RYSZARD STEMPLOWSKI

Introduction

Scholars have been taking an interest in this complex *problemática* of European—Latin American relations, comparisons and perceptions for many years, mostly offering descriptions rather than explicitly theoretical treatments. Since most of the contributions to the debate in this century make virtually no reference to the earlier efforts, and since many such efforts originated in Poland, where there has always been an interest in explicit comparison between aspects of Latin America and Europe, especially Central and Eastern Europe, I shall take this opportunity to briefly mention the earlier debate.

This is not a place for a detailed historical sketch, but we can afford to go some three decades into the past. About 30 years ago, a symposium was organized in Poland on *La imagen de América latina en la Europa de los siglos 19. y 20.* The contributions to this symposium were published in *Estudios Latinoamericanos,* no. 6, two volumes (37 contributions, now accessible on the internet thanks to the Polish Society for Latin American Studies). Among these contributions were studies on the

imágenes of Latin America in Belgium, Denmark, France, Great Britain, Hungary, Italy, Poland, the Soviet Union, Spain, and Sweden.[1]

Two decades ago yet another symposium was held in Poland, hosted by an independent group of scholars, on *Contemporary Societies in a Comparative Perspective: Eastern Europe and Latin America in the 20th century* (64 contributions).[2] More generally, the period saw an outpouring of books that explicitly compared or otherwise brought together Latin America and Europe, in particular Central-Eastern Europe. I have in mind here books such as the English version of Henryk Szlajfer's edited volume on "economic nationalism in East-Central Europe and South America (1918–1939);" Adam Przeworski's book on political and economic reform in Eastern Europe and Latin America; or Juan J. Linz and Alfred Stepan's edited collection covering Spain, Portugal, Greece, Uruguay, Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Romania, USSR/Russia, Estonia, and Latvia.[3]

At the 1998 World Congress of Sociology in Montreal a symposium was held on *"las alternativas al eurocentrismo y colonialismo en el pensamiento social latinoamericano contemporáneo."* "The alternatives" were further developed in a volume edited by Edgardo Langer on *La*

---

[1] Appendix One [below]. Cf. R. Stemplowski, "Latin American Image in Contemporary Europe: A Case in the Social Construction of Reality," in: G. Gorzelak (ed.), *Regional Dynamics of Socio-Economic Change*, Warsaw: Warsaw University 1988, pp. 193–211 (the volume contains the contributions presented at a conference in 1984).

[2] *Estudios Latinoamericanos*, no. 14 (2 vols.), 1991; Appendix Two [below]. See also: H. Delpar, *Looking South: The Evolution of Latin Americanist Scholarship in the United States,1850–1975*, Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2008.

[3] H. Szlajfer (ed.), *Economic Nationalism in East-Central Europe and South America, 1918–1939*, Centre of International Economic History, Genève: Librairie Droz 1990. A. Przeworski, *Democracy and the Market: Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America, Studies in Rationality and Social Change*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991. J. J. Linz, A. Stepan (eds.), *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation. Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe*, Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1996. J. Kieniewicz, "Los aspectos teoréticos de la visión recíproca entre los polacos y los españoles," in: J. D. Marina (ed.), *El cambio de la imagen mútua de Polonia y España desde la transición, Wzajemny obraz Hiszpanii i Polski od czasu przejścia do demokracji*, Warsaw: Instituto Cervantes de Varsovia, Instytut Historii PAN, 2008, pp. 175–189. Kieniewicz, following Joachim Lelewel (see footnote 22), put forward a proposal with respect to the theoretical aspects of the reciprocal vision between the Poles and Spaniards in the 19th and 20th centuries.

colonialidad del saber … published five years after the Montreal symposium.[4] This new approach was meant to supersede the previously dominant approach (Eurocentric, etc.). More or less simultaneously, the critical approach to Eurocentrism found its expression in Peter Beardsell's book on Latin America returning the gaze of Europe, and, later, in a book by Walter D. Mignolo on the ideal of Latin America.[5] I would add that some Latin Americanists in Poland, notably the historians, had been openly criticizing the Eurocentric approach as early as the 1970s, taking a sceptical position to both mainstream research and official Marxism.[6]

The books published this century may make no direct reference to the earlier debates, but they carry on with the comparative project, e.g. José de Onís' study on the perception of the U.S. by the Spanish American writers or John Reid's book on Spanish American images of the United States, and others.[7]

The most recent literature that focuses on comparing aspects of Latin America and Europe is diverse. Two themes are worth highlighting. The first is the use of the idea of "coloniality." The authors of essays in a volume edited by Moraña, Dussel and Jáuregui seem to offer, above all, an outright challenge to almost everything that had been published on Latin America by qualifying it as Eurocentric or colonial(ist). They continue the line of "*la colonialidad del saber*." Following Aníbal Quijano they see "coloniality" as "pivotal to the understanding and critique of early and late stages of colonialism in Latin America, as well as its

---

4 See Apendix Three [below].

5 P. Beardsdell, *Europe and Latin America. Returning the Gaze*, Manchester University Press, 2000. W. D. Mignolo, *The Idea of Latin America*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005.

6 Cf. R. Stemplowski, "Historiadores latinoamericanistas polacos entre lo político y lo casual," a paper for a conference to be held at the University of Hamburg, *Balance de cincuenta años de historiografía europea sobre la independencia latinoamericana. 1810–1960–2010*, December 2010.

7 J. de Onís, *The United States as Seen by Spanish American Writers*, New York: Hispanic Institute in the United States, 1952. J. T. Reid, *Spanish American Images of the United States 1790–1960*, Gainesville: The University Presses of Florida, 1977; H. Pietschmann, M. Ramos Medina, M. Cristina Torales (eds.), con la colaboración de K. Kohut, *Alemania y México: percepciones mútuas en impresos, siglos XVI–XVIII*, México DF: Universidad Iberoamericana, 2005.

long-lasting social and cultural effects."[8] Quijano "defines coloniality as a global hegemonic model of power in place since the Conquest that articulates race and labor, thus combining the epistemological *disponitifs* for colonial dominance and the structures of social relations and exploitation which emerged with the Conquest and continued in the following states of Latin America's history."[9] The idea of explaining the present situation (or the origins of it) by applying the concept of colonialism appeared also in cultural studies on Russian and/or Soviet domination in Poland and other countries.[10] Some historians reject it;[11] some follow the cultural studies approach.[12]

---

[8] M. Moraña, E. Dussel, and C. A. Jáuregui (eds.), *Coloniality at Large. Latin America and the Postcolonial Debate*, Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2008, p. 17. But only a few of the European publications on Latin America are included in the very extensive bibliography in this interesting book, references to such works are scarce, and publications on Latin America in other languages than English (mostly American), Spanish and Portuguese, are hardly noticed, if at all, which makes many works on Latin America and Europe published in continental Europe look irrelevant, notably those in German and French, let alone in the languages seemingly too exotic for anyone to know like Swedish or Polish. Paradoxically, it amounts to a reinforcement of the criticised position. Some of the authors dealing with comparisons between Latin America and the USA make the imbalances even more pronounced – see F. Fukuyama (ed.), *Falling Behind. Explaining the Development Gap Between Latin America and the United States*, Oxford University Press, 2008; Cf. H. W. Tobler, P. Waldmann (eds.), *Lateinamerika und die USA im "langen" 19. Jahrhundert. Unterschiede und Gemeinsamkeiten*, Köln-Weimar-Wien: Böhlau, 2009.

[9] M. Moraña, E. Dussel, and C. A. Jáuregui (eds.), *op. cit.*, p. 19.

[10] E. Thompson, "East Central European Democracies and Russia: the End of Colonialism?," in: A. Allain, and G. Essama (eds.), *Libre echange et identite culturelle*, Paris-Lille: Presses Universitaires, 1998, p. 201–211.

[11] D. Beauvois, "Niemilknąca inteligencja polska na zachodnich kresach cesarstwa rosyjskiego w XIX wieku," in: J. Kieniewicz (ed.), *Inteligencja, imperium i cywilizacje w XIX i XX wieku*, Warsaw: Artes Liberales UW, 2008, p. 52.

[12] J. Kieniewicz, "Political Violence, Civilizational Oppression, and Colonialism," in: *idem* (ed.), *Silent Inteligentsia. A Study of Civilisational Oppression*, Warsaw: Institute of Interdisciplinary Studies Artes Liberales, University of Warsaw, 2009, pp. 20–58, 203; *idem*, *The Polish Fate in the Russian Empire. A Colonial Situation* [in Russian] forthcoming; cf. *idem*, "Kariera czy zdrada? Wykształcony Polak przekracza granice cywilizacji," in: *idem* (ed.), *Inteligencja…*, *op. cit.*, p. 208.

