

## LAMENT AND UTOPIA: RESPONSES TO AMERICAN EMPIRE IN GEORGE GRANT AND LEOPOLDO ZEA

*Michael A. Weinstein*

Two great nations, Canada and Mexico, border the United States, which is the most powerful empire in the contemporary world and, indeed, the greatest organized concentration of power in human history. When, in the nineteenth century, the United States expanded westward spurred by the myth of Manifest Destiny, Canada nearly experienced and Mexico felt most intensely the impact of military confrontation with their dynamic neighbor. Today a conflict of arms between the United States and either of its neighbors is unthinkable because of the overwhelming might of the United States. The sheer military supremacy of the United States over the nations which border it is the primary geopolitical fact which determines the character of Canadian and Mexican marginality to the American empire. In addition to its coercive superiority, the United States exerts economic domination over its neighbors through the trade and investment of its corporations, and a growing cultural hegemony secured through the influence of its communications media. In his *Lament for a Nation* George Grant grasped the comprehensiveness of Canadian dependency on the United States by linking the 1962-63 defense crisis over Canadian acceptance of nuclear missiles to the emergence of Canada as a "branch-plant" society controlled by corporations based in the United States. In North America military, political, economic, and cultural power is centered in the United States, a fact which makes Canada and Mexico not only geographically but socially peripheral to their imperial neighbor.

Canadian and Mexican marginality to the United States is so obvious a fact that it may seem gratuitous and perhaps indelicate, especially for someone from the United States to insist upon it. But, as Alfred North Whitehead often noted, one of philosophy's purposes is to bring to conscious expression the pervasive features of reality. In the sphere of social reality the pervasive features are often just those which it is uncomfortable for many people to acknowledge because conscious recognition of them may heighten the sense of insecurity and intensify inferiority feelings, or may bring to light a guilty conscience. Those who live in the United States and have appropriated for themselves the name "Americans" usually have at best a subliminal awareness of Canadian and Mexican marginality. Americans generally do not conceive of the United States as an empire, but instead as the greatest nation in the world. They are told by their communications media that Canada and Mexico are "neighbors," not dependencies, and relations with the two are reported as if they were among equals. The great achievement of peaceful borders and open doors between good

## LAMENT AND UTOPIA

neighbors (though, of course, minor quarrels sometimes cloud any friendship) is the dominant mythology about North America in the United States. Every attempt is made to conceal the fact of supreme American power, recognition of which might foster feelings of guilt and raise the question of responsibility for the effects of power. The fact of American empire is acknowledged far more keenly in Mexico and Canada than it is in the United States, but even in the dependencies of the empire there is a tendency to dull awareness of marginality in order to decrease wounded pride and anxiety.

Two of the most profound philosophers in the contemporary world, the Canadian George Grant and the Mexican Leopoldo Zea, have based much of their thinking on the marginality of their respective nations to the American empire. In great part their vocation as philosophers has been to understand the organizing principles of society in the United States, which they believe to be the principles of modern social life. Far from attempting to mute the fact of American supremacy of power, Grant and Zea have stressed that fact in their interpretations of contemporary world history. Both of them express a deep ambivalence towards the United States which gives their thought a nondogmatic character and nurtures their creativity. For Grant, Canada shares the fate of the United States, which is the spearhead of the global triumph of technique over substantive norms, whereas for Zea Mexico is at the forefront of the worldwide movement to universalize the values of the modern Occident, the leader of which is the United States. Acute awareness of marginality leads neither Zea nor Grant to bitter anti-Americanism or to *ressentiment*, but to clarification of the situations of their respective nations in current world history. The historical possibilities of Canada are defined by Grant and those of Mexico by Zea in dialectical opposition to the dynamic, expansionist, and instrumentalist system of the United States. The protagonist in their historical dramas is the United States, to which Mexican and Canadian histories are at best weaker alternatives and at worst mere compensatory adaptations. The fact of Mexican and Canadian marginality is underscored by recognition that no philosopher in the United States has defined a life's work in the context of Canadian, Mexican, or even of North American history. Mexican and Canadian thinkers, in contrast, cannot but have the United States in mind.

