stationed and would pass on the knowledge in a clear and scholarly fashion, as did Mr. Osborne, international relations would look somewhat different from what they do today.
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This volume attempts two things: 1) to analyze critically the treatment of the Conquest by nineteenth-century historians; 2) to set forth a new approach to that history. With one exception (Prescott) the eight historians are Mexican: Bustamente, Alamán, Mora, José Fernando Ramírez, Orozco y Berra, Alfredo Chavero, and Justo Sierra. Each is allotted a chapter that consists of a thumbnail biography, an analysis of the author's treatment of the Conquest, and a bibliography of his publications. A final chapter, which reassesses the significance of the Conquest, is probably the most controversial section of the book.

The basic hypothesis of the volume is widely accepted—that the current Hispanista-Indigenista controversy is rooted in the Conquest itself, and that in turn modern historians reflect present-day tensions when they write on the Conquest. Rico González declares that neither historical school is founded on reality. "El hispanista tiene la vivencia de una España inexistente, fantástica. . . . El indigenista crea en su mente un mundo indígena que nunca existió." (Pp. 284.) He advocates instead a new concept, founded on historical relativism and determinism. The ideal historian should explain but not judge (pp. 270-71). He would discover that both conqueror and conquered played their roles within the narrow confines of historical necessity. In the new history there would be no room for good or evil; heroes or villains.

The historical approach advocated here will probably gain few adherents, however ideal it may appear in the abstract. Few historians of the Conquest will willingly forego all judgments; certainly some of them will challenge the concept of a rather narrowly defined historical determinism.
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