The second theme worth highlighting is that of challenges to Eurocentrism in research on Latin America.[13] The Eurocentric approach manifests itself in the application of analytical categories that stem from the history of the so-called most advanced European societies to other societies (a model-dependent assessment). As Trevor-Roper put it, explaining Europe's position in a Eurocentric manner: "The new rulers of the world, whoever they may be, will inherit a position that has been built up by Europe, and by Europe alone. It is European techniques, European examples, European ideas which have shaken the non-European world out of its past—out of barbarism in Africa, out of a far older, slower, more majestic civilization in Asia; and the history for the last five centuries, in so far as it has significance, has been European history."[14]

How should researchers react to the charge of Eurocentrism? The answer is more complex than it might at first appear. The "decentering" of "Europe" should not be done without due care to preserve some of the value of the older approach. Only European culture so far proved to be cumulative over such a long period, including the agricultural and industrial revolutions, evoking emulation of the European path world-wide, first in America (USA, Canada), and stimulating present-day globalization in its own way.[15] Also, we should remember that any strongly defined

---

13 Cf. G. Menzies, *1421 – The Year China Discovered the World*, New York: Harper, Perennial Edition, 2004; J. Goody, *The Theft of History*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006; G. Menzies, *1434 – The Year a Magnificent Chinese Fleet Sailed to Italy and Ignited the Renaissance*, London: HarperCollins, 2009.

14 "I do not think that we need to make an apology if our study is Euro-centric" – argues the author; H. R. Trevor-Roper, *The Rise of Christian Europe*, London: Thames and Hudson, 1965, p. 11. Cf. R. Stemplowski, "Plural Culture, Singular Future," *Jahrbuch für Europäische Überseegeschichte* 10, 2010, pp. 27–46.

15 Anti-Eurocentric beliefs appeared in Europe (mostly Western Europe and the USA) in the 1960s-1980s as forms of the political culture of support for the then Third World countries against imperialism, real and imagined. Ideologically motivated as this support mostly was, it was also important because of methodological requirements. But the very ideological slant of many debates made the whole idea of countering the Eurocentric position rather divisive. In many cases the anti-Eurocentric beliefs, justified philosophically as they were, did not arise exclusively from research requirements. Such beliefs in Europe and some other countries were manifestations of some sort of anti-establishment inclination during the Cold War and the growing significance of the developing world. It has found its reflection in the choice of research topics and in the contents of the publications.

culture has a self-limiting character. That is why Latin American perceptions of European culture owe something to this culture's diversity and complexity that falls outside simple definitions but fires the imagination. The distinct European contribution to the formation of the American nation-states[16] does not come down simply to the European powers' military and economic expansionism. That said, this only suggests that we should not throw out European culture; it does not defend the use of a Eurocentric framework. It reminds us that to be able to understand the European contribution we cannot reject the European experience altogether.

One can understand, however, those who grow justifiably impatient at witnessing many non-Latin Americans who feel free to keep passing judgmental views on Latin America without bothering to acquaint themselves with the growing volume of research from Latin America itself. It is no consolation for anyone that things are not much better with respect to the Western European/North American knowledge of the history and politics of many other regions, including Central and East European countries. These gaps in knowledge and understanding will probably decrease. Emphazising the Eurocentric slant should help to find an appropriate balance in research.

Avoiding Eurocentrism, while keeping an open mind about the value of the European experience, solves only one important problem for scholars. There is also a difficult question—just as relevant now as before—over the status of terms such as "Latin America" and "Europe." Both terms figure as unit of description and analysis in scholarly debates, as well as in the contemporary media and conventional wisdom, but is there anything like "Latin America," or for that matter "Europe," that exists today and that goes beyond simple geographical reference?

Following a rich tradition, an affirmative answer with respect to "Latin America" comes, among other places, in a three-volume synthesis of the history of Latin America from the fall into decline of the colonial period until contemporary times, published over

16 Cf. N. Miller, *In the Shadow of the State. Intellectuals and the Quest for National Identity in Twentieth-Century Spanish America*, London: Verso, 1999; *idem*, *Modernity In Latin America: Intellectuals Imagine the Future, 1900–1930*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

25 years ago in Poland. The main author and editor of the work, Tadeusz Łepkowski (1927–1990), the first president of the *Asociación de Historiadores Latinoamericanistas Europeos* (1978–1981), claimed in the closing essay ("Latin American civilization") that the common denominator of Latin America manifests itself in political culture, i.e. "public life organizing the community: state and power; law, and political structures and customs; the governing and the governed, their conflicts: the relations between the organized groups and of the state to the external world: cooperation, coexistence, war and making war."[17] Moreover, Łepkowski noticed the "huge convergences in state structures and political culture of Latin America and the USA (…); nevertheless, in practice, the North American standard does not function, or, rather, functions with a limited scope if not as a sheer formality. The state tradition and political culture of Anglo-America and Ibero-America are quite different qualities." He also pointed to the European influence, believing that what belongs to the specifically Latin American political culture are "personalism, militarism, populist phraseology."[18] Łepkowski's essay, and his other work, refer to Latin America as a whole, and in his understanding its political culture is a correlate of its civilization.[19] That is, political culture is part of the civilization and is analyzed as one unit rather than multiple political cultures.

Łepkowski was only one of many scholars who typically took Latin America as an analytical category. Other notable examples include Howard Wiarda, who treats the Latin American region as a unit of civilization, as a cultural area, mentioning even the 'soul' of Latin America. He justifies his approach, writing about revolutions, positivism, nationalism, Marxism, and corporatism, that is indirectly

---

17 T. Łepkowski, "Cywilizacja latynoamerykańska," in: R. Stemplowski (ed.), *Dzieje Ameryki Łacińskiej*, vol. III: *1930–1975/1980*, Warsaw: KiW, 1983, pp. 599–600. The volume is a part of the three-volume synthesis under the general editorship of T. Łepkowski, *Dzieje Ameryki Łacińskiej od schyłku epoki kolonialnej do czasów współczesnych*, Warsaw: KiW, 1978–1983.

18 T. Łepkowski, *op. cit.*, p. 621, 623.

19 R. Stemplowski, "States and Political Cultures in Latin America," in: *idem* (ed.), *On the state of Latin American States. Approaching the Bicentenary*, Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza AFM, 2009, pp. 395–396.

about the potential and actual premises of political culture.[20] Vanden and Prevost, too are convinced that there is the certain specific variety of political culture that is Latin American, ergo common to the whole of Latin America.[21]

This raises two important questions. What commonalities and how much and many of them are needed to recognize (i.e. to perceive) the existence of the analytical unit—"Latin America?" Even if we could identify "Latin American political culture" would this make the region into one civilization? These questions apply not just to Latin America. It is clear that treating "Europe" as an analytical unit is also a problem in itself, as even the European Union itself has a culturally complex structure.[22]

On top of that we have to ask whether the concept of civilization is useful at all in comparing Europe and Latin America or for the purposes of identifying their mutual perceptions? It seems to me that the concept can be useful when applied to

---

[20] H. Wiarda, *The Soul of Latin America: The Cultural and Political Tradition*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003. Wiarda emphasises that while the founding fathers of the USA were the people running away from European absolutism and feudalism, the Ibero-American colonies functioned thanks to the people who were recreating European systems within them.

[21] H. E. Vanden, G. Prevost, *Politics of Latin America. The Power Game*, Second Edition, Oxford University Press, 2006, p. 175.

[22] For a notion of several Europes – see: R. Stemplowski and L. A. Whitehead (eds.), *After the Attack: Several Europes and Transatlantic Relations*, Warsaw: PISM, 2002, p. 217; [participants of the recorded debate are: Benoit D'Aboville, Lord (John) Alderdice, Fernando Andresen-Guimarçães, Michael Brenner, Peter Burian, Nicholas Burns, Stanisław Ciosek, Ulrich Daldrup, Ginte Damusis, Daniel Dultzin, Sheldon Ekland-Olson, Leon Fuerth, Mircea Geoana, Heather Grabbe, Wolf Grabendorff, Lawrence S. Graham, János Herman, John Higley, Jean-Jacques Kasel, Andrei Kolosovsky, Sergiy Komisarenko, Hans Christian Krüger, Imants Liegis, Geoffrey Martin, Miguel Mesquita da Cunha, Gebhardt von Moltke, Porfirio Muñoz Ledo, Zdzisław Najder, Jerzy Nowak, Andrzej Olechowski, Thomas Ouchterlony, Horst Pietschmann, Philippe de Schoutheete, Alisher Shaykhov, Ryszard Stemplowski, Willy Stevens, Anton Thalmann, Peter Trubowitz, Magdaléna Vášáryová, Alexandr Vondra, Allen Weinstein, Laurence Whitehead, Jerzy J. Wiatr]. The first ever comparative historical study of two European countries seems to be the one of 1820 by the Polish historian Joachim Lelewel, "Paralelo histórico entre España y Polonia en los siglos XVI, XVII y XVIII" (published in Polish, 1831), for the Spanish version see—J. Kieniewicz, "La obra de Joachim Lelewel 'Paralelo histórico entre España y Polonia en los siglos XVI, XVII y XVIII' (1831)," *Hispania. Revista Española de Historia*, vol. LI, 1991, pp. 695–734.

societies from the distant past and from the *longue durée* point of view. Even then, to make use of it, we need to be precise and define civilization, for example, as "a culture of a specific type, a culture of a society that existed in an integral territory for a prolonged period of time under conditions of continuity of the political system and type of economy, and participated in the diffusion of patterns among civilizations in a non-continuous way limited as to the subject, thus achieving a high level of homogeneity, autonomy and self-sufficiency."[23] Nevertheless, neither contemporary Europe nor Latin America should be understood as distinct civilizations.[24] This, of course, does not preclude us from using "Europe" and "Latin America" as geographical referents or even referents to some broadly understood cultural units.