The ability to ignore one's contingency and accidentality is, according to the Mexican philosopher Emilio Uranga, a prerogative of the strong.<sup>1</sup> Those who are able to enforce their definitions of the situation create the situation and may exclude themselves from it by turning the weaker parties into constants and variables in a series of living experiments. The strong tend to absolutize their perspectives and when they philosophize to do so in the language of universality. The more powerful they are in relation to the weak, the more the strong are likely to overlook the qualitative differences between themselves and the weak, and to judge the weak as merely weak, as inferior, and not as different and as having a uniquely distinctive center of life. The weak have no such luxury when they philosophize. They are conscious that they are limited by the strong and, therefore, that their perspectives are relative to those of the strong. The weak, then, philosophize far more in the language of particularity than in that of

## MICHAEL WEINSTEIN

universality. Their thought clings to concrete history, which is a field revealing the specific limitations of some individual complexes of social fact by others. The weak, indeed, reach out for a universality which is won through the encounter with particular fact and which is in opposition to an actuality marked by diversity.

The importance in the thought of Grant and Zea of the particular history of North America and of its possible universal significance places their work in the context of the historical currents of philosophy which emerged at the turn of the twentieth century during the reconsideration of Hegelianism. This is not to say that Grant and Zea are strict historicists. Grant recurs to the tradition of natural law for a critical standard by which to judge modernity, whereas Zea appeals to the Christian humanist tradition of Spanish Enlightenment for his vision of a universal community. Yet both Grant and Zea are dedicated to living and thinking, in the terms of José Ortega y Gasset, at the "height of the times", which for them means to be self-conscious about the relations of their thought to their historical circumstances. Zea's thought has been nourished most by Ortega's perspectivism and Karl Mannheim's sociology of knowledge, both of which were deeply influenced by German historicism. Grant's doctoral dissertation was written about the British theologian John Wood Oman who wrote that "the real fulfilment of religion" is, "in freedom and independent thinking, to find our true relation to the past and to society and to the whole task of the Kingdom of God."<sup>2</sup> Grant and Zea have walked down Oman's "weary road," seeking universal significance through their specific historical circumstances, especially the circumstance of the dependency of their nations on the American empire.

### Empire and Technology

The hallmark which distinguishes the thought of Grant and Zea from other anti-imperialist thinking is the insistence of both of them that the United States is the supreme exemplar of modernity and, therefore, of the progressivist historical tendency in the contemporary world. The ambivalence of Grant and Zea towards the United States is encapsulated in their commitment to appreciate fully the significance of modernity, which means for them to assimilate the meaning of American society, and in their simultaneous rejection of central elements of that meaning. In his earliest book, *Philosophy in the Mass Age*, Grant argued that the philosophy of the United States is more modern than its major progressivist competitor, Marxism, because "pragmatism is much more completely a history-making philosophy than Marxism."<sup>3</sup> According to Grant, whereas in "Marx's philosophy man's power to make the world is limited by a final necessary outcome," in "pragmatism man is entirely open to make the world as he chooses and there is no final certainty."<sup>4</sup> In Grant's vision of the public situation the essence of modernity is the deliverance of nature to a human will which is unhindered by any normative limitations and which tends,

## LAMENT AND UTOPIA

therefore, to seek control, including control over human nature, for its own sake. North American history reveals most clearly that modernity is a social process which eliminates any submission to fixed ends in favor of the "will to will," which was identified by Martin Heidegger. It is just the unleashing of the "will to will" which so disturbs Grant when he observes the dynamism of North American society. At the root of the modern identification of time with history is the hidden and bitter truth that "if history is the final court of appeal, force is the final argument."<sup>5</sup>

Zea's belief that the society of the United States is the spearhead of modernity is based on his judgment that it incorporates more than any other society the principles of "rationalism." According to Zea, rationalism is "the supreme expression of modernity."<sup>6</sup> Applying the distinction of Ferdinand Toennies between community and society, Zea argues in a parallel fashion to Grant that rationalism "disengages the casual relation of means-end from the common life, making of the common life a more or less adequate means to the ends pursued by each individual in particular."<sup>7</sup> Rationalist principles and practices subordinate "collective entities, forms of common living founded in a whole of interests transcending individuals, to another form of common living which resides in the concrete interests of individuals."<sup>8</sup> Whereas in a community individuals are "knit together and live together in virtue of an end which transcends them," in a society "each individual looks for, in the common life, the elements that will allow his own betterment and that will guarantee that his efforts towards the social good will redound, in the end, to his own good."<sup>9</sup> Rationalism, then, though it releases individual energies and is the ground for technological achievement and material advance, destroys communities based on substantive norms and initiates a reign of selfishness in society.

