

**David Mayer**

*Department of Social and Economic History,  
University of Vienna, Austria*

## **Tropics Defiant – Clio Militant. On Marxist Historiographic Debates in Latin America in the ‘Long 1960s’ in Transnational Perspective. PhD Project**

'Marxism' – understood as a global, manifold and unevenly structured mesh of debates and references – has undoubtedly played an important role in 20<sup>th</sup> century history. It transcended the cleavages of the Cold War, First and Third World as well as the boundaries of science and politics. This global mesh of debates, however, has yet not been consistently historicized. For this purpose, and based on recent discussions on global history, postcolonial studies, the history of intellectuals, different forms of knowledge and social networks, a new field of research is introduced in this thesis: Historical Marxism.

One of the realms in which references to Marx and Marxisms played a critical role in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, was historiography. This holds true not only for the historical sciences as an academic discipline but also for social-political disputes about how to understand the past (politics of history).

This PhD thesis offers a study of Latin American historiographic debates inspired by Marxism. It focuses on the 'long 1960s' and on Argentina, Mexico, and Chile. Two debates are reconstructed in detail: First, the controversy about historical socio-economic formations and transformations, which were concerned with determining the character of colonial and post-colonial societies in Latin America (feudal or capitalist?) and with specifying the different modes of production in these societies. Second, the debate about the Mexican Revolution in which the popular masses as historical actors, social conflicts and questions of political domination were in the centre of interest. The analyses of this thesis focus on the referentiality in these debates, i. e. the way how these referred to other debates both formally and with regards to contents. For this the following questions are dealt with: Which ideas and arguments did the participants of Latin American debates base themselves on? Were these references local, transnational or transcontinental? What were the preconditions for references to texts and debates from other places (translations, travels, stays abroad etc.)? How did these references influence the interpretations of authors? Were there characteristic reference patterns?

These questions are dealt with in a reference analysis carried out in both qualitative and quantitative design. For this purpose a corpus of 68 texts has been generated. It is shown that the debates exhibited a specific blend of 'local' and 'global' references. In the qualitative analysis the specific modes of transfer and appropriation in the debates become visible. It is shown, inter alia, that the Latin American debates about 'feudalism – capitalism' until the end of the 1960s were not a mere offshoot of the Anglo-Saxon 'transition debates' developing since the 1940s, but to a high degree an autochthonous variant of the feudalism-capitalism-discussions. From the beginning of the 1970s on these two lines of debate (which had been,

nevertheless, mediated by a series of general historical factors) connected in the controversies about modes of production.

For the quantitative reference analysis, citation data was collected from the corpus. These 9270 citations are analysed with Social Network Analysis methods. Various measures relevant for citations analysis are calculated and visualized in network graphs (indegree, prestige, hubs and authorities etc.). This results, inter alia, in a typical reference pattern of the debates studied. In addition, the quantitative analysis clearly indicates that 'national' references play an important role in the texts.

The PhD thesis shows that processes of transfer, reception and transformation in 20<sup>th</sup> century Marxism in many cases ran contrary to established notions of 'centre' and 'periphery' and went their own ways. Although Historical Marxism did not overcome existing structures of socio-economic inequality and geopolitical hierarchy, it nevertheless constituted a distinct form of knowledge with its own transnational structure.

Contact: [david.mayer@univie.ac.at](mailto:david.mayer@univie.ac.at)