governor, the [?42:35], the king.

He saying from the very beginning, new Spain, which became Mexico in 1821, when



it became independent from Spain, but new Spain, it was a decreed a unit.

It's going to be catholic, it's going to be run by the king of Spain, whom we remember Charles the fifth, 1521, it's not quite that early but whereas he says, look, in the US, there were this little [43:06] groups so religious [43:08] who won't going to let the state mess with them, they knew who they were, they were nation before they were state.

The state comes in 1776 or somewhat thereafter.

So, again, this dichotomy this is very starkly drawing difference between the US and Mexico.


Mexico was imposed from, a state was imposed and over time, the nation evolves where's the opposite is true of the US.

The state comes out of the communities, the colonies that had clear sense of their own.

If not national, at least their own communal identity is one better than the other.

I don't think he's asking that question here.

Let's keep on going.

 **[43:58]**

The idols versus images, the third point on my list, is a bottom of 368.

And I'm going to just go ahead and book forwards on here.

No less profound difference.

You're going to end up finding out that he doesn't think they're many similarities at all.

I'm going to propose some similarities myself but...

It's a it's a again this is the either or either or either or structure um..

And no less profound difference was the opposition between Catholic orthodox and protestant reformism.

We've already talked about this a bit.

In Mexico catholic orthodoxy now what does he mean by orthodoxy he means the rules of the religion.


Everybody's busy obeying the dogma.



It's dogmatic.

We use dogmatic has a negative trend that that says something about our non-dogmatic culture.

Dogmatic doesn't have to be negative it means to follow the rules orthodoxy.

 **[45:02]**

You follow the rules versus protestant reformism, you know, fighting against the rules.

In Mexico Catholic orthodoxy had the philosophical thought, philosophical form of new Thomason.

Anybody want to right on that I'd love that I can help you with that saying Thomason the quietness thirteenth century.

He is the basis of the counter reformation, Catholic country reformation.

[?45:27] of thought more apologetic that then critical apologetic nonsense of saying you're sorry in the sense of an apology as a speech.

As a statement of beliefs, more dogmatics and critical, we can say, and offensive in the face of emergent of an emerging modernity.

Orthodoxy prevented examination and criticism.

Now that's pose criticizing the Mexico very strongly and criticizing the Catholic church.

In new England the communities we're often made up a religious dissidents.

People who are already mad or already so I don't like it the way it is.

I'm going to have a new world.

That's why I'm here.

Or at least the people who believe that the scriptures should be read freely.

I think we'll stop there but would you go on and read the next paragraph I'll let you read it yourselves.

It's a continuation of this difference he's making between protestant reformism and Catholic orthodoxy.



He's talking about rationalism critical thought wondering whether this is the way it should be as opposed to saying well this is the way it's written and this is the Catholic position, a catholic.

So here he becomes oddly.

Look at the very bottom of 369, one-line up

It's a nice phrase he's in favor of rational start.

He's clearly here anti catholic at least with respect to modernity

So his look at cactus back this orthodoxy this belief in traditional kept it kept Mexico from modernizing and kept Spain from modernizing.

Now we can argue about that somewhat.

But look at actually about one two three four five six seven eight lines up from the bottom of three sixty nine.

It's the paragraph that begins if one considers the historical evolution of the two societies that he's doing nothing but about that's what he's doing.

I want to start with that the United States if you see one two three four five six seven eight.

The sense that begins the eight line up on 369.

The United States was born of the reformation and the enlightenment.


It's to think of seventeen seventy six.

It's already end of the eighteenth century.

The French revolution is going to be seventeen eighteen now the storming of the best deal.

There's all of the democratic movement.

The US is born way after Hispanic world a hundred years at least.

 **[48:04]**

We don't even have to consider the priesthood light man think of Thomas Jefferson think of Benjamin with his kites and his key and all his...

His founding fathers and a few mothers I suppose...



The US were rationalize.

Their dues says weren't Catholic they weren't even peer written.

By then they said believed in a mechanical universe where there was a prime mover that's what dues means.

It means they weren't against a god but they didn't think of god is a proof of personal relationship with god.

It was that a prime mover he sets the world in motion and like eight clock the world continues to tick.

Those are our founding fathers hours I say the US.

I hope hours

So let's let's start again eight lines up.

The United States was born of the reformation and the enlightenment.

And the reformation here it's saying no to Catholic orthodoxy.

That reformation thing is really important cause it means protestantism and means pluralism and means exclusion of indigenous peoples all the stuff his accruing meaning here. Right.

It came into being under the sign of criticism and self-criticism.

Now when one talks of criticisms of criticism, one is talking of change.