The similarities of and differences between the thought of Grant and Zea can be grasped by focusing on their fundamental critiques of modernity and of its most advanced exemplar, the United States. Both the pragmatism described by Grant and the rationalism delineated by Zea destroy the bases of premodern communities by sweeping away belief in and commitment to substantive norms which limit the range of permissible activities of human beings towards one another. The dynamism of the United States is, then, for both thinkers a result of the liberation of American life from traditional restraints. Grant and Zea part company, however, when they discuss the dialectical opposite of community. For Grant modernity means the substitution of a new collectivism, humanism, for the traditionalism and communalism which has been superseded. The collective entity "man" is the subject of a "history," the meaning of which is control over nature for its own sake. In one of his most brilliant and profound images Grant connects the American space program with the will to mastery as an "end in itself": "To conquer space it may be necessary to transcend jordinary humanity, and produce creatures half flesh and half metal."<sup>10</sup> There is a sense of the demonic possibilities of modernity in Grant's thought which leads to the insight that the cruel irony of a pure humanism is the negation of a flesh and blood humanity and its substitution by an artificial species designed to exert its power over space and the things within it. For Zea, in contrast, modernity involves at

## MICHAEL WEINSTEIN

its root the destruction of all collective entities and their replacement with masses of detached individuals. The counterpart of Grant's demonism of the will in Zea's thought is greed or egoism. The essence of the American empire is not untrammelled conquest of nautre but unrestrained greed. The rationalist society achieves, for Zea, only such unity as is necessary for the most powerful of its components to satisfy their interests. The ideals of the American polity - "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" - are universal, but the practice of the American empire is to deny to other peoples the opportunity to achieve these ideals because it aims to appropriate the benefits of the industrial age for itself.

The differences between Grant's and Zea's critiques of the American empire may be related to the diverse circumstances in which they philosophize. Arthur Kroker has observed that Canada is "the most modern of modern nations," the one to which Albert Camus's "utterance on the absurd is most appropriate."<sup>11</sup> Canadian nationality is defined, by Kroker, as a tension "between destiny and exile, between nationalism and cosmopolitansim, between a form of identity rooted in a powerful and brooding sense of the Canadian homeland and an identity based on a flight beyond the homeland, in exile."<sup>12</sup> For Grant's generation exile prevailed over destiny and the greatest fruit of his vocation has been a "lament" for the absorption of Canada into the American technological complex. The most brilliant Canadians must choose, at a sacrifice, to remain "other" to the American empire. Most of them do not so choose and are welcomed into the empire, as the stunning successes of John Kenneth Galbraith, David Easton, and Marshall McLuhan demonstrate. In Kroker's sense of the modern situation, which is epitomized by the Camusian individual whose "exile is without remedy," Canada, not the United States, is the most modern place of all. Those who live in the United States are blinded by the power of their nation to the universal implications of their social patterns, which is why, perhaps, they need a Galbraith to teach them about the "technostructure," an Easton to translate political life into 'cybernetic language for them, and a McLuhan to explain television to them. The Canadian contribution to the social thought of the American empire has been great: Canadian liberals are the perfect exponents of the technological cosmopolis. Grant stands out against the cosmopolitan alternative, which he understands to mean service to the American empire. Yet he understands that Canada's fate is to be an auxiliary of American projects. Grant is aware that English Canadians share a Protestant culture with Americans and that both peoples are implicated in "the position where technological progress becomes itself the sole context within which all that is other to it must attempt to be present."<sup>13</sup> In order to gain an independence from the American empire Grant must wrench himself out of a social world which is his own - the world of the dynamic Great Lakes - and appeal to possibilities which have been superceded not only by history but by the form of "time as history." No wonder that Grant's vision penetrates to the demonism of the modern: Canadians are caught up, willingly or not, as integral participants in the adventures of the American empire.