We can also engage in comparisons of these units as a whole and their component parts. The intra-regional differentiation notwithstanding, most countries of Latin America are more similar to Europe than to any other non-European country or region. There is, however, a marked economic imbalance between and within the Latin American states that sets it apart from Europe. In addition, most European countries are acting to a large extent and increasingly so as one entity, the European Union.[25]

Mentioning the above differences invites a further question: Are the differences between Latin America and the European Union countries similar to, lesser, or greater than those between Latin America and the United States? In asking the question, rather than offering an answer, we are justified by both the idea of revisiting the comparisons made, and the ongoing historical debate on the Atlantic World of the two Hemispheres. Certainly, Latin America in the 19th and 20th centuries differs from the United States in many ways. Firstly, there is a distinct political instability in Latin America; secondly, Latin America has an ambiguous

---

23 R. Stemplowski, "Towards Coalition of Cultures," *The Polish Foreign Affairs Digest*, 2002, no. 2 (3), p. 151.

24 For more about the applicability of the concept "civilization": R. Stemplowski, "Plural Culture, Singular Future…," *op. cit.*

25 The Russian Federation as a bioregional state, Euro-Asian, falls outside the comparisons.

approach to legal norms, beginning with the constitutional ones;[26] thirdly, there is a profound gap in economic development.[27] The historical statistics are almost always questionable, but the 20th century data are usually the most accurate. On explaining the development gap between Latin America and the United States, Fukuyama and his collaborators show that the gap emerged in the first two-thirds of the 19th century, the next one hundred years allowed a modest catching-up (despite the disastrous Great Depression after 1929 and the outbreak of the Second World War), but then the gap began to widen again.[28] When we add data on Western Europe, the comparative picture is even more complete.

Latin American per capita GDP as percentage of the per capita GDP of (1) USA, and (2) Western Europe

	1700	1820	1870	1913	1950	1973	2001	2008*
LA/USA	99.9	55.1	27.1	27.9	26.1	26.9	20.7	14.3
LA/WE	52.8	57.4	34.7	42.8	54.7	39.5	30.2	17.5

LA = Latin America & Caribbean. WE = Western Europe.
The data for 1700–2001, as elaborated from F. Fukuyama, *Falling Behind…*, *op. cit.*, and A. Maddison, *op. cit.*, see—C.M. Lewis (below, p. 201).
* The data for 2008 according to the Atlas methodology. If the Purchase Power Parity methodology is applied, the LA position is more favorable; World Bank, *Gross national income per capita 2008, Atlas method and PPP*, http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DATASTATISTICS/Resources/GNIPC.pdf.

26 H. W. Tobler, "Einführung," in: H. W. Tobler, P. Waldman (eds.), *Lateinamerika und die USA…*, *op. cit.*, p. 11; cf. P. Waldmann, "Zur Rolle der Verfassung in der Gründungsphase der USA und der lateinamerikanischen Staaten," in: H. W. Tobler, P. Waldman (eds.), *op. cit.*, pp. 27–53.

27 F. Fukuyama (ed.), *Falling Behind…*, *op.cit.*, p. 3.

28 Here I draw upon my essay "Plural Cultures…," *op.cit.* Fukuyama and his collaborators are drawing upon Maddison's works, i.a., *The World Economy: A Millennial Perspective*, Paris: OECD 2001, F. Fukuyama, *op. cit.*, pp. 6–7. According to A. Maddison, the average annual rate of growth, 1870–1989, is 1.41% for Latin America, 1.74% for Western Europe, and 1,87% for the Western offshoots (including USA); close figures, if one disregards the lengthy duration and structural differences. Cf. C. Feinstein, P. Temin, G. Toniolo, *The World Economy Between the World Wars*, Oxford University Press, 2008, p. 8.

Fukuyama and his collaborators say that "those explanations that focus on geography, natural endowments of resources or other material conditions, culture in a broad sense, or a dependent relationship with the developed world are unlikely to be identifying the true reasons for lagging performance." There are other factors that matter. To overcome the gap, "Latin America must follow sensible economic policies that produce monetary and fiscal stability, while at the same time seeking to open the region's economies to the global trading system. Institutions are critical for formulating, implementing, and supporting good policies. These institutions include property rights and the rule of law, electoral systems, executive branches with appropriate powers, legislatures that are both representative and efficient, political parties that include society's important social actors, court systems that are independent of political authority and effective in implementing the rule of law, and an appropriate distribution of powers to the different levels of government—national, state, and local. Social inequality lies at the root of the region's lack of economic competitiveness, in addition to being a source of political instability. This suggests, then, a need to take a new look at social policy, not by returning to the entitlement politics of the past; rather by seeking innovative ways of solving social problems."[29]

Things are even more complicated: The Gini coefficient in the U.S. is comparable to that of China,[30] let alone to that of the biggest countries of Latin America. This phenomenon complicates the comparisons. Further research is needed to create a Latin America–USA frame of reference for the Europe–Latin America comparisons.

Importantly, in seeking an adequate model for their regional cooperation, the Latin American countries are looking toward the European Union rather than NAFTA or the USA alone.

---

[29] *Ibidem*, p. 8.

[30] For the explanation of the phenomenon, see T. Judt, "What Is Living and What Is Dead in Social Democracy?," *The New York Review of Books*, 17 December 2009, p. 88.

Given the prevailing political circumstances and the known pragmatic views so dear to the heart of any politician in Europe or Latin America, the most attractive factor in Latin American—European cooperation is the European Union. At the risk of being deemed a Eurocentric, I would suggest the EU should become even more active *vis-à-vis* Latin America, particularly South America, and South American governments and societies at large should be taking an even closer look at the EU. It is a model to study, if not to emulate. The study should include a focus on the process of convergence within the EU, and the Eastern neighborhood policies of the EU (specifically its relations with Ukraine and Belarus) because of the similarities between Latin American and East European countries.[31] Although the historic impulses for the independence of the Latin American countries came from above and from outside,[32] the actual external impulse in the shape of the message about European integration is different. It is not Eurocentric to believe that we in the EU live in the best governed and internally connected group of countries. It would be a mistake to see the EU and EU-outreach as a colonial or imperialist scheme. But, yes, there are many Eurocentrics in our midst.

*

* *

This volume grows out of the conference "Europe and Latin America: Looking at each other?," held in Warszawa and Kraków, 3–5 July, 2009.

Each contributor to the volume was invited to write on a specific topic, keeping the bibliography to a minimum, while being free to apply the methodological approach of her/his choice and to

---

[31] The percentages corresponding to those in the table, and pertaining to the Latin American–East European comparison (without the USSR and former USSR) are following: 1700 (86,9), 1820 (101,3), 1870 (72,6), 1913 (87,3), 1950 (118,7), 1973 (90,3), 2001 (94,1). The ratio of Latin America & Caribbean to Europe and Central Asia (2008) is 91,4. For the sources—see the table.

[32] Cf. H. Pietschmann, "Kommentar aus der Sicht Lateinamerikas," in: H. W. Tobler, P. Waldman, *op.cit.*, pp. 673–680.

modify the topic in line with her/his own interests. Contributors were then given the opportunity to revise their papers after the conference (the discussants commented on the final versions of the papers).

The book is a compromise combining various research perspectives: European,[33] Latin American, comparative, anthropological, economic, historical, sociological, and political scientific. Most European and Latin American societies/states are close enough to make the comparisons easier than in the case of the European-Asian studies, and yet distinct enough to arouse both curiosity and caution,[34] and all of them are becoming increasingly aware of their developing identities within the web of the global system.

Carlos Escudé writes about the significance of the state and its territory for the identities of individuals, communities, nations, etc. in contemporary Latin America and Europe, and in particular about the sub-national, national and nation-state, and supranational variants. Given the present state of the debate about identity, every essay on such a topic is also understandably an exercise in self-identification. The author contrasts the historical roots of European and Iberian American writing about the myths associated with Iberian American identities—Iberian America as a zone of peace and European integration as immunization against intra-European war. He argues that questions about identity directed to Latin Americans and to Europeans, even when they are phrased in the same way, are in fact interpreted as different questions. Thus even when both the Europeans and the Latin Americans answer denying the existence of a common European or Latin American identity respectively, we cannot take the denials at face value.

---

33 I hesitate to apply terms like "Europeanist" because of its specifically political association (e.g., advocating the European Union), whereas the adjective and/or the noun "Latin Americanist" do not seem to invoke such anxieties, and even less so "comparativist."