The transformation of critical philosophy into progressive ideology came about and reached its peak in the nineteenth century the broom of rational as criticism now that's a funny phrase that's the one I was headed for the broom of rational sweeping away the old notions and so forth.

But it's a kind of critical phrase to.

Look how he does it.

The broom of Russia's criticism swept the ideological sky clean of myths in beliefs.

The ideology of progress in its turn this place the timeless values of Christianity.

And pretty soon the US is only given over to material stuff.

That's what he is going to say.





He is going to say this broom of rationalize criticism got rid of the past got rid of the traditions in ways that make us secular, make the US a secular.

Culture always ready to leave into the future as he says in the middle of the next paragraph.

And that is my second my fifth point and I think he is.

He's looking at history he is he's trying to figure history but he's looking at is a radically a historical culture us.

That's what he's saying he's saying

You don't remember the past year critical a reforming uh... resistance position is great but what it means that you're always getting rid of what came before.

So there's a imply critique here always ready to leap into the future.

Don't read that as the great thing.

🔊 **[50:57]**

For traditionalists like past interested in history and interested in culture which is a historical construction how how is that possible. Ok.

You forget that he's starting to say to us US readers of his essay.

Let's get to the conclusions.

And with my two um... exclamation points and see where he's been heading.

So far we can read his pro-Mexican stance there's that moment as I said when he says look you know this Catholic orthodoxy prevented us for a long time from moving into modernity.

We just obeyed we just so forth so...

He says he says the hispanic will never had an enlightenment that's not true.

But the eighteenth century, as you know in northern Europe is kinda

Well it's the consolidation of a great deal of sciences conducts allegation of Deism and as I said.

He says now that wasn't the way it was in Spain and in the Spanish world.

But we are going to see at the end of his way more pro-Mexican then he is pro-the US and it means when you set up a dichotomy and you find opposites all along you



won't be surprised if the guy finally or the woman writing the essay finally says I prefer this to that.

We can say well some of those oppositions are false. We've already looked at some of them.

But in the end he's going to weep the US for being too pluralist, too futurist, too critical.

If critical means getting rid of and reforming all of the time.

So let's see what he says.

It's page three seventy four the middle the paragraph begins the sickness of the west is moral rather than social and economic defined it

It is true that the economic problems are serious and that they've not been solved.

Inflation unemployment on the rise poverty is not disappear despite affluence.

Several groups women and racial, religious and linguistic minorities still are or feel excluded

But the real most profound discord lives in the soul of my goodness here's the poet moving into the area of the soul we can expect anything.

Hum... but he's he's not going to go too far the soul

For he is going to do is creek critique American culture for being too powerful, too rich, too blind


And that's that's his position that I...

Let's keep going.

Skip to the... he goes on about how bad things are he go to the next paragraph I will not continue.

The evils of the west have been described often enough most recently advice Solzhenitsyn.

I don't know if you've read Alexander Solzhenitsyn, a great Russian novelist still alive I believe very old.

 **[53:58]**

But things like cancer ward huge novels that critiqued the Russian, the soviet system.



He was imprisoned and so forth.

He is a man of admirable character however

Although up Solzhenitsyn's description seems to me accurate his judgment of the causes of the sickness of western society does not or does not does not...

Nor does the remedy he proposes.

His judgment nor the remedy aren't working.

We cannot renounce the critical tradition of the west nor can we return to the medieval sia craddock state dungeons of the inquisition are not an answer to the good log camps.

Solzhenitsyn has been spent time.

It is not worthwhile substituting the church state for the party state.

One orthodoxy for another.

Says we've got to remain critical we've got even though maybe too much credit too much resistance to much reformation sweeps the passed away we have to hang on to a critical sense however.

Let's keep going.

The only effective arm against orthodoxies is criticism.

And in order to defend ourselves against devices of intolerance and fanaticism are only recourse is the exercise of the opposing virtues.

Tolerance and freedom of spirit.

I do not disown Montesquieum, Hume, Kant.

He thinks I belonged to this western critical tradition.

But now, okay, so we aren't going to throw the baby out with the bath water.

We're going to remain we're going to retain the critical often protestant sometimes Catholic

Tradition of critical thought.

But now let's look at the US says.

Wait a minute.



The crisis of the US affects the very foundation of the nation.

By which I mean the principles that founded it he's saying the US is in trouble it's betrayed its own origins.

I've already said that there is a light motive running through American history.

A light motive that same tune and same theme

Running to American history from period colonies of new England to the present day.

Namely the tension between freedom and equality.

Okay another these tricky pairs and we're going to see one more note.

Oh I think we have to evacuate.

I think that's what mean.

See you next time.

Go quick

See you on Tuesday.