In contrast to Grant, Zea speaks as an outsider, as one who has not been welcomed as a participant in American adventures, but whose nation has been

## LAMENT AND UTOPIA

used, so far as possible, as "prime matter," a "resource," an "instrument" by the United States. Whereas Grant must choose to marginalize himself with regard to the American empire Zea has no choice but to be marginalized. For Zea, modern history has been made by the "Occident," which includes France, England, and the United States. The successive leaders of the Occident have imposed their own values on the rest of the world declaring the ways of the others to be *infrahuman*. Those marginalized by the Occident have sought to imitate the dominant powers, not only as the expression of an inferiority complex, but because of the great material benefits brought by technology and the intrinsic appeal of democratic ideals. The failure of the Occident to share its material bounty and its political good with the rest of the world is, for Zea, the great historical fact of modernity. His experience is not that of being caught up in the technological whirlwind, but that of being excluded from full participation in modern life, of being a means to alien ends. Zea looks forward to the transcendence of greed and to the realization of a universal community based on the irreducible dignity of each person. He is of a people which is not at the cutting edge of modernity, but which is in a rapid process of modernization. He believes that the United States has failed to serve its ideals and that the torch of progress has passed to the oppressed peoples of the Third World who will promote a richer vision of universality in which community will be grounded in the shared condition of "solitude, suffering, and the need to resolve the urgent problems which assail all men, just by virtue of the simple fact that they are men."<sup>14</sup> Whereas Grant gains his leverage to critique the American empire from an appeal to the past, Zea transcends the rationalism of modernity with a utopian vision of a planetary community united by existential awareness. For Zea, humanism is not necessarily demonic, because its meaning may be ministrations to the finitude of each person, not the unrestrained will to control. Zea claims the right of the Third World to try to do better with technology and democracy than the American and Soviet empires have done. His hope, from the kind of viewpoint Grant takes, is that of one who has not yet become modernized enough to understand how technique creates its own totalization of the world.

Despite the differences in their interpretations of the essence of modernity and the basic principles of the American empire, Grant and Zea are in perfect agreement on what the society of the United States has become. According to Grant, the "doctrine of progress is not, as Marx believed, the perfectibility of man, but an open-ended progression in which men will be endlessly free to make the world as they want it."<sup>15</sup> "The very signature of modern man" is "to deny reality to any conception of good that imposes limits on human freedom."<sup>16</sup> Yet unleashing the "will to will" involves, in Grant's view, a deep and tragic irony. As a technological order of life is developed and as the impulse to mastery effectively turns on human nature itself, "the vaunted freedom of the individual to choose becomes either the necessity of finding one's role in the public engineering or the necessity of retreating into the privacy of pleasure."<sup>17</sup> Similarly to Grant, Zea observes that "in order to file down the rough edges of common living, assigning to each individual a place inside of which his action will encounter the least friction, individuals are transformed into tiny pieces of a colossal wheelworks of

## MICHAEL WEINSTEIN

a great machine which grows ever more powerful and the aim of which transcends the wishes of those who compose it."<sup>18</sup> Zea remarks that liberty, defined as "the capacity to act in another manner than that which has been programmed" is continually diminishing in the United States, and that unpredictability, improvisation, and useless and gratuitous expenditure, all of which are the sources of creative activity, are disappearing from American life.<sup>19</sup> Reflecting on the American quest for security Zea queries: "Security for whom? Little by little this who or someone is being lost."<sup>20</sup> Zea's vision of the contemporary Occident culminates in the striking thesis that "Occidental man has ended by dehumanizing himself, by transforming himself into the instrument of his instrument."<sup>21</sup> Puritanism, according to Zea, had made the Western individual the instrument of God's design on earth. But that individual has become purely an instrument of development, progress, and opulence.<sup>22</sup> Only the resistance of the oppressed to becoming adjuncts of the instrumental complex promises a vindication of humanity. Though Grant might not agree that Zea's hope is founded, he is at one with Zea on the description of society in the United States.