34 A topical example—Eldar Shafir, behavioral economist, Princeton University, in the interview he has given to Magdalena Rittenhouse, *Tygodnik Powszechny*, 22–30 May 2010: "(Let's say) we do a big study concernig **Latin America** or **Africa**. Will it be applicable to **Sweden** and **Norway**? Or to **Poland**? I do not know—we have to test it." I am grateful to Magdalena Rittenhouse for making the transcript of the recording (in English) available for publication.

A Latin American denying the existence of a common Latin American identity is already likely to be taking for granted a degree of commonality that would suffice to make a European conclude that such an identity is present; and yet the Latin American would demand more before giving a positive answer. Europeans, on the other hand, may judge that there is little commonality between different Europeans and yet they may respond that there is a common European identity because the consequences of regional segmentation are considered too atrocious. Similarly, when it comes to "national identity," the Europeans and the Latin Americans interpret the phrase differently. **Escudé** concludes, however, that there is a paradoxical confluence between the two regions. Like Iberian America long before it, the European Union has now become a zone of peace. The two regions' historical experiences, so different from one another, have led to a point of convergence.

Aleksander Posern-Zieliński examines the changing attitudes of Europeans towards indigenous peoples: from colonialism (by some European countries) and ignorance prevailing throughout Europe to a partnership being offered by the EU and the growing friendliness of the European public. Under the European powers' colonial system, the indigenous peoples of Latin America were relegated to the lowest position, but at the same time they were treated by colonial administration technically as a protected category (limited autonomy, collective property rights, own authorities). With the emergence of the states in Latin America the indigenous peoples' previous status was dismantled. They were declared citizens, but no proper recognition was offered of their ethnic identity, cultural tradition, and different organization, thus rendering them in fact second or even third class citizens. However, at the same time an interest in the Indian population was awakening in Europe owing to the research endeavors of people such as German scientist Alexander von Humboldt. His letters, essays and books, published at the beginning of the 19th century, enormously increased the interest of other European scientists and explorers in the study of the New World. Later, the leftist intellectuals and activists, as well as "*indigenistas*," and the paternalistically oriented "friends of the natives" (most of them Europeans), developed a series of concepts to solve "the problem"

either by the implementation of land reform, partitioning large estates, or by the so-called civilizational advancement of the aboriginal population (considered to be a necessary first step in the integration of the indigenous people with the mainstream of the national society). Over the last one hundred and fifty years, the 'International Congresses of Americanists', initiated in Europe, have been the most important institutional manifestation of the interest in the indigenous peoples and the other historical and anthropological aspects of the Americas. That said, Latin American Indian studies in Europe have exerted a rather limited influence on the situation in Latin America, including the indigenous peoples, if only because the majority of publications were in languages other than Spanish and Portuguese. This started to change some twenty years ago, when the translations began to appear, and, more importantly, with work that applied research findings to social practice, thereby inducing social change. In Latin America European social scientists are usually identified as emissaries of NGOs, whose task is to implement development projects helping the local population. It is quite difficult to convince the local population that European academics contribute to the European solidarity movement with the *"indígenas"* of Latin America. The *"indígenas"* are perceived in Europe not only as those marginalized by conquest and colonial domination, but also as victims of internal colonization, civil wars and current evident violations of human, ethnic, civic, and property rights, and of the so-called civilization, modernization and other European, and not exclusively European, concepts that are not properly understood. In the European Union countries, the indigenous peoples are increasingly perceived as partners. The European Union is working on a program which will express the new attitude in Europe, and launch tripartite cooperation (the E.U. agencies—indigenous and other local actors—target country government).

Alan Knight offers a short synthesis of two hundred years of Anglo-Mexican relations, including mutual perceptions. He begins by presenting a short narrative overview of these relations and perceptions, from which he then develops several analytical themes. His periodization is based upon the two national histories and the global context. In the first period (1810–1876), the

relations in question "were vitiated by disputes over debt and claims for damages. Mexico was a classic case of great potential gone to waste." In the second period (1876–1910), the "relations with Mexico improved as old claims were settled, the *Pax Porfiriana* offered security to British interests, and the Porfirian regime came to be seen as a model state," but Mexico "made an early shift from the British to the American sphere of economic influence," whereas Britain—"pressed by rivals in the Old World (…) increasingly deferred to the U.S. in the New." In the next period (1910–1940), events in Mexico determined again the course of the relationship; rapid social and political reform (the new Constitution, 1910) coincided with the period of British decline. The 1940s marked a transition to the final phase under consideration. For Britain, the world war brought a further liquidation of assets around the world. In Mexico, the generation of the Revolution was replaced by a new generation dedicated to brisk capitalist development and closer relations with the U.S.; the predominance of the U.S. was well established, and President Salinas's decision to enter NAFTA (1994) both confirmed and accelerated a profound process of North American economic integration. **Knight** applies a sophisticated formula for linking relations with perceptions, emphasizing that perceptions tend to reflect relations in the problem at hand: "…it is difficult to discern enduring 'attitudes' or 'perceptions' which governed the bilateral relationship (in its several guises) over time. Rather, circumstances —the practical reality of the relationship—tended to generate the attitudes and perceptions. Or, to put it differently, the latter enjoyed only a very limited 'autonomy,' which means that historians who chase up 'cultural' (i.e. 'cognitive') attributes—for example, by deconstructing travelers' accounts of 'the periphery'—and believe that their findings explain 'centre-periphery' relations, are probably wrong. Those attributes may have scant causal or explanatory power; and, to the extent that they exist, they may be products of antecedent conditions or circumstances." Economic relations were most important, but "Mexican elites looked to Britain as a model of economic progress and stable representative government," and they also saw Britain as a counterbalance to the United States, at least in the prerevolutionary period. The author

believes it is reasonable to use the term "dependency" in dealing with the Anglo-Mexican relationship prior to the Revolution. The concept of "empire" may denote some coercion. The author offers also comparisons of the British and U.S. attitudes to Mexico ("power blinds and blinkers"). **Knight's** essay throws light on the evolution of the European stance *vis-à-vis* the indigenous peoples (see **Posern-Zieliński's** essay) while the British perception presented here may have something in common with the formation of the EU member states' public policies towards non-European immigration, first of all in the countries with a colonial past.

Carlos Luiz Ribeiro writes about perceptions of the football culture shared between Europe and Brazil. In his own words, to write about it means to refer to a "civilizing process." He argues that contemporary developments in Brazil and Europe are intertwined, and the culture of football is an intrinsic part of those developments. Football as a product of English culture came to symbolize the modernization of social, cultural, and sporting habits, very much to the liking of the local elites at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries. And in the 1930s football in Brazil made the transition from a pastime of the elite to a sport loved by the masses. The idea that "football explains Brazil' became a commonplace expression for understanding the development of the sport and the formation of the nation, along the public policies aiming at using European immigration to "whiten the population, to erase our black and slave roots, and allow us into the white and civilized world."

The author's description is reminiscent of Domingo Sarmiento's opposition of "barbarism" and "civilization" and of the Argentine public policy of "gobernar es poblar," populate the country with Europeans. In Brazil, more than in any other country, football owed its status to borrowing from Europe, and so the Argentine policy of "gobernar es educar" appears to me to be yet another association, and a testimony to the European—Latin American relations and perceptions.

Furthermore, **Ribeiro** argues that in search of the international legitimization or recognition of Brazil, the Brazilians used the cultivation of a cultural exoticism, as expressed by

carnival or by football. In other words, the Europeans were induced by the Brazilians to acknowledge Brazil as an embodiment of the special and valuable manifestations of culture. And it worked. Through a feedback effect, the strategy has formed the young Mulatto Nation pride, the cause being helped by the Canarinhos' victories, and by the cheap airfares to Rio. It was also helped by the fact that national identity in Brazil was more important than the regional ones, whereas in Europe—according to **Ribeiro**—religious and local identities were stronger than the national ones. But presently the national teams in Europe do arouse high emotions, and the author offers his explanation. The situation in Brazil is also changing, as football has become a part of the entertainment industry and a source of big money, as in Europe, and the globalization of the football market has also embraced Brazil and Europe. Hence state regulations have been introduced. In Brazil, however, the legal regulations quite often give ground to informal ones.

We the *latinoamericanistas* know the saying that was coined in Spanish colonial era: *la ley se acata pero no se cumple*, law is revered but not observed. Even more so when one deals with a mass entertainment for the mass society, which establishes a unique frame of reference for many identity-formative processes world-wide, and elevates the football player to the position of cultural broker. But European football fans may have difficulty in establishing the national cultural identities of some members of the ostensibly national teams these days, which complicates an unconditional acceptance of football as a means of national manifestation. Anyway, there is much more than merely the football, nowadays, that encourages the Europeans to look at Brazil as a rising power.