From their positions on the margins of the American empire, Grant, the self-conscious and voluntary other, and Zea, the excluded outsider, find the essence of that empire to be the drive towards a technological society. For both of them the horror of the contemporary age is to be dragooned into a social process in which human beings become means of their means who are unable to orient their action to achieve a genuine good. The urge to mastery which Grant finds at the heart of American society and the greed which Zea discovers there are, in principle, subject to no substantive limitation. Both thinkers were moved to their most profound and impassioned criticism of the American empire by the Vietnam War, Grant because of his noble shame at "being party to that outrage" and Zea because it provided him with the final confirmation that the United States could not be expected to move towards universalizing its values. Having concluded that the United States is a dangerous power whose citizens are so involved in reproducing and expanding their own social mechanism that they are incapable of caring for its consequences, neither Grant nor Zea suggests how the blind imperial beast might be tamed. Indeed, it is not their place to do so, but their failure to speak to the question of how empire might be limited shows how deep the effects of marginalization go. Since Hiroshima there has been a brooding sense throughout the world that the United States holds itself above substantive norms of public morality. In the thought of Grant and Zea that sense becomes articulate but has no practical issue.

### Beyond the Imperial Fact

The critiques made by Grant and Zea of the American empire and their identification of the United States with modernity itself impel them to look beyond modern life for their own normative commitments. Grant recurs to the premodern civilization of the West, the productive and uneasy synthesis of

## LAMENT AND UTOPIA

Athens and Jerusalem, to ground his critical standard, whereas Zea looks forward to an ideal society based on universal awareness of human suffering and finitude, though he often attempts to root that vision in the past by appealing to the Christian humanism of the Siglo de Oro and to the antipositivist philosophies which appeared in Latin America at the turn of the twentieth century. Grant's conservative vision, unlike the reactionary thought of the nineteenth century, grows out of a deep acquaintance with and assimilation of the liberal form of life, and a consequent reflection upon it. Philip Hanson remarks that as Grant thought through "the liberal trust in human history as the progressive reincarnation of reason" he could no longer "celebrate the new age" produced by this trust.<sup>23</sup> Grant, says Hanson, "became a spectator, waiting and listening to the speeches, rituals and strivings of a society dominated by technique."<sup>24</sup> Hanson aptly concludes that "only charity in its highest form can sustain a spectator in our technological age."<sup>25</sup> Grant's conservatism is informed by what the political philosopher Francisco Moreno calls "passionate humbleness."<sup>26</sup> The appeal to Greco-Christian natural law made by Grant is tinged with tragic irony: "For myself, as probably for most others, remembering only occasionally can pass over into thinking and loving what is good. It is for the great thinkers and the saints to do more."<sup>27</sup> In a manner analogous to Grant's conservatism Zea's progressivism has none of the easy optimism of nineteenth-century positivism. As Raymond Rocco points out, in Zea's view "all history *presumes* the principle of life, which, for Zea, means the life of each person."<sup>28</sup> Rocco notes that "the concepts of commitment, responsibility freedom," which Zea gains from his encounter with existentialism, have in his thought as "their common reference the dignity, the integrity and welfare of the person."<sup>29</sup> Zea, then, is not an exponent of unlimited progress, but a proponent, just as Grant is, of normative limitation progress, on dynamic action. That despite his affirmation of personalism Zea cannot avoid the nihilistic consequences of historicism is a critique suggested by Rocco. But the tension in Zea's thought does not detract from his clear intention to place normative restrictions on the acquisitive desires which are set free by a rationalistic and technological society.

Sustaining the complexity, self-criticism, and irony which characterize the attempts of Grant and Zea to push beyond modernity are the serious engagements of these thinkers with the features of human life which have been most clearly expressed in contemporary existentialism. Grant, like Camus, enters the discourse of existentialism through raising the question of the meaning of finite human life. In the most existentialist of his writings, the brief essay "A Platitude," he observes that though "the true account of the human situation" may indeed be "an unlimited freedom to make the world as we want in a universe indifferent to what purposes we choose," such an account implies that "we do not have a system of meaning."<sup>30</sup> For Grant, the great issue of contemporary civilization is how a system of meaning might be recovered. He suggests no program for renewal, because he believes the modern project to be all-encompassing, but appeals in the fashion of Heidegger to "listening for the intimations of deprivation," cultivating a sense of what has been lost in

## MICHAEL WEINSTEIN

technological society.<sup>31</sup> For Grant, "any intimations of authentic deprivation are precious, because they are the ways through which intimations of good, unthinkable in public terms, may yet appear to us."<sup>32</sup> In his essay "In Defense of North America" Grant articulated the paradox of North American life that "the very substance of our existing which has made us the leaders in technique stands as a barrier to any thinking which might be able to comprehend technique from beyond its own dynamism."<sup>33</sup> In "A Platitude" he suggests that "we do not know how unlimited are the potentialities of our drive to create ourselves and the world as we want it."<sup>34</sup> There are, perhaps, contradictions internal to technological society, for example, "the divided state which characterises individuals in modernity: the plush patina of hectic subjectivity lived out in the iron maiden of an objectified world inhabited by increasingly objectifiable beings."<sup>35</sup> Grant's opening to possible contradictions within modern life is less an offering of hope than a counsel to dispose oneself to listen, not to despair but to be alive to what may grow in the interstices of a world formed by technique and by its impulse to mastery.

Similarly to Grant Zea believes that the problem of meaning is central to contemporary life and thought. Zea shares Grant's preoccupation with the implications of a civilization for whose members history is the only horizon and observes that for contemporary human beings the problem of meaning is more profound than it was for those who lived in previous times. "The man of our times," says Zea, has "taken account of the historicity of essences and has been able to do so because he has remained without transcendental references to support himself."<sup>36</sup> All that is left to the contemporary individual, according to Zea, is "History and along with it immanentism: that is, not being able to find support in anything other than himself."<sup>37</sup> Just as Grant achieved insight into "time as history" from his encounters with the works of M.B. Foster, Nietzsche, Heidegger, and Leo Strauss, so Zea draws his inspiration from "the Historicism of Dilthey, Scheler and Ortega."<sup>38</sup> In particular Ortega's theme that the human condition is one of "shipwrecked being" resonates in Zea's work and unites it with Grant's informing vision that "our present is like being lost in the wilderness, when every pine and rock and bay appears to us as both known and unknown, and therefore as uncertain pointers on the way back to human habitation."<sup>39</sup> Zea, however, finds in historicism not only deprivation but promise. Historicism, for Zea, has made possible the recognition by Latin American thinkers that they belong to an authentic philosophical tradition by teaching them that all thought is an original and intelligible response to particular and concrete circumstances. By universalizing the circumstantiality of thought historicism allows Latin Americans to understand their intellectual history not as an inferior copy of successive European ideas but as an engagement with their social and cultural marginality. There is a sense in which Zea finds immanentism to be a challenge and opportunity. For Zea, contemporary thought has delivered human beings over to life, their radical reality: "What is important to the contemporary man is to live, without being preoccupied about whether this life is a dream or a reality."<sup>40</sup>

The marginality of Grant's and Zea's thought to the spirit of the American

## LAMENT AND UTOPIA

empire is most evident in their proclivities to take history seriously. Grant's "listening for the intimations of deprivation" and Zea's looking forward to a universal community add the dimensions of past and future respectively to the blind concern with the present of the American empire. As Zea points out, "the North Americans, one can say, have acted with views to a present already achieved which must be conserved, whereas the Ibero-Americans have acted with views to a future which ought to be realized."<sup>41</sup> Grant separates the primal Canadian project, now eclipsed, from Zea's North America and actualizes the sense of deprivation in a lament: "The impossibility of conservatism in our era is the impossibility of Canada. As Canadians we attempted a ridiculous task in trying to build a conservative nation in the age of progress, on a continent we share with the most dynamic nation on earth."<sup>42</sup> The present in which the American empire lives is not that of Whitehead's "drop of experience" which, as it perishes, still catches a piece of eternity, but the "specious present" of process, the treadmill which can only be named by the contradictory phrase—continuous change. American dynamism is at its core restlessness, not so much the will to will or greed, but in times of prosperity the will to get ahead and in times of decline the will to cope. Americans, as the protagonists of empire, have had the luxury not only of ignoring languages other than their own, but of ignoring the dimensions of time which are not actual, the symbolic past of spoliated possibility and the symbolic future of unrealized potentiality. The realization of time as history, then, may be a gift-curse of the marginal whereas the creation of time as history may be a by-product of technological empire.