Colin M. Lewis's contribution emphasizes modernization. He perceives it as the essence of development by industrialization, with particular reference to the post-1940 period. He argues that since the early 19th century, intellectuals, and would-be statesmen and policy-makers in Latin America have looked as much to Europe as to other parts of the world when formulating ideas about state-formation and pondering economic strategies. In

the 1930s and 1940s, they considered the structuralists' projects, Keynesian-style welfare capitalism prevalent in much of Western Europe, and variants of the Soviet planning model, and later on, in the 1950s and 1960s, the free trade or the common market routes, both of which were reflected upon more-or-less contemporaneously in Europe and Latin America. However, by the 1970s, industrialization projects in Latin America were more influenced by those applied in East Asia than in Europe. More recently still, the integrationist projects and economically-based regional security strategies have been much observed in both Latin America and Europe, and have served as a basis for cooperation (Mercosur–EU).

The author's identification of industrialization with modernization has a long tradition.[35] Readers may want to link these assertions on Latin America and Central and Eastern Europe with some other data. After all, the latecomers to modernization may have similar perceptions of the most advanced societies, and vice versa.[36]

---

35 R. Stemplowski, "Modernisierung – Theorie oder Doktrin? Anmerkungen eines Lateinamerika-Historikers," in: W. Conze, G. Schramm, K. Zernack (eds.), *Modernisierung und Nationale Gesellschaft im ausgehenden 18. und im 19. Jahrhundert,* Berlin: Duncker & Humblot GmbH, 1979, pp. 9–27; *idem*, "Modernization as a Conceptual Tool for Research in Comparative Ethnohistory of Eastern Europe and Latin America," see—appendix two [below].

36 I would add such indicators of modernisation (without elaborating upon them here) as the Gini coefficient, potable water supply, food supply, housing, electricity supply, (un)employment, human security (particularly in big cities), government spending for, and organization of, the health services, including insurance, literacy, and access to education of various levels, as well as public libraries, publishing activity, artistic production and accessibility (theatre, music, art exhibitions, cinema), public transportation, use of the domestic appliances (computer and internet, TV and radio, washing machine, refrigerators, dishwashers), and some quality criteria like the regional cooperation of states, consolidation of democracy (and political culture in general), efficiency of the public administration (including the judiciary), parliamentary scrutiny, women's share in professional and public life, etc., ethnic and national minorities rights, NGO's activities, ecological awareness, levels of corruption, etc. Anyone acquainted with the realities of the two regions will know that the average level in Central and most countries of Eastern Europe is much higher than that of Latin America, in all of the above mentioned respects. I will mention only one dimension: the income inequality indicator (Gini coefficient) in the European Union is 31, in Poland 37 (after taxes and transfers, it is going up), in Mexico 47, and in Brazil it is almost 60 (it is going down). Poland and Mexico are members of the OECD. The data are for mid-2000, see: http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?QueryId=11112& Query Type=View; 10 March 2010. Cf. Hieronim Kubiak's commentary, in this volume.

Lawrence S. Graham focuses on international and national aid-oriented organizations that rely on contract personnel to execute much of the work in technical assistance (development, modernization). It is a complex array of organizations and activities extending from highly technical and engineering-oriented endeavors to humanitarian undertakings. Graham's academic work draws on participatory observations from, among other places, Brazil, Yugoslavia and Northern Ireland. Participatory observations are especially important here. Graham points out that examining projects such as Brazil-EU cooperation, means dealing with little transparent data. The insiders—i.e. those engaged in the details of new policy initiatives and in the movement from the initial discussions to facilitating the final agreements—remain anonymous in most cases. This, in turn, leads to speculation about their intent. However, in the context of projects relating to democractic assistance in Latin America and Eastern Europe, things are simpler in that the contents of the advice can be deduced, and sometimes even learned directly, from the widely disseminated publications on transformation, etc. The case of so-called failing states is different in that the category is poorly defined. Conflict-ridden societies are yet another case (Guatemala, Yugoslavia, Georgia), and even a highly developed state may not be immune to a conflict (Northern Ireland).

The U.S. consultants' career patterns are outlined, and **Graham** argues that perceptions do matter and can make a difference in how consultants look at their terms of reference in working in Europe and Latin America. But this is a world of development and political initiatives in which, while a few individuals stand out, the vast majority remains anonymous in the multitude of reports and evaluations conducted and the contracts entered into over the years. It is a difficult subject to investigate.

Ericka López Godoy asks why some former hegemonic parties are able to adapt to democratic conditions, i.e. are able to gain or maintain electoral office following the establishment of new democratic procedures under truly competitive conditions. On the basis of the sources available to her in English and/or Spanish, she compares three parties that she classifies as

successful: (1) the Institutional Revolutionary Party (the world's longest-lived ruling party) in Mexico, (2) the Hungarian Socialist Party (MSzP, the legal successor to the previously ruling Hungarian Communist Party), and (3) the Democratic Left Alliance in Poland (SLD, the legal successor to the previously ruling Polish United Workers Party); and a party that she classifies as unsuccessful: the Czech Republic's Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia (KSÈM). **López** offers an assessment of the party apparatus in the three successful cases. She examines it from the perspective of the relationship between, on the one hand, the successful adaptation of the former hegemonic party based on cooption as the basis of legitimacy and, on the other hand, the nature of the previous regime (inclusive and not inclined to pursue a committed membership, staffed with diversified and pragmatic elites).

Patricio Valdivieso reviews the recent political past of Chile, since the end of Chilean democracy (1973) through the "authoritarian" military regime (1973–1990) and the detainment of Pinochet in London (1998) to its aftermath. He begins by outlining the international context as prevailing in 1960–1973 (the impact of the Cuban Revolution, Latin American policies of the U.S. and European governments), and the principal features of Chilean politics (growing polarization and political violence). The author then presents a synthesis of information on the systematic violations of human rights by state agents since September 1973, and describes *"la reacción moral"* to it within and without Chile. As the movement for the protection of human rights developed, the rulers of Chile were condemned, and Valdivieso gives credit for this to the churches, the United Nations, European NGOs and the U.S. government. He puts on the record the efforts made in Chile since 1990 to establish truth, justice and reconciliation. He singles out the Retting Report (1992) and the detainment of Pinochet in London as important events. He points also to the set of reasons for the cruelty of human rights violations, including the *desapariciones forzadas*, committed under the military regime: the radicalization of the officials in charge, the fear of the perpetrators of being exposed by the victims' families nationally and internationally, the response to strong pressures from abroad

and from the clergy. Both the violations of human rights, and opposition to authoritarian military government, had exerted their influence on the identity of the ruling parties' coalitions in the decades that followed, and inspired the reform of the administration of justice, as well as other public policies.

Antoni Dudek writes about a debate in Poland between columnists, politicians and professional historians over the assessment of recent history and on the so-called historical policy as a public policy to shape national identity. He also considers the data from public opinion surveys recording the changing evaluation of the recent events. The most important part of the public debate is the dispute between the supporters of the liberal model (the state is not allowed to make any policy to influence the beliefs of the citizens) and conservative polemicists (it is the duty of the state to form the historical conscience of society). The liberal model prevailed until the beginning of the first decade of this century. The supporters of the conservative model have been gaining the upper hand recently, but it does not seem to have had a lasting effect. **Dudek's** argument and that of **Valdivieso** enable us to link the Chilean and Polish cases with respect to the relationship between identity and democracy.

Since identity and democracy emerge in this book as the principal thread in discussing comparisons and perceptions, some additional remarks will not be out of place. In Poland, people are used to red in many shades, but the debate is best described in different colours. The "liberals" are inclined to paint the pre-1989 past in various colours, including black, and frequently just in grey, while the "conservatives" display a principled penchant for black. All of them condemn the Stalinist period, of course. It is the debate about the more recent past that is both much hotter and more nuanced. **Dudek** refers to the recent past. However, as social practice proves, some readers may think that even a liberal model of the history policy implies some historical policy, just a different one from the conservative version. Therefore, I would suggest that an additional distinction be made between those who postulate the abstention of the state from public discourse about history (no historical policy whatsoever, with the exception of school

textbook regulations, which implies a common denominator as to the basics in history), and those demanding the state does participate in such a discourse to influence the beliefs of the citizens of all generations (e.g. funding a special museum, officially celebrating certain anniversaries, funding the maintenance of the military cemeteries abroad, supporting war veterans, reporting on some celebrations on public radio and TV, etc.). Both policy orientations are shown here as poles apart (no pun intended), whereas one should cover all the participants of the public discourse, not just the active supporters of an orientation. One way to do so would be to perceive the issue in terms of political culture, as the beliefs under consideration are pretty widespread and relatively stable, and they (a) are related to the identity of the society as a political nation that is the constitutionally defined sovereign, (b) are expressed in public discourse, and (c) refer to the state as the institutional correlate of that identity, and especially to the constitutional system of policy-making.[37] It would be interesting to compare the Chilean and Polish discourses to the Spanish revival of the debate on the Civil War and the demands of public actions in support of the victims' families, or to the Uruguayan uses of history in the political parties' politics, or to the Soviet manipulation of the post-1917 Ukrainian history, or to Austria's official posture towards the history of its citizens' participation in the activities of the Nazis, or to the incipient debate in the Russian Federation on the Soviet Union's mobilization of resources with respect to industrialization, the Second World War and/or the Cold War armaments. Having mourned the millions of the Polish citizens killed by German hands under Hitler, and having condemned the Nazi Germans, one wonders to what extent the Polish historical investigation and the identification and national commemoration of other victims (executions of the dozen thousands of Polish POWs by the Soviets in the Soviet Union in Katyń in 1940, and in other places, and deportations of hundreds thousand of the Polish citizens to the Soviet Far East) may induce the Russians to condemn Stalin (and the great many of his henchmen) and to identify and commemorate the millions of

[37] Cf. R. Stemplowski, "Political Cultures…," *op. cit.*, pp. 386–387.

Soviet citizens who fell in the Soviet Union under Stalin. The actions like those by *Las Madres de Plaza de Mayo* in Buenos Aires or *Las Damas de Blanco* in Havana, as well as the new position of some Latin American governments and courts on the military dictators and perpetrators of mass exterminations, become part of a similar culture of justice and responsibility. And that does not take place without implications for identity and perceptions.

Peter H. Smith begins by posing the problem: is democracy in Latin America (just) surviving or is it already consolidating? His answer is that it has for the most part survived but its future is far from assured. The greatest threat stems from the ideological struggle between political forces of the Left and Right. One particular instrument of political struggle is the misuse of the institution of impeachment. A party may be unable to win elections but it can, while in opposition, blackmail the president with this exhausting procedure. They are not doing it to remove him or her from office, as the opposition in Parliament are too weak to attain such a goal on their own. Rather, they are trying just to curtail his or her political efficiency, and weaken the president strategically as a political rival. Independent media and an incipient civil society may help to strengthen the much desired equilibrium between the legislative and executive powers, and the people have been provided with authentic chances to express their political preferences, but this new political tactic may hamper the consolidation of democracy.

Jacek Kurczewski writes about democracy in Europe, and refers to democratizations, assessing the differences and similarities between East Central Europe and Latin America. The turning point for democracy in Europe is 1945, when a "people's democracy" appeared alongside the pluralist model. He enumerates three distinct waves of democratization in: firstly, (West) Germany and Austria ("denazification"), and France ("*devichyssoiement*"); secondly, in Portugal, Spain, and Greece ("authoritarian regimes"); thirdly, in the state socialist countries ("Communist totalitarianism in Eastern Europe"). The author emphasizes the emancipation perspective of regime transformation, proposing a scheme of "four directions of rights". Kurczewski discusses the cases of Poland and

Hungary, the "leaders of change." He puts these two cases in a wider European context, including the European Union. He concludes with comparisons between Europe and Latin America, underlining the structural differences. "The question of freedom and democracy in Latin America was thus different from that same question in [Central and Eastern Europe], because only through context does the idea of democracy gain its meaning."

Kurczewski's and **Smith's** essays reveal a comparison of the presidential system (in Latin America) with the parliamentary–cabinet one (historically well-rooted in European political culture), especially with respect to the differences the systems make to the transformation of autocratic states into democratic rule of law states. What emerges is a tentative suggestion that the presidential system is a higher obstacle to this transformation. The 19th century Latin American constitutionalists should have perhaps been looking at Europe rather than the U.S. There has also been an enormous difference between Latin America and Central and Eastern European member states of the European Union in terms of the personal security of the citizen, and this has been slowing down the democratization or consolidation of democracy in Latin America.

Karl Buck underlines the very different historical and political starting conditions for regional integration in both Europe and Latin America, due to which Latin America cannot be expected to have similar objectives, institutions and results to the EU. The EU process, far from being smooth, profited, i.a., from the conviction that sharing or pooling sovereignty does not diminish but reinforces the role countries can play. The real problem today is not loss of sovereignty, as some in Latin America fear, but loss of influence. According to the author, researchers agree on the typical weaknesses in Latin America and wonder if in terms of politics and economies Latin America can be considered a regional or even subregional unity or unities. Intra-regional trade has not grown as expected. Advances were often the result of influence by an external partner which, however, also became the source of discord. **Buck** discusses competing or rapidly changing new concepts of Latin American and Caribbean (LAC) integration like

ALBA, CSAN, UNASUR, CALC, IIRSA or Plan Puebla Panama, with various levels of integration density, and addresses the bi-regional negotiations and strategic partnerships entered into by the EU. Though the results of the projects are mixed, one need not end with simple pessimism, the loss of interest by the EU, or altogether abandoning bi-regional advances. There is less of a cleavage between the EU and LAC cultures than between the EU and Asia. The EU-LAC strategic partnership was created for more dialogue and cooperation, and the EU and LAC do discuss global challenges and bi-regional issues and potential. The EU–LAC summits do have an impact and concrete outcome. Parallel to clearly greater political and economic autonomy and assertiveness in LAC, there is a new move in Latin America towards intensified cooperation in infrastructure and productive interconnectivity. Whereas less emphasis is placed on a final institutionalization of relations, the author is optimistic that the EU–LAC dialogue and cooperation are moving in the same direction, privileging now gradual coordination and cooperation.

We know that although the powerful drive of the economy helps to overcome the historic lack of the mutual complementarity among the Latin American economies and their orientation *hacia afuera,* the economic drive is not yet as strong over there as in Europe. **Buck's** *tour d'horizon* helps also to understand how the Hispanic American perception of the European integration of states reinforces the Bolivarian ideal of unity, whereas Europe missed such an ideologically strong stimulus and has founded its integration on another experience of its own. There was no perception or emulation of an extra-European phenomenon. The dynamics of European integration owes much to the disastrous experiences of the two world wars, which helped the post-Second World War integration of the major continental power, Germany, into the new community. There is no such atrocious and traumatic experience with Brazil in Latin America. Paradoxically, the comparatively low intensity of intra-continental conflict in the history of Latin America is an ambivalent, if not a negative, factor as a premise for South American integration.

*

* *

The contributions to this volume are commented upon by the invited discussants: **Leszek Jesień, Hieronim Kubiak, Beata Wojna,** and **Lubomir W. Zyblikiewicz. They** are Polish academics and/or political analysts of various disciplines, generations, and political formations; European–Latin American relationship is not their major research interest, if any. However, their comments contain valuable observations on the contributions involved, and suggestions as to further research.

My own motivation for putting together this conference was related, among other things, to the growing necessity for cooperation among the European Union and the South American countries and their organizations. I was struck by a statement by an expert in foreign policy-making that I had come across when browsing through the European Union websites, to the effect that "we do not know anything about Latin America." I was put out: "We?" "Anything?" When my initial reaction subsided I realized that he may have been not too wide off the mark. "We" do not even need to ask an inhabitant of an EU member state what he or she knows about a neighboring country, let alone Latin America. The same phenomenon occurs in Latin America. The statement "we do not know anything …" is true on an alarming scale. Neither should we harbor any illusions as to whether the nations on the two continents are eagerly awaiting such books as this one or those referred to above. Nevertheless, it makes sense to help European politicians and their advisers to learn a bit more about Latin America and, *cetaeribus paribus*, to help the Latin Americans to understand our European endeavors.

The valuable contributions in this volume notwithstanding, this project has also shown how slow the integration of the previous contributions and current research can be. And the range of sources in different languages for comparative studies is, of course, much larger than those mentioned above. Research on the relationship, including the mutual perceptions, of Europe and Latin America requires more scholarly energy to lead to a truly

systematic conceptualization and appraisal of the relationship which stems from looking at each other.

It is fortunate that the advancement in the European Union's development is inducing further interest in comparative studies, and the newly established University of Latin American Integration, and the Mercosur Institute of Advanced Studies, may help to enlarge the Latin American interest further. Research on mutual perceptions, as a part of comparative studies, should help to develop cooperation between the regions. Why not create a consortium of universities in Europe and Latin America to take up a research project consisting, e.g., in assessment of encyclopaedia —"European" and "Latin American"—entries, testing them on the presence of stereotypes? Given the significance of the *problemática*, the European Commission and UNASUR or Mercosur may consider it appropriate to support the project.[38]

The comparisons between Europe and Latin America presented here may confirm the impression that the distance between the two regions, huge as it is, is probably getting smaller. It remains to be seen if the impression turns into something more convincing. It remains to be seen what emerges from systematic

[38] C. Freres, S. Gratius, T. Mallo, A. Pellicer, J. A. Sanahuja (eds.), *¿Sirve el diálogo político entre la Unión European y América Latina?*, Madrid: Fundación Carolina, 2007, www.fdundacioncarolina.es; "In this book, different authors analyse, from its beginning in the 1980s until now, the results of the political dialogue between the European Union and Latin America. Following some theoretical remarks on the progress and constraints of regionalism and interregionalism, two chapters draw a critical balance of the regional, subregional and bilateral political dialogue fora. A fourth chapter compares the European-Latin American dialogue with similar mechanisms. Chapter 5 analyses the most relevant political conflicts in European-Latin American relaciones. Finally, several scenarios and concrete proposals with regards to the future of relations between Latin America and the EU are designed."—FRIDE, Fundación para las Relaciones Internacionales y el Diálogo Exterior; *Europe's World, Weekly Newsletter*, 21 May 2010. "Nowadays, Latin America is not quite as poor as in previous decades, but is certainly more violent and unstable. The region faces less traditional security threats such as drug trafficking, urban violence and political polarisation. These require new international responses that differ from the European Union's development angle and the military/legal route followed by the Unites States. As a key donor, the EU has contributed to the reduction of poverty in Latin America, but this hasn't had a corresponding effect on reducing security problems."—S. Gratius, "La UE y el círculo vicioso entre la podreza y la seguridad en América Latina," FRIDE, *Europe's World, Weekly Newsletter*, 21 May 2010.

research, now largely nonexistent, including on the relationship between the complex shades of red of states and peoples that compose the two regions. We hope to encourage such efforts. They should enhance, above all, the creation of a theoretical model integrating research in international relations with comparative studies of the countries concerned (including the topic of perception).