How does an American, one who is concerned, as Grant is, to understand "what it is to live in the Great Lakes region of North America," join the discourse shaped by the independent contributions of Grant and Zea? Both of the great marginal philosophers demand that one be what Grant calls an "intellectual patriot" in order to engage them fully in discussion. The voice of the American must be a voice vindicating the present, not in the sense of justifying inequalities of power or of praising technological feats, but of cultivating a vivacious despair in what I can best call an open experience of the new world, an experience unencumbered by any symbolic projections of past or future. The American who dares to take time as history seriously should drink immanentism to the dregs and cultivate what William James in his best moments called "inward tolerance," an unflinching look at oneself and one's works. And what is that new world to which one should be open? It is a world in which mind has been collectivized and externalized in the mass media of communication and in which individual concern for the meaning of the totality no longer serves a public function but is inimical to scientific administration. It is the privilege of the American thinker to witness philosophy become anachronistic and the mind itself be drawn outside of itself. The plush patina of hectic subjectivity has become a sensory reaction to external images. The iron maiden of an objectified world has become a shock, a pill, a television screen. Can one tolerate one's own exteriorization from the outside? Can interiority be reclaimed? Those are questions raised by one who is in the empire and of it.

Department of Political Science  
Purdue University

# MICHAEL WEINSTEIN

## Notes

- \* I wish to thank Purdue University for awarding me a Fellowship at its Humanities Center under which this paper was written. I also wish to thank the staff of the Newberry Library in Chicago, particularly Ms. Karen Skubish and Mr. Richard H. Brown, for facilitating my research and for providing me with carrel space and the privileges of the Library.
1. Emilio Uranga, *Análisis del Ser del Mexicano*, México: Porrúa y Obregon. 1952, 70.
  2. John Oman, "Mysticism and its Expositors," *Hibbert Journal*, 26 (1927-28), 458.
  3. George Grant, *Philosophy in the Mass Age*, New York: Hill and Wang, 1960, 103.
  4. *Ibid.*
  5. George Grant, *Lament for a Nation: The Defeat of Canadian Nationalism*, Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1965, 89.
  6. Leopoldo Zea, *La Esencia de lo Americano*, Buenos Aires: Editorial Pleamar, 1971, 55.
  7. *Ibid.*
  8. *Ibid.*
  9. *Ibid.*
  10. Grant, *Lament*, 56.
  11. Arthur Kroker, "Migration from the Disciplines," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 15, 3 (1980), 4.
  12. Arthur Kroker, "Identity and the Flight Within," *Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory* 4, 3 (1980), 6.
  13. George Grant, "In Defence of North America," in Grant, *Technology and Empire*, Toronto: House of Anansi, 1969, 40.
  14. Zea, *La Esencia*, 102.
  15. Grant, *Lament*, 56.
  16. *Ibid.*
  17. *Ibid.*
  18. Zea, *La Esencia*, 64.
  19. *Ibid.*
  20. *Ibid.*
  21. Leopoldo Zea, *La Filosofía Americana Como Filosofía Sin Mas*, México: Siglo Veintiuno, 1969, 119.
  22. *Ibid.*
  23. Philip J. Hanson, "George Perkins Grant: A Negative Theologian speaks on Technology," unpublished manuscript, 3.
  24. *Ibid.*
  25. *Ibid.*

## LAMENT AND UTOPIA

26. Francisco J. Moreno, *Between Faith and Reason: An Approach to Individual and Social Psychology*, New York: New York University Press, 1977.
  27. George Grant, *Time as History*, Toronto: CBC Learning Systems, 1969, 52.
  28. Raymond Rocco, "Marginality and the Recovery of History: On Leopoldo Zea," *Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory* 4, 3 (1980), 44.
  29. *Ibid.*
  30. George Grant, "A Platitude," in Grant, *Technology and Empire*, 138.
  31. *Ibid.*, 141.
  32. *Ibid.*, 141.
  33. Grant, "In Defence of North America," in Grant, *Technology and Empire*, 40.
  34. Grant, "A Platitude," in Grant, *Technology and Empire*, 142.
  35. *Ibid.*
  36. Liopoldo Zea, *La Filosofía en México*; II, México: Biblioteca Mínima Mexicana, 1955, 137.
  37. *Ibid.*
  38. *Ibid.*, 254.
  39. Grant, *Time as History*, 52.
  40. Zea, *La Filosofía en México*; II, 221.
  41. Zea, *La Esencia*, 44.
  42. Grant, *Lament*, 68.
-