*

* *

The sponsoring hosts of the conference were the Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski Kraków University, and the Polish Institute of International Affairs in Warszawa. They shared the total costs involved.

We worked first in Warszawa and then in Kraków, logistics resting in the sure hands of Agnieszka Kondek, Conference Secretary at the Polish Institute of International Affairs, Warszawa, and of Tomasz Dalowski, Director at the Kraków Society for Education, the founding body of the Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski Kraków University. I had the privilege to serve in my capacity as a project originator and program coordinator.

Dr. Sławomir Dębski, then Director of the Polish Institute of International Affairs, hosted the dinner in Warszawa, attended by Dr. Andrzej Olechowski, former Minister of Finance and Minister of Foreign Affairs, who spoke about the current economic crisis, and took questions from participants.

While in Kraków, Professor Zbigniew Maciąg, a member of the founding group of the Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski Kraków University, gave a dinner in one of the underground chambers of the Wieliczka salt mine (see the UNESCO list of World Heritage Sites). Professor Barbara Stoczewska, Pro-Rector of the Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski Kraków University, opened the Kraków stage of the conference works.

The written comments by Professors Dudek and Zyblikiewicz were translated by Zbigniew Szymański, while those by Professor Kubiak by Elżbieta Gołębiowska. English language consultancy was provided by James Tierney (concerning the papers beginning on pp. 79, 139, 261, 357).

I am grateful to the Polish Institute of International Affairs, to both the then Director Sławomir Dębski, and to the Acting Director Jacek Foks, for accepting the book for publication, to Ms. Dorota Dołęgowska, Technical Editor, to Joanna Sokólska for her expert copy editing, and, first of all, to Ms. Małgorzata Krystyniak, Head of Publications Division Section, Bureau for Public Information; without her expert handling of the work this book would not have appeared.

I would like to thank Włodzimierz Borodziej, Benjamin Jackson, Horst Pietschmann and Zofia Stemplowska for their comments on an earlier version of this introduction.

Appendix One

Estudios Latinoamericanos,
vol. 6, I Parte, II Parte, Warszawa 1980.

www.ptsl.pl/Estudios/Estudios/EL-06-1.htm
www.ptsl.pl/Estudios/Estudios/EL-06-2.htm

La imagen de América Latina en la Europa de los siglos XIX y XX
La V Reunión de Historiadores Latinoamericanistas Europeos,
Toruń, 26 – 31 de mayo de 1978,

CONTENTS

[…]

Nicolai M. Lavrov, La imagen de América Latina en la URSS

Tadeusz Łepkowski, La imagen de América Latina en la Polonia de los siglos XIX y XX

Charles Minguet, La imagen de América Latina en la Francia de los siglos XIX y XX

Francisco Morales Padrón, La imagen de Hispanoamérica en la España de los siglos XIX y XX

Magnus Mörner, La imagen de América Latina en Suecia en los siglos XIX y XX

Ponencias

Moisei Samuilovič Al'peróvič, La dictadura del Dr. Francia en Paraguay y la opinión pública rusa del siglo XIX

Adam Anderle, Temas latinoamericanos en la prensa húngara del siglo XIX. Formación de naciones, desarrollo nacional

Hans Bach, La imagen de México en Alemania durante la intervención extranjera y el imperio de Maximiliano (1861–1867)

Horst Drechsler, La imagen de Venezuela en Alemania durante la intervención anglo-alemana en Venezuela, 1902–1903

Guy-Alain Dugast, La imagen de Méjico en Francia en los años posteriores a la independencia (1821–1838). A través del testimonio de los viajeros

Krzysztof Groniowski, O mito da América Latina no campo polonês no período das «febres brasileiras»

Lewis Hanke, La imagen futura de América Latina del siglo XX: observaciones y preguntas sobre la naturaleza de las fuentes gubernamentales en archivos latinoamericanos y sobre su acceso a investigadores

Hermann Kellenbenz, Jürgen Schneider, A imagen do Brasil na Alemanha do século XIX: impressões e estereótipos: da independencia ao fim da monarquia

Marcin Kula, La política de los Estados Unidos hacia la Revolución Cubana de 1933 vista por la diplomacia británica

Nicolai M. Lavrov, Revolución Mexicana de 1910–1917 en los documentos del Archivo de la política exterior de Rusia

Tadeusz Łepkowski, El conflicto religioso en el México de los años veinte y treinta del siglo XX en la opinión pública polaca

Paul Manor, A imagen do Brasil na França no começo do século XX

Guy Martinière, La Escuela de los «Annales» y las Américas Latinas (1929–1949)

Endre Medzibrodszky, Repercusión del «imperio» de Maximiliano y de la lucha independentista del pueblo mexicano en la prensa húngara contemporánea

Antonio Melis, El movimiénto de solidaridad con la lucha de independencia de Cuba en Italia (1895–1898)

Maria Paradowska, Los indios de América del Sur en la iconografía polaca del siglo XIX

Eugenia Scarzanella, La de América Latina en la prensa y en los debates de la III Internacional, 1929–1935

Marcelo Segall Rosenman, Joseph Conrad, el más grande novelista sobre América Latina

Rosario Sevilla Soler, La revolución mejicana en la prensa de Sevilla

Francisco de Solano, La imagen de Venezuela vista por el militar profesional, 1815–1820

Alexei Shtrajov, América del Sur tal como la presentara un diplomático ruso en la segunda mitad del siglo XIX

Gustav Siebenmann, La imagen de América Latina en textos alemanes del siglo XIX y XX. Preliminares para su investigación

Gudmund Stang, América Latina en el espejo del sistema educacional noruego, 1814–1977

Ryszard Stemplowski, La República Socialista de Chile de 1932 vista por el Foreign Office. (Una reconstrucción de la imagen, basada en materiales del Public Record Office)

Eddy Stols, A descoberta da América Latina como terra de missão e continente-problema pela opinião católica belga (1895–1970)

Glyn Williams, La imagen sobre América Latina en Gales durante los siglos XIX y XX

Enriqueta Vila Vilar, La esclavitud americana en la política española del siglo XIX

Appendix Two

Estudios Latinoamericanos, vol. 14, I Parte, II Parte, Warszawa 1992.

Contemporary Societies in a Comparative Perspective. Eastern Europe and Latin America in the 20th Century. International Conference organized by the East European Research Group (Warszawa) and *Estudios Latinnoamericanos* (Instytut Historii PAN, Warszawa) in Pułtusk, 29 May–1 June, 1990, under the auspices of the Stefan Batory Foundation (Warszawa).

Contents

Plenary Sessions

Iwanowski, Zbigniew W., Latin American Intelligentsia: Change in the Structure, Status and Character

Żarnowski, Janusz, The Historical Role of the Intelligentsia en East-Central Europe and south-Eastern Europe

McCann, Frank D., Towards an Analysis of Brazilian Culture and Society

Tischner, Rev. Józef, Liberation theology versus the Solidarity Ethic

Stemplowski, Ryszard, Modernization as a Conceptual Tool for Research in Comparative Ethnohistory of Eastern Europe and Latin America

Wojski, Zygmunt, La influencia del español argentino en el placo de la revista "Orędownik" (Misiones)

Political Section

Kochański, Aleksander, The Communist International in Eastern Europe and Latin America

Gravil, Roger, Foreign Interference in Argentina in the mid-1940s

Rapoport, Mario, South America and the Great Powers in the 20th Century: Historical Reflections on the Cases of Argentina and Brazil

Jaén, Ricardo Julio, Argentina and Brazil. Struggle for the Leadership of the Integration Projects

Quijada, Monica, A Study on Political vs. Cultural and Economic Boundaries Based on the Analysis of the Argentine Integration Project of the Southern Cone Countries, 1946-1955

Garzón Valdés, Ernesto, The Argentine Military and Democracy

Alberti, Giorgio, Los dilemmas de la consolidación democrática en el Cono Sur de América Latina, con algunas referencias comparadas a los países del Sur de Europa

Grugel, Jean, Theories of Transition from Authoritarian regimes—Is There a role for Popular Opposition? The Case of Chile

Ost, David, Transition theory and eastern Europe

Sobrado Chávez, Miguel, You Shall Sell Oxygen

Sukosd, Miklos, From Propaganda to "Öffentlichkeit" in Eastern Europe: Four Models of the Public Sphere under State Socialism

Ners, Krzysztof Janusz, Post-Comunist Europe and Beyond. Peripheral, Dependent or Simply Capitalist?

Kukliński, Antoni, Latin America and East-Central Europe. The Past—the Present—the Future

New Projects

Hahn, Hans Henning, Political emigrations and Political Activities in Exile: Some Propositions for a Comparative Approach

Batou, Jean, Industralization of Mexico, Romania and Turkey in the 1930s: Convergent Eeconomic Policies and Contrasting Social Dynamics

Appendix Three

Edgardo Langer, comp., *La colonialidad del saber: eurocentrismo y ciencias sociales. Perspectivas latinoamericanas*, CLACSO, Buenos Aires 2003

Contents

Bibliography

Beardsdell, P. *Europe and Latin America. Returning the Gaze*. Manchester University Press, 2000.

Beauvois, D. "Niemilknąca inteligencja polska na zachodnich kresach cesarstwa rosyjskiego w XIX wieku." In: J. Kieniewicz (ed.). *Inteligencja, imperium i cywilizacje w XIX i XX wieku*, Warsaw: Artes Liberales UW, 2008.

Delpar, H. *Looking South: The Evolution of Latin Americanist Scholarship in the United States,1850–1975*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2008.

Szlajfer, H. (eds.). *Economic Nationalism in East-Central Europe and South America, 1918–1939*, Centre of International Economic History, Genève: Librairie Droz 1990.

Estudios Latinoamericanos, vol. 6, I Parte, II Parte. Warsaw 1980. See Appendix 1.

Estudios Latinoamericanos, no. 14 (2 vols.). Warsaw 1991.

Estudios Latinoamericanos, vol. 14, I Parte, II Parte. Warsaw 1992. See Appendix 2.

Feinstein, C., P. Temin, and G. Toniolo. *The World Economy Between the World Wars*. Oxford University Press, 2008.

Fukuyama, F. (ed.). *Falling Behind. Explaining the Development Gap Between Latin America and the United States*, Oxford University Press, 2008.

Freres, C., S. Gratius, T. Mallo, A. Pellicer, J. A. Sanahuja (eds.). *¿Sirve el diálogo político entre la Unión European y América Latina?*. Madrid: Fundación Carolina, 2007, www.fdundacioncarolina.es.

Gratius, S. "La UE y el círculo vicioso entre la podreza y la seguridad en América Latina." FRIDE, *Europe's World, Weekly Newsletter*, 21 May 2010.

Goody, J. *The Theft of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Judt, T. "What Is Living and What Is Dead in Social Democracy?." *The New York Review of Books*, 17 December 2009.

Kieniewicz, J. "Los aspectos teoréticos de la visión recíproca entre los polacos y los españoles." In: J. D. Marina (ed.). *El cambio de la imagen mútua de Polonia y España desde la transición, Wzajemny obraz Hiszpanii i Polski od czasu przejścia do demokracji*. Warsaw: Instituto Cervantes de Varsovia, Instytut Historii PAN, 2008.

——. "La obra de Joachim Lelewel 'Paralelo histórico entre España y Polonia en los siglos XVI, XVII y XVIII' (1831)." *Hispania. Revista Española de Historia*, vol. LI, 1991.

——. "Kariera czy zdrada? Wykształcony Polak przekracza granice cywilizacji." In: J. Kieniewicz (ed.). *Inteligencja, imperium i cywilizacje w XIX i XX wieku*, Warsaw: Artes Liberales UW, 2008.

——. *The Polish Fate in the Russian Empire. A Colonial Situation* [in Russian] forthcoming.

——. "Political Violence, Civilizational Oppression, and Colonialism." In: J. Kieniewicz (ed.). *Silent Inteligentsia. A Study of Civilisational Oppression*, Warsaw: Institute of Interdisciplinary Studies Artes Liberales, University of Warsaw, 2009.

Langer, E. (ed). *La colonialidad del saber: eurocentrismo y ciencias sociales. Perspectivas latinoamericanas*. CLACSO, Buenos Aires 2003. See Appendix 3.

Linz, J. B., A. Stepan (eds.). *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation. Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe*, Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1996.

Łepkowski, T. "Cywilizacja latynoamerykańska." In: Stemplowski, R. (ed.). *Dzieje Ameryki Łacińskiej*, vol. III: *1930–1975/1980*. Warsaw: KiW, 1983.

——. *Dzieje Ameryki Łacińskiej od schyłku epoki kolonialnej do czasów współczesnych*. Warsaw: KiW, 1978–1983.

Maddison, A. *The World Economy: A Millennial Perspective*, Paris: OECD 2001.

Menzies, G. *1421 – The Year China Discovered the World*. New York: Harper, Perennial Edition, 2004.

——. *1434—The Year a Magnificent Chinese Fleet Sailed to Italy and Ignited the Renaissance*. London: HarperCollins Publishers, 2009.

Mignolo, W. D. *The Idea of Latin America*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005.

Miller, N. *In the Shadow of the State. Intellectuals and the Quest for National Identity in Twentieth-Century Spanish America*. London: Verso, 1999.

——. *Modernity In Latin America: Intellectuals Imagine the Future, 1900–1930*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Moraña, M., E. Dussel, and C. A. Jáuregui (eds.). *Coloniality at Large. Latin America and the Postcolonial Debate*. Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2008.

de Onís, J. *The United States as Seen by Spanish American Writers*, New York: Hispanic Institute in the United States, 1952.

Przeworski, A. *Democracy and the Market: Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America, Studies in Rationality and Social Change*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Pietschmann, H. "Kommentar aus der Sicht Lateinamerikas." In: H. W. Tobler, P. Waldmann (eds.)s. *Lateinamerika und die USA im "langen" 19. Jahrhundert. Unterschiede und Gemeinsamkeiten*. Köln–Weimar–Wien: Böhlau, 2009.

Pietschmann. H., M. Ramos Medina, M. Cristina Torales, in cooperation with K. Kohut (eds.). *Alemania y México: percepciones mútuas en impresos, siglos XVI-XVIII*. México DF: Universidad Iberoamericana, 2005.

Reid, J. T. *Spanish American Images of the United States 1790–1960*. Gainesville: The University Presses of Florida, 1977.

Rittenhouse, M. Interview with M. Eldar Shafir. *Tygodnik Powszechny*, 22–30 May 2010.

Stemplowski, R. "Historiadores latinoamericanistas polacos entre lo político y lo casual," a paper for a conference to be held at the University of Hamburg, *Balance de cincuenta años de historiografía europea sobre la independencia latinoamericana. 1810–1960–2010*, December 2010.

———. "Modernisierung—Theorie oder Doktrin? Anmerkungen eines Lateinamerika-Historikers." In: W. Conze, G. Schramm, and K. Zernack (eds.). *Modernisierung und Nationale Gesellschaft im ausgehenden 18. und im 19. Jahrhundert*. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot GmbH, 1979.

———. "Latin American Image in Contemporary Europe: A Case in the Social Construction of Reality." In: G. Gorzelak (eds). *Regional Dynamics of Socio-Economic Change*, Warsaw: Warsaw University 1988.

———. "Plural Culture, Singular Future." *Jahrbuch für Europäische Überseegeschichte* 10, 2010.

———. "States and Political Cultures in Latin America" In: R. Stemplowski (ed.). *On the state of Latin American States. Approaching the Bicentenary*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza AFM, 2009.

———. "Towards Coalition of Cultures." *The Polish Foreign Affairs Digest*, 2002, no. 2 (3).

Stemplowski, R., and L. A. Whitehead (eds.). *After the Attack: Several Europes and Transatlantic Relations*. Warsaw: PISM, 2002.

Thompson, E. "East Central European Democracies and Russia: the End of Colonialism?." In: A. Allain, and G. Essama (eds.). *Libre echange et identite culturelle*. Paris-Lille: Presses Universitaires, 1998.

Tobler, H. W. "Einführung." In: H. W. Tobler, P. Waldmann (eds.). *Lateinamerika und die USA im "langen" 19. Jahrhundert. Unterschiede und Gemeinsamkeiten*. Köln-Weimar-Wien: Böhlau, 2009.

Tobler, H. W., P. Waldmann (eds.). *Lateinamerika und die USA im "langen" 19. Jahrhundert. Unterschiede und Gemeinsamkeiten*. Köln-Weimar-Wien: Böhlau, 2009.

Trevor-Roper, H. R. *The Rise of Christian Europe*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1965.

Vanden, H. E., and G. Prevost, *Politics of Latin America. The Power Game*. Second Edition, Oxford University Press, 2006.

Waldmann, P. "Zur Rolle der Verfassung in der Gründungsphase der USA und der lateinamerikanischen Staaten," In: H. W. Tobler, P. Waldmann (eds.). *Lateinamerika und die USA im "langen" 19. Jahrhundert. Unterschiede und Gemeinsamkeiten*. Köln-Weimar-Wien: Böhlau, 2009.

Wiarda, H. *The Soul of Latin America: The Cultural and Political Tradition